ABSTRACT

KENNEDY, SHANNON L. Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction of Community College Leaders. (Under the direction of Dr. Timothy G. Hatcher).

The purpose of the study was to examine the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators employed by community colleges in the nine mega-states. This research can guide future research on mentoring functions and job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators and guide practical implementation of mentoring programs in community colleges. Theoretical support for this research was Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (1994) Social Cognitive Career Theory. The survey instrument used for this research included demographic questions, the Mentoring Functions Scale (Noe, 1988), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Seven research questions guided the study: 1) How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive job satisfaction, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire? 2) How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, as measured by Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale? 3) Are there relationships between career support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? 4) Are there relationships between psychosocial support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? 5) Are there relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or
formally mentored? 6) Are there relationships between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored? 7) Do mentoring functions and demographic variables explain a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction?

The research method used was a non-experimental survey design. A random proportional cluster sample of executive-level community college administrators selected from the nine mega-states was used for the study. The Mentoring Functions Scale and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were used in the web-based survey to collect data. Data were collected over a three-week span yielding a total of 262 responses giving a 34.1% response rate.

Findings indicated that executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored are satisfied with their jobs. Further, participants reported perceived levels of both career support and psychosocial support. The level of career support, however, was higher. Correlations indicated that there is no relationship between the mentoring function of career support or psychosocial support and gender of protégé, gender of mentor, or type of mentoring relationship. Correlations also indicated protégés received more career support and psychosocial support in formal mentoring relationships than in informal mentoring relationships. Correlations revealed more female protégés received psychosocial support than male protégés and those in a formal mentoring relationship may have higher levels of overall job satisfaction than those protégés in an informal mentoring relationship. Overall, job satisfaction had no significant relationships with the demographic variables. However, as career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions
increased, overall job satisfaction increased. A regression showed that career support could
be used to explain 53.1% of the variance of overall job satisfaction.
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Chapter One

Introduction

This chapter introduces research investigating career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions as well as the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of informally or formally mentored executive-level community college administrators. The study was conducted with a sample of executive-level community college administrators from the nine mega-state community colleges (Palmer, 2008). To provide context, community colleges and their current issues and career development of community college leaders are discussed. Mentoring and mentoring functions and are also discussed in this chapter. Job satisfaction is defined and the literature related to job satisfaction and community college administrators is discussed. The research problem is identified and the purpose for this research is explained.

The theoretical framework which supports the study is presented as is the conceptual framework that illustrates the relationship of the study variables. The research questions that guided the study are also presented. Chapter one concludes with the significance, the limitations, and the delimitations of the research.

This research focuses on the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction and the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support of informally or formally mentored executive-level community college administrators. To better understand the research, it is important to understand the context of the community colleges.

Since they were founded in 1901, community colleges have evolved from junior and technical colleges to comprehensive, complex institutions (Amey, VanDerLinden, & Brown,
2002; Piland & Wolf, 2003; VanDerLinden, 2004; Wallin, 2002). Community colleges now enroll nearly half of all undergraduate students (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013) and are recognized as the leaders in the United States in workforce development (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). According to Mullin and Phillippe (2013), community colleges operate as economic engines. They posit that the community college is a launching pad for first-time students and a re-launching pad for individuals that need retraining for the changing economy. Mullin and Phillippe (2013) argued community colleges are also vital to the communities they serve because of their responsiveness to the local community’s needs. Because of the workforce development mission of more than 1,100 community colleges in the United States serving over eight million students (Mullin & Philippe, 2013), the study of community colleges is important and relevant. Moreover, it is clear that community colleges have a significant impact on our economy and our communities (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Mullin & Phillippe, 2013); therefore, the continued success of community colleges is critical. However, community colleges are facing significant challenges. Shrinking resources, diverse student bodies, fluctuating enrollments, aging faculty, retiring leaders and executives, changing technology, decreasing student skills, the effects of globalization, and conflicts over institutional missions are some of the issues facing today’s community college (Amey, 2005; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Ebbers, Gallisath, Rockel, & Coyan, 2000; Eddy, 2005; McNair, Duree, & Ebbers, 2011; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Townsend & Bassoppo-Moyo, 1997). These issues make community colleges very complex and diverse institutions and dealing with these challenges requires strong leadership (Piland & Wolf, 2003). As mentioned one of the significant issues facing community colleges today is the retirements of community college
executive-level administrators (McNair et al., 2011). Replacing individuals to retirement is difficult enough but to exacerbate the problem, there are not enough qualified replacements in the pipeline (Boggs, 2003). These retirements and the lack of replacements in the pipeline are driving the critical need for empirical research such as the present study of career development of administrators within the community college environment (Piland & Wolf, 2003). The next section focuses on the career development of the administrators that are leading or will be leading the nation’s community colleges.

**Career Development of Community College Leaders**

Community college administrators must be prepared to handle the challenges of their position and have a thorough understanding of the community college in order to lead these complex institutions (Piland & Wolf, 2003). One way to accomplish this is through career development. Career development is defined as a continual process of making and adjusting to career choices due to evolving self-concepts and occupational opportunities (Osborne, Brown, Niles, & Miner, 1997). Career development of community college administrators was not emphasized until the retirements of administrators, including presidents, became a significant problem in the early 2000s (McNair et al., 2011; Piland & Wolf, 2003). With the empirical and anecdotal evidence suggesting a leadership gap due to retirements, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) was prompted to put an increased emphasis on career development of current community college faculty, staff, and administrators by offering leadership programs and developing competencies for community college presidents. According to the AACC, “The development and availability of well-
prepared leaders is vital to the continued success of community colleges and their students” (AACC, n.d.).

According to Carroll and Romero (2003), career development for executive-level community college administrators has focused on leadership training often with multiple approaches including graduate coursework and leadership development programs. Graduate coursework has included the study of community college economics, politics, educational policy, and organizational change (University of Texas, 2012). Leadership development programs take different approaches. For example, one program holds monthly seminars on different leadership topics like “leadership theories, concepts, and practices” and “understanding and leading complex academic and public organizations” (Crosson, Douglas, O’Meara, & Sperling, 2005, p. 54).

While beneficial, the programs take a broad look at community colleges and not necessarily at the nuances of the state in which the community college is located or the characteristics of each individual community college (Carroll & Romero, 2003). More is needed than a purely academic approach (Piland & Wolf, 2003).

One example of a career development program for aspiring administrators and presidents that uses a multi-faceted approach is the Community College Leadership Academy (CCLA), which was developed in Massachusetts to prepare faculty and administrators for administrative positions becoming available (Crosson et al., 2005). CCLA incorporates academic enrichment, including the opportunity to earn academic credit, monthly seminars, a summer residency, and an assigned mentor. Mentoring is included in most of the career development programs for community college leaders (Carroll & Romero,
This includes AACC sponsored-programs for community college administrators including the AACC John E. Roueche Future Leaders Institute (Roueche - FLI) for mid-level administrators and the Future Presidents Institute (FPI) for senior-level administrators on the path to a presidency (AACC Leadership Suite, n.d.). Mentoring of community college administrators is a career development method to meet the increasing shortage of leaders (Shults, 2001; VanDerLinden, 2005) and provides a more relevant set of skills than other approaches (VanDerLinden, 2005).

**Mentoring and Community College Leaders**

While studies related to mentoring in the community college primarily focus on faculty and students (Galbraith & James, 2004; Perez, 1998; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007), research shows a majority of current community college administrators have had a mentor. In a 2001 AACC survey of community college presidents, 57 percent indicated that a mentor had been instrumental in helping them obtain their current position (Shults, 2001). Even more critical, 62 percent said that a mentor had been valuable or very valuable in preparing the president for the challenges and tasks of the position (Shults, 2001). In a study of community college administrators, VanDerLinden (2005) found that 56 percent of administrators had a mentor during their career. Gender and relationship type were not addressed by either Shults (2001) or VanDerLinden (2005). However, VanDerLinden (2005) found that mentors of community college administrators provide encouragement and advice, serve as a reference, help develop professional networks, encourage professional development and additional education, provide training on a specific skill, and advise on the political aspects of the job. McDade’s (2005) research found that support and challenge,
motivation, evaluation, creation of networks, modeling, and awareness of leadership highlighted the mentoring relationship of the protégés of community college presidents in informal mentoring relationships. Valeau and Boggs (2004) suggested that a community college mentor in a formal mentoring relationship assists “in developing advanced management skills, acquiring personal contacts, and, most important, becoming socialized into the values that are expected of senior college leadership” (p. 49).

Even with data to support the idea that a mentor provides valuable mentoring functions to administrators, there has been surprisingly little research on the mentoring functions and outcomes, such as job satisfaction, mentoring has had on community college administrators. A large percentage of the research related to mentoring within the community college context deals with the mentoring of students (Galbraith & James, 2004; Howard & Grosset, 1992; Perez, 1998) and faculty (Schrodt, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007).

As a career development intervention/tool, mentoring has been shown to have numerous benefits for the protégé (the person receiving mentoring) including higher expectations for advancement; career and job satisfaction; organizational commitment; higher levels of compensation; salary growth; reduced turnover and job stress; and, more promotions than individuals without mentors (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2007; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Lee & del Carmen Montiel, 2011). Organizations benefit from increased communication, succession planning, organizational socialization, employee retention, and productivity (Allen, et al., 2004; Chao, 2007; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Zey, 1988). Ensher, Thomas, and Murphy (2001) argued,
“Mentoring appears to be a win-win intervention with positive benefits accruing to not only individual protégés but to work groups and the organization itself” (p. 420).

Mentoring in the workplace is described as a relationship between two individuals where one, typically a senior employee, teaches the other about his or her job, facilitates networking, orients the junior employee about the industry and the organization, and coaches with regard to social and personal issues (Allen, 2006; Kram, 1985).

There are two distinct functions of mentoring. Kram (1985) defined mentoring functions as both career support and psychosocial support. Career support enhances career advancement, while psychosocial functions enhance competence and sense of identity (Kram, 1985).

Career functions help protégés learn about the organization and help prepare them for advancement (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Career functions, as described by Kram (1985), primarily aid in career development of the protégé (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007). Career support includes sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and providing challenging assignments (Ragins, & Kram, 2007).

According to Kram, “Psychosocial functions are those aspects of a relationship that enhance an individual’s sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role” (1985, p. 32). Psychosocial functions also build on trust, intimacy, and relationship bonds (Ragins & Kram, 2007). The psychosocial functions depend on the quality of the interpersonal relationship and the benefits impact not only the career of the protégé but other areas of his or her life. Kram (1985) lists psychosocial support as role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship.
Another important component of mentoring is whether the relationship is informal or formal. Informal mentoring develops because of shared interests, job demands, and admiration between two individuals and is mutual (Noe, 1988; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). By definition, formal mentoring relationships are initiated by the organization (Eby & Lockwood, 2005) and include defined roles and responsibilities, goals, and an evaluation process (Zachary, 2005; P-Sontag, Vappie, & Wanberg, 2007). According to Ragins and Cotton (1999), protégés with informal mentoring relationships receive greater benefits than those in formal mentoring relationships. Chao et al. (1992), in their study of alumni from a large university and a small private institute, found that informally mentored protégés reported higher levels of job satisfaction, salary, and organizational socialization than protégés in formal mentoring relationships. Studies have shown the benefits of informal relationships in the community college (McDade, 2005; VanDerLinden, 2005). Research also supports the benefits of the few formal mentoring programs in community colleges (Valeau & Boggs, 2004; Van Ast & Field, 2005). Van Ast and Field (2005) found community college faculty members in a structured mentoring program were rated to be more effective by students than non-mentored faculty. Valeau and Boggs (2004) found that 92 percent of respondents found the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) mentoring program for aspiring community college leaders to be at least somewhat positive and 97 percent would recommend the program to others.

Another important variable in mentoring is gender. Research shows that gender impacts mentoring functions and outcomes (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). In a 1999 study, Ragins
and Cotton found that protégés with a history of male mentors received greater compensation than protégés with a history of female mentors. They further found that male protégés with female mentors reported less career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions than any other gender combination (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). VanDerLinden (2004) found 62% of women community college administrators had a mentor while only 56% of male administrators had a mentor. However, the gender of the mentor or the protégé are not the only gender concerns. The gender make-up of the dyad is also important. Cross-gender relationships, argues Kram (1985), are problematic (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Kram, 2007). Men and women often form traditional roles from past situations and this leads to an unsatisfactory experience of the protégé (Kram, 1985). More recently, Dougherty, Turban, and Haggard (2007), found cross-gender relationships are less beneficial long-term. The major issues associated with cross-gender mentoring relationships are the limitations of role modeling, intimacy and sexual concerns, public scrutiny, and peer resentment (Dougherty et al., 2007).

On the other hand, there are hidden advantages to cross-gender relationships. Kram (1985) suggested that that public scrutiny forces both the mentor and the protégé to manage their relationships in the context of the organization. Noe (1988) found mentors in cross-gender relationships used the relationship more effectively by valuing the mentor than those in same-gender mentoring relationships. Little is known about the gender composition of mentoring relationships among community college administrators.
The research on mentoring suggests that there are benefits to the protégé including job satisfaction. The next section discusses job satisfaction, mentoring, and community college leaders.

**Job Satisfaction and Mentoring**

Mentoring has been shown to have positive career development benefits for the protégé. One of those benefits is job satisfaction (Ensher et al., 2001). The variable of job satisfaction is the most frequently studied in the field of organizational behavior (Spector, 1997). Multiple studies have shown individuals with mentors have greater levels of job satisfaction (Fagenson, 1989; Phillips & Imhoff, 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1992; van Emmerik, 2004). Ensher et al. (2001) found that mentoring was a significant predictor of job satisfaction in their study of 142 protégés in informal mentoring relationships.

While many studies exist on job satisfaction, there are limited studies in the literature on job satisfaction of community college administrators. In a study of community college leadership teams, Chieffo (1991) found involvement in the decision-making process impacts the job satisfaction of the leadership team. Chieffo (1991) defined the leadership team as administrators excluding the college president. Further, Chieffo (1991) found that community college administrators with greater role clarity had a higher level of job satisfaction. In the introduction to the study, Chieffo (1991) revealed that a search of the literature yielded no other studies examining job satisfaction of community college administrators. After a review of the literature, the same is still true even though the benefits of job satisfaction have been validated in other career fields (Allen et al., 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2007).
Studies dealing with job satisfaction and community colleges relate to members of the faculty and staff, not administrators, as evidenced by a review of the literature. For example, McBride, Munday, and Tunnell (1992) studied whether job satisfaction impacted the propensity to leave of full-time community college faculty. McBride et al. (1992) concluded that faculty in the study were generally satisfied with their jobs. In a study of part-time community college faculty, Valadez and Anthony (2001) found that salary, benefits, and job security were important issues negatively impacting job satisfaction. However, the study revealed part-time faculty participants were satisfied with their roles (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). Bauer (2000) found that rewards and recognition, personal choice and empowerment, work-life balance, and growth through training and development contributed to the job satisfaction of frontline community college staff.

While research exists showing the positive relationship between having a mentor and job satisfaction, studies focused on the satisfaction of workers within traditional corporate occupations like engineering (Ragins & Cotton, 1999), manufacturing (Scandura, 1992), and healthcare (Fagenson, 1989). Again, very little research has been done on the relationship between mentoring and job satisfaction among community college administrators (VanDerLinden, 2005).

The complex nature of community colleges has made career development of executive-level community college administrators critical for the future success of community colleges (Piland & Wolf, 2003). An impending shortage of community college leaders has further exacerbated the problem (Boggs, 2003; McNair et al., 2011; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002) and thus supports the present study. Most executive-level community
college administrators, particularly presidents, have community college experience (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002; 2007). Therefore, it is logical to develop administrators from current community college employees. With the realization that community college administrators are usually current community college employees and the acknowledgment that job satisfaction leads to positive outcomes for both the organization (Ensher et al., 2001) and the employee (Allen et al., 2004), community colleges should value and work to achieve higher levels of overall job satisfaction among community college administrators. Mentoring has been linked to higher levels of job satisfaction in employees in a variety of disciplines (Allen et al., 2004). The present study addresses the lack of research regarding mentoring functions and job satisfaction in the community college environment.

**Problem Statement**

The increasing complexity and ever-changing challenges of community colleges are well documented (Amey, 2005; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Eddy, 2005; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Townsend & Bassoppo-Moyo, 1997). Furthermore, the literature on the impact of impending retirements of community college presidents and administrators that typically fill vacant presidencies is also plentiful (Boggs, 2003; McNair et al., 2011; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002).

Mentoring has played an important role in the leadership development and the development of skills, knowledge, and abilities of community college leaders (Shults, 2001; VanDerLinden, 2005). The construct of mentoring consists of two dimensions – career and psychosocial support. Mentoring functions have been associated with job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004). Job satisfaction has been associated with positive work outcomes for both the
Much of the research on mentoring and job satisfaction and executive leadership is from corporate environments including engineering and manufacturing and from healthcare (Fagenson, 1989; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1992). In academia, mentoring and job satisfaction studies are generally conducted with university faculty as participants (Smith, Smith, & Markham, 2000). Few studies examined mentoring and job satisfaction in the community college environment, particularly with community college administrators as participants (Chieffo, 1991; VanDerLinden, 2005).

Studies with mentoring, mentoring functions, and job satisfaction with leaders are well-documented within the career development and business-oriented job satisfaction literature; however, the problem is that there is little research available on mentoring functions and job satisfaction conducted within a community college environment. Even less empirical evidence exists on mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and the extent that these functions can be used to explain variance in the overall job satisfaction of mentored community college administrators (Noe, 1998; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The present study surveyed executive-level administrators from nine states (California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas). Executive-level community college administrators are important because 1) the success of the community college depends in part on its leaders (Vaughan, 2006), and 2) because very few studies have been conducted with this group (Chieffo, 1991). The community colleges in the nine states in the sample are designated as “mega-state
community colleges” by Palmer (2008) because the states account for more than 50% of the national total for state appropriations to education. According to Palmer (2008), because just nine states make up 50% of the total of all state spending on education, these nine states are important in educationally-based research studies like the present study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to investigate the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support as measured by Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale, and the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) of mentored executive-level community college administrators employed by the mega-state community colleges. The research seeks to measure perceptions of overall job satisfaction of mentored community college leaders. Additionally, the research seeks to determine the mentoring functions, career support and psychosocial support, received by mentored community college leaders. Further, the research explores if relationships exist between the mentoring functions of executive-level community college administrators and the demographic variables of gender of administrator, gender of mentor, relationship type (informal or formal), and most influential relationship type if the protégé experienced both an informal and formal relationship. The research also explores if relationships exist between overall job satisfaction of mentored community college leaders and demographic variables of gender of administrator (respondent), gender of mentor, relationship type (informal or formal), and most influential relationship if the respondent had both an informal and a formal mentoring relationship and between mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction of mentored leaders. Lastly, the research determined if the mentoring
functions of career and psychosocial support could be used to explain a significant amount of variance in the overall job satisfaction of mentored community college administrators.

Theoretical Framework

Because of the nature of mentoring as a career development tool, career development theory as espoused by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) supports the present study of mentoring. Similarly, job satisfaction can be tied to career development; therefore, career development theory can also serve as the foundation for studies involving job satisfaction (Dawis, 1991). The career development theory suitable to the changing community college environment (Amey, 2005) and the social nature of the community college (VanDerLinden, 2005; Vaughan, 2006) is Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT). Developed by Lent et al. (1994), SCCT explains the formation and elaboration of career-relevant interests, selection of careers, and performance and persistence within an occupation, and job satisfaction (Lent & Brown, 2006). SCCT is based on Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory and more recently, Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory. SCCT is the most appropriate foundational theory for the present study because it supports both the social nature of the community college (VanDerLinden, 2005) and the use of mentoring and job satisfaction as career development tools (Barnett & Bradley, 2007; Keller, 2007). Social Learning Theory was also the basis for Noe’s (1988) development of the Mentoring Functions Scale designed to measure the two mentoring functions of career and psychosocial support.

As it relates to career development, Bandura (1986) suggested that occupational endeavors depend on cognitive and social competencies. Social learning theory combines elements of behaviorist and cognitive orientation (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Bandura
(1977) suggested that human behavior is learned by modeling others. He argued, “Because people can learn from example what to do, at least in approximate form, before performing any behavior, they are spared needless errors” (Bandura, 1977, p. 22). Social learning theory has also been used in the study of mentoring (Keller, 2007). Keller (2007) researched how mentoring relationships influence youth development with social learning theory as a basis. Noe (1988) suggested that mentors, through modeling, can facilitate the personal and professional development of protégés.

One of the most studied variables in career development research is mentoring (Kram & Bragar, 1992). Mentoring in the workplace is defined as a relationship between two individuals where one (the mentor), typically a senior employee, teaches the other about his or her job, facilitates networking, orients the junior employee about the industry and the organization, and coaches with regard to social and personal issues (Kram, 1985; Allen, 2006). Mentoring has two functions: career support and psychosocial support. The concept of mentoring using these two-dimensions has received empirical support in several studies (Chao, et al., 1992; Noe, 1988; Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

According to Keller (2007), social cognitive theory “is highly relevant for mentoring because it explicitly addresses the observation of a model as an important mode of learning” (p. 39). The work of a community college administrator is social in nature (VanDerLinden, 2005); therefore, SCCT is appropriate to use in studying community college administrators. SCCT is also appropriate in the study of job satisfaction. According to Lent and Brown (2006), SCCT helps build a more comprehensive understanding of job satisfaction by considering how cognitive, environmental, and other factors impact job satisfaction. In a
2005 study, Lent, Singley, Sheu, Gainor, Brenner, Treistman, and Ades, “confirmed the utility of the social cognitive model of domain-specific and global life satisfaction” (p. 438). According to Lent et al. (2005) one domain-specific satisfaction measure is job satisfaction.


Other theories such as social capital theory (VanDerLinden, 2005; vanEmmerik, 2004) have been used in the study of mentoring and job satisfaction with community college administrators and faculty. Social capital relates to the social nature of the community college environment; however, it is not a career development theory. Since the framework of the present study is career development, SCCT was a more appropriate theoretical foundation.

With the changing, complex nature of the community college environment, having qualified administrators has become critically important. Having a mentor that provides career and psychosocial support has been shown to increase job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2007; Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Further, job satisfaction, which has been shown to reduce turnover (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974), has the opportunity to keep qualified community college administrators on the job at a time when qualified and committed leaders are needed most. SCCT fully supports the purpose of the present study. The next section includes the conceptual framework which describes the relationship between the variables.
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for the present study describes the variables in the study and how they related to each other to examine the research questions. The independent variables in the present study were the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, and the demographics of gender of the administrator (respondent), gender of the mentor, whether the community college administrator has been in an informal or formal mentoring relationship, and if in both types of mentoring relationships, the most influential type. The dependent variable was the measurement of job satisfaction.

The conceptual framework is based on a model by Ramaswami and Dreher (2007) which, similar to the present study, used Social Cognitive Career Theory. They suggested that mentoring functions have individual and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, salary attainment, and productivity/performance. With the exception of job satisfaction, outcomes, such as reduced turnover, were not a part of the present study because there was significant empirical evidence that mentoring functions can predict reduced turnover, work commitment, organizational socialization, and organizational success (Allen et al., 2004; Chao et al., 1992; Ensher et al., 2001; Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001; McBride, et al., 1992).

The model further incorporates the mentor-protégé relationship type defined as formal or informal mentoring. The model is modified because the original model fails to incorporate gender which is clearly identified in the related literature as a significant variable (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Figure 1.1 is an illustration of the conceptual framework for the present study.
The variable of mentoring functions was measured by Noe’s (1988) mentoring functions scale and included both career and psychosocial support. Both mentoring functions, career and psychosocial support, have an impact on the overall job satisfaction of employees. Using meta-analysis, Allen et al. (2004) found both career and psychosocial support generate positive attitudes about one’s job.

Job satisfaction is the dependent (outcome) variable because variables used to measure mentoring functions may be directly related to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined by Spector (1997) as how people feel about their job(s). The MSQ Short Form
measures one’s overall job satisfaction. Previous research suggested that job satisfaction is one variable (Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996; Ensher et al., 2001; Scandura, 1997).

The demographic variables were gender of administrator (respondent), gender of mentor, relationship type (informal or formal), and most influential relationship type if the respondent had both. The gender composition of the mentoring relationship is critical to mentoring functions and outcomes (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). According to Allen et al. (2004), male mentors provide more career support to protégés of either gender while female mentors provide more psychosocial support to protégés of either gender. Similarly, Godshalk and Sosik (2007) found female mentors provided more role-modeling (a component of the psychosocial function of mentoring) and less career support than male mentors. They also found that male protégés perceived more psychosocial support from female mentors. Conversely, female protégés perceived more career support from male mentors.

Cross-gender mentoring relationships have been shown to be problematic by limiting role modeling, creating concerns of intimacy, sex, public scrutiny, and peer resentment (Kram, 1985). However, mentors in cross-gender relationships use the relationship more effectively than their counterparts in same-gender relationships (Noe, 1988; Ragins & Kram, 2007).

The majority of mentoring relationships are informal (Noe, 1988). The mentoring relationship develops because of shared interests, job demands, and admiration between two individuals (Noe, 1988). On the other hand, formal mentoring is defined as efforts initiated by an organization to match mentors with protégés (Eby & Lockwood, 2005). Formal
mentoring relationships are usually short term, have clearly defined roles and responsibilities and an evaluation of the process is completed (P-Sontag et al., 2007; Zachary, 2005).

According to P-Sontag et al. (2007), formal mentoring is not intended to replace informal mentoring relationships. The primary purpose is to take advantage of workplace relationships in a structured manner. This approach not only supports an individual’s career development but may also facilitate the completion of organizational goals such as diversity enhancement, succession planning, and employee retention (P-Sontag et al., 2007).

Chao et al. (1992) found that informally mentored protégés reported higher levels of job satisfaction, salary, and organizational socialization. According to Eby and Lockwood (2005), mentors in formal mentoring relationships are shown to be more disinterested, self-absorbed, and neglectful than mentors in informal mentoring relationships. However, Eby and Lockwood (2005) argued that formal mentoring relationships have a different purpose and therefore provide unique benefits. Some of those benefits include learning, career planning, and coaching on day-to-day work challenges. Research studies on formal mentoring programs in community colleges are few; however, those that exist, in California and Iowa, for example, have been successful, according to Valeau and Boggs (2004) and Van Ast and Field (2005).

The next section documents the research questions used in the present study.

**Research Questions**

Seven research questions were developed to support and provide guidance for the present study’s problem and purpose. Each research question identified is followed by the
kind of research method used to answer the question. For more details on methods used in the present study, see below and Chapter Three: Research Methods:

Research question one: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive job satisfaction, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire? (means, standard deviation)

Research question two: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, as measured by Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale? (means, standard deviation)

Research question three: Are there relationships between career support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? (Correlation – Pearson’s)

Research question four: Are there relationships between psychosocial support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? (Correlation – Pearson’s)

Research question five: Are there relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored? (Correlation – Pearson’s)

Research question six: Are there relationships between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction of executive-level
community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored?

(Correlation – Pearson’s)

Research question seven: Do mentoring functions and demographic variables explain a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction? (Multiple regression)

The next section explains the research methods used in the study.

**Research Methods**

The research methods for the present study used a quantitative, non-experimental survey research design. The population consisted of all of the executive-level community college administrators from the nine mega-state community colleges located in the United States. A random proportional cluster sampling procedure was used to ensure that the number of community colleges equally represented based on the population from each of the nine mega-states. Random proportional cluster sampling was most appropriate because it was inexpensive over a large geographical area (Sproull, 2002).

Executive-level administrators from the nine mega-state community colleges were surveyed using items from two instruments, the Mentoring Functions Scale developed by Noe (1988) and the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss et al. (1967). Using Cronbach’s Alpha, Day and Allen (2004), reported internal reliability from .79 to .94. The Mentoring Functions Scale has a previously published construct validity substantiated by confirmatory factor analysis (Tepper, Shaffer, & Tepper, 1996). The MSQ has a reliability of .90 and measures satisfaction in accordance with the Theory of Work Adjustment proving construct validity (Weiss et al., 1967). Evidence for support of this claim is obtained from construct validation studies of the Minnesota
Importance Questionnaire and other studies based on the Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss et al., 1967).

In addition to the items from the two survey instruments, data related to demographic characteristics was also collected from the participants. The survey instruments were administered online. Data were collected from executive-level administrators employed during the 2012-2013 academic year. See Chapter Three for a detailed explanation of the methods used in the present study, including the sampling procedures, data collection procedures, validity and reliability of the measurements used, response rates, and data analysis techniques.

**Significance of the Study**

The present study of mentoring functions and job satisfaction of community college leaders is significant for several reasons. First, concern exists because of impending retirements of current and potential community college leaders (McNair et al., 2011). With shortages of community college leaders continuing to be a threat to the success of the community college and workforce development, career development has become important to groups like the AACC (Boggs, 2003). One method of career development, which will reduce turnover and assist in keeping community college leaders working in community colleges, is mentoring. Mentoring consists of two distinct functions – career support and psychosocial support. Individuals who receive mentoring functions have higher levels of overall job satisfaction. Research shows employees with higher levels of job satisfaction are less likely to leave an organization (Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001; McBride et al., 1992). In a time when a shortage of qualified community college leaders is of concern, reducing turnover
by improving job satisfaction is critical to the continued success of the community college, thereby making the study significant.

Community colleges play a significant role in workforce training (Cohen & Brawer, 2003) and economic development (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013; Vaughan, 2006). Further, community colleges enroll nearly half of all undergraduate students in the United States of America (“Students at Community Colleges,” 2012; Vaughan, 2006). The number of students and the role of community colleges on the local and national level make community colleges worthy of study. The success of the community college depends, in part, on its leaders (Vaughan, 2006) so understanding how mentoring functions impact job satisfaction of community college leaders is important to the future of community colleges.

Finally, research on mentoring functions and job satisfaction of community college leaders fills a gap in the related literature. The results of the study could be helpful to community colleges and community college systems all across the United States interested in developing and retaining future leaders which is necessary because of impending retirements and the lack of replacements in the pipeline.

**Definition of Terms**

Mentoring, career support, psychosocial support, job satisfaction, formal mentoring relationship, informal mentoring relationship, career development, community college, and community college executive-level administrators are important terms that need to be defined for this research. This section contains the theoretical definition of these terms used throughout the study. More detail about each term will be provided in Chapter Two: Literature Review.
Career Development

Career development is a continual process of making adjusting to career choices due to evolving self-concepts and occupational opportunities (Osborne et al., 1997).

Community College

A community college is a public, comprehensive, regionally accredited institution of higher education that typically offers the associate degree as its highest degree (Vaughan, 2006).

Career support

Career support enhances career advancement and helps protégés learn about the organization (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Career support includes sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and providing challenging assignments (Kram, 1985).

Community College Executive-Level Administrator

A community college executive-level administrator is defined as a president, executive vice president, vice president, or a senior-level employee that reports directly to the president.

Formal Mentoring Relationship

Formal mentoring relationships are initiated by the organization (Eby & Lockwood, 2005) and include defined roles and responsibilities, goals, and an evaluation process (P-Sontag et al., 2007; Zachary, 2005).

Informal Mentoring Relationship
Informal mentoring develops because of shared interests, job demands, and admiration between two individuals (Noe, 1988).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is simply the extent to which people like their jobs (Spector, 1997).

**Mentoring**

Using the traditional workplace definition, mentoring is defined as an intense interpersonal relationship between an older, experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced, younger colleague (protégé) in which the mentor provides career and psychosocial support (Kram, 1985; Russell & Adams, 1997; VanDerLinden, 2005).

**Psychosocial support**

“Psychosocial functions are those aspects of a relationship that enhance an individual’s sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role” (Kram, 1985, p. 32). Psychosocial support includes role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship.

**Limitations**

This study had a number of limitations. Because the data were collected through a survey, the first limitation was self-reporting bias. All data collected were self-reported by the participants. The second limitation was the need for respondents to understand or conceptualize mentoring and job satisfaction as I intended.

The study had limitations because of the use of an internet-based survey tool. Due to the use of an online survey, a low response rate was expected (Dillman, 2007) but not experienced. The study was also conducted over a short period of time, from September 7 to
September 28, 2012. Individuals who may have been out of the office at length or who do not promptly check email may have not had time to respond to the survey.

Finally, the research is limited because of the correlational design of the study. While a correlational study can show a relationship between variables, it cannot prove that one variable causes change in another variable.

**Delimitations**

The research also has a number of delimitations which bound the survey. The study is bound by the population which includes executive-level community college administrators in the nine mega-states in the United States. A proportional random cluster sample was used to address the fact that each of the nine mega-states had a different number of community colleges. Generalizability is limited to the nine states in the samples rather than all fifty states in the U.S.

The study is further delimited because it is confined to a specific time – a sample of executive-level community college administrators employed during the 2012-2013 academic year. Also, there was the possibility that the mentoring relationship occurred at some point in the past and respondents may not remember the details of the relationship. Finally, the study is delimited by the use of two instruments with one measuring mentoring functions and the other measuring job satisfaction.

**Summary**

While job satisfaction of community college administrators has been researched, there is still very little empirical research. Research on the relationship mentoring functions have with overall job satisfaction of community college administrators is even more limited.
The research study investigated the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction with mentored community college administrators. The study builds on and expands previous research of the construct of mentoring functions by reviewing the literature and empirically researching the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall levels of job satisfaction in the community college context.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This study investigated mentoring functions and job satisfaction among mentored executive-level community college administrators with reference to the demographic variables of gender and type of mentoring relationship (informal or formal). The review of the literature includes a discussion of the context of the study, including community colleges and community college executive-level administrators. This is followed by a discussion of career development theories and Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) in particular, and the published empirical research that used career development and SCCT theories. Career development theories that support the variables of mentoring and job satisfaction are also discussed and a justification for the use of SCCT is presented. An examination of the published research on mentoring and mentoring functions is then offered. Mentoring is also examined with respect to the variables of gender, type of mentoring relationship, and the most influential relationship if a protégé has had both an informal and formal mentoring relationship. Finally, the review includes a discussion of job satisfaction and job satisfaction and mentoring.

The Community College

In order to understand the study, it is important to understand the context in which the study occurs. In the present study, the population was executive-level administrators that work in community colleges. Research with this population is important because the success of community colleges is dependent, in part, on its leaders (Vaughan, 2006) and very little research has been conducted with this group (Chieffo, 1991; VanDerLinden, 2005).
Community colleges offer credit and noncredit courses to a broad constituency and typically serve as cultural, social, and intellectual hubs in the community (Vaughan, 2006). Community colleges are different than other higher education institutions because of their focus on open door access, equity, comprehensiveness of offerings, and teaching and learning (Vaughan, 2006). For the purpose of this research, a community college is defined as a public, comprehensive, regionally accredited higher education institution that typically offers the associate degree as its highest degree (Vaughan, 2006).

Since 1901 with the opening of Joliet Junior College, community colleges have filled a unique place in higher education (Piland & Wolf, 2003). Community colleges, along with other educational institutions, grew out of a need to train workers to operate America’s growing industries in the early 1900s (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Junior colleges were developed in several states because of the idea that universities did not need to be burdened with freshman and sophomore classes. The concept garnered significant support, especially in California, where nearly two junior colleges opened every year from 1910 to 1960 (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Junior and community colleges continued to grow during the nineteenth century, but the most significant growth occurred during 1945-1975, also known as the Mass Higher Education Era (Cohen, 1998). The catalyst for the increase in the development of all higher education institutions was the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act, more commonly referred to as the GI Bill, passed in 1944 (Cohen, 1998). Designed to reward military personnel for service to their country and improve skills for the job market, the GI Bill provided
The community college further blossomed with the issuance of the Truman Commission Report in 1947. The Truman Commission Report asserted an important way to break down barriers to higher education was to establish publicly-supported, two-year institutions easily accessible to most citizens, with low or no tuition, and comprehensive in nature offering not only general education programs but technical skills as well (Vaughan, 2006). Thus, the modern day community college was born. By the 1960s, every state in the country had at least one community college (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Other legislation, including the Higher Education Act which provided more federal support including financial aid, contributed to the rapid growth of community colleges (Vaughan, 2006).

In recent times, the community college has become even more important to not only the local community, but to the nation (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013). Community colleges enroll nearly half of all undergraduate students (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013; Vaughan, 2006). They are also recognized as the leaders in the United States in workforce development (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). According to Mullin and Phillippe (2013) community colleges serve as launching pads for first-time students, re-launching pads for individuals that need retraining, and as a “local commitment” (p. 6) because of the responsiveness to local needs. Community colleges, therefore, operate as economic engines and are vital to the success of the country’s economic recovery (Mullin & Phillippe (2013). Put simply, community colleges are “brokers of opportunity” (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013, p. 6).
Community colleges are also social institutions (VanDerLinden, 2005; Vaughan, 2006). Vaughan (2006) argues that community colleges are intellectual, social, and cultural hubs for the community the college serves. It is common for community colleges to host art exhibits, plays and musical performances, and speakers on cultural issues (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). These events are usually open to the public and are often free of charge giving access to the local community (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Community colleges also offer a wide array of courses including hobby courses and courses for personal enrichment (Vaughan, 2006). The course offerings are driven by the needs of each unique community. These attributes make the community college a social institution which is part of the community college mission.

The mission of the community college has evolved over the years but has essentially focused on the core values of open access and equity, comprehensive program offerings, community-based service, workforce development, and an emphasis on teaching and learning (Vaughan, 2006). While the mission has been both applauded and accepted, the community college is not without challenges. According to Cohen and Brawer (2003), community colleges have always struggled with issues of funding, public perception, purpose, and value. While these perennial problems still persist, community colleges are faced with even more complex and pressing issues.

These recent challenges threaten the mission of the community college and call for strong community college leaders and administrators (Boggs, 2003; Mullin & Phillippe, 2013). The next section describes the current community college climate, the need for
effective leaders, and the conundrum that exists because of the retirement of so many community college leaders and the lack of replacements in the pipeline.

**Community College Leaders**

Contemporary community college leaders face significant challenges in today’s community colleges. Shrinking resources, diverse student bodies, fluctuating enrollments, aging faculty, changing technology, decreasing student skills, retiring leaders, the effects of globalization, the need for developing the workforce in a changing economy, and conflicts over institutional missions are all current issues (Amey, 2005; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Ebbers, et al., 2000; Eddy, 2005; McNair et al., 2011; Mullin & Phillippe, 2013; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Townsend & Bassoppo-Moyo, 1997). Financial strain, fluctuating enrollment, and retiring faculty and administrators are the most significant issues facing the community college and its future (Katsinas, 2005; Shannon & Smith, 2006). The challenges of today’s comprehensive, complex community colleges call for qualified executive-level administrators.

Leading a community college has become more complex in the last decade because of two factors – complex missions and growth (Romero, 2004). Hendrick, Hightower, and Gregory (2006) said, “In the last 40 years, two-year college enrollments have exploded in the United States” (p. 628). From 1965 to 1999, community college enrollments increased by 413 percent (Kasper, 2003).

According to Mullin and Phillippe (2013), there are more than 1,100 community colleges enrolling over eight million students. Forty-five percent of all first-time college entrants in the nation attend community college (Bragg, 2001). Students choose community
colleges for several reasons including more selectivity at colleges and universities, and workplace requirements (Kasper, 2003).

In recent years, enrollments have fluctuated dramatically across the United States after many workers have been laid off. In 2009, for example, Delos highlighted rising enrollments in California, Texas, North Carolina, Indiana, and New York. She argued that it is typical for enrollments at community colleges to increase during periods of recession. However, just a few years later, the AACC reported enrollment drops of three to five percent in the nation’s community colleges (“Community college enrollment dip sparks concerns,” 2012). The AACC contended the biggest reason for declining enrollments is related to the rising cost of tuition. Tuition costs have soared, in large part, because of the reduction in state support and other budget issues (Katsinas, 2005; Shannon & Smith, 2006). Interestingly, educational attainment rates improve with higher levels of state support (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013). These drastic changes, which often vary dramatically from year to year, require strong and consistent leadership (Boggs, 2003).

A leadership drought, however, is occurring because community colleges are facing a generational transition in which leaders are retiring at a significant rate (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007). In California, for example, there were 22 presidential vacancies in 2007 and 28 in 2006 (Piland & Kehoe, 2008). These vacancies account for nearly a quarter of all leaders in California’s 110 community colleges. Noting that community college presidents are retiring at a high rate, Boggs (2003) argues, “Even more alarming is that the administrators who report to the presidents – and who might be expected to replace them – are also approaching retirement” (p. 15). Further, the senior administrative pipeline has failed to yield enough
qualified candidates to fill the vacancies in these positions (Campbell, 2006). This leadership gap prompted the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) to put an increased emphasis on the career development of current community college faculty, staff, and administrators. One initiative of the AACC was the Leading Forward Project which identified the skills needed for community college presidents (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007). Begun in 2000, the six competencies were used to design a curriculum for training programs. The competencies include organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007). Two national programs, that use the competencies from the Leading Forward Project, continue to operate today in order to prepare future community college administrators and presidents for the country’s community colleges. The AACC John E. Roueche Future Leaders Institute prepares mid-level community college managers for higher levels of leadership (AACC John E. Roueche Future Leaders Institute, n.d.). The Future Presidents Institute, also sponsored by the AACC, is designed for senior-level administrators planning to move into a presidency in two to three years (Future Presidents Institute, n.d.) The career development of those aspiring and current administrators is critically important for the future of the country’s community colleges (Boggs, 2003; Mullin & Phillippe, 2013). The next section focuses on career development and career development theory.

Career Development

In a 1993 interview, Super posited that career development, as a concept, did not exist in the 1950s (Freeman, 1993). He explained that in the past, it was thought you made a vocational choice and were married to that choice over your entire working life (Freeman,
1993). Research has shown that this is not the case and that career development is a continual process of making career choices and adjusting to career choices due to evolving self-concepts and occupational opportunities (Osborne et al., 1997).

According to Brown and Brooks (1996), career development is a process of preparing to choose, choosing, and continuing to make choices from among the careers available. Further, career development, argued Super (1992), is not a built-in biological system but an interactive human development process. Peterson, Sampson, Rearson, and Lenz (1996) defined career development as “the implementation of a series of integrated career decisions over the life span that provide a guiding direction to one’s career path” (p. 428). Clearly, career development is not easily defined as it is an ongoing process and because “people differ in their abilities and personalities, needs, values, interests, traits, and self-concepts” (Super, Savickas, & Super, 1996, p. 123) it is unique to each individual. For the purpose of this research, career development is defined as a continual process of making adjusting to career choices due to evolving self-concepts and occupational opportunities (Osborne et al., 1997).

In the past century, the concept of career development has both expanded and evolved. Career development is most often discussed in the context of career development theory (Brown & Brooks, 1996). The next section focuses on the foundations of career development theory and includes a discussion of Social Cognitive Career Theory (Lent et al., 1994) that supports the present study.
Career Development Theory

The beginnings of career development theory can be traced back to Parsons (1909), when in 1909 he asserted that people will be more satisfied with their careers if they actively engage in choosing a career rather than simply relying on chance (Brown & Brooks, 1996). Parsons believed that not only would people be more satisfied with their careers, but an employer’s cost would decrease and the employee’s efficiency would increase (Parsons, 1909). Parsons’ model became very relevant during World War I and the Great Depression, and again in World War II when it became increasingly important for individuals to be placed in personally meaningful jobs so that they could do the work satisfactorily (Brown & Brooks, 1996). This model became known as trait-and-factor theory. Parsons’ premise is still the basis of most modern career development theories (Brown & Brooks, 1996).

Trait-factor theories are the oldest and most empirically tested approach to career development theory. According to Osipow and Fitzgerald (1996), the trait-factor approach is a straightforward matching of the abilities and interests of an individual with a vocation. Trait-and-factor models ruled in the 1920s and 1930s and still dominate career development practice (Brown & Brooks, 1996). Holland’s Theory and the Theory of Work Adjustment are the most widely used trait-factor theories (Brown & Brooks, 1996).

After Parsons’ initial work in career development, multiple theories were developed. In the 1950s, developmental career development theories were introduced as well as theories based on personality (Osipow & Fitzgerald, 1996). Trait-factor theories were further explored and multiple instruments were developed (Osipow & Fitzgerald). In the 1970s and
1980s, behavioral career development theories and theories incorporating cognitive and social learning aspects were introduced.

Krumboltz’s Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making (SLTCMD) was “designed to address the question of why people enter particular educational programs or occupations, why they may change educational programs or occupations, and why they may express various preferences for different occupational activities at selected points in their lives” (Mitchell & Krumboltz, 1996). Social learning theory combines elements of behaviorist and cognitive orientation (Merriam and Caffarella, 1999). Bandura (1977) suggested that human behavior is learned by modeling others. He argued that people can learn from example what to do before performing any behavior or task and therefore make fewer errors. Social and environmental context, particularly modeling and mentoring, is the foundation of social learning theory.

Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) developed by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994), is also grounded in social learning theory (Brown & Brooks, 1996). According to Lent et al. (1994) SCCT is based on Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory and Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory. SCCT provides “a unifying framework for understanding, explaining, and predicting the processes through which people develop educational and vocational interests, make academic and occupational choices, and achieve varying levels of success and stability in their educational and work pursuits” (Brown, Lent, Telander, & Tramayne, 2011, p. 81). SCCT is concerned with career interest development, choice, and performance (Lent et al., 1994) and more recently, job satisfaction (Lent & Brown, 2006). In other words, SCCT attempts to explain why people become interested in a certain career,
why they experience success or failure, and why the eventually choose particular career behaviors (Brown et al., 2011).

SCCT argues career development is shaped by variables related to one’s self, known as person variables, and variables related to the individual’s environment, known as environmental variables (Lent et al., 1994). The person variables consist of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals. Outcome expectations are the consequences of succeeding or failing at a particular task and include physical, societal, and self-evaluative outcomes (Lent et al., 1994). Physical outcomes include job satisfaction and societal and self-evaluative outcomes are outcomes of mentoring (e.g. acceptance, positive self-concept). Environmental variables include gender, ethnicity, social supports, and barriers which influence one’s career-related motivations, interests, and behaviors (Nolan, Buckner, Marzabadi, & Kuck, 2008). According to Nolan et al. (2008), the environmental variables are integral components of mentoring “and the social supports to which SCCT refers are likely to include mentoring relationships as a central component” (p. 237).

Person-environment fit or trait-factor theories, such as Holland’s and Dawis and Lofquist’s (1984) are criticized for offering only a limited explanation of job satisfaction and not incorporating more recent research on situational influences on job satisfaction (Lent & Brown, 2006). SCCT is a framework that incorporates common elements of several career theorists including Super, Holland, Krumboltz, and Lofquist and Dawis (Lent, 2005).

**Empirical Research with SCCT.** SCCT has been used to undergird a variety of studies. The SCCT model has been determined to predict self-efficacy in math (Klassen, 2004), science (Britner & Pajares, 2006), and educational technology (Sahin, 2008). Sahin
(2008) concluded that self-efficacy is a strong and significant predictor of both outcome expectations and interests. Lindley (2005) tested the SCCT model with 225 undergraduate students and concluded self-efficacy and outcome expectations correspond to career choice (Lindley, 2005). Goals, the last of the person variables, have also been empirically tested (Lent, 2005).

More recently, Lent et al. (2005) have added job satisfaction to the model as one of the outcome expectations of SCCT.

**Empirical Research with SCCT and Job Satisfaction.** In 2005, Lent et al. conducted a study to determine if social cognitive variables impacted college students’ satisfaction. Results of the study indicated social cognitive variables, including environmental supports and self-efficacy, predicted domain satisfaction. Included in domain satisfaction was job satisfaction, defined as work and income (Lent et al., 2005). The college students in the study were traditional college students at a large university.

SCCT was used by Caprara et al. (2003) in their study of job satisfaction with high school teachers. In 2006, Lent and Brown attempted to provide a comprehensive understanding of job satisfaction which incorporated the person-focused outcomes of job satisfaction (e.g. salary) and the organization consequences such as productivity and turnover. Using SCCT as a foundation, Lent and Brown (2006) suggested environmental supports and resources, such as encouragement and mentoring, positively impact self-efficacy, which in turn leads to higher levels of job satisfaction. Lent and Brown (2006) call for further research with employed workers. In a job satisfaction study, Barnett and Bradley (2007) used Lent and Brown’s (2006) model with employed workers in public and private
sector organizations. Verbruggen and Sels (2010) used the model to determine if career
counseling impacted satisfaction of Flemish career counseling clients. They found that clients
with higher levels of goal self-efficacy at the end of counseling were more satisfied with their
job six months after the counseling ended than those clients with lower goal self-efficacy
levels (Verbruggen & Sels, 2010).

SCCT is concerned with environmental supports and resources as a predictor of job
satisfaction. Environmental supports are defined in the literature as encouragement,
modeling, and positive feedback (Lent & Brown, 2006). These components are all included
in the definition of mentoring (Kram, 1985) and are argued to be integral components of
mentoring (Nolan et al., 2008).

**Empirical Research with SCCT and Mentoring.** According to Keller (2007), social
cognitive theory “is highly relevant for mentoring because it explicitly addresses the
observation of a model as an important mode of learning” (p. 39). Using SCCT as a
foundation, Nolan et al. (2008) found men chemists were more likely than women chemists
to have a mentor during their undergraduate years. They further found that men had more
positive graduate school experiences with their mentor. These functions are described as
career support by both Kram (1985) and Noe (1988).

SCCT supports the present study. Because it was concerned with the career
development of executive-level community college administrator, career development theory
was used to undergird the study. Further, SCCT was used in previous research with
mentoring. Finally, SCCT is concerned with environmental supports and resources as a
predictor of job satisfaction and job satisfaction is the dependent variable in the study.
Mentoring as a career development tool is discussed in the next section. The section also discusses mentoring functions and concludes with a discussion of mentoring in the community college context.

**Mentoring and Mentoring Functions**

As a concept, mentoring dates back more than 2,000 years to Homer’s *The Iliad*. In the story, Odysseus left his son, Telemacheus, under the care of his friend, Mentor. More recently, mentoring has become the subject of many studies (Dougherty et al., 2007; Eby & Allen, 2008; Lentz & Allen, 2007; Noe, 1988; Ragins & Kram, 2007). One of the first prominent studies to focus on mentoring dates back to Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee’s (1978) research on the career development of adult men. Levinson et al. (1978) suggested that the mentor relationship is one of the most developmentally important and complex relationships an individual can have in early adulthood. Lentz and Allen (2007) posit mentoring relationships are distinct from other developmental influences and they are both significant and powerful to those involved. According to Ragins and Kram (2007), “At its best, mentoring can be a life altering relationship that inspires mutual growth, learning, and development. Its effects can be remarkable, profound, and enduring; mentoring relationships have the capacity to transform individuals, groups, organizations, and communities” (p. 3).

According to Eby, Rhodes, and Allen (2007), “The prevalence of mentoring in our daily lives and our vernacular use of the term is a mixed blessing” (p. 8). They argued that on a positive note, mentoring has been studied in a variety of contexts; however, this has led to the confusion of the meaning of mentoring. Eby and Allen (2008) agreed that there are
differences of opinions as to what constitutes a mentoring relationship. They do, however, contend that a mentoring relationship is a dyadic relationship that is reciprocal and mutually beneficial even though the primary focus is on the development of the protégé (Dougherty et al., 2007; Eby & Allen, 2008). Still, mentoring or mentorship is defined in a multitude of ways. Levinson et al. (1978) added, “Mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationship and the function it serves” (p. 98). Daloz (1983) characterized the mentor as a guide on a journey that points the way, offers support, and challenges the protégé. P-Sontag et al. (2007) argued, “Mentoring is not a program; it is a change process” (p. 604). In an in-depth qualitative study of employees at a utility company, Kram (1983) further defined mentoring in the workplace. With the workplace as the context, mentoring was described as a relationship between two individuals where one, typically a senior employee, teaches the other about his or her job, facilitates networking, orients the junior employee about the industry and the organization, and coaches with regard to social and personal issues (Allen, 2006; Kram, 1985). “The workplace mentor is a unique source of power and support that facilitates the professional development of the protégé within the organization” (Lentz & Allen, 2007, p. 160).

For the purpose of the present research, mentoring was defined as an intense interpersonal relationship between an older, experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced, younger colleague (protégé) in which the mentor provides career support and psychosocial support (Kram, 1985; Russell & Adams, 1997; VanDerLinden, 2005). This definition is considered the traditional definition of mentoring in the workplace and since the study also includes job satisfaction, the workplace definition is most appropriate.
A mentoring relationship is also different from other similar relationships and distinctions must be made. According to Eby et al. (2007), a mentor-protégé relationship differs from a role model-observer, a teacher-student, and a supervisor-subordinate relationship primarily by the degree of mutuality and the relational closeness. According to Scandura and Pellegrini (2007), mentoring in the workplace is different from other workplace relationships like the supervisor-subordinate relationship. While a supervisor-subordinate relationship may develop into a mentoring relationship, the initial relationship lacks some of the necessary components of the relationship, namely the mutual commitment to the protégé’s long-term career development (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007). Ragins and Kram (2007) argued the core of mentoring, which distinguishes it from other personal relationships, is that it is a developmental relationship in the career context.

The study of mentoring as a construct has occurred for a century but it became more of a scholarly pursuit after the pioneering research of Kathy Kram (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1989; Noe, 1988; Scandura, 1992). In 1983, Kram’s exploratory qualitative study of managers at a large northeastern public utility company first appeared in the *Academy of Management Journal*. Kram interviewed both parties of the mentoring dyad, the mentor and the protégé (Dougherty et al., 2007). Kram (1983) posited that mentoring is a developmental relationship and that it serves two purposes: career support and psychosocial support. Career support involves specific behaviors that support the protégé’s career progress which enhance the protégé’s likelihood of becoming successful in his or her career (Dougherty et al., 2007). The career support function includes sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments (Kram, 1983; Kram, 1985). The psychosocial
support function includes more personal aspects of the relationship that enhance the protégé's sense of professional competence (Dougherty et al., 2007). Psychosocial support includes role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1983; Kram, 1985). Kram (1985) extended her study into a book focusing on mentoring relationships in the workplace. Kram’s (1985) work is still considered the seminal source on workplace mentoring (Dougherty et al., 2007). Dougherty et al. (2007) argued that understanding Kram’s work is important in order to understand the conceptualization of mentoring.

Another early literature review that supported many mentoring studies is Hunt and Michael’s (1983) look at mentoring as a career development and training tool. Hunt and Michael (1983) reviewed the literature on mentoring as it relates to career development and developed a framework for a mentoring model for the career development of women. The framework consists of outcomes of the mentor-protégé relationship, the context within which the relationship emerges, characteristics of both the mentor and the protégé, and stages in the mentoring process (Hunt & Michael, 1983). The framework suggested multiple variables (e.g. age or gender of mentor, type of organization, characteristics of a successful mentor) for study. In fact, based on the framework, Hunt and Michael (1983) suggested 36 different research questions for further study on mentoring. While neither Kram (1983, 1985) nor Hunt and Michael (1983) presented a quantitative study with sound psychometric properties, the research is the foundation for a significant number of mentoring studies. In fact, mentoring has been the focus of more than one thousand studies since these first studies appeared in the literature (Underhill, 2006).
Since Kram’s (1985) seminal work, considerable research has been conducted on mentoring at work (Allen et al., 2004; Dougherty et al., 2007; Underhill, 2006). According to Ragins and Kram (2007), mentoring relationships offer significant career advantages for protégés. Mentoring has been shown to provide both objective and subjective career outcomes for the protégé. Objective measures of career success include tangible outcomes such as promotion rates and compensation (Allen et al., 2004; Dougherty & Dreher, 2007). Subjective measures are intangible outcomes such as job involvement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to stay, among others (Dougherty & Dreher, 2007; Underhill, 2006). Phillips and Imhoff (1997) contend that mentoring is one resource for advancement. Underhill (2006) said that protégés have a significant advantage in the workplace over non-protégés. Allen and Poteet (1999) considered that the development of mentoring relationships was a key strategy for growth, learning, and advancement.

According to Moore, Twombly, and Martorana (1985), “Mentoring is perhaps one of the most influential of the informal factors which are thought to impact decisions about individual career advancement” (p. 42). Thus, the literature suggested that mentoring was an important aspect of work-based outcomes for the protégé and is related to outcomes such as reduced turnover and job satisfaction important to the present study.

**Mentoring functions**

Mentoring has been shown to have two distinct functions for the protégé. Kram (1985) was the first to define mentoring functions as career support and psychosocial support. According to Ramaswami and Dreher (2007), the mentoring relationship leads to the enactment of career and psychosocial support by the mentor that elicits “cognitive, affective,
and behavioral responses from the protégé, ultimately affecting that latter’s outcomes” (p. 215). Indeed, the literature supports this notion that the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support lead to positive outcomes for the protégé (Allen et al., 2004; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2007).

Ensher and Murphy (1997) found that protégés that received both career support and psychosocial support from their mentor were more satisfied with the mentoring relationship than those protégés who did not receive both mentoring functions. Research has shown that career support predicts a protégés compensation and advancement while psychosocial support is related to the protégés satisfaction with the relationship mentoring (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Both mentoring functions, however, have been shown to predict the protégés career and job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004).

Career functions help protégés learn about the organization and help prepare them for advancement (Chao et al., 1992; Ragins & Kram, 2007). Career functions include sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and providing challenging assignments. Kram (1985) argued that sponsorship is the most observed career function. Sponsorship involves the public support of a younger, less-experienced individual which might include nominating the younger employee for lateral moves or promotions. The primary criticism of sponsorship is the appearance of favoritism. Kram (1985) believes, however, “in the long run, sponsorship results in personal advancement and organizational recognition” (p. 26) for both the mentor and the protégé.

As a career function, exposure-and-visibility is described as the socialization process that prepares an individual for positions of greater responsibility. Specifically, exposure-and-
visibility provides the protégé with assignments that increase his or her visibility to organizational decision makers and provides exposure for future opportunities (Noe, 1988). Coaching is when the mentor suggests strategies for accomplishing work objectives and achieving career aspirations. Coaching can “enhance career development by teaching the protégé how to effectively navigate within the organization by providing information on how to accomplish work tasks, receive recognition, and meet one’s career aspirations” (Baranik, Roling, & Eby, 2010, p. 368). The coach also explains the organizational hierarchy. Kram (1985) argued that the information and advice given to the protégé through coaching is essential to career advancement. Gottfredson (2005) suggested that the terms coaching and mentoring are used interchangeably. However, the literature on mentoring research does not support this contention (Noe, 1988).

The final two career functions of mentoring are 1) protection and 2) challenging assignments. According to Kram (1985), “Protection involves taking credit and blame in controversial situations, as well as intervening in situations where the junior colleague is ill-equipped to receive satisfactory resolution” (p. 29). The mentor reduces unnecessary risks that could threaten the protégé’s reputation (Noe, 1988). The challenging assignments function primarily occurs in a boss-subordinate relationship where the boss provides challenging work with technical training and feedback. According to Lankau and Scandura (2002), “The challenging assignments are what enable the protégé to gain the skills necessary to take advantage of opportunities (p. 98). Challenging assignments can also support career development by providing the protégé with opportunities for new learning. This is more effective when coupled with feedback and technical support (Baranik et al., 2010). McKeen
and Bujaki (2007), argued successful women seek out challenging assignments and mentors have a role in advising which assignments to accept. According to Baranik et al. (2010) when a mentor from the same organization provides career support, it is a signal that the organization is concerned and invested in the protégé’s career development.

Psychosocial support is the second mentoring function. “Psychosocial functions are those aspects of a relationship that enhance an individual’s sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role” (Kram, 1985, p. 32). They build on trust, intimacy, and relationship bonds and enhance the protégé’s identity, self-worth, and self-efficacy (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Psychosocial functions depend on the quality of the interpersonal relationship and the benefits impact not only the career of the individual but other areas of one’s life. Chao et al. (1992) suggested that psychosocial functions include activities that influence the protégé’s self-image and competence. Role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship are considered psychosocial functions (Kram, 1985). Each function is further discussed.

Role modeling involves the demonstration of attitudes, values, and behavior of the mentor (Noe, 1988). According to Kram (1985), “Role modeling succeeds because of the emotional attachment that is formed” (p. 34). Noe (1988) suggested that mentors, through modeling, can facilitate the personal and professional development of protégés. Sosik and Godshalk (2000) found that female mentors were perceived to provide more role-modeling than male mentors and the role-modeling provided was perceived to be the greatest in cross-gender pairs with female mentors. The terms role model and mentor are linked in many ways. Zachary (2005) argued, “Mentors who are role models demonstrate the possible in
action, raise the bar for relationships and performance, and embody desirable characteristics” (p. 167). It is important to note that role modeling is just one component of the psychosocial support function of mentoring. The terms role model and mentor may not be used interchangeably; it can be argued, however, that to be a mentor, one must also be a role model. A role model is a critical developmental step in establishing a mentoring relationship (Kram, 1985). Scandura (1992) even found evidence to support role modeling as a third function of mentoring. However, this has not been substantiated in further research and is thus not a mentoring function for the present research study.

Another of the psychosocial functions is acceptance-and-confirmation. Through acceptance-and-confirmation, “both individuals derive a sense of self from the positive regard conveyed by the other” (Kram, 1985, p. 35). Noe (1988) characterized acceptance-and-confirmation as unconditional positive regard.

The third of the psychosocial functions is counseling. In counseling, the protégé has the opportunity to explore personal concerns. Kram (1985) argued that counseling explains how an individual can develop competence and potential, how he or she can relate to peers and superiors without compromising personal values and individuality, and “how he or she can incorporate growing responsibilities and commitments at work with other areas of life” (p. 36). Friendship is the last psychosocial function. Friendship in a mentoring relationship is defined as the social interaction that results in enjoyable exchanges about work and outside of work for both the mentor and the protégé (Kram, 1985). Friendship allows the protégé to feel like a peer with the mentor (Baranik et al., 2010). There are limits to friendship (Kram,
Most mentors limit friendship to the work context in order to minimize the appearance and conflict of a boss-subordinate relationship (Kram, 1985).

The concept of mentoring as a two-dimensional construct has received empirical support (Noe, 1988). According to Ragins and Cotton (1999), it is important to remember that a mentor may provide some but not necessarily all of the components of the mentoring functions. Kram (1985) argued that the greater number of components the mentor provides, the more beneficial the mentoring relationship. Mentoring, therefore, is not an all or nothing phenomenon (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007).

As defined by Kram (1985), the mentoring functions of career and psychosocial support, became worthy of study as evidenced by Ragins and Kram (2007) and McKeen and Bujaki (2007). The empirical research on mentoring functions occurs in the context of gender, informal or formal relationship type, and the most influential relationship type if a protégé has experienced both an informal and formal mentoring relationship.

**Demographic Variables**

Having a mentor has been shown in the literature to have a positive effect on the career advancement of women (Dreher & Ash, 1990); however, research has shown that women experience barriers to gaining a mentor (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Gender, is therefore, an important factor in the study of mentoring. Another important consideration in mentoring research is the type of relationship. Relationship type, for the purpose of this study is defined as formal or informal. This section of the literature review discusses the gender and the gender composition of the mentoring relationship, the type of mentoring relationship.
(informal or formal), and the most influential type of relationship if a protégé has experienced both an informal and formal mentoring relationship.

**Gender as a Variable**

According to McKeen and Bujaki (2007), “Successful mentoring relationships convey so many benefits that we must enhance our understanding of gender and mentoring to ensure that all individuals, regardless of gender, and all organizations understand the issues surrounding mentoring relationships and have access to the beneficial effects and opportunities that arise with mentoring” (p. 199).

Previous research on mentoring and gender has yielded important considerations for mentors and protégés alike. According to Dougherty et al. (2007), mentoring appears to be beneficial for both men and women. They further suggested that gender does not seem to have an influence on the willingness to mentor others or on becoming a mentor (Dougherty et al., 2007). However, Turban, Dougherty, and Lee (2002) found that protégés are more likely to be involved with a mentor of the same gender. High-achieving women in higher education affirm that mentoring was critically important in their career progress (Tolar, 2012). McKeen and Bujaki (2007), argued that mentoring relationships are essential to the success of women and helped women overcome barriers to advancement that are unique to women.

The gender composition of the mentoring relationship is critical to mentoring functions and outcomes (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). According to Ensher and Murphy (2011), there are consistent differences in mentoring relationships between males and females. Male mentors provide more career-related support while female mentors provide more
psychosocial support (Allen et al., 2004; Ensher & Murphy, 2011). Okurame (2007) also found that female mentors provided more psychosocial functions than males. Okurame (2007) contends that females usually assume more nurturing roles, are socialized to be more interpersonally sensitive and more flexible, and are more accommodating and willing to discuss than males. Like Okurame (2007), Godshalk and Sosik (2007) found female mentors provided more role-modeling and less career-related functions than male mentors. They also found that male protégés perceived more psychosocial support from female mentors. Conversely, female protégés perceived more career-related functions from male mentors.

Cross-gender relationships, argues Kram (1985) are problematic. According to Turban et al. (2002), women and minorities are more likely to be in cross-gender relationships than white men. Ensher and Murphy (2011) suggested that men in high level positions may be hesitant about being involved with female protégés and this can be “particularly harmful as it denies opportunities to women” (p. 256). Further, men and women often form traditional roles from past situations and this leads to an unsatisfactory experience of the protégé (Kram, 1985). The major issues associated with cross-gender mentoring relationships are the limitations of role modeling, intimacy and sexual concerns, public scrutiny, and peer resentment. Another limitation is the development of the friendship (Kram, 1985; McKeen & Bujaki, 2007). Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that same-gender female mentoring relationships were more likely to participate in all social activities than cross-gender relationships. This finding speaks to the concern of having the mentoring relationship be misconstrued as sexual in nature.
Ragins and Cotton (1999) also found that mentoring relationships with two males lead to more financial compensation than other mentor-protégé dyads. They further found that male protégés with female mentors reported less career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions than any other gender combination and male protégés with female mentors reported less satisfaction, less challenging assignments, and less exposure in the organization (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Underhill (2006) found that minority protégés in mentoring relationships with a mentor of the same gender received more psychosocial support than those in cross-gender relationships.

On the other hand, there are hidden advantages to cross-gender relationships. Kram (1985) suggested that public scrutiny forces both the mentor and the protégé to manage their relationships in the context of the organization. She added, “Both individuals learn new ways of relating to the world from their opposite-gender colleagues” (p. 132). Noe (1988) found mentors in cross-gender relationships used the relationship more effectively than those in same-gender mentoring relationships. More recently, Godshalk and Sosik (2007) found that protégés in cross-gendering mentoring situations reported more psychosocial support than those in same-gender relationships.

Gender is important in the present study because most of the executive-level community college administrators are male (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). Women administrators may have had difficulty in obtaining a mentor.

The Variable of Mentoring: Relationship Type

The majority of mentoring relationships are informal (Noe, 1988). The mentoring relationship develops because of shared interests, job demands, and admiration between two
individuals (Noe, 1988). Ragins and Cotton (1999) suggested that the informal relationship develops on the basis of mutual identification. They further suggested that mentors select protégés who are viewed as younger versions of themselves (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). The informal mentoring relationship includes the mentor’s desire and willingness to help the protégé and the protégés willingness to be open to advice and assistance from the mentor (Chao et al., 1992). According to Chao et al. (1992), the informal mentoring relationship is not managed, structured, or formally recognized by the organization. Dougherty et al. (2007) argued the informal workplace mentoring relationship exists between a senior member of the organization and a junior member and is naturally formed, is mutually beneficial, and is maintained on a voluntary basis. For the purpose of this research, an informal mentoring relationship is defined as one that develops because of shared interests, job demands, and admiration between two individuals (Noe, 1988).

On the other hand, formal mentoring is defined as efforts initiated by an organization to match mentors with protégés (Eby & Lockwood, 2005). Formal mentoring relationships are short term and “may have less identification, comfort, and motivation than informal relationships” (Ragins and Cotton, 1999, p. 544). The basic difference in the two type of mentoring relationships is in the formation of the relationship (Chao et al., 1992). For the purpose of this research, a formal mentoring relationship is defined as a relationship initiated by the organization (Eby & Lockwood, 2005) which includes defined roles and responsibilities, goals, and an evaluation process (P-Sontag et al., 2007; Zachary, 2005).

According to Tolar (2012), organizations have invested resources in mentoring programs for three main reasons: to attract, to develop, and to retain employees. Formal
mentoring programs developed after the creation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Affirmative Action programs (Kram & Bragar, 1992). The idea behind the first formal mentoring programs was to create advancement opportunities for women and minorities (Kram & Bragar, 1992). Formal approaches are often attached to a specific program, process, or initiative (Zachary, 2005).

In a formal mentoring relationship there are several core components that must be present (Kram & Bragar, 1992). Roles and responsibilities are defined, specific developmental goals are set, orientation and training is required, and evaluation of the process is completed (Kram & Bragar, 1992; P-Sontag et al., 2007; Zachary, 2005). According to Kram and Bragar (1992), “Any attempt at expediency which minimizes planning or reduces the orientation, training, and monitoring components is likely to undermine programs’ effectiveness” (p. 226). Additionally, they argue program flexibility and voluntary participation are essential in any program, regardless of objectives or organizational context (Kram & Bragar, 1992). Chao et al. (1992) agreed positing formal mentoring relationships entail a degree of pressure as the mentor and protégé may be required to participate in the program as a function of their positions in the organization. They contended, “This pressure could decrease a mentor’s motivation to help the protégé and decrease the protégés willingness to be open to assistance from the mentor” (p. 621).

P-Sontag et al. (2007) suggested that formal mentoring is not intended to replace informal mentoring relationships. The primary purpose is to take advantage of workplace relationships in a structured manner. This approach not only supports an individual’s career development but may also facilitate the completion of organizational goals (P-Sontag et al.,
2007). Examples of organizational goals include diversity enhancement, succession planning, and employee retention. Organizational support of a formal mentoring program is necessary for the program to succeed (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007). A number of research studies have been conducted to determine the value of formal mentoring in the workplace in a variety of different careers. For the present study, understanding the relationship type experienced by community college administrators is important to the future success of community colleges. The next section highlights some of the formal mentoring programs with an emphasis on programs conducted in community colleges.

**Empirical research on formal mentoring.** In a study of 3,000 engineers, social workers, and journalists, Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that protégés with formal mentors received fewer benefits than those protégés in informal mentoring relationships. Chao et al. (1992) found that formally mentored protégés reported lower levels of job satisfaction, salary, and organizational socialization than protégés in informal mentoring relationships. According to Eby and Lockwood (2005), research has also shown that mentors in formal mentoring relationships are shown to be more disinterested, self-absorbed, and neglectful than mentors in informal mentoring relationships. However, Eby and Lockwood (2005) argued formal mentoring relationships have a different purpose and therefore provide unique benefits to the protégé. Some of those benefits received include learning, career planning, and coaching on day-to-day work challenges.

Few research studies were located that focused on formal mentoring programs in community colleges. Some programs have been developed which include a formal mentoring component but mentoring is not the primary focus. For example, the Community College
Leadership Academy (CCLA) was developed in Massachusetts to prepare faculty and administrators for positions that would be coming available (Crosson et al., 2005). CCLA is not a formal mentoring program but a leadership development program with a mentoring component. During a week-long residency portion of the CCLA program, participants have the opportunity for intense interaction and individual coaching sessions with an assigned mentor (Crosson et al., 2005).

Although most leadership development programs only have a formal mentoring component as one part of the program, there are two notable community college formal mentoring programs that have shown some success. In 1992, Iowa State University, in cooperation with nine of the 15 Iowa community colleges, instituted the Community College Induction/Mentoring Program (CCIM). CCIM was designed to train career and technical education faculty new to teaching (Van Ast & Field, 2005). According to Van Ast and Field (2005), the faculty development program was based on “43 instructor teaching and learning outcomes rated essential by 66 Iowa community-college administrators or supervisors, and 177 seasoned faculty” (p. 175). The idea behind the program was that most community college teachers, particularly those in the career and technical fields, are hired based on subject matter expertise, not based on teaching credentials or experience. CCIM is a two-year program designed to support faculty in their first two years of teaching by providing psychosocial development, career development, personal support, responsive educative experiences, on-going feedback and assessment (Van Ast & Field, 2005). At the end of the two years, the mentees would be “relieved of their teaching responsibilities, continue on an initial licensure track, or be placed on a regular licensure track” (Booth, Moore, & Van Ast,
In addition to having a mentor, CCIM requires attendance at a series of seminars. The result, after two years, is 12 undergraduate credit hours earned through Iowa State University (Booth et al., 1995).

For CCIM, veteran faculty members are chosen by supervisors to serve as mentors to new faculty. Mentors then participate in an eight-hour workshop that explains how to be a mentor. The mentors and the mentees identify semester goals and action plans to help meet those goals. The process is guided by a mentor-mentee handbook developed by Van Ast (2003). The handbook describes mentoring and includes characteristics that define a good mentor (Van Ast, 2003). The handbook details the needs of new faculty and recommends specific activities for the mentor to teach including classroom management, keeping student records, motivating students, and providing feedback.

According to Booth et al. (1995), the instructors in CCIM are evaluated after both their first and second years of teaching. Students are asked to compare these teachers to other instructors the students have. Teachers that have participated in CCIM rated significantly higher by students in 15 of 18 survey items that measured instructor performance and effectiveness in the classroom (Booth et al., 1995). Van Ast and Field (2005) found that students’ perceptions of their mentored teacher’s effectiveness was significantly better when compared to non-mentored instructors. This example, although not with administrators, shows that formal mentoring programs exist in community colleges. In California, the formal mentoring program is specific to administrators.

The Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) offers a system-wide model with the largest community college system in the country. The ACCCA
developed a mentoring program in the late 1980s to fill a projected void in senior-level administrators in California (Valeau & Boggs, 2004). According to the ACCCA website:

The ACCCA Mentor Program is a statewide activity whose purpose is to provide a personal and professional development experience for selected individuals who have demonstrated a potential for expanded leadership roles in their current, or future, responsibilities with the California Community College system (ACCCA, n.d.).

The mentor program is described as a heavily participant-oriented program with an emphasis on skill building and collaborative learning. The mentee must sign a learning contract that places emphasis on leadership development. The mentee also must initiate and complete one face-to-face meeting with his or her mentor monthly.

The mentor is to act as a role model, guide, colleague, and expert for the mentee. More specifically, the mentor is to help the mentee develop and complete his or her learning contract, expose the mentee to new and complex administrative tasks and processes, and introduce them to new and higher level management systems and practices (ACCCA, n.d.).

The program accepts between 15 and 20 applicants each year and at the time of Valeau and Boggs (2004) study, more than 250 mid-level administrators had completed the program since its inception in 1988. The number of completers has most likely grown significantly since the 2004 study. According to Valeau and Boggs (2004), one of the most useful aspects of the ACCCA program is that the organization has maintained accurate records on the participants of the program making empirical study of the effects possible. Valeau and Boggs (2004) found that 92 percent of respondents found the ACCCA program at least somewhat positive and 97 percent would recommend the program to others.
One reason the program has been successful is that both the mentors and the protégés voluntarily participated. According to Kram (1985), formal mentoring programs may not be very effective because of the forced nature of the program. She posits that voluntary participation in a formal mentoring program reduces the risk of a destructive relationship. P-Sontag et al. (2007) agreed that voluntary participation is critical and that both the mentor and the protégé must be fully committed during the entire process if the relationship is to be successful.

Godshalk and Sosik (2007) suggested that to improve formal mentoring programs, training improvements should be made. Those improvements include more mentor-centric approaches including assessing the mentor’s self-awareness, more importance given to life events in the development of mentoring relationships, and developing trust and commitment. P-Sontag et al. (2007) suggested that pairs who take the time to get to know each other on a personal level have more successful partnerships and develop trust more quickly. Finally, Eby and Lockwood (2005) sited clear communication of program objectives, quality matching of mentors and protégés, and monitoring and follow-up of program participants as key elements of successful formal mentoring programs.

Zey (1988) suggested that clear goals for the program be articulated at the outset. He also suggested that who should participate, how the mentor and the protégé will be matched, length and timing of the program, how and how often the interaction will occur, and the mentor’s responsibilities be clear up front. For Iowa’s faculty development program, Van Ast (2003) developed a handbook that gives explicit instructions and expectations for all participants. These clear expectations are also one of the strengths of the ACCCA mentoring
program. All of the programs described have some form of evaluation. This is essential, according to Zey (1988), who argued that evaluation is a key element in the success of a formal mentoring program.

**Informal or Formal Mentoring Relationships: Most Influential.** While formal mentoring programs have delivered successful outcomes, research indicates that informal mentoring relationships provide more substantial benefits to the protégé than formal relationships and are therefore, more influential relationships for the protégé. Turban and Lee (2007) argued:

One explanation relating to why formal relationships are not as beneficial as informal relationships is that some of the beneficial aspects of social attraction may be absent in formally assigned mentoring pairs, suggesting that we need to understand more about what individual differences promote success in mentoring relationships. (p. 22)

Allen and Poteet (1999) contended one reason formal programs may not be as successful is because mentors are often self-nominated and lack the necessary communication and coaching skills needed to be a successful mentor. They further posited that the success of a formal mentoring program depends on the individual characteristics of the mentor (Allen & Poteet, 1999).

Another reason that formal programs are not as beneficial could be the fairly young age of formal programs. According to P-Sontag et al. (2007), formalized programs did not become prevalent in the United States until the late 1980s; therefore, there are few individuals in the workplace with the expertise to properly lead a successful formal mentoring program. Further, there is little empirical research on formal mentoring programs.
(Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007). Most of the information related to formal mentoring programs, as demonstrated by those programs in community college settings, is anecdotal.

As evidenced by just two examples of formal mentoring programs for community college faculty and administrators, formal mentoring programs are few in the community college environment. More likely to occur are informal mentoring relationships (Chao et al., 1992). Additionally, more mentoring relationships in the community college are among faculty and students (Galbraith & James, 2004; Perez, 1998; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007), and not with community college administrators. The next section explores mentoring and community college administrators.

**Mentoring of community college administrators.** In a study of community college administrators, VanDerLinden (2005) defined mentor as “a long-term, professionally-centered relationship between two individuals in which the more experienced individual, the mentor, guides, advises, and assists in the career of the less experienced protégé” (p. 737). According to Valeau and Boggs (2004), a community college mentor assists “in developing advanced management skills, acquiring personal contacts, and, most important, becoming socialized into the values that are expected of senior college leadership” (p. 49). Other examples of the activities a mentor participated in include providing encouragement and advice, serving as a reference, helping develop professional networks, encouraging professional development and additional education, providing training on a specific skill, and advising on the political aspects of the job (VanDerLinden, 2005). The mentoring functions as defined by Kram (1985) are consistent with the activities found in the research of community college administrators.
McDade (2005) conducted a qualitative study to explore the nature of the mentoring relationship of community college presidents. She interviewed 10 presidents and their protégés for the study. Using Brookfield’s (1989) strategies for facilitating critical thinking as a template, McDade (2005) was able to show that support and challenge, motivation, evaluation, creation of networks, modeling, and awareness of leadership development diagram the mentoring process.

VanDerLinden’s (2005) study of community college administrators found that 56 percent of administrators had a mentor during their career in higher education. In an AACC survey, 57 percent of presidents responded that mentors had helped them obtain their current position as president (Boggs, 2003; Shults, 2001; Wallin, 2002). Moore et al. (1985) also found that the majority of community college executives have at least one mentor. They also found that first mentors were overwhelmingly male and over 90 percent were white. The mentoring component was part of a larger national survey of community college administrators known as the Today’s Academic Leaders project. The Moore et al. (1985) study asked several questions related to mentoring including gender and race of mentor, length of mentor relationship, the type of influence the mentor had, whether the mentor assisted in helping the protégé obtain his or her current position, and if the protégé is now a mentor for someone else.

Brown, Martinez, and Daniel (2002) found that communication skills, particularly effective listening and feedback skills, are considered the most important leadership skills by community college administrators. Communication skills were identified by the American Association of Community Colleges Leading Forward Project as one of the six competencies
community college leaders must have (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007). The role modeling function of mentoring provides communication skills through the development of listening, feedback, socialization and people skills (Kram, 1985; Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007).

According to Ebbers et al. (2000), a career development program in Iowa encourages internship experiences as a way to provide role models and mentors to aspiring community college leaders. Emphasis is placed on women mentoring other women because they are good listening resources and provide unbiased feedback.

After studying community college presidents, Vaughan (1986) gave the following advice to “would be” presidents. He suggested, “Get into the academic pipeline; get the appropriate degree; work with a mentor; be willing to move; and call attention to yourself by doing a good job and by doing more than is required for survival” (p. 233). The worth of a mentor in community college leadership was realized by Vaughan more than 30 years ago.

Mentoring is clearly proven to be an effective tool in producing organizational outcomes of organizational commitment (Allen et al., 2004), organizational socialization (Chao et al., 1992), and, organizational success (Ensher et al., 2001). Mentoring has further shown the individual benefits of job satisfaction (Fagenson, 1989; Phillips & Imhoff, 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1992; van Emmerik, 2004) which leads to the outcome of reduced turnover (Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001; McBride, et al., 1992). And, mentoring plays an important role in preparing community college employees for leadership positions (McDade, 2005; Shults, 2001). Mentoring and mentoring functions are important in the present study. If mentoring is to help fill the need of replacing retiring leaders by helping
prepare leaders for the pipeline, understanding mentoring functions and mentoring relationships among community college leaders is important.

The next section focuses on the concept and research of job satisfaction. The discussion includes job satisfaction within the community college environment.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is often defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Job satisfaction is an attitude toward work-related conditions, facets, or aspects of a job (Wiener, 1982). For the purpose of the present research, job satisfaction is defined as how people feel about their jobs (Spector, 1997). The nature and causes of job satisfaction began being systematically studied in the 1930s (Locke, 1976).

The study of job satisfaction as a variable is deemed worthy for two reasons (Spector, 1997). First, from the humanitarian perspective, people deserve to be treated fairly and with respect and job satisfaction can be considered a reflection of good treatment. Secondly, from a utilitarian point of view, “job satisfaction can lead to behavior by employees that affects organizational functioning” (Spector, 1997, p. 2). Further, job satisfaction has been argued to be “the most informative data a manager or researcher can have for predicting employee behavior” (Roznowski & Hulin, 1992, p. 26).

According to Hosie, Sevastos, and Cooper (2006), job satisfaction is a multi-dimensional construct. Job satisfaction takes into consideration both intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Dawis, 1991; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, and Feldman, 2005). Intrinsic job satisfaction is satisfaction with the work itself, to the internal characteristics inherent in a job, and how
people feel about the work they do (Dawis, 1991; Spector, 1997). Examples include
utilization of skills, job complexity and opportunities, and amount of responsibility and
challenges (Hosie et al., 2006). Extrinsic job satisfaction, on the other hand, refers to external
characteristics or satisfaction with the conditions of work (Dawis, 1991) and may include
items such as compensation, work conditions, hours of work, and job security (Hosie et al.,
2006). While many studies look at both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, the present study
measures only overall job satisfaction. Previous research suggests that overall job satisfaction
can be studied as one overall measure (Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996; Ensher et al.,
2001; Scandura, 1997). Using meta-analysis, Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) found that
overall job satisfaction as a single-item measure is acceptable in research studies.

**Empirical research on job satisfaction.** According to Spector (1997), the variable of
job satisfaction is the most frequently studied in the field of organizational behavior. Job
satisfaction has been studied with a number of populations and against a multitude of
variables. Research has shown that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and the
propensity to remain with an organization (Porter et al., 1974). Porter et al. (1974) found that
satisfaction with the opportunities for promotion and satisfaction with the work itself were
significant factors in an employee’s intention to stay or leave the job.

According to Tett and Meyer (1993), the most commonly proposed antecedents in the
predictive models of voluntary turnover are organizational commitment, intent to quit, and
job satisfaction. Using meta-analysis, Tett and Meyer (1993) found that job satisfaction
correlates more strongly than organizational commitment with turnover intentions. However,
the study also indicated that satisfaction and commitment “each contribute uniquely to turnover intention/withdrawal cognitions” (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 285).

Lambert, Hogan, and Barton (2001) used existing data from 1,515 employed individuals (16 or older, working more than 20 hours per week) across the United States to assess whether work environment impacts job satisfaction and whether job satisfaction has a significant effect on turnover intent. Lambert et al. (2001) found that work environment does impact job satisfaction. They also found that job satisfaction has a large direct effect on turnover intentions. The study also concluded that task variety, relations with coworkers, and financial rewards all had a positive effect on job satisfaction (Lambert et al., 2001).

Gender has also been shown to be related to job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). Lambert et al. (2001) suggested that the impact of gender of job satisfaction is inconsistent in the literature. According to Spector (1997), men and women are both found to have the same levels of job satisfaction. Lambert et al. (2001), however, found that males have a lower level of job satisfaction than females. They argue that “men are more likely to stay in a job where they are not satisfied because they are socialized to view themselves as the primary breadwinner” (p. 245).

**Empirical research on job satisfaction and community colleges.** In the community college literature, Chieffo (1991) found that community college administrators with greater role clarity had a higher level of job satisfaction. Community college administrators were defined as leadership team members with the exception of the president or chief executive officer. Chieffo (1991) also found that a shared vision and culture led to greater levels of job satisfaction. This was one of the few studies that examined job satisfaction with community
college administrators even though job satisfaction has been studied widely (Chieffo, 1991). According to Downey (2008), “Despite the importance of retaining qualified academic leaders, only a paucity of research has explored the factors that contribute to job satisfaction among college administrators [and] even fewer studies have examined community college administrative job satisfaction”(p. 597). Most studies dealing with job satisfaction and community colleges relate to other members of the faculty and staff, not administrators.

McBride et al. (1992) studied whether job satisfaction impacted the propensity to leave of full-time community college faculty. McBride et al. (1992) concluded faculty were generally satisfied with their jobs. However, their study showed that faculty members not satisfied with role clarity and communication are more likely to leave.

Hutton and Jobe (1985) conducted a study to describe the job satisfaction of the community college faculty in Texas. They found faculty members were most satisfied with the task of teaching and with their relationships with supervisors and colleagues. The Texas community college faculty were least satisfied with opportunities for professional growth and development and time allocation including satisfaction with their current teaching assignment (Hutton & Jobe, 1985).

In a study of part-time community college faculty, Valadez and Anthony (2001) found that salary, benefits, and job security were important issues negatively impacting job satisfaction. Part-time faculty indicated they would leave their current position in order to obtain a more permanent faculty position. However, the study revealed part-time faculty were satisfied with their roles and were satisfied with their choice to pursue a career in academics (Valadez & Anthony, 2001).
Flowers (2005) compared the job satisfaction between African-American faculty in two-year and four-year institutions. Flowers (2005) found that African-American faculty teaching at both two-year and four-year institutions had higher levels of job dissatisfaction with extrinsic factors such as benefits, salary, and opportunity for advancement. He also found that African-American faculty higher levels of job satisfaction with intrinsic factors such as time available to mentor students, time to prepare for class, and authority to decide which courses to teach. While the intrinsic and extrinsic factors were similar for faculty teaching at both two-year and four-year institutions, the research showed African-American faculty in two-year colleges had higher levels of overall job satisfaction than those teaching at four-year colleges and universities (Flowers, 2005). Kim, Twombly, and Wolf-Wendel (2008), using data from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, also found community college faculty were more satisfied with their jobs than faculty members at four-year institutions.

Murray and Murray (1998) studied job satisfaction and propensity to leave a community college among division chairpersons. For the purpose of the study, they defined a division chair as “an administrator who supervises several faculty and reports to the chief academic officer of the community college, usually designated as the academic dean or vice president” (Murray & Murray, 1998, p. 45). In a similar study, Murray, Murray, and Summar (2000), found that chief academic officers in community colleges are generally satisfied with their jobs, even though they experience some role conflict. Murray et al. (2000) also found that most chief academic officers intend to stay in their position and most have aspirations of becoming a community college president.
In a study of community college staff, Bauer (2000) found that four factors contribute to the satisfaction of front line staff. Front line staff members are defined as primarily clerical and secretarial staff who often serve as the first point of contact with prospective students, current students, and legislative officials (Bauer, 2000). According to Bauer (2000), the four factors contributing to the job satisfaction of front line staff are rewards and recognition, personal choice and empowerment, work-life balance, and growth through training and development.

Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell (2000) argued that low levels of job satisfaction among student affair officers (SSAO) leads to health problems and can be costly to institutions. They also suggested that low levels of job satisfaction also lead to high turnover rates and low organizational commitment of administrators. Anderson et al. (2000) found that male senior student affairs officers were more satisfied with their jobs than their female counterparts. Additionally, Anderson concluded that older SSAOs were more satisfied than younger SSAOs and married SSAOs were more satisfied than single SSAOs. Anderson et al. (2000) argued very little research has been conducted focusing just on student affairs administrators.

It is obvious from the literature review that job satisfaction is studied among community college employees but the studies are varied. The variables in each study were very different from each other and it is difficult to pull common themes. The review indicates that job satisfaction has not been widely studied with executive-level community college administrators (Chieffo, 1991; Downey, 2008) and thus, there is a significant gap. The next
section describes the impact mentoring has on job satisfaction. Included in the discussion is mentoring and job satisfaction in higher education.

**Mentoring and Job Satisfaction**

According to Ensher et al. (2001), mentoring has gained popularity and attention as research indicates a number of positive career outcomes for protégés. One of those positive career outcomes is job satisfaction and several studies have shown individuals with mentors have greater levels of job satisfaction than those without mentors (Fagenson, 1989; Lee & del Carmen Montiel, 2011; van Emmerik, 2004). Ensher et al. (2001) found that mentoring was a significant predictor of job satisfaction in their study of 142 protégés in informal mentoring relationships.

Fagenson (1989) studied “whether men versus women in higher versus lower level positions perceived equal benefits from being or not being mentored in their careers/jobs” (p. 311). A stratified random sample (on job level and gender) of 518 men and women in high and low-level positions in a healthcare organization received a questionnaire from the company’s management development office. The response rate was 48 percent (Fagenson, 1989). The jobs were classified by high and low-level positions using the company’s graded position classification. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents indicated they had a mentor. Fagenson (1989) found that those that reported having a mentor also reported having more career mobility and opportunity, more recognition, more satisfaction, and more promotions than those without a mentor.

Similarly, Lee and del Carmen Montiel (2011) found that mental health professionals in informal mentoring relationships with their supervisor had higher levels of job satisfaction.
than the mental health professionals that were not in a mentoring relationship. They also found that protégés that received the mentoring function of career support had higher levels of job satisfaction than those that did not.

In an effort to determine why mentoring works, Baranik et al. (2010) measured what mentors are giving their protégés by assessing the level of career support and psychosocial support. Baranik et al. (2010), in their study of mentoring dyads comprised of supervisors and subordinates, found that protégés that received career and psychosocial support functions of mentoring believed their organizations cared about them and had high levels of job satisfaction.

In higher education, Van Emmerik (2004) studied mentoring and job satisfaction with university faculty members in The Netherlands. Van Emmerick (2004) concluded that the results of the study “replicate and underscore mentoring to be a critical resource to boost the career and psychosocial development of employees” (p. 591). The findings of the study also suggest that having multiple mentors increases the levels of job satisfaction. In a similar study, Smith et al. (2000) found university faculty with mentors are committed to the organization, have higher levels of job satisfaction, and lower turnover intentions than those without a mentor. Nickels and Kowalski-Braun (2012) studied job satisfaction from the mentor’s perspective. Nickels and Kowalski-Braun (2012) found that minority staff members that served as mentors to minority women students experienced increased levels of job satisfaction. These studies show that higher education faculty and students have benefited from having a mentor and that higher education staff that serve as mentors have experienced increased job satisfaction. The studies, however, are limited as most empirical research
focuses on the satisfaction of workers in the more traditional corporate fields like engineering (Ragins & Cotton, 1999), manufacturing (Scandura, 1992), and healthcare (Fagenson, 1989). After a review of the literature, it is evident that very little research has been done on the relationship between mentoring and job satisfaction with community college administrators (VanDerLinden, 2005).

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed the literature on mentoring and job satisfaction. The chapter was divided into five main sections. The first section gave the context for the study and described the current community college climate. The chapter included a general discussion of career development and then the career development theories which link mentoring and job satisfaction. A rationale for why Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (1984) Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) was used to support the study was presented.

A definition of mentoring and background information on mentoring and its outcomes were given. The discussion on mentoring included the two mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, the impact of gender, the two types of mentoring relationships (formal and informal), and the most influential relationship type. The dependent variable in the study, overall job satisfaction, was also discussed. The literature on job satisfaction was reviewed with an emphasis on job satisfaction in higher education, particularly the community college. Finally, a discussion of the extant literature which included both mentoring and job satisfaction as variables was discussed.

While job satisfaction of community college administrators has been researched, there is still very little empirical research. Research on the relationship mentoring functions
have with overall job satisfaction of community college administrators is even more limited. The previous research described has examined the relationship between mentoring and job satisfaction and how that relates to other outcomes, but there is little understanding of how mentoring functions relate to job satisfaction particularly with the community college administrator population. The present study builds on and expands previous research of the construct of mentoring functions by reviewing the literature and empirically investigating mentoring functions and job satisfaction in the community college context. It further expands previous research by investigating the relationships between the demographic variables (gender of administrator, gender of mentor, informal or formal mentoring relationships type, and most influential mentoring relationship type if the protégé experienced both) and mentoring functions and job satisfaction.
Chapter Three

Research Methods

The purpose of the present study was to investigate career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions as well as the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of informally or formally mentored executive-level community college administrators. This chapter includes information on the research methods and a description of the procedures used to carry out the study. First, a description of the research design is provided. Next, the chapter continues with a discussion of the population of executive-level community college administrators and the sampling methods used. This chapter also includes a discussion of data collection, instrumentation, and response rates. The data analysis techniques are also discussed. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Research Design

The research design was a non-experimental correlational study designed to assess how mentoring functions are associated with job satisfaction. According to Sproull (2002), a non-experimental design is one that does not have an experimental variable but does include a variable that can be measured and the researcher can control what to measure, when to measure, and what do ask. For the present study, the researcher measured mentoring functions and job satisfaction.

The data collection was a self-administered survey design. Quantitative research methods were chosen to aid in understanding the relationship between mentoring functions and job satisfaction among community college administrators. Additional details are provided in the data analysis section. The next section discusses the population.
Population

Participants in the study included executive-level community college administrators in the nine mega-state community colleges with job titles of president, executive vice president, vice president, chief academic officer, chief operating officer, and chief financial officer. Specifically, all individuals reporting directly to the president were included. The nine mega states were identified by Palmer (2008) because the states account for more than 50% of the national total for appropriations made by the states to education. The nine mega states are California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Table 3.1 provides a list of the nine mega state community colleges with the number of community colleges in each state.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 indicates a total of 404 public community colleges in the nine mega-states in 2012: California (N = 110), Florida (N = 28), Georgia (N = 27), Illinois (N = 45), New York (N = 35), North Carolina (N = 58), Ohio (N = 23), Pennsylvania (N = 14), and Texas (N = 64). The next section contains a discussion of the sample including sample size and sampling procedures.

**Sample**

A random proportional cluster sample was used so the number of community colleges equally represented the population of community colleges from each state. For the present study, proportional cluster sampling was most appropriate because it was both inexpensive and faster over large geographical areas (Sproull, 2002).

**Sample Size**

According to Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001), sample size should be based on the primary variables used in the study. The variables of mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction were the two primary continuous variables in the present study. Because both the mentoring functions scale and the MSQ instruments contained Likert scales with five possible response items, sample size was calculated based on five response items.

To determine sample size, it was estimated each community college would have five executive-level administrators. This figure was ascertained after a review of 20 websites of community colleges in each of the nine mega-state community colleges. The researcher averaged the number of executive-level administrators from each of the 20 colleges and arrived at an estimate of five. Using the estimated five administrators per college and based on 404 community colleges in the nine mega states, the estimated population of community
college administrators was calculated as 2,020 (404 x 5 = 2,020). According to Bartlett et al. (2001), the best formula for sample size for a continuous variable is Cochran’s (1977).

Cochran’s (1977) formula for sample size included the following:

\[ n = \frac{(t)^2 \times (s)^2}{(d)^2} \]

\( t = \) “the level of risk the researcher is willing to take that true margin of error may exceed the acceptable margin of error” (Bartlett et al., 2001, p. 46). The accepted margin of error for the present study is .05 (\( t = 1.96 \)).

\( s = \) “estimate of standard deviation in the population” (Bartlett et al., 2001, p. 46). Using a five point scale, 98% of the data will fall within six standard deviations. Thus, \( s = 5 \) (points in scale) divided by 6 (standard deviations).

\( d = \) “acceptable margin of error for mean being estimated” (Bartlett et al., 2001, p. 46). The margin of error was three percent which according to Bartlett et al. (2001) is considered acceptable in educational and social research; thereby, the acceptable margin of error was calculated by multiplying the five points in the scale by the three percent margin of error.

\[ n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times (5/6)^2}{(5 \times .03)^2} = 119 \]

Since 119 represented 5.9% of the population of 2020 individuals, further calculations were needed. Cochran’s (1977) formula provides a method to adjust the sample when the sample is more than 5% of the population.

\[
\text{Adjust sample} = \frac{\text{Sample}}{1+\frac{n}{\text{Population}}} = \frac{119}{1+119/2020} = 112
\]
The number of community colleges to be chosen based on Cochran’s (1977) formula is 112 which represents 28% of the population. In order to ensure an adequate response rate, Bartlett et al. (2001) suggested that the researcher use past research to account for the anticipated response rate. According to Adams (2006), previous response rates with executive-level community college administrators varied between 20% and 43%. Therefore, a conservative estimate of the desired total number of respondents needed (112) was divided by the lowest previous response rate (.20) per Adams (2006). The required sample size, using these calculations, is 560 participants. If, as estimated, each community college provides five executive-level administrators, 112 community colleges were needed for the study in order to yield 560 participants. See Table 3.2.

**Random Proportional Cluster Sampling Procedure**

For the random proportional cluster sampling procedure, the number of community colleges in each state was divided by the number of total community colleges in all of the nine mega-states (Bartlett et al., 2001). This gave the proportion needed from each state. Because the literature states that between 56-57% of community college executive-level administrators have had a mentor (Shults, 2001; VanDerLinden, 2005), the number of colleges needed from each state was then multiplied by 44% to ensure an adequate sample size. The original number of community colleges and the number needed to adjust the sample size were added together. According to these calculations, 167 community colleges were required for the sample. According to Sproull (2002), more clusters should be selected to reduce sampling error; therefore, all estimates were rounded up.
After the proportion was determined for each state, the colleges were randomly selected using SPSS, version 19. The complete frame of executive-level community college administrators consisted of 835 individuals. The number of selected community colleges in the sample ($N = 167$) - number of community colleges to select ($112 \times$ proportion) + ($112 \times$ proportion x 44%) - as illustrated in Table 3.2, was multiplied by the expected five executive-level administrators from each institution.
Table 3.2

Proportional Sampling of Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Community Colleges</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
<th>Number of Community Colleges to Select (112 x proportion) + (112 x proportion x 44%)</th>
<th>Number of Participants per State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>100.7%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All numbers of community colleges were rounded up.
Once the sampling procedures were determined, an application to conduct research using human subjects was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of North Carolina State University. The completed application, copies of the proposed survey, letters used to contact participants, and other required information was provided to the IRB committee on June 5, 2012. IRB approval was granted on July 24, 2012, as shown in Appendix D.

An Excel spread sheet was created for each of the nine states in the sample. The organizational charts of all the selected colleges were examined and participants were identified. Each participant’s email address and name were collected from the college’s website along with the college where he or she worked. A total of 769 executives were identified. All of the 769 executive-level administrators from each college randomly selected were invited to participate in the research study by email.

The next section discusses the instrumentation used in the study. This includes a discussion of construct validity and reliability.

**Measures and Instrumentation**

Measures used in the study included a demographic data questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form, and the Mentoring Functions Scale. Section one of the instrument requested the following information: gender of the respondent, whether the individual has ever had a mentor, gender of the mentor, the type of mentoring relationship (formal or informal), and if the respondent had both a formal and informal mentoring relationship, which was the most influential.
The second section contained the Mentoring Functions Scale (Noe, 1988). All 21-items from the instrument were used. Permission was obtained to use the Mentoring Functions Scale (see Appendix A). While several instruments measuring mentoring functions exist, researchers suggested that Noe’s and Scandura’s (1992) be the focus of future use because they have the most consistent measures of mentoring functions (Godshalk and Sosik, 2007). Participants who indicated they have had a mentor answered the questions on the Mentoring Functions Scale. If respondents had more than one mentor, they were instructed to respond based on their most influential mentor. The most influential mentor was defined by the respondent as a definition was not provided by the researcher.

Respondents were asked the extent to which his or her mentor had provided the functions of career support (e.g., “To what extent has your mentor suggested specific strategies for achieving your career goals”) and psychosocial support (e.g., To what extent has your mentor discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts”). Thirteen of the 21 items were related to the career support function of mentoring. Eight of the 21 items were related to the psychosocial support function. The items were on a 5-point Likert scale and response categories range from 1 (to a very slight extent) to 5 (to a very large extent).

The third and final section consisted of the entire MSQ Short Form (Weiss et al., 1967). Permission to use the MSQ is provided in Appendix B. The MSQ was first developed in 1967 as part of the Work Adjustment Project conducted through the University of Minnesota (Weiss et al., 1967). In the present study, respondents were asked about how
satisfied he or she was with various aspects of the job, such as company policies, compensation, and working conditions (e.g., “How satisfied am I with this aspect of my current position: The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities?”). Each item was measured on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied); 2 (dissatisfied); 3 (can’t decide); 4 (satisfied); and 5 (very satisfied). The next two sections discuss construct and content validity.

**Construct Validity of the Instruments**

The validity of Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale was determined by the author using exploratory factor analysis, principal factoring with an Oblim rotation (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). Individual factor loadings ranged from .34 to .84. The factor analysis revealed two factors: 1) career support; and 2) psychosocial support for the present study.

Tepper et al. (1996) conducted confirmatory factor analysis on the Mentoring Function Scale and found psychosocial support and career support to be valid when measured across genders.

According to Weiss et al (1967), “Since the short-form MSQ is based on a subset of the long-form items, validity for the short-form may in part be inferred from validity of the long-form” (p. 24). Weiss et al (1967) suggested that the MSQ measures satisfaction in accordance with the Theory of Work Adjustment proving construct validity. Evidence for support of this claim is obtained from construct validation studies of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire and other studies based on the Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss et al., 1967).
Pilot Study: Establishing Content Validity and Usability

For the present study, a pilot was conducted to test the procedures and to establish content validity (Sproull, 2002). According to Creswell (2009), a pilot study improves questions, format, and scales. The entire survey was distributed to a non-random sample of 25 individual community college executives employed by 17 colleges located in North Carolina that represented the population. The 17 colleges were colleges that were not randomly selected to participate in the actual study (Sproull, 2002). The researcher contacted presidents and vice presidents she knew personally by email to ask for participation. Pilot study participants were instructed to complete the survey and provide feedback via email or telephone. Specifically, they were asked to establish content validity and to evaluate 1) question wording and clarity of each item, 2) time and ease of survey completion, and 3) completeness and coherence (Sproull, 2002). Suggestions for improvement were made, via email and by phone, to the researcher. Based on the feedback, the directions were altered for clarity. No other changes were made.

Usability was also addressed in the pilot study. The survey was available online for evaluators beginning August 12, 2012 and was open through August 30, 2012. No usability issues were identified by pilot study participants.

Reliability

Noe (1988) measured internal consistency for section two, mentoring functions, using Cronbach’s alpha. The alpha’s were .89 for career support and .92 for psychosocial support. The Mentoring Functions Scale has been used in previous research with alphas ranging from .79 to .93 for career support and .84 to .94 for psychosocial support (Day & Allen, 2004).
These reliability values are sufficient, because according to Hair et al. (2006), the values of .60 to .70 are generally acknowledged as being the lower limits of acceptability.

The MSQ had been employed in numerous studies and has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties. Reliability for the measurement of overall job satisfaction was reported as above .70 in five different administrations of the instrument (Weiss et al., 1967).

Data Collection

This section identifies the data collection methods used for the present study. The survey was created and deployed using a web-based program called Survey Monkey™. Survey Monkey hosted the survey and provided the raw data thereby accommodating the technical requirements of the study. Appendix C provides an illustration of the research participant’s web-based interface with the study’s measures. Informed consent was obtained from each participant, including pilot study participants, by their willingness to complete the survey. Participants had the opportunity to request a final copy of the study once it was completed.

The data collection techniques used in the present study were suggested by Dillman (2007). Dillman (2007) proposed a respondent-friendly questionnaire using five respondent contacts: 1) a pre-notification letter, 2) a questionnaire with cover letter, 3) a thank-you follow up, 4) a replacement questionnaire, and 5) a final contact.

In accordance with Dillman’s (2007) suggested format, the first contact was a brief pre-notification email describing the research study (See Appendix E). The email was sent to the entire list from the researcher’s North Carolina State University email address. All of the recipient’s email addresses were put in the blind copy field on the email to retain anonymity.
Of the 769 community college leaders, nine emails were returned as undeliverable or with messages that the individual had retired or left the institution. Three of the nine participants emailed the researcher to say that they no longer worked at the institution but did provide the email address of his or her replacement. Three of the nine participants indicated that they had retired. The researcher then revisited the website for those colleges and located the retiring individual’s replacement. Email addresses were obtained for those individuals. The other three email addresses were corrected. All new and corrected email addresses were included in the sample while approximately nine incorrect addresses were deleted.

Two days following the pre-notification email, the 769 individuals representing the study population were sent an email with an attached letter that included all requirements established by the approved IRB: the purpose of the study, the risks and benefits associated with participating, compensation, confidentiality, rights as a participant, research contact information, an informed consent statement, and a thank you for those willing to participate (See Appendix F for a copy of the informational letter). A link to the survey was also included in the email. The instructions indicated that by clicking the link to the web-based survey, participants were consenting to participate in the study. This email was the second contact to participants. Because Survey Monkey requires that a statement be included in all surveys created with Survey Monkey allowing the recipient to opt out of all Survey Monkey surveys, 23 surveys were undeliverable because the recipient had previously opted out of all Survey Monkey surveys. Therefore, a total of 746 emails with the informational letter and the link to the survey were sent. During the first five days of online accessibility, a total of 130 individuals responded ($N = 130$) or 16.9% of the total sampled.
Five days after the survey was initially sent, non-respondents received a follow-up email which reiterated the importance of the study (See Appendix G). The email included a link to the survey. During the next five days of online accessibility, a total of 69 individuals responded. This was an additional 9% of the total sample.

A final thank you email was sent five days following the second reminder email containing a link to the survey (See Appendix H). The email distributed in the third deployment included a link to the survey and another plea for participation. During the third deployment, a total of 63 individuals responded for an additional 8.2% of the total. The participation for each deployment of the survey is depicted in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deployment Number</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>% Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Dillman’s (2007) collection steps, a final contact using a postcard reminder would have been sent to non-respondents if an adequate number of participant responses was
not obtained. This step was unnecessary because the response rate was 34.1% which was in
the expected range from previous studies with executive-level community college
administrators (Adams, 2006)

**Non-Response Bias**

The survey was available for a three-week time period, from September 7, 2012, to
September 28, 2012. Because all responses were requested within such a short time frame,
non-response bias was not an issue.

The next section discusses the data preparation and analysis. Details are given for
each research question.

**Data Preparation and Analysis**

The statistical software programs that were used for the analysis of the study are
Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel. The data analysis
consisted of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics on the demographic and study
variables. Multiple regression was used to determine if mentoring functions and demographic
variables respectively explain a significant amount of variance on job satisfaction.

**Data Preparation**

According to Sproull (2002), data preparation is necessary for identifying missing
data, incorrect responses, or unexpected findings. The first step in preparing the data was to
examine the data by scanning through the raw numbers for inconsistencies in responses to
determine errors in data entry (Sproull, 2002). Next, missing data was addressed. It is
important to address missing data and it is appropriate to delete cases or variables that create
problems within defined limits (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). After the data were examined
and accepted, tests for univariate outliers were conducted to ensure normality or a normal curve and scatter plots were analyzed to determine linearity (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005).

Univariate outliers were tested for by computing Z scores (Hair et al., 2006). The Z scores were used to analyze the number of standard deviations an observation fell below or above the mean and which observations were outliers. According to Hair et al. (2006), outliers need to be identified because they can distort statistics. Further, results based on data that includes outliers cannot be easily generalized (Hair et al., 2006).

A normal probability plot or histogram was used to compare the goodness of fit of the cumulative distribution of data to test for normality. According to Hair et al. (2006), a normal distribution is critical because it is the benchmark for statistical methods. Kurtosis was used to examine the peakedness and skewness was used to examine the symmetry (Hair et al., 2006). Kolmogorov-Smirnov was also used to test the normality of the variables (Mertler & Vannatt, 2005). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is depicted in Chapter 4.

Linearity is required to assume regression analyses and was, therefore, tested. Linearity relates to the pattern of association between pairs of variables and the ability of the correlation coefficient to represent the relationship (Hair et al., 2006). Scatterplots were examined to determine linearity.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine construct validity of the mentoring functions inventory (Hair et al., 2006). The principle components extraction method was used with an Oblim rotational method. An Oblim rotational method represents the clustering of variables more accurately than other rotations (Hair et al., 2006).
To determine internal consistency, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used. To ensure scale reliability, internal consistency is necessary (Hair et al., 2006). According to Hair et al. (2006), Cronbach’s alpha is a reliability measure ranging from 0 to 1, with a value of .60 to .70 considered the lower limits of acceptability. For the present research, a Cronbach’s alpha cut off of .70 was utilized (Nunnally, 1967). The next section discusses the research questions and the specific techniques used in the analysis.

**Research Questions and Methods Used**

Research question one: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive job satisfaction, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire? Frequencies, means, percentages, and standard deviations were computed for Research Question One. Results are included in Chapter Four.

Research question two: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, as measured by Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale? Frequencies, means, percentages, and standard deviations were computed for Research Question Two and the results are located in Chapter Four.

Research question three: Are there relationships between career support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? Pearson’s correlations were used to examine the relationships for Research Question Three. The results of the Pearson’s correlations are presented in Chapter Four.
Research question four: Are there relationships between psychosocial support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? Pearson’s correlations were used to examine the relationships and results are presented in Chapter Four.

Research question five: Are there relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored? Pearson’s correlations were used to examine the relationships. The results are presented in Chapter Four.

Research question six: Are there relationships between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored? Correlations using Pearson’s Product Moment were determined to examine the relationship for Research Question Six. The results of the Pearson’s correlations are included in Chapter Four.

Research question seven: Do mentoring functions and demographic variables explain a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction? A multiple regression was used to explain job satisfaction. The results of the regression analysis are presented in Chapter Four. Mentoring functions and demographic variables were independent variables while job satisfaction served as the dependent variable.

Summary

The present study investigated the mentoring functions, career support and psychosocial support, and the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of community college leaders. Seven research questions were utilized in the study. SPSS software was used
to analyze the data. Pre-screening of the data included a factor analysis and determining
Cronbach’s alphas. Means, frequencies, standard deviations, Pearson’s correlations, and a
multiple regression analysis was used to answer the questions (Hair et al., 2006).
Chapter Four

Results

This chapter provides the results of the survey assessing perceptions of community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-state community colleges regarding mentoring functions and job satisfaction. This chapter includes pre-analysis measures including examining linearity, utilizing factor analysis to determine construct validity, and testing for internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha. The analysis of the data also included using means and standard deviations to evaluate the perception of mentored administrators with overall job satisfaction and with the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support. Pearson’s correlation was used to evaluate the relationship between the mentoring functions of career and psychosocial support and job satisfaction, between the mentoring functions and demographic variables, and between job satisfaction and the demographic variables. Finally, a multiple regression analysis was used to determine the extent mentoring functions and the demographic variables impact job satisfaction. A summary is included.

Data was collected for this research using an online survey emailed to community college administrators in September 2012.

Pre-Measurement Data Analysis

The data were examined for accuracy prior to analysis by examining the dataset and making sure there were no obvious data entry errors. A total of 262 participants started the survey. On average, there were 1.8 variables that were identified with missing data meaning that in each case, there was an average of 1.8 variables that did not have an answer. The
respondents were sorted on the lowest to highest number of items with missing data. Any response that was more than three standard deviations (5, .02%) from the mean (1.8) was discarded. Five cases were removed. In four additional cases, only half of the questions were answered and therefore were removed. All other responses (253, 97%) were less than one standard deviation from the mean and were retained (Hair et al., 2006). After examining the data, multicollinearity was not an issue. Kolmogorov-Smirnov was used to test the normality of the variables (Mertler & Vannatt, 2005). According to Hair et al. (2006), a normal distribution is critical because it is the benchmark for statistical methods.

Table 4.1 – *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test to Assess Normality of Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction Items* – contains data from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to assess normality.
Table 4.1

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test to Assess Normality of Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Functions Items</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Given you assignments or tasks in your work that prepared you for an administrative position.</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Made you respect him/her and want to act in a way that merits his/her respect and admiration.</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nominated you for desirable lateral moves or promotions.</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Made you enjoy interacting with him/her.</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provided assistance and direction on how to solve problems you face in your job.</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Given you assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills.</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kept feelings and doubts you shared with him/her in strict confidence.</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of you becoming a community college administrator or receiving a promotion.</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Helped you to meet new colleagues.</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helped you to clarify your career goals.</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts.</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her.</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encouraged you to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from your work.</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems.</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual.</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Contributed to your improvement in a number of skill areas.</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Shared ideas with you.</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Discussed your goals and development plans with you.</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Encouraged you to try new behaviors on the job.</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Increased your self-confidence.</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community.</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my supervisor handles his/her workers.</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way college policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The chances for advancement on the job.</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The working conditions.</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The way my colleagues get along with each other.</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Lilliefors Significance Correction. *p<.05.
The most common way to test for linearity is to examine scatter plots (Hair et al., 2006). The plots visually confirmed linearity of the data.

To determine internal consistency for each scale, Cronbach’s alphas were computed. According to Nunnally (1967), the suggested level of acceptability is .70 or higher. The Cronbach’s alpha for the mentoring functions scale was .92; and, the Cronbach’s alpha for the job satisfaction scale was .94. Both scales were within the acceptable range.

**Demographic Results**

The survey included categorical level demographic variables of gender of administrator (respondent), whether the respondent had a mentor, gender of mentor, type of mentoring relationship, and most influential mentor for those respondents that indicated they have had both an informal and formal mentor. See Table 4.2 *Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Gender, Mentoring, Type of Mentoring Relationship, and Most Influential Mentoring Relationship.*
Table 4.2

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents' Gender, Mentoring, Type of Mentoring Relationship, and Most Influential Mentoring Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Mentoring Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informally Mentored</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally Mentored</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Influential Mentor if Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Relationship</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Relationship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Not all respondents answered every question therefore the $n$ and $f$ are not consistent for each question ($n = 262$).
Of the respondents, 147 (56.8%) were male, and 112 (43.2%) were female. One hundred seventy-six of the respondents (67.4%) indicated they had a mentor, and 85 (32.6%) specified they did not have a mentor. Of the respondents who had a mentor, 120 (68.6%) indicated that their mentor was male and 55 (31.4%) indicated that their mentor was female.

Of the respondents with a mentor, 132 (75.4%) were informally mentored, 13 (7.4%) had a formal mentoring relationship, and 30 (17.1%) responded that they had experienced both an informal and a formal mentoring relationship. Of those respondents that experienced both types of mentoring relationships, 17 (58.6%) indicated the informal relationship was the most influential relationship and 12 (41.4%) indicated the formal relationship was the most influential.

Overall, more males responded to the survey. The majority of respondents indicated they have had a mentor and most of the mentors were male. Of those respondents with a mentor, the majority were in an informal mentoring relationship.

**Mentoring Functions Construct Validity**

Table 4.3 – *Factor Loadings for Mentoring Functions* – illustrates the factor loading for the mentoring functions items based on a confirmatory factor analysis using a principal components extraction method and an Oblim rotational method. This method was used to establish construct validity (Creswell, 2009). As illustrated in Table 4.3, the factor analysis suggested two separate factors: 1) career support; and, 2) psychosocial support. Thirteen items loaded on career support and 8 items loaded on psychosocial support. Cronbach’s alpha was .88 for career support and .86 for psychosocial support. Both were at the acceptable level (Nunnally, 1967).
Table 4.3

*Factor Loadings for Mentoring Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Functions</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Factor One (Career Support) Items</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Given you assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills.</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Given you assignments or tasks in your work that prepared you for an administrative position.</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Contributed to your improvement in a number of skill areas.</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Shared ideas with you.</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Increased your self-confidence.</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Encouraged you to try new behaviors on the job.</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Helped you to meet new colleagues.</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of you becoming a community college administrator or receiving a promotion.</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Made you respect him/her and want to act in a way that merits his/her respect and admiration.</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provided assistance and direction on how to solve problems you face in your job.</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nominated you for desirable lateral moves or promotions.</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Made you enjoy interacting with him/her.</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Factor Two (Psychosocial Support) Items</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her.</td>
<td>-.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encouraged you to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from your work.</td>
<td>-.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts.</td>
<td>-.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems.</td>
<td>-.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Discussed your goals and development plans with you.</td>
<td>-.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helped you to clarify your career goals.</td>
<td>-.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual.</td>
<td>-.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kept feelings and doubts you shared with him/her in strict confidence.</td>
<td>-.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *- 5-point scale: 1 = to a very light extent to 5 = to a very large extent
The frequencies and percentages for each item in the mentoring functions survey are identified in Table 4.4 Frequencies and Percentages by Item for the Two Mentoring Functions of Career Support and Psychosocial Support.

Table 4.4
Frequencies and Percentages by Item for the Two Mentoring Functions of Career Support and Psychosocial Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 To a Very Light Extent</th>
<th>2 To a Small Extent</th>
<th>3 To Some Extent</th>
<th>4 To a Large Extent</th>
<th>5 To a Very Large Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results in Table 4.5 *Cronbach's Alpha, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Mentoring Functions* include the mean and standard deviation for each item in the Mentoring Functions Scale. The Cronbach’s alpha for the overall scale was acceptable at .92. The range of values was a minimum of 1.00 to a maximum of 5.00 for all items.
Table 4.5

*Cronbach's Alpha, Mean, and Standard Deviation for the Mentoring Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring functions items</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Given you assignments or tasks in your work that prepared you for an administrative position.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Made you respect him/her and want to act in a way that merits his/her respect and admiration.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nominated you for desirable lateral moves or promotions.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Made you enjoy interacting with him/her.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provided assistance and direction on how to solve problems you face in your job.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Given you assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kept feelings and doubts you shared with him/her in strict confidence.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of you becoming a community college administrator or receiving a promotion.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Helped you to meet new colleagues.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helped you to clarify your career goals.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encouraged you to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from your work.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Contributed to your improvement in a number of skill areas.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Shared ideas with you.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Discussed your goals and development plans with you.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Encouraged you to try new behaviors on the job.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Increased your self-confidence.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5-point scale: 1 = *to a very light extent* to 5 = *to a very large extent*
Job Satisfaction Analysis

Overall job satisfaction was the dependent variable for the present study. Using exploratory factor analysis, all job satisfaction items loaded on one factor.

Table 4.6 Frequencies and Percentages by Item for Job Satisfaction contains the frequencies and percentages for the 20 items for job satisfaction.

Table 4.6
Frequencies and Percentages by Item for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied or dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in Table 4.7 *Overall Cronbach's Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for Job Satisfaction Items* include the means and standard deviations for each job satisfaction item. The Cronbach’s alpha for the overall scale was acceptable at .94. The minimum means for all items was 1.00 while the maximum for all items was 5.00.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction items</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my supervisor handles his/her workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way college policies are put into practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The chances for advancement on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The way my colleagues get along with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* a - 5-point scale: 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied
The following describes the results for each of the seven research questions.

**Research Question One**

The findings for the first research question along with the analysis of the data are presented. Range, mean, and standard deviation data are presented in raw numbers and averaged scores.

Research question one: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive job satisfaction, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

The respondents rated each of the 20 items from 1 to 5 (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = N (can’t decide), 4 = satisfied, and 5 = very satisfied). Overall job satisfaction was measured and considered as a single factor (construct) for the present study.

**Table 4.8 Number of Items, Minimum, Maximum, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Overall Job Satisfaction of Community College Executive-Level Administrators, Non-Averaged** displays the raw, non-averaged scores for overall job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>83.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale responses were 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = N (can't decide), 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied.
Overall job satisfaction had a maximum score of 100, meaning some individuals answered five (very satisfied) to each of the 20 items of the job satisfaction measure.

Table 4.9 Minimum, Maximum, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Averaged Job Satisfaction of Community College Executive-Level Administrators displays the averaged scores for overall job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average scores are raw scores divided by the number of items in each scale. Scale responses were 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = N (can't decide), 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied.

The mean score of the averaged construct of overall job satisfaction is 4.18 (SD=.57), meaning that most executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs as measured by the MSQ.

**Research Question Two**

Research question two: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive
mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, as measured by Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale?

The respondents \((N = 176)\) rated each of the 21 items from 1 to 5 (1 = to a very light extent, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a large extent, and 5 = to a very large extent). Items were summed for the appropriate factor. Of the two types of mentoring support, career support had 13 items and psychosocial support had 8 items. Table 4.10

*Number of Items, Minimum, Maximum, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Mentoring Functions of Community College Executive-Level Administrators, Non-Averaged*

provides the summed scores of each mentoring function factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>50.97</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each construct had a different number of items in the scales (career support = 13 items and psychosocial support = 8 items). Scale responses were 1 = to a very slight extent, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a large extent, 5 = to a very large extent.

To compare the constructs of the summed scale for the two mentoring functions, the total number of items were added then divided by the total number of items. Table 4.11 –
Minimum, Maximum, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Averaged Mentoring Functions of Community College Executive-Level Administrators – provides the average scores for both career support and psychosocial support. As already stated, the scores were interpreted by 1 = to a very light extent, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a large extent, and 5 = to a very large extent with the mentoring function questions.

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average scores are raw scores divided by the number of items in each scale. Each construct had a different number of items in the scale (career support = 13 items and psychosocial support = 8 items). Scale responses were 1 = to a very slight extent, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a large extent, 5 = to a very large extent.

Career support had a higher averaged minimum score (2.00) and higher averaged mean score (3.92) than psychosocial support (Minimum = 1.25, M = 3.80). More executive-level community college administrators received career support than psychosocial support from their mentor.
Research Question Three

Research question three: Are there relationships between career support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators?

The purpose of the third question was to examine if relationships existed between the mentoring function of career support and the demographic variables of gender of respondent (administrator), gender of mentor, relationship type, and most influential relationship type if more than one type of mentoring relationship existed. A Pearson’s correlation was used to answer this question. The correlation was analyzed using the factor of career support with each of the demographic variables.

Table 4.12 – Relationship Between Community College Leader's Perceived Level of Career Support with Gender (Female), Gender of Mentor (Male), Relationship Type (Formal), and Most Influential Type of Mentoring Relationship (Formal) as Measured by Pearson's Product Moment Correlation – shows the relationship between career support and the demographic variables.
Table 4.12

*Relationship Between Community College Leader’s Perceived Level of Career Support with Gender (Female), Gender of Mentor (Male), Relationship Type (Formal), and Most Influential Type of Mentoring Relationship (Formal) as Measured by Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>Career Support</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>*Negligible Association</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Mentor (Male)</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Type (Formal)</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Influential Type (Formal)</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Davis’ (1971) descriptors were used: .70 or higher = very strong association, .50-.69 = substantial association, .30-.49 moderate association, .10-.29 = low association, .01-.09 = negligible association. *\( p < .01 \).*

The results of the Pearson’s correlation revealed a negative association (Davis, 1971) between career support and gender of protégé and formal as the most influential mentoring type. However, none of the demographic variables had a statistically significant relationship with the mentoring function of career support. The most influential mentoring relationship type (formal mentoring) had a low association with career support (Davis, 1971).

In order to determine if there was a significant difference in the career support received by protégés by the gender composition of the mentoring relationship, a one-way ANOVA was used. The predictor variable of gender composition was measured on a nominal scale which assumed four values (male-male mentoring relationship, female-female mentoring relationship, male with a female mentor, and female with a male mentor). The
design was between-subjects because each participant appeared in only one group. The analysis revealed that the effect was not significant as depicted in Table 4.13 - Gender Composition of the Mentoring Relationship and Career Support Using Anova

Table 4.13

Gender Composition of the Mentoring Relationship and Career Support Using Anova

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58.719</td>
<td>19.573</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8852.28</td>
<td>58.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>8910.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Research Question Four

Research question four: Are there relationships between psychosocial support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators?

The fourth question examined if relationships existed between the mentoring function of psychosocial support and the demographic variables of gender of respondent (administrator), gender of mentor, relationship type, and most influential relationship type if more than one type of mentoring relationship existed. Correlations were determined for psychosocial support and each demographic variable.
Table 4.14 – Relationship Between Community College Leader's Perceived Level of Psychosocial Support with Gender (Female), Gender of Mentor (Male), Relationship Type (Formal), and Most Influential Type of Mentoring Relationship (Formal) as Measured by Pearson's Product Moment Correlation – depicts the relationship between the mentoring function of psychosocial support and the demographic variables.

### Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>Psychosocial Support</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Mentor (Male)</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Type (Formal)</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Influential Type (Formal)</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Davis' (1971) descriptors are as follows: .70 or higher = very strong association, .50-.69 = substantial association, .30-.49 moderate association, .10-.29 = low association, .01-.09 = negligible association. *$p$<.01.

None of the demographic variables had a statistically significant relationship with the mentoring function of psychosocial support. Both gender and the most influential mentoring relationship type had a negative low association with psychosocial support.
In order to determine if there was a significant difference in the psychosocial support received by protégés by the gender composition of the mentoring relationship, a one-way ANOVA with a between-subjects design. The predictor variable of gender composition was measured on a nominal scale which assumed four values (male-male, female-female, male with a female mentor, and female with a male mentor). The analysis revealed that the effect was not significant as depicted in Table 4.15 - *Gender Composition of the Mentoring Relationship and Psychosocial Support Using Anova*

Table 4.15

*Gender Composition of the Mentoring Relationship and Psychosocial Support Using Anova*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123.782</td>
<td>41.261</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4024.99</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>710.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**Research Question Five**

Research question five: Are there relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored?

The fifth question examined if relationships existed between overall job satisfaction and the demographic variables of gender of respondent (administrator), gender of mentor,
relationship type, and most influential relationship type if more than one type of mentoring relationship existed. Correlations were determined for overall job satisfaction and each demographic variable.

Table 4.16 – Relationship Between Community College Leader's Perceived Level of Overall Job Satisfaction with Gender (Female), Gender of Mentor (Male), Relationship Type (Formal), and Most Influential Type of Mentoring Relationship (Formal) as Measured by Pearson's Product Moment Correlation – depicts the relationship between job satisfaction and the demographic variables.

Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Mentor (Male)</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Type (Formal)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Influential Type (Formal)</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Davis' (1971) descriptors are as follows: .70 or higher = very strong association, .50-.69 = substantial association, .30-.49 moderate association, .10-.29 = low association, .01-.09 = negligible association. *$p<.01$. 
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None of the demographic variables had a statistically significant relationship with overall job satisfaction. Three variables were negative. The most influential mentoring relationship type had a negative low association with job satisfaction.

**Research Question Six**

Research question six: Are there relationships between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored?

The sixth research questions sought to examine if relationships existed between the two mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction. Correlations were determined for the two mentoring functions subscales (career support and psychosocial support) and overall job satisfaction. Table 4.17 – *Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Mentoring Functions as Measured by Pearson's Product Moment Correlation* – illustrates the relationship between job satisfaction and mentoring functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Davis' (1971) descriptors are as follows: .70 or higher = very strong association, .50-.69 = substantial association, .30-.49 moderate association, .10-.29 = low association, .01-.09 = negligible association. *$p<.01$. 
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The Pearson’s correlation revealed a low association between career support and overall job satisfaction and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction. As the measurement of career support increased, overall job satisfaction increased. Likewise, as the measurement of psychosocial support increased, overall job satisfaction increased. Both associations were significant.

**Research Question Seven**

Research question seven: Do mentoring functions and demographic variables explain a significant amount of variance on job satisfaction?

Using a regression analysis, the final research question sought to determine if the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, and the demographic variables of gender, gender of mentor, relationship type, and most influential relationship type if more than one type of mentoring relationship existed explain a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction.

Table 4.18 – *Multiple Regression Analysis to Explore if Mentoring Functions of Community College Administrators and Demographic Variables Explain a Significant Amount of Variance in Perceived Job Satisfaction* – depicts the variables that explain a significant amount of variance on job satisfaction.
Table 4.18

*Multiple Regression Analysis to Explore if Mentoring Functions of Community College Administrators and Demographic Variables Explain a Significant Amount of Variance in Perceived Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1692.090</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>333.418</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1495.729</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3187.818</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Overall R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>72.025</td>
<td>2.798</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>3.829</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>-1.115</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-4.283</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Mentor</td>
<td>-6.834</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Influential Relationship Type</td>
<td>-1.465</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05

Career support and psychosocial support were related. There was 42.1% shared variance between career and psychosocial support. The regression ($F = 3.62$, $df = 21$, $p = .022$) developed a significant model. The regression revealed that only one variable, career support ($t = 3.829$, $p = .001$) was significant. Career support explained 53.1% of the variance in job satisfaction.
Summary

The chapter presented the findings of the analyzed data. Demographic information about the participants in the study was provided. Descriptive statistics related to the two instruments were also provided and gave information related to how the participants responded. A factor analysis was conducted for the Mentoring Functions Scale to determine construct validity. Internal consistency was examined using Cronbach’s alphas.

Descriptions of executive-level community college administrators who have been informally or formally mentored levels of job satisfaction and mentoring functions were presented to address the first two research questions. Correlations were conducted to address research questions three, four, five, and six. In order to address question seven, a multiple regression analysis was completed to determine if mentoring functions and demographic variables explained a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction.

Findings for question one revealed the mean score of the averaged construct of overall job satisfaction is 4.18, meaning that most executive-level community college administrators that have been formally or informally mentored were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs as measured by the MSQ. Findings for question two revealed that more administrators received career support (M = 3.92) than psychosocial support (M = 3.80).

The third question revealed a negative association (Davis, 1971) between career support and gender of protégé and most influential mentoring type. Both gender and the most influential mentoring relationship type had a negative low association with psychosocial support as discovered in question four. Findings for question five indicated the most influential mentoring relationship type had a negative low association with job satisfaction.
In question six, it was revealed career support and overall job satisfaction and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction had a low association. Both associations were significant.

The regression model explained 53.1% of the variance in job satisfaction. The regression revealed that career support explained 53.1% of the variance on job satisfaction.
Chapter Five

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The primary purpose of this research was to investigate the mentoring functions, career support and psychosocial support, and the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators from the nine mega-state community colleges. This chapter includes an overall summary of the study, conclusions based on the results of the analysis of the research, a general discussion related to the findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research. Research limitations and final thoughts are also included. To learn more about mentoring functions and jobs satisfaction of community college leaders, seven research questions were developed. The first question described how mentored executive-level community college administrators from the nine mega-states perceived job satisfaction. Describing the perceptions of mentoring functions was the focus of the second research question. The next two questions investigated if relationships existed between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and demographics. The fifth question examined if there were relationships between overall job satisfaction and the demographic variables. The sixth question focused on determining if there was a relationship between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored. The seventh research question explored if career support, psychosocial support, and the demographic variables explained any amount of variance in job satisfaction. The next sections provide a brief summary of the chapters in this study.
With support from the literature, the primary purpose of Chapter One was to demonstrate the need for research on mentoring functions and job satisfaction of mentored executive-level community college administrators. The chapter also included the problem, purpose, and the significance of the study. Community college administrators are retiring at an alarming rate (McNair et al., 2011); therefore, community college professionals should be concerned with the job satisfaction of its current leaders and those in the pipeline to become executive-level community college administrators. These retirements and an insufficient number of individuals in the pipeline are driving the critical need for empirical research on the career development of administrators within the community college environment (Piland & Wolf, 2003). Mentoring is one form of career development and has played an important role in the leadership development and the development of skills, knowledge, and abilities of community college leaders (Shults, 2001; VanDerLinden, 2005). Mentoring consists of two functions – career support and psychosocial support – and those functions have been associated with job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004). Job satisfaction has been associated with positive work outcomes for both the organization (Allen, et al., 2004; Chao, et al., 1992; Chao, 2007; Zey, 1988) and the employee (Allen, et al., 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2007; Lankau & Scandura, 2002).

The present study builds on and expands previous research on mentoring functions and job satisfaction through a review of the literature that suggested the need to empirically research the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall levels of job satisfaction in a community college context.
Chapter Two’s purpose was to review the literature related to mentoring and mentoring functions, as well as job satisfaction. A discussion of community colleges, which included the current challenges for executive-level administrators, began the chapter. Theories that have been used in the literature related to mentoring and job satisfaction were reviewed. The literature related to the study was organized into the topics of community colleges, career development and career development theory, mentoring which included discussion on mentoring functions, the demographic variables of mentoring gender and mentoring relationship type (informal or formal), job satisfaction, and, job satisfaction and mentoring. The literature review revealed no studies with mentoring functions and job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators. However, literature containing empirical data on the benefits of mentoring and job satisfaction to the individual was found.

The third chapter included a detailed description of the research methods used in the study. The research design, population, sampling plan, instrumentation, validity, usability, reliability, data collection methods, and the data preparation procedures were included. Missing data and non-response bias was addressed as well.

The fourth chapter presented the findings of the analyzed data. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for the Mentoring Functions Scale and Cronbach’s alpha was used to test the reliability of the scales for both instruments used in the study. The seven research questions that guided the study were addressed. Descriptive statistics were provided using the means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages for the respondents’ perceptions of job satisfaction, perceptions of mentoring functions, and demographic data. The demographic
data included the gender of the administrator, whether the respondent had a mentor, the
gender of the mentor, the mentoring relationship type (informal or formal), and the most
influential relationship type if the respondent had both. A Pearson’s correlation was
conducted to determine the relationship between career support and the demographics,
psychosocial support and the demographics, overall job satisfaction and the demographics,
and between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall
job satisfaction. Multiple regression was used to determine if mentoring functions and
demographic variables explained a significant amount of variance in overall job satisfaction
of mentored executive-level community college administrators.

In this fifth and final chapter, a discussion of the findings and conclusions is
provided. Discussion and findings concerning the demographic data is presented. Findings
and conclusions for each of the seven research questions is also the provided. After a general
discussion, implications for practice are presented. Recommendations for future research
related to the topic and an explanation of the study’s limitations finalize this chapter.

**Discussion of Findings and Conclusions**

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the mentoring functions, career
support and psychosocial support, and the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of
mentored executive-level community college administrators from the nine mega-state
community colleges. Seven research questions were used to guide the study. Research
question one described the perceptions of the participants’ overall job satisfaction. The
second research question sought to describe the mentoring functions of career support and
psychosocial support of the participants. The third research question examined if
relationships existed between career support and demographic variables. The fourth research question examined if relationships existed between psychosocial support and demographic variables. The fifth research question examined if relationships existed between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables. The sixth research question examined if relationships existed between career and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction. The seventh research question sought to explore if career support and psychosocial support could explain any amount of variance in overall job satisfaction. The first conclusions are applicable to the demographics variables.

**Demographic Data**

The demographic data revealed more males (56.8%; \( n = 147 \)) responded to the survey than females (43.2%; \( n = 112 \)). A majority (67.4%) of respondents indicated they have had a mentor. This frequency is higher than in previous studies where between 56-57% of administrators reported having a mentor (Shults, 2001; VanDerLinden, 2005). The findings may be higher because of the random cluster sampling procedure that used only nine states and one of those states was California. With the largest number of community colleges in the country, California had more community colleges than the other eight states in the sample, because of the random cluster sampling procedure. According to the literature, California is the only state in the country with a formal mentoring program for aspiring community college administrators (Valeau & Boggs, 2004). This may have impacted the number of respondents with a mentor. VanDerLinden (2005) studied only administrators from Michigan and the AACC study as reported by Shults (2001) included all of the community colleges in the country. The mentors were predominantly male (68.6%). Most of the mentoring
relationships were informal (75.4%). Only 7.4% of the respondents indicated only a formal mentoring relationship while 17.1% of respondents indicated they had both an informal and formal mentoring relationship. A total of 24.5% of respondents, therefore, indicated they had a formal mentoring relationship. This percentage was to be expected considering that administrators in California comprised 27.2% of the sample and, as mentioned, California is the only state in the sample to have a formal mentoring program for aspiring community college administrators (Valeau & Boggs, 2004). Of those respondents that had both a formal and informal mentoring relationship (n = 30), 58.6% indicated that an informal mentoring relationship was the most influential. This is fully supported by the literature where informal mentoring relationships are more influential to the protégé than formal mentoring relationships (P-Sontag et al., 2007; Turban & Lee, 2007). Turban and Lee (2007) said, “One explanation relating to why formal relationships are not as beneficial as informal relationships is that some of the beneficial aspects of social attraction may be absent in formally assigned mentoring pairs” (p. 22).

**Findings and Conclusions by Research Question**

The present study investigated the mentoring functions and perceived levels of job satisfaction. A random proportional cluster sample from the nine mega-states (Palmer, 2008) was used for this research. Data were collected from executive-level community college administrators, including presidents, from the 112 randomly selected community colleges in the nine mega-states: California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and, Texas (Palmer, 2008). All administrators were invited by email to
participate in an online survey combining mentoring functions and job satisfaction instruments as well as demographic questions.

**Research question one findings and conclusions**

Research question one: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive job satisfaction, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

Research question one described the perceptions of overall job satisfaction of mentored executive-level community college administrators as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form (Weiss et al., 1967). The study found that administrators that had been mentored are satisfied with their jobs ($M = 4.18$, $SD = .57$). The finding that community college administrators have high levels of overall job satisfaction is supported by the literature which indicates employees with a mentor have high levels of job satisfaction (Ensher et al., 2001; Van Emmerick, 2004). The definition of mentoring used in the present study was based in the workplace. Mentoring is defined as an intense interpersonal relationship between an older, experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced, younger colleague (protégé) in which the mentor provides career and psychosocial support (Kram, 1985; Russell & Adams, 1997; VanDerLinden, 2005). Administrators may have high levels of job satisfaction because of the psychosocial support mentoring function. Psychosocial support functions, as defined by Kram (1985), are those “aspects of a relationship that enhance an individual’s sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role” (p. 32). According to Chao et al. (1992), psychosocial support includes activities that influence the protégés self-image and competence. It is logical
to assume that an administrator with a positive self-identity and a feeling of competence and effectiveness related to their ability to perform their job would lead to higher levels of job satisfaction.

**Research question two findings and conclusions**

Research question two: How do community college executive-level administrators from the nine mega-states that have been informally or formally mentored perceive mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support, as measured by Noe’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Scale?

Research question two described the perceptions of the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support. The two functions were reported by participants with career support ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .58$) being higher than psychosocial support ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .65$). However, respondents indicated high levels of both career support and psychosocial support from their mentor. Career support functions were slightly higher than psychosocial support functions. This finding is also supported by the literature because the majority of mentors were male (68.6%) and research indicates that male mentors provide more career support functions than female mentors (Allen et al., 2004). Females provide more psychosocial support functions (Allen et al., 2004).

**Research question three findings and conclusions**

Research question three: Are there relationships between career support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? The demographic variables included the gender of the respondent (administrator), the gender of the mentor, the type of mentoring relationship (informal or formal), and the most influential
type of mentoring relationship if a participant had both an informal and formal mentoring relationship. A Pearson’s correlation was used to determine if a relationship existed. The correlation revealed a negative association between career support and gender of protégé ($r = -.047$) and career support and most influential mentoring type ($r = -.212$). The correlation between career support and gender of mentor ($r = .073$) and career support and relationship type ($r = .070$) were positive and both revealed a negligible association. None of the demographic variables had a statistically significant relationship with the mentoring function of career support. The most influential mentoring relationship type (formal mentoring) had a low association (Davis, 1971) with career support.

An ANOVA was analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in the career support support received by protégés by the gender composition of the mentoring relationship. The predictor variable of gender composition was measured on a nominal scale which assumed four values (male-male, female-female, male with a female mentor, and female with a male mentor). The analysis revealed that the effect was not significant indicating that there is no relationship between the mentoring function of career support and gender of protégé, gender of mentor, or gender composition of the mentoring relationship. While the present study did not find a relationship between career support and gender, past research has suggested a relationship. According to Tolar (2012), high-achieving women in higher education affirmed that mentoring was critically important in their career progress. Career progress is supported by the mentoring function of career support which includes sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and providing challenging assignments (Ragins, & Kram, 2007). It was surprising to find no relationship between career
support and gender because male mentors provide more career-related support than female mentors (Allen et al., 2004; Ensher & Murphy, 2011) and the majority of mentors (68.6%) in the present study were male.

**Research question four findings and conclusions**

Research question four: Are there relationships between psychosocial support and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators? A Pearson’s correlation was used to determine if a relationship existed between psychosocial support and the demographic variables.

The study found that none of the demographic variables had a statistically significant relationship with the mentoring function of psychosocial support. However, both gender ($r = -0.132$) and the most influential mentoring relationship type ($r = -0.293$) had a negative low association with psychosocial support. An ANOVA was analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in the psychosocial support received by protégés by the gender composition of the mentoring relationship. Again, the predictor variable of gender composition was measured on a nominal scale with four values. The analysis revealed that the effect was not significant. This finding is contradictory to previous research which indicates that female mentors provide more psychosocial support than male mentors (Allen et al., 2004). The findings could be related to the formal mentoring program in California. The program may include training for the mentor which addresses issues with cross-gender relationships. Training related to gender could explain the findings that there was not a significant difference in career or psychosocial support and the gender composition of the relationship.
Research question five findings and conclusions

Research question five: Are there relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored? A Pearson’s correlation was used to determine if a relationship existed between overall job satisfaction and the demographic variables. None of the demographic variables had a statistically significant relationship with overall job satisfaction. The most influential mentoring relationship type ($r = -.189$) had a negative low association with job satisfaction.

Overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators had no relationship with gender of protégé, gender of mentor, or relationship type. The findings were surprising considering previous research indicates that both mentoring relationship type and gender impact the levels of job satisfaction (Lambert et al., 2001; Lee & del Carmen Montiel; Spector, 1997). The community college, because of its social and collegial nature, may be different than the corporate environments where most studies of job satisfaction have occurred (Fagenson, 1989; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1992).

Research question six findings and conclusions

Research question six: Are there relationships between the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored? The Pearson’s correlation revealed statistically significant relationships between both career support and overall job satisfaction and psychosocial support and overall job satisfaction. As the measurement of career support increased, overall job satisfaction increased. Likewise, as
the measurement of psychosocial support increased, overall job satisfaction increased. The
findings indicated significant relationships between both mentoring functions, career support
and psychosocial support, and overall job satisfaction. Both mentoring functions have been
shown to predict job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004). It can be concluded that mentoring,
whether informal or formal, is significant in the study and is related to job satisfaction. It can
also be concluded that the protégé is learning from the mentor (based on the definitions of
career support and psychosocial support), thereby increasing their job satisfaction. To
support this conclusion, several definitions are presented. Mentoring is defined in the study
as an intense interpersonal relationship between an older, experienced colleague (mentor) and
a less experienced, younger colleague (protégé) in which the mentor provides career and
psychosocial support (Kram, 1985; Russell & Adams, 1997; VanDerLinden, 2005).
Psychosocial support includes role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and
friendship and also includes activities that influence the protégé's self-image and competence
(Chao et al., 1992; Kram, 1985). Competence is included in the measure of overall job
satisfaction by specific items in the MSQ (e.g. the chance to do something that makes use of
my abilities). By increasing competence in the job, the protégé is indeed learning from the
mentor.

Research question seven findings and conclusions

Research question seven: Do mentoring functions and demographic variables explain
a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction? A regression analysis was conducted to
determine if the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and the
demographic variables explain a significant amount of variance. The regression \( F = 3.62, df \)
developed a significant model. The regression revealed that only one variable, career support ($t = 3.829, p = .001$) was significant. Career support explained 53.1% of the variance in job satisfaction.

The current study found that as the measurement of the mentoring function of career support increases, executive-level community college administrators perceive higher levels of overall job satisfaction. Because career support was the only variable that was significant in the regression model, the results are consistent with the idea that mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction are related. In previous research, the mentoring function of career support has been shown to predict a protégé’s job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004). However, psychosocial support was not included in the model even though it is related to job satisfaction. It can be concluded that job satisfaction is higher when a mentor has given the protégé assignments or tasks that prepared the protégé for an administrative position, given the protégé assignments that presented opportunities to learn new skills, and contributed to the protégé’s improvement in a number of skill areas (Noe, 1988; Weiss et al., 1967).

**General Discussion**

The purpose of this research was to investigate the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support and the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of mentored executive-level community college administrators employed by the mega-state community colleges. Additionally, the research explored if relationships existed between the mentoring functions of executive-level community college administrators and the demographic variables of gender of administrator, gender of mentor, relationship type (informal or formal), and most influential relationship type if the protégé experienced both an
informal and formal relationship as well as if relationships existed between overall job satisfaction of mentored community college leaders and demographic variables.

According to Lambert et al. (2001), it is “important to explore, confirm, and understand the key antecedents of job satisfaction (p. 234). Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) argue that identifying factors that influence job satisfaction is the best and most meaningful information managers have to incorporate interventions to increase job satisfaction, thereby reducing turnover. With the threat of the success of community colleges because of retirements of community college leaders looming (McNair et al., 2011), community college professionals such as Boards of Trustees and politicians should be concerned with the job satisfaction of its current leaders and those in the leadership pipeline to become executive-level community college administrators. Without paying close attention to career development and its importance to job satisfaction, potential leaders may exit the pipeline and/or if they attain an executive position, their job satisfaction may impact their decision to stay or leave.

The study found that as career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions increased, overall job satisfaction increased. This finding is supported by the literature and is important because mentoring functions and job satisfaction have not previously been studied with executive-level community college administrators.

Mentoring, whether informal or formal, in the present study of community college administrators, has an impact on the administrators’ satisfaction with their job. One reason for this finding could be the social nature of the community college. Community colleges are cultural, social, and intellectual hubs in the community (Vaughan, 2006). They are designed
to serve the local community by being responsive to the needs of their service area. It is reasonable to assume that because of the social nature of the community college, those individuals that would be drawn to work in the community college would have social personality traits. Further, mentoring is inherently social. The psychosocial support function of mentoring includes role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1985). All of these aspects of psychosocial support are social. Even career support has elements that involve socialization – namely, sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, and coaching (Kram, 1985).

The present study has affirmed the use of Social Cognitive Career Theory (Lent et al., 1994) with both the study of mentoring and job satisfaction. The study also validated the use of SCCT with executive-level community college administrators. SCCT is concerned with environmental supports, which includes mentoring, as a predictor of job satisfaction (Lent & Brown, 2006). While the present study did incorporate the environmental variables defined in SCCT, it did not focus on the person variables of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals (Lent et al., 1994).

Finally, it can be concluded that mentoring supports the career development of executive-level community college administrators. By providing career support and psychosocial support, a mentor has helped the protégé become more competent (Chao et al., 1992) and knowledgeable about their work environment (Kram, 1985). This, in turn, leads to positive benefits for both the administrator (Allen, et al., 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2007; Lankau & Scandura, 2002) and the community college for which the administrator works (Ensher et al., 2001).
Implications for Practice

Future research that builds on the present study can have significant implications for community colleges. In a time when executive-level community college administrators are retiring at a high rate (McNair et al., 2011), community college boards and leaders must be concerned about filling vacancies with qualified and prepared leaders. Both researching and implementing formal mentoring programs like the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) program may be a cost-effective way to prepare administrators for jobs becoming available and to increase overall job satisfaction. The present study found that a majority of administrators have had a mentor and that a fairly high percentage (over 25%) of administrators have been in a formal mentoring relationship. Additional research is needed to better understand the role of both formal and informal mentoring among executive-level administrators in community colleges.

Community colleges or community college systems, depending on the state, should consider implementing formal mentoring programs for aspiring administrators. If a formal mentoring program is implemented, a training program for both the mentor and the protégé should be included (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007) and gender should be carefully considered in the pairing of mentors and protégés (Dougherty et al., 2007). A formal mentoring program for aspiring administrators could be modeled after California’s mentoring program. The program requires participation in all events and includes at least four face-to-face meetings between the mentor and protégé. These meetings are arranged by the protégé (ACCCA, n.d.). The program also features elements of both career support and psychosocial support. Career support is provided by giving participants appropriate training for administrators and
providing participants with a network for career opportunities (ACCCA, n.d.). Psychosocial support is provided by the mentor who is to give advice to the protégé (ACCCA, n.d.).

If a community college’s leadership or human resources department chooses not to implement a formal program they should at the very least be supportive of informal mentoring relationships. The study found that executive-level community college administrators that have been informally or formally mentored have received high levels of career support and psychosocial support mentoring functions and they have high levels of overall job satisfaction. One way to support informal mentoring relationships is to provide incentives for those individuals willing to serve as mentors. Incentives could range from release time for the mentor to work with the protégé to something as simple as public recognition for the mentor. These incentives may encourage others in the organization to serve as mentors. Also, even if a structured program is not established, training should be conducted for anyone willing to mentor. Particularly, how to provide career support and psychosocial support should be discussed. The study indicated both career support and psychosocial support were positively related to overall job satisfaction and research has shown that the more mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support received, the more satisfying the mentoring relationship (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Mentors can provide career support by providing assistance and direction to the protégé on how to solve problems the protégé faces in the job, giving the protégé assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills, and by helping the protégé improve in a number of skill areas. Psychosocial support can be provided by the mentor by encouraging the protégé to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from the protégé’s work, sharing personal
experiences as an alternative perspective to the protégé’s problems, and keeping feelings and doubts shared by the protégé in strict confidence.

The study indicated that there was no difference in the level of career support and psychosocial support by gender. The composition of the mentoring dyad did not impact either career support or psychosocial support. These findings may indicate that the community college environment is different from other private sector workplaces. This could mean that the community college has become more tolerant of women in leadership compared to other workplace environments.

The implications of this research may lead to a better understanding of the methods to prepare future community college administrators. The study found that mentoring leads to higher levels of overall job satisfaction. Job satisfaction leads to positive work outcomes for both the protégé (Allen, et al., 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2007; Lankau & Scandura, 2002) and the organization (Ensher et al., 2001). One of those outcomes is reducing turnover (Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001; McBride, et al., 1992). At a time when prepared and qualified leaders are in short supply (Piland & Wolf, 2003), this is critical to the continued success of community colleges.

Finally, this research can be used by aspiring executive-level community college administrators. The study found that a majority (67.4%) of administrators had a mentor. This finding indicates that aspiring administrators should get a mentor whether through a formal program or just an informal relationship. Research indicates that serving as a mentor is beneficial to the mentor (Allen & Poteet, 1999). Community college leaders nearing
retirement should consider serving as a mentor to aspiring leaders to ensure there are adequate replacements in the pipeline.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The present study reinforced the importance of understanding executive-level community college administrators’ perceptions of mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction. Additional research is needed to better understand the relationship. Based on the survey response, there is interest in this topic. Further, no other research was found that focused on the specific problem identified in the study. As community college leaders continue to retire and fewer individuals are prepared to take their place, the importance of this topic will only increase.

Future research should focus on the differences in overall job satisfaction between those administrators that have been mentored and those that have not. Research indicates that mentored individuals have higher levels of job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004; Lee & del Carmen Montiel, 2011). The present study did not ask non-mentored administrators about their level of job satisfaction. The study only focused on the overall job satisfaction of mentored administrators. A comparison between the overall job satisfaction of those administrators that have been mentored and those that have not will help determine if mentoring does in fact impact overall job satisfaction as opposed to something else like organizational commitment (Underhill, 2006).

The study’s findings are generalizable within the nine mega-states as defined by Palmer (2008). Future research should be conducted outside of the nine states included in the present study to see if the findings apply to all community college administrators.
The study could be replicated with other types of community colleges in the United States including private not-for-profit, private for-profit, and tribal institutions. Future research could also include replicating the study with community colleges or their equivalent in other countries. The study could also be replicated with a different population of employees working in community colleges. For example, the study could be conducted with those on the dean level or even with department chairs.

Future research should consider how the relationship between mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction is impacted by ethnicity. Turban et al. (2002) found that protégés are more likely to form relationships with mentors of the same race. According to Underhill (2006), protégés in mentoring relationships with mentors of the same ethnicity reported higher levels of psychosocial support. Ensher and Murphy (1997) found that protégés with mentors of the same ethnicity reported more career support than those in cross-race relationships. A study that considers the ethnicity of both the mentor and the protégé would contribute significantly to the literature.

Similarly, the position of the executive-level community college administrator should also be considered in future research. Presidents, student development officers, chief academic officers and chief finance officers may perceive job satisfaction differently as their skill set and developmental needs may be different (Chieffo, 1991). Overall job satisfaction may be higher, for example, for chief academic officers than chief finance officers in the current climate because of the significant budget cuts to community colleges (Katsinas, 2005; Shannon & Smith, 2006).
Gender should also be the focus of future research. The study did not find a difference of the levels of mentoring functions received by protégés according to the gender composition of the mentoring dyad. Past research has indicated that the gender composition is critical to mentoring functions and outcomes (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). The gender composition of the dyad and its impact on mentoring functions should be further studied in the community college environment.

The present study, like most mentoring studies (Godshalk & Sosik, 2007), measured perceptions using subjective measures (i.e. self-reports). Outcomes of mentoring that lead to job satisfaction (e.g. more promotions and salary) should be studied using objective measures. Examples of objective measures are company records or interviews with supervisors (Godshalk & Sosik, 2007). This could include a qualitative study including interviews with both the protégé and the mentor to provide deeper exploration of mentoring functions and overall job satisfaction. The most appropriate qualitative design for extending this research is a phenomenological design because it allows participants to describe experiences as they are lived (Burns & Grove, 2005).

Another area of research that should be explored is the job satisfaction of the mentor as opposed to the job satisfaction of the protégé. Dougherty et al. (2007) posit that mentoring is a mutually beneficial relationship. According to Lentz and Allen (2007), mentors experience increased personal and job satisfaction. Gentry, Weber, and Sadri (2008) found that managers that serve as mentors and provide career support to their protégés outperform managers who do not serve as mentors. After a review of the literature, there is no research on the impact mentoring has on the mentor in the community college environment.
Finally, future research should also focus on the impact of formal mentoring programs for executive-level community college administrators. According to Eby and Allen (2008), most empirical research on formal mentoring has occurred with youth mentoring and not mentoring in the workplace. For the most part, the research on the outcomes of formal mentoring programs in higher education is sparse and anecdotal (Valeau & Boggs, 2004; Van Ast & Field, 2005). However, by supporting a formal mentoring program, community colleges may experience higher levels of organizational commitment, retention, productivity, and managerial succession (Godshalk & Sosik, 2007).

**Limitations**

This research study had a number of limitations which impacted the results of the study. Proportional random cluster sampling was used in the study to address the limitation that each of the nine mega-states had a different number of community colleges. While the sampling technique addressed that limitation, generalizability is limited to the nine states in the sample and not to all 50 states in the United States of America.

Because the study was sent via email, the response was limited by how often those invited to participate checked their email accounts. Also, many people were aware of computer viruses and were less likely to open emails from sources they did not already know. To address this limitation, the first contact informing the invitee about the upcoming survey was an email from the researcher's university account and not directly from Survey Monkey. Survey Monkey which was used to create and deploy the survey, however, was another limitation. Survey Monkey requires the survey creator to include a statement giving the survey receiver the option to opt out of all Survey Monkey surveys. Twenty-three of the 769
individuals invited to participate had opted out of all Survey Monkey surveys so they did not receive the email and were, therefore, unable to participate.

The survey did not ask if the participant was currently in a mentoring relationship but if they had ever had a mentor. The relationship could have been at any time. The extent that participants could accurately recall the details of their mentoring relationship may be problematic. Further, the research design was a one-time survey conducted over a few weeks within the 2012-2013 academic year. Results were also limited to the timeframe of the study which covered three weeks in the early part of the 2012-2013 school year.

Access is another limitation to the study. Participants were invited to participate through college web page searches and phone calls. A number of positions were vacant so individuals that held those positions or would fill those positions were unable to participate. Access was further limited due to the population. Executive-level community college administrators are quite busy and would need to have a specific interest in the topic in order to take the time to complete the survey.

Final Thoughts

Community colleges are important to the economic recovery of the United States (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013). They are the leaders in workforce development in the country (Boggs, 2003) enrolling more than eight million students and nearly half of all undergraduates (Mullin & Phillippe, 2013). The future success of community colleges is critical to the United States and that success depends, in part, on community college leaders (Vaughan, 2006). Because of the impending retirements of current and potential community college leaders (McNair et al., 2011) career development, which will reduce turnover and
assist in keeping community college leaders working in community colleges, has become more important. The present study shows that the mentoring functions of career support and psychosocial support are related to the overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators. In this research, when the measurement of career support increased, the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction increased; likewise, when the measurement of psychosocial support increased, the perceived levels of job satisfaction increased. Research shows employees with higher levels of job satisfaction are less likely to leave an organization (Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001; McBride et al., 1992). In a time when a shortage of qualified community college leaders is of concern, reducing turnover by improving job satisfaction is critical to the continued success of the community college. As indicated by the results of the present study, mentoring is one method to increase job satisfaction and ensure both adequate numbers and quality of future community college leaders.
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Permission to Use the Mentoring Functions Scale

Shannon Kennedy - RE: Mentoring Functions Scale

From: "Noe, Raymond" <noe.22@fisher.osu.edu>
To: Shannon Kennedy <kennedy@clevelandcommunitycollege.edu>
Date: 10/31/2011 7:50 AM
Subject: RE: Mentoring Functions Scale
Attachments: mentorfunctions.doc

Shannon:

You have my permission to use the Mentoring Functions Scale in your research project. There is no cost for using the scale. I have attached the complete instrument.

Good luck with your dissertation!

Ray

From: Shannon Kennedy [mailto:kennedy@clevelandcommunitycollege.edu]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2011 2:36 PM
To: Noe, Raymond
Subject: Mentoring Functions Scale

October 30, 2011

Dr. Raymond A. Noe
Robert and Anne Hoyt Designated Professor of Management & Human Resources
628 Fisher Hall
Fisher College of Business
2100 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Professor Noe:

I am currently in the dissertation phase of my doctoral program at North Carolina State University. I respectfully ask permission to use your "Mentoring Functions Scale" referenced in the following article:


My study, under the direction of Dr. Timothy J. Hatcher, is examining mentoring functions and job satisfaction of community college leaders. I believe the Mentoring Functions Scale will be critical to the success of my research. I am also requesting permission to modify the instrument as needed, based on feedback from my pilot testing to fit the specifics of my research. Of course, full credit will
be given to you as the author in my dissertation and any academic manuscripts that are produced from my research.

If you agree, could you also supply me with the complete instrument? Finally, can you please tell me the cost for using your instrument for dissertation research for a sample of approximately 500 participants? Please call me with any questions at 704-472-7930. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,
Shannon L. Kennedy
Doctoral Student
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Permission to Use the MSQ Short Form

August 13, 2012

Shannon Kennedy
224 Silver Creek Lane
Shelby, NC 28152

Dear Shannon Kennedy,

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short form on a secure web site for your research project as you requested. Please note that each copy that you make must include the following copyright statement:

Copyright 1977, Vocational Psychology Research
University of Minnesota. Reproduced by permission.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) Demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including, scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research

Driven to Discover™
Appendix C
Participant Interface for Online Survey

Thank you for participating in my dissertation research. By starting the survey, you are stating that you have read the informational letter and are consenting to participate in the study. The first questions will gather demographic information. The next 21 questions will ask you about your relationship with your mentor. The final 20 questions will ask you about how satisfied you are with certain aspects of your current position.

What is your gender?
- Female
- Male

Have you ever had a mentor? For the purpose of this survey, mentoring is defined as an intense interpersonal relationship between an older, experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced, younger colleague (protege) in which the mentor provides career and psychosocial support (Kram, 1985; Russell & Adams, 1997; VanDerLinden, 2000).
- Yes
- No

In answering the next two questions, if you have had more than one mentor, please consider your most influential mentor as you answer.

What is or was the gender of your mentor?
- Male
- Female

In order to assist individuals in their development and advancement, some organizations have established formal mentoring programs. Protégés and mentors are linked by the organization through assigned mentors or formal opportunities aimed at developing the relationship. Informal mentoring relationships are developed spontaneously, without organizational assistance (Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Day & Allen, 2004).

Which type of mentoring relationship were you in?
- Formal
- Informal
- Both
Appendix C (Continued)
Participant Interface for Online Survey

Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction of Community College Leaders Survey

Formal and Informal Mentoring:

If you have had both a formal and an informal mentoring relationship, which mentor was the most influential?

- Mentor in Formal Relationship
- Mentor in Informal Relationship

Given you assignments or tasks in your work that prepared you for an administrative position.

- To a very light extent
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a large extent
- To a very large extent

Made you respect him/her and want to act in a way that merits his/her respect and admiration.

- To a very light extent
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a large extent
- To a very large extent

Nominated you for desirable lateral moves or promotions.

- To a very light extent
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a large extent
- To a very large extent

Made you enjoy interacting with him/her.

- To a very light extent
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a large extent
- To a very large extent

Suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.

- To a very light extent
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a large extent
- To a very large extent

Provided assistance and direction on how to solve problems you face in your job.
Appendix C (Continued)
Participant Interface for Online Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction of Community College Leaders Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following questions are intended to measure how satisfied you are with your job. To answer the following questions, ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my current position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be “somebody” in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my supervisor handles his/her workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From: Deb Paxton, IRB Administrator
North Carolina State University
Institutional Review Board

Date: July 24, 2012

Title: Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction of Community College Leaders

IRB#: 2736

Dear Shannon Kennedy

The research proposal named above has received administrative review and has been approved as exempt from the policy as outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations (Exemption: 46.101. b.2). Provided that the only participation of the subjects is as described in the proposal narrative, this project is exempt from further review.

NOTE:
1. This committee complies with requirements found in Title 45 part 46 of The Code of Federal Regulations. For NCSU projects, the Assurance Number is: FWA00003429.

2. Any changes to the research must be submitted and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

3. If any unanticipated problems occur, they must be reported to the IRB office within 5 business days.

Please forward a copy of this letter to your faculty sponsor, if applicable.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deb Paxton
NC State IRB
Pre-notification Email

Subject: Community College Administrator Dissertation Research

Dear Community College Administrator:

In a few days, you will receive a survey designed to better understand the relationship of mentoring and job satisfaction among executive-level community college administrators. The survey will take between 6-9 minutes to complete.

This survey will help the field in a variety of ways, including, providing direction for community college leaders in succession planning, providing information useful for developing mentoring programs in community colleges, and disseminating knowledge to community college executives on mentoring functions and job satisfaction.

The survey is part of my dissertation research. I would sincerely appreciate your help in this important study.

Gratefully,

Shannon L. Kennedy
Doctoral Candidate
North Carolina State University
slkenned@ncsu.edu
704-472-7930
Title of Study: Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction of Community College Leaders

Principal Investigator: Shannon L. Kennedy Facult Sponsor: Dr. Tim Hatcher

Dear Community College Administrator:

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Your participation is voluntary. You have the right to be a part of this study, to choose not to participate, or to stop participating at any time without penalty.

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of the research study is to investigate mentoring functions, career support and psychosocial support, as well as the perceived levels of overall job satisfaction of executive-level community college administrators.

What will happen if you take part in the study?
The survey will take only 6-9 minutes to complete; your timely response will greatly increase the accuracy of the study. Five days after you initially receive the survey, you will receive a thank-you/follow-up email. In hopes that an additional reminder will increase the response rate, you will receive a second reminder via email three days later. Thank you very much in advance for responding.

Risks
Potential risks include discomfort in answering questions related to your work environment, supervisor, and relationship with a mentor.

Benefits
The potential benefits of the research include benefits to community college leaders in developing mentoring programs, increasing job satisfaction thereby reducing turnover, and developing succession planning programs.

Confidentiality
The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent of the law. Your identity will not be revealed in any publication resulting from the study. No identifying information will be collected on the survey; therefore, the researcher will not be able to link a survey with an individual providing each respondent with anonymity. After data collection is completed, all data will be stored on a flash drive which will be kept secure.
Compensation
For participating in this study you will not receive any form of compensation.

What if you have questions about this study?
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Shannon Kennedy at slkenned@ncsu.edu or 704-472-7930.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/515-4514).

Consent to Participate
By clicking on the link below, you are agreeing that you have read and understand the above information. You have received a copy of this form which you may print for your records. You may request a copy of the final study once it is completed from the researcher.

<survey link>

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Sincerely,

Shannon L. Kennedy
Doctoral Candidate
North Carolina State University
slkenned@ncsu.edu
704-472-7930
Dear Community College Administrator:

I recently sent you a survey for a study on mentoring functions and job satisfaction of community college leaders. This is just a reminder that if you have not completed the survey, your response is very valuable to the findings. The survey will only take between 6-9 minutes to complete.

You can access the survey directly by clicking the following link:

<survey link>

Your participation is voluntary and refusal to participate will not negatively impact you in any way. You may discontinue at any time without penalty. For participating in this study you will not receive any form of compensation. Potential risks of participating include discomfort in answering questions related to your work environment, supervisor, and relationship with a mentor. The potential benefits of the research include benefits to community college leaders in developing mentoring programs, increasing job satisfaction thereby reducing turnover, and developing succession planning programs.

The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent of the law. Your identity will not be revealed in any publication resulting from the study. After data collection is completed, all data will be stored on a flash drive which will be kept secure.

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Shannon Kennedy at slkenned@ncsu.edu, or 704-472-7930. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/515-4514).

Many thanks,

Shannon L. Kennedy
Appendix H
Final Thank You Email

Dear <Community College> Administrator:

If you recall, I sent you a survey for a study on mentoring functions and job satisfaction of community college leaders for my dissertation research approximately two weeks ago. Your response is critical to the findings. Please take between 6-9 minutes to complete the survey. Your participation is voluntary; refusal to participate will not negatively impact you; and, you may discontinue at any time without penalty.

You can access the survey directly by clicking the following link:

<survey link>

For participating in this study you will not receive any form of compensation. Potential risks of participating include discomfort in answering questions related to your work environment, supervisor, and relationship with a mentor. The potential benefits of the research include benefits to community college leaders in developing mentoring programs, increasing job satisfaction thereby reducing turnover, and developing succession planning programs.

The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent of the law. Your identity will not be revealed in any publication resulting from the study. After data collection is completed, all data will be stored on a flash drive which will be kept secure.

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Shannon Kennedy at slkenned@ncsu.edu, or 704-472-7930. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/515-4514).

Gratefully,

Shannon L. Kennedy