

# **THE ROLE OF LOCUS OF CONTROL IN MENTOR RELATIONSHIPS**

---

by T. F. Jahnel

**UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.**

# THE ROLE OF LOCUS OF CONTROL IN MENTOR RELATIONSHIPS

---

*A qualitative approach to mentees' mentor preferences and associations with internal- and external-directed mentors*

## **Author**

T. F. Jahnel

## **Supervision**

S. Janssen, MSc.

Dr. J. Karreman

**UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.**

Enschede, September 9, 2011

## Abstract

This paper presents results of two studies designed to examine the role of the characteristic trait locus of control in mentor-mentee relationships. It was hypothesized that by a free mentor choice a similarity of the mentee's and the mentor's locus of control is preferred by the mentee. Additionally, the studies aimed to provide insight into the mentees' reasons for the mentor choice and their associations with the different mentor types. In order to verify this hypothesis, two studies were conducted using qualitative research methods. At first, four mentor statements were created based on the *Work Locus of Control Scale* of Spector (1988). The four mentor statements were manipulated as total internal, moderate internal, moderate external and total external directed attitudes. On the basis of these statements interviews were conducted. The first study focused on the initiation of a mentor relationship. Therefore, students in their final phase of their study had to choose their favorite mentor from the four manipulated mentor statements in a created situation and explain it (N=23). Following that, students' concrete experiences with mentoring were evaluated in a second study. These interviewed respondents (N=15) participated in a mentorship and were asked to describe their actual experiences and based on this their mentor preference in case of a free choice from the four manipulated mentor statements. The outcomes showed a tendency that mentees prefer a mentor with the same locus of control and equally perceived attitude. In this context, mentees stated a preference for a mentor providing characteristics, which lead to trust between mentee and mentor. Additionally, different associations with the four manipulated mentor types were encountered. Respondents, who chose a more internal-directed mentor, prefer individual support including scientific and contextual assistance for a better personal development. Respondents, who chose a more external-directed mentor, favor help and support in concrete terms from a mentor. Supplementary, a structured mentor program with clear guidelines for both, the mentee and the mentor tend to result in a more successful mentoring.

## Samenvatting

Deze scriptie presenteert de resultaten van twee onderzoeken naar de rol van de karaktertrek *locus of control* in mentor-protégé relaties. Het was verwacht dat in het geval van een vrije mentorkeuze de protégé een mentor met een overeenkomende locus of control prefereert. Verder waren de onderzoeken bedoeld om inzicht te geven in de redeneringen van de protégés voor hun mentorkeuze en hun associaties met de verschillende mentor types. Om the hypothesis te verifiëren zijn twee kwalitatieve onderzoeken uitgevoerd. Ten eerste werden vier mentor uitspraken op basis van de *Work Locus of Control Scale* van Spector (1988) opgesteld. Deze vier mentor uitspraken waren gemanipuleerd als totaal intern, moderat intern, moderat extern en totaal extern gerichte instelling. Op basis van deze uitspraken werden interviews afgenomen. De focus van het eerste onderzoek lag op de initiatie van een mentor-protégé relatie. Daarvoor werden studenten in hun finale fase van de studie gevraagd welke van de vier opgestelde mentor types ze zouden prefereren in het geval van een vrije mentor keuze en wat de redenen daarvoor zijn (N=23). Vervolgens werden in een tweede studie ervaringen van studenten met mentor relaties geëvalueerd. De respondenten van de tweede studie (N=15) waren studenten, die in een mentor programma participeerden. Interviews werden afgenomen in welke de studenten werden gevraagd hun ervaringen met de mentoren te beschrijven en op basis daarvan te verklaren welke mentor type van de vier vertoonde types zij zouden prefereren in het geval van een vrije mentorkeuze. De resultaten laten zien dat er een tendens bestaat dat protégés een mentor met dezelfde locus of control en een gelijke waargenomen instelling prefereren. In deze samenhang constateerden de respondenten dat ze een mentor prefereerden welke eigenschappen heeft, die tot vertrouwen tussen de mentor en de protégé leiden. Bovendien zijn de verschillende associaties met de vier mentortypes uitgelegd. De respondenten, welke een meer intern gerichte mentor prefereerden, wilden van een mentor vooral individuele ondersteuning en inhoudelijke begeleiding gebaseerd op vakkennis. Respondenten, die een meer extern gerichte mentor kozen, eisten van een mentor meer concreet hulp en ondersteuning. Aanvullend blijkt een gestructureerd mentorprogramma met duidelijke richtlijnen tot een succesvoller mentorbegeleiding te leiden.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2 THEORETICAL APPROACH</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>2.1 Mentor-mentee relationship</b>                               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>2.2 Locus of Control as combining characteristic trait</b>       | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>3 STUDIES</b>  | <b>11</b> |
| <b>3.1 Method study 1</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| 3.1.1 Participants  | 11        |
| 3.1.2 Procedure and instruments                                     | 12        |
| 3.1.3 Data analysis procedure                                       | 13        |
| <b>3.2 Results study 1</b>  | <b>14</b> |
| 3.2.1 Participants' locus of control                                | 14        |
| 3.2.2 Requested characteristics of a perfect mentor                 | 18        |
| 3.2.3 Reasons for mentor choice and the participants' expectations  | 21        |
| 3.2.4 Describing the 'anti-mentor'                                  | 24        |
| <b>3.3 Method study 2</b>   | <b>27</b> |
| 3.3.1 Participants  | 27        |
| 3.3.2 Procedure and instruments                                     | 28        |
| 3.3.3 Data analysis procedure                                       | 29        |
| <b>3.4 Results study 2</b>  | <b>30</b> |
| 3.4.1 Critical incidents  | 30        |
| 3.4.2 Meaning of the mentors' and mentees' locus of control         | 34        |
| <b>4. GENERAL DISCUSSION</b>  | <b>45</b> |
| <b>4.1 Limitations, follow-up studies and practical implication</b> | <b>49</b> |
| <b>REFERENCES</b>   | <b>52</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX</b>   | <b>57</b> |

# 1 INTRODUCTION

*"Mentoring is a brain to pick, an ear to listen, and a push in the right direction."*

*(John Crosby)*

In organizations there are always employees who have more experience and expertise in certain fields than others. To share this knowledge and keep it 'alive' within an enterprise, mentor programs are created to form mentor-mentee relations. In these relations the more experienced person advises and supports a colleague who has less work experience. In some enterprises this kind of relation is formally organized, such as in so-called 'buddy programs'. In other enterprises, mentor-mentee relations between employees are developed totally informally by the employees themselves.

For organizations this kind of relationship is of great value. Based on mentoring, experience and knowledge of the employees are passed on to the younger and newer colleagues. This tends to result in more efficient sharing of information between the employees (Mullen, 1994) and a higher productivity and better performance (Noe, 1988; Scandura, 1992). Besides, young or rather new employees are faster and more profoundly incorporated. The benefits of a mentorship for mentees are a significantly enhanced career development and higher job satisfaction (Kram, 1983). Compared to other job starters mentees reported higher satisfaction, better work mobility, more career opportunities, better valuation and more promotion (Fagenson, 1988) whereas mentors perceive more personal satisfaction and extended career opportunities (Noe, 1988).

For that reason it is important for enterprises to have a well designed and implemented mentor program. Though, what are the factors that make a mentorship efficient for both parties? Existing research about mentoring focused mainly on the predictors and outcomes of mentoring. On the part of the mentor, research about mentors' preferred mentee characteristics was conducted (Allen, 2003, 2004; Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1996). From the point of view of the mentee there is research regarding the predictors and the outcomes of mentoring (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins, 2006; Noe, 1988), but little research is directed towards the mentees' preferences, especially when it comes to their personality traits and the effects of these traits on the received mentoring functions. One personality trait, which has effect on many aspects including behavior and work outcomes, is a person's locus of control. People, with an internal locus of control expect to have the possibility to control their behavior and their accomplishments, people with an external locus of control assume to be controlled by

the environment. Existing mentoring research related to this personal trait concentrated on mentees' work outcomes and accomplishments in the context of their locus of control. There is no research which focused on mentee's experiences with mentors related to their locus of control, which characteristics in the context of the mentor's locus of control mentees prefer in a mentor relationship and which associations they have with the different mentor types.

This article focuses on the impact of the characteristic trait locus of control in mentor relationships. The accomplished studies elaborate to which extent the mentor's and the mentee's locus of control affect the mentee's mentor choice, the mentees' associated expectations and their actual gained experiences with the mentor.

## **2 THEORETICAL APPROACH**

To give an overview of the topic *mentoring* related to mentor's and mentee's characteristic traits, this study is embedded in existing research concerning mentor-mentee relationship and the characteristic trait *locus of control*. At first the construct mentor-mentee relationship is lined out and reasons for building up a mentor-mentee relationship are explained. Following that, the characteristic trait locus of control is explained and the related aspects to an internal and an external locus of control are described.

### **2.1 Mentor-mentee relationship**

Most mentoring studies are based on Homans' *Social Exchange Theory* (1958). This theory displays human behavior as a model in which people in an interaction balance the costs of the participation against their own assets of the interaction. Thus, it can be seen as a cost-benefit analysis of an interaction between two persons. According to this theory, individuals would rather bond with someone else if they think that there is a high probability to get more benefit than expending effort. Based on this concept, many recent studies have focused on the attraction of mentees who seem to perform well. According to Allen (2004), mentees' ability and willingness to learn has a crucial impact on being mentored.

At the beginning of a mentor-mentee relationship no guarantee is given that both parties will fulfill the give-and-take principle. First, the mentor supports the mentee, who in turn has to take the mentor's advice and implement it well. If a good

mentor-mentee relationship is formed, both parties benefit from it. However, the development of a profitable relationship depends not only on expert knowledge and power on the one hand but also on great qualifications and motivation on the other hand. The willingness to cooperate and to support each other has to be present on both the mentor's and the mentee's side.

A significant factor for forming a relationship is attractiveness on both sides (Berscheid, 1994; Duck, 1990), which may not be disregarded in the field of mentor-mentee relationships. It can be claimed that some elements, which lead to attractiveness between people are the same in personal as in mentoring relationships. Kram (1985) found out that attractiveness is crucial for initiating a mentorship, particularly in informal relationships.

According to Byrne's similarity-attraction-paradigm (1971), there is a greater attractiveness between persons who perceive interpersonal similarities. Those similarities refer to race, gender, as well as attitude and personality traits, which is also confirmed in research by Duck (1990). His findings show that individual characteristics of employees have a high impact on the level of attractiveness, supporting Byrne's theory (1971). According to Byrne the effects of similarities between persons are attributed to rewards of interacting. Meaning that interacting between people with similar terms of opinion, attitude or values assures the actor in right opinion, attitude or values. Additionally, similarities between persons increase predictability among each other. This again leads to easier and more trusting communication and interacting (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). Furthermore, similarities between people have the effect of perceiving the interaction among each other as more entertaining and amusing (Berscheid & Walster, 1978).

The perception of forming an open, trusting and also pleasant relationship with good results can be motivating and stimulating for starting a mentor-mentee relationship, as well. If a feeling of being similar in fundamental opinion and attitude exists, the expectation of an equal cooperation is formed quickly and in this way, fulfills a cost-benefit analysis. This theory has been extensively studied in the last years. According to Ragins' and Cotton's (1999) investigation, mentors in informally developed mentorships choose mentees with whom they enjoy working together. Moreover, their research demonstrated that interpersonal similarities lead to more successful relationships between mentor and mentee and mentees were more satisfied with the mentoring.

Burke, McKeen and McKenna (1993) found better mentoring if the mentee is similar to the mentor in terms of intelligence, attitude toward procedures, personality, background, ambition, education and extracurricular activities. The group members' personality is an important factor for the quality of working together. According to



Adkins, Ravlin and Meglino (1996) and Smith (1998), there is a correlation between similarities in personality and cooperation and production at work. The research by Adkins, Ravlin and Meglino (1996) confirms that employees with the same opinion towards certain values cooperate superiorly. The work of Smith (1998) indicates that employees' similarities in personality facilitate open communication and reciprocal investments in relationships.

Consequently, there are many reasons to rather start a mentor-mentee relationship with a person who shares similarities in personality, attitudes and interests and who perceives mutual benefit from the cooperation. One personality trait, which has significance for one's personality on the one hand and an effect on the cooperation of two persons on the other hand, is a person's locus of control.

## **2.2 Locus of control as combining characteristic trait**

Locus of control is a personality trait influencing persons' perception of whether they have the possibility to control their behavior on their own (internal locus of control) or are being controlled by the environment (external locus of control). Individuals with an internal locus of control, henceforth referred to as 'internals', assume their performance to be dependent on their own behavior, thus self-controlled. Individuals with an external locus of control, henceforth referred to as 'externals', assume their work performance and success to be not self-controlled but dependent on luck, fate and others actions, thus controlled by the environment (Phares, 1976; Rotter, 1966, 1971; Weiss, 1996). Accordingly, a person's locus of control is a characteristic trait which has great effect on the person's work field.

Firstly, these diverse perceptions and justifications of performance and success lead to various approaches of work. As Davis and Phares (1967) and Seeman and Evans (1962) reported, internals invest more effort and energy on learning than externals do. Furthermore, internals can apply information better than externals. The reason for this difference is the perception of internals of having total control over their success. Externals, however, proceed on the assumption that their success depends on environmental factors and not on their own behavior. Additionally, it is ascertained that internals experience higher job satisfaction than externals do. This is due to their quicker acceptance of responsibility, their higher work motivation and improved performance when stimulating bonuses and payments are applied (George, 1992). An explanation for this can be that internals do not only perceive more self-control but also prefer situations in which control is possible (Spector, 1982). Thus, they attribute their success to their good performance and want to be rewarded for that.

Secondly, the difference between internals and externals can also be found in work environment and type of work. A further effect of the perception of self-control is a better performance of internals if there is more autonomy and flexibility in their work (George, 1992). Furthermore, internals prefer direct reward and compensation for their effort because they assume that their success is totally self-controlled and self-responsibly achieved (Spector, 1982). Externals, however, aspire to a well-structured and safe job; they are less involved in decisions and need more compliance standards but not necessarily rewards for esteeming the organization (Weiss, 1996). As externals base their success on environmental factors they also justify mistakes based on situational factors more than internals do (Phares, 1976).

Thirdly, regarding work performance, Spector (1982) stated that internals very often display higher job motivation, job performance, job satisfaction and leadership than externals. As Reitz and Jewell (1979) reported, the personality trait locus of control is significantly related to a person's job involvement, whereby internals have a higher job involvement than externals. Job involvement is defined as the extent of the psychological identification with the job, or rather, to which extent a job is essential for self-perception. The more important a job is for an individual, the more effort and energy the person will invest and the more important it is for the person to perform well and to provide good results (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

Research also confirms the correlation between locus of control, job satisfaction and performance. As such, Judge and Bono (2001) could demonstrate that locus of control is related to job satisfaction and job performance. According to the meta-analysis of Ng, Sorensen and Eby (2006), there is a consistent relation between locus of control and job satisfaction, task performance and mental health.

These results can be explained by the distinct perception of internals and externals. Internals, who think that their success and their actions are completely controlled by themselves relate to and identify with their job, which they perceive as being totally under their own control. By thinking they have the possibility to control everything, internals hold themselves responsible for their job satisfaction, including that they try to find a solution or change something by themselves if they are not satisfied with their work. By contrast, externals think that their success depends on environmental factors, which means that they do not relate to their job as strongly as internals do. Furthermore, their satisfaction depends on environmental factors as well, which they perceive as not controllable or to be influenced.

Based on these findings it can be assumed that the characteristic trait locus of control has effect on mentoring functions. Against the backdrop of Homans' (1958) social exchange theory, Byrne's (1971) similarity-attraction-paradigm and the described distinct attitudes of externals and internals, it can be hypothesized that in a

mentoring program, in which free mentor choice is possible, internals would rather choose internals as mentor and externals would rather choose externals as mentor. Research about persons' preference for the same locus of control has been carried out. Phares and Wilson (1971) did research on this subject with students concerning their choice of friends based on Rotter's (1966) *Interpersonal Judgement Scale* and *Internal-External Locus of Control Scale*. Their findings showed that, when it comes to friendship, internals prefer internals as friends. Externals, however, did not have a significant preference. In 1975 Nowicki and Blumberg investigated the same hypothesis but instead of Rotter's scales (1966) they used audio tapes. The tapes were manipulated as well in internal-directed as in external-directed versions. The outcome of this study was that both internals and externals preferred the internal-directed version. In 1980 Fagan examined the same hypothesis with pupils. For measuring interpersonal attractiveness he used a sociometric test instead of Rotter's (1966) *Interpersonal Judgement Scale*. The results equalled those of Phares and Wilson's (1971) with internals preferring internals and externals not having a significant preference.

These results can be reasoned by the fact that internals tend to choose controllable situations. As Berger and Calabrese's (1975) research shows, there is a greater awareness of predictability and thus of controllability as well, if personal similarities are perceived. Since externals generally do not conceive a strong controllability, they are influenced to a larger degree by other environmental factors, evidently also when it comes to choosing friends.

In sum, research exists which describes persons' preferences concerning a similar locus of control, in those cases referring to choosing friends. In addition to that, there is research detailing the different attitudes of internal- and external-directed persons, respectively. According to the described literature, it can be hypothesized that in mentoring programs internal-directed mentees would rather choose an internal-directed mentor. Based on the same perception of control, the expectations of the results of the mentoring and their attitude concerning accomplishments and success they would rather find each other attractive. Further, it can be hypothesized that external-directed mentees would feel attracted by external-directed mentors because the cooperation with a person whose attitude regarding control and the environment's impact is the same seems more pleasant, more comfortable and thus better understandable. It is possible that there will not be a distinct link between external-directed mentees and external-directed mentors because for external-directed persons many other environmental factors seem to be more determined than the same perceived attitude. Environmental factors affecting external-directed persons are the expected impact of luck, helplessness (Palenzuela, 1988) and powerful others

(Levenson, 1973). To enrich the previous findings of mentees' mentor preference with descriptive outlines of real world phenomena qualitative studies are conducted to additionally consider which advantages and disadvantages, respectively, are expected or rather are experienced with a mentor who has a (dis)similar locus of control.

### **3 STUDIES**

In order to investigate the mentee's preference of the mentor's locus of control and the associated advantages and disadvantages, two qualitative studies were conducted. In both studies the context was a mentoring program for students of a university in which the mentor assists the mentee with projects and university or practical work tasks. Two phases of the mentoring relationship were investigated. The first study focused on the initiation of the mentor relationship for which a scenario was set up. The respondents of the first study were students in their final phase of their study. They had to predict their free mentor choice in the created situation and explain it. Following that, students' actual experiences with mentoring were evaluated in a second study. These interviewed respondents, participating in a mentorship, were asked to describe their actual experiences and based on this, their mentor preference in case of a free choice. In this way expectations and wishes concerning mentors and their locus of control of inexperienced and experienced mentees can be compared.

#### **3.1 Method study 1**

##### **3.1.1 Participants**

The participants of the first study were 23 German students from two universities in Enschede (Saxion University of Applied Sciences and University of Twente). The courses they were enrolled in were Communication Science, Psychology, Business Administration, Chemistry, European Studies, Mechanical Engineering (all provided at the University of Twente) and Physical Therapy and Textile Management (provided at the Saxion University). Of the 23 students, 11 were male and 12 female. The average age of the participants was 24 years, ranging from 22 to 27 years. All participants were in their final phase of their Bachelor studies (12 students) or already doing their Master studies (11 students). In this way previous experience with tutors and mentors was guaranteed and furthermore the participants were on the verge of beginning their career. Therefore, the students were adequate participants to imagine a scenario of choosing a good mentor.

### 3.1.2 Procedure and instruments

For conducting an interview resting upon a scenario of choosing a formal mentor who assists the respondents with projects or tasks, four mentor statements were developed on the basis of the *Work Locus of Control Scale* designed by Spector (1988). They were manipulated to each describe a total-internal (mentor 1), moderate-internal (mentor 2), moderate-external (mentor 3) and total-external locus of control attitude (mentor 4). See Table 1 for the manipulated statements.

Table 1: Manipulated statements of four mentor types with different a *Locus of Control*

| <b>Mentor type</b>              | <b>Statements</b>   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Mentor 1<br>(total-internal)    | A job is what you make of it. Often, you have more opportunities to grow in your job than you think. If you know what you are searching for in a job, you will find one which accomplishes your expectations or you can enrich your current job, in a fulfilling way as well. |
| Mentor 2<br>(moderate-internal) | Natural commitment and good quality winds up in success and I am very proud of my achievements. But I also learned to just wait and see and believe in my fortune.  |
| Mentor 3<br>(moderate-external) | It takes a lot of luck to find a job that satisfies and pleases you. However, you also have to go out there and show yourself, to help your luck along. For in the end you have to be at the right time in the right place with the right qualification.                      |
| Mentor 4<br>(total-external)    | I was lucky. I did know the right people, which is important in life. I am very pleased with my job and very happy that I was at the right time in the right place, so I am at this point in life.  |

The interviews took place in a comfortable surrounding chosen by the participants themselves. At the outset of the interviews students were assured that their responses would remain confidential and anonymous. The students were asked to read the four statements of potential mentors with all having the same expert knowledge and same qualifications. The interview was conducted based on the four mentor statements. All participants granted permission to record the interviews and transcribe them later.

The questions of the interview were divided into questions about requested characteristics of a perfect mentor, the impression of the four presented mentors, reasons for the mentor choice and questions about the characteristics of the participant. At the beginning of the interview the participants were asked which of the four presented mentors they would choose in case of a free mentor choice. Following that, they should explain their choice and determine their most deciding reasons. To get a more distinct description of their view of the four mentor types the participants were asked to explain why they have not chosen the mentor type with the opposite

locus of control of their chosen one. At the end of the first section concerning the free mentor choice the participants were asked which characteristics of the mentor currently supervising the participants were most important and why.

Referring to their own characteristics the participants were asked to describe how they would search for a job and what preference they have concerning the setup and structure of a company (they would want to work for), concerning work environment (mainly teamwork or mainly individual work) and concerning work setup (totally structured and given or totally free and independent). In this way, the participants' own characteristics can be compared to their mentor choice and their associations with the four mentor types. As described in the theory section there is a difference between internal- and external- directed persons with respect to their preference of job setting and job structure. Internal-directed persons prefer autonomy and flexibility in their work (Spector, 1982), whereas external-directed persons prefer a well-structured and safe job (Weiss, 1996).

To examine the participants' own locus of control they were asked to fill in a survey. The survey consisted of statements of Millar and Shevlin's *Career Locus of Control Scale* (2007) and of Spector's *Work Locus of Control Scale* (1988) with a 5 point Likert scale (1=strongly agree; 5=strongly disagree) answering possibility. A sample item for an external-directed statement is: "*Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.*" Overall reliability of both scales was significant (Cronbach's alpha=.78). As there were only German participants the survey was translated into German and checked and corrected by a native speaker in both English and German. Filling in the survey was framed as a validating task for one of the researchers in order to prevent the participants from giving socially desirable answers. Each interview session lasted approximately 30 minutes. The interview was conducted in German, for an English version of the interview scheme see Appendix A, Table 1.

### **3.1.3 Data analysis procedure**

For analyzing the qualitative data a multistep content analysis was conducted. First, for each content section all comments were reviewed and sorted by similar meanings. Once the comments were grouped the developed clusters were furnished with generic terms (e.g. "ability to empathize"). Each content section was reviewed by a second researcher, who re-categorized the comments into clusters. In cases where the two researchers disagreed, reasons for the categorization were discussed and the remarks were shifted to the most appropriate cluster. In two cases this led to the erasing of two established clusters. In order to categorize the comments most accurately a new cluster was created in five cases. After categorizing all the comments, the content

sections were narrowed by condensing the clusters with the same underlying themes. A further approach was the distinction of the participants' mentor preferences. For that reason the different content sections' clusters were further sorted by the participants' mentor choices (total-internal, moderate-internal, total-external, moderate-external).

The participants' own locus of control was determined based on the locus of control scale the participants had to fill in. Therefore, external-directed items of the scale were reversed and the average values of the scale were computed per participant.

### **3.2 Results study 1**

At first, the data of the locus of control scale was analyzed to define the participants' own locus of control. Completing the characterization of the respondents the qualitative data referring to the favored job structure and job setting sorted by the respondents' mentor choice was dissected. The remaining qualitative data of the interviews were combined into three main fields of topics. First, the respondents' answers concerning their desired characteristics of their perfect mentor type were analyzed, described and reanalyzed by mentor choices. Subsequently, the respondents' reasons for their mentor choice and the associated expectations regarding this mentor type were pictured. To get a more distinct outline of the respondents' mentor choice and their association with the four mentor types, the remarks with relation to the opposite mentor type of their mentor choice (the 'anti-mentor') were analyzed and delineated.

#### ***3.2.1 Participants' locus of control***

To determine the participants' locus of control they were asked to fill in a survey. After reversing the external-directed items, lower results of the locus of control survey with a 5 point Likert scale stand for more internal-directed whereas higher results stand for a more external-directed locus of control (values < 3 are seen as internal-directed; values > 3 are seen as total external-directed). After computing the average values, the outcomes show that all respondents scored high on the internal locus of control with average values ranging from 1,5 to 2,2. Though the outcomes of the interviews did show differences between the participants' attitudes and preferences. For these reasons the data of the locus of control scale was not admitted to further analyses.

### ***Favored job structure and job setting***

The participants were asked about their favored job structure and job setting. As described in the theory about locus of control, individuals with an internal locus of control prefer more autonomy and flexibility in their work (Spector, 1982) and people with an external locus of control prefer a well-structured and safe job (Weiss, 1996). However, the outcomes of the locus of control scale did not show any variance; instead there was variance in the respondents' preferences of job structure and job setting.

A total of 83 comments relating to job structure and job setting was identified. These comments were classified into 11 dimensions by the first researcher. Agreement of the two researchers was significant with 83,13% ( $\kappa=.83$ ,  $t=26.06$ ,  $p<.01$ ). After discussion on and revisions of the classification of the comments the two researchers did not agree on, two additional groups were made to assign the comments most precisely. For all 13 dimensions of favored job structure and job setting see Table 2 in Appendix B. Altogether, working autonomously and having the possibility to develop own ideas are the most frequently given answers. The comments are more indicative and highlight a more distinct pattern after categorizing them into groups according to the participants' mentor choice.

#### *Subclassified by mentor choice*

The mentor choice out of the four presented mentor types is not evenly spread; a tendency of decreasing interest by decreasing internal locus of control was noticed. In effect of the 23 respondents 10 chose the total-internal directed locus of control mentor type, 7 the moderate-internal, 5 respondents chose the moderate-external mentor type and one participant chose the total-external directed mentor type.

After sorting the comments concerning the participants' favorite job structure and job setting by the participants' mentor choice, distinct patterns became visible. In Table 2 the most frequently stated wishes are listed, categorized by the respondents' mentor choice.



Table 2: Favored job structure and job setting classified by mentor choice

| <b>Mentor choice</b>                       | <b>Categories</b>           | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Total-internal mentor (10 participants)    | Working autonomously        | 7                       | In the end it comes down to the fact that you perform well on your own or rather that you are able to perform well. (Interview 1.24)  |
|  | Interchange with colleagues | 5                       | I would like to get feedback (from my colleagues) and have the possibility to see how others solve their problems and also just for working together with other people to brighten cross-cultural skills and to find new perspectives solving problems. (Interview 1.12)  |
|  | Own ideas                   | 4                       | I would like to develop things myself and to play a part in contributing to change something. (Interview 1.12)  |
| Moderate-internal mentor (7 participants)  | Working autonomously        | 6                       | I want to have the possibility to decide independently what I do and what I'm interested in and so on. (Interview 1.2)<br>I like having more freedom in my own decisions. (Interview 1.15)  |
|  | Own ideas                   | 5                       | I need the freedom to develop (myself) and what drives me forward. (Interview 1.16)   |
|  | Taking responsibility       | 3                       | I enjoy taking responsibility. (Interview 1.16)   |
|  | Interchange with colleagues | 2                       | To speak about problems with colleagues and seek advice. (Interview 1.2)<br>[...], on the other hand, I would like to interchange with colleagues about technical subjects, but I like being a specialist in certain fields. (Interview 1.23)   |
|  | Given structure             | 2                       | A certain structure in the beginning would be helpful for me. (Interview 1.19)  |
| Moderate-external mentor, (5 participants) | Working autonomously        | 4                       | I always want to enforce my position. (Interview 1.11)<br>My best-case scenario would be, that nobody has to give me orders and I could work on my own. (Interview 1.4)   |
|  | Given structure             | 4                       | Sometimes you need someone being above you, a chief you can talk to and discuss problems. (Interview 1.18)  |
|  | More work alone             | 3                       | In certain cases I better work alone, I am not the kind who wants to do everything within a team. (Interview 1.18)  |
|  | More teamwork               | 2                       | I would rather work within a team. (Interview 1.3)  |
| Total-external mentor (1 participant)      | Career                      | 1                       | In some way I'm a career girl, but I don't want to adjust my whole life to my work. I would like working in a higher position, of course you have to take a little bit more responsibility then, but I want to have clear timelines. I don't know, being available 24 hours a day, that's not for me! (Interview 1.8) |
|  | Indifference                | 1                       | I don't care, I just do what I have to do. (Interview 1.8)  |

Analyzing the comments of the participants of mentor choice group 1 (total-internal mentor) it is notable that they are particularly interested in working autonomously but they are also very interested in an interchange with colleagues. A clear pattern of interest in further developments of own skills and learning something new is recognizable (*"I would like having a superior who leads you to new ideas and who encourages me and who gives me new input to think about. I would like to have a person I can get advice and new input from."* Interview 1.14). In this group preferences for both working individually and working in a team were found.

The participants who chose the moderate-internal mentor are particularly interested in working autonomously and having the possibility to develop their own ideas. They prefer taking responsibility, though there is no clear preference of working alone or within a team. All comments of this group result in optimizing own skills and work, even comments regarding 'interchange with colleagues' and 'given structure' aim at improving ones own competences (see Table 2).

It is difficult to find a pattern in the participants' comments of the third mentor group (moderate-external mentor). There are both participants who prefer to work within a team and participants who prefer to work alone and autonomously. Some want to develop their own ideas while others like to have a given structure and perform well as a team (see Table 2).

The participant who chose the total-external mentor seems to be very focused on their own career, though not based on interests and dedication but on the career itself. For this participant content and job setting are not immensely important. More crucial for this respondent is earning money and having clearly marked-out working-hours without any extra hours (see Table 2). The participant mentions no other items concerning preferred job structure and job setting. For more given comments concerning the favored job setting and job structure see Appendix B, Table 3-6.

In summary, working autonomously and having the possibility to develop own ideas are the most given answers when taking all comments as a whole. Viewed per cluster, differences are notable. The participants who chose the total-internal mentor type preferred working autonomously and put their emphasis on further personal developments and individual needs. For the participants who chose the moderate-internal mentor type improving their own skills and having the possibility to work on their own ideas are most important. For the participants who chose the moderate-external mentor type a distinct pattern could not be analyzed. The focus of the respondent who chose the total-external mentor type is working on the career and earning much money without preference in a certain job structure or setting.

### **3.2.2 Requested characteristics of a perfect mentor**

The participants were asked to describe important characteristics of their image of a perfect mentor. A total of 72 comments can be structured into 12 groups. Classification agreement between the researchers was very high at 93,05% ( $\kappa=.92$ ,  $t=25.87$ ,  $p<.01$ ). After discussing the classification of the comments the two researchers did not agree on, 3 additional groups were created to classify the comments most accurately (see 15 groups with sample comments in Table 7 in Appendix C). The most conforming answers were classified in the categories feedback, ability to empathize, motivation and willingness to support and reliability and motivating. The category feedback can be divided into honest, direct, clear, constructive, objective and good feedback, where honest feedback was mentioned the most. In Table 7 in Appendix C all categories are listed in the order of most requested characteristics.

#### ***Subclassified by mentor choice***

Looking at the comments sorted by mentor choice, it was found that the participants who chose the total-internal mentor perceive honest, clear and helpful feedback as important as it will further them in their work from a reliable, well prepared mentor. At the same time they find it very important to have a mentor who pays attention to their personality and their individual requirements and developments (*"I'd like a mentor, who includes my personality in his grading and evaluation."* Interview 1.6). By considering all the listed comments of this group it is clearly recognizable that the emphasis of these participants is laid on individual support with regard to their personal developments. See Table 3 for the most frequently given comments of this group, for all given comments by the participants of this group see Table 8 in Appendix C.

For participants who chose the moderate-internal mentor getting honest, clear and helpful feedback, that will further them in their work is important. If arranging the comments' dimension in order of frequency, the dimension 'motivation and willingness to support' is in second place. The comments of this group show that these participants put the emphasis on contextual, scientific support (*"good expert knowledge for helpful guidance and support"* Interview 1.25). This can also be confirmed by considering all the listed comments of this group which all refer to improving their contextual work. The most agreeing comments of this group are listed in Table 3, for all mentioned dimensions and comments of this group see Table 9 in Appendix C.

Participants who chose the moderate-external mentor type do not show a coherent pattern. Most frequented is getting honest and clear feedback from a mentor (*"I'd want the mentor to give honest and clear feedback."* Interview 1.3) who is willing to support its mentee (*"[...] Getting assistance and hints."* Interview 1.4). See Table 3 for the most matching comments of this group, for all given comments by the participants of this group see Table 10 in Appendix C.

The participant who chose the total-external mentor type mentions wanting a mentor who is willing to help and who is available (see Table 3). See Table 11 in Appendix C for an overview of the given comments.

In summary, all groups stated good feedback and motivation and willingness to support as important factors. When looking precisely at the comments of the four groups, however, differences in their interpretation of these terms were found. The participants who chose the total-internal mentor type lay their emphasis on individual support for a better personal development. Participants who chose the moderate-internal mentor type especially wanted contextual and scientific support. The main concern of the participants who chose the moderate- and the total-external mentor type is to have an available mentor providing help and support on their tasks in concrete terms.

Table 3: Requested characteristics of a perfect mentor classified by mentor choice

| <b>Mentor choice</b>                       | <b>Categories</b>                     | <b>No. of comments</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Total-internal mentor (10 participants)    | Feedback                              | 5                      | I find honest and clear feedback most important. (Interview 1.10)  |
|  | Ability to empathize                  | 5                      | I'd like him to cater for me. (Interview 1.20)<br>To have an understanding for mentee and mentee's problems. (Interview 1.21)                                |
|  | Reliability                           | 5                      | The mentor should be reliable (Interview 1.14)<br>I would like the mentor to be on time and well-prepared (Interview 1.17) and well-ordered (Interview 1.22) |
|  | Motivation and willingness to support | 4                      | The mentor should back up my developments. (Interview 1.20)<br>The mentor should have the motivation to be willing to help me. (Interview 1.6)               |
|  | Motivating                            | 4                      | Giving compliments and motivation. (Interview 1.12)<br>Positive thinking, being motivating. (Interview 1.14)   |
|  | Room for development                  | 2                      | Open and tolerant, the mentor shouldn't try to force his way of thinking on me. (Interview 1.12)   |
| Moderate-internal mentor (7 participants)  | Feedback                              | 6                      | I'd like to get honest and clear feedback. (Interview 1.19)  |
|  | Motivation and willingness to support | 3                      | (Professional knowledge) for helpful advising and support. (Interview 1.23)<br>New approaches and good hints. (Interview 1.16)                               |
|  | Reliability                           | 2                      | The mentor should be reliable, on time. (Interview 1.15)   |
|  | Expert knowledge                      | 2                      | Good expert knowledge (Interview 1.15)   |
|  | Room for development                  | 1                      | Letting me think and work independently (Interview 1.23)   |
| Moderate-external mentor, (5 participants) | Feedback                              | 5                      | For my taste, feedback has to be honest and clear. (Interview 1.11)  |
|  | Motivation and willingness to support | 3                      | The mentor should be able to point out new approaches. (Interview 1.18)  |
|  | Ability to empathize                  | 2                      | I'd like the mentor to have the ability to empathize with somebody. (Interview 1.9)  |
|  | Motivating                            | 2                      | Compliments are important (Interview 1.4)  |
| Total-external mentor (1 participant)      | Motivation and willingness to support | 1                      | Good support and the willingness to help in case of problems. (Interview 1.8)  |
|  | Availability                          | 1                      | The mentor should be available and should be free for me. (Interview 1.8)  |

### ***3.2.3 Reasons for mentor choice and the participants' expectations***

The participants were asked to explain their mentor choice and to outline their expectations. A total of 96 distinct comments was given regarding reasons for mentor choice and participants' expectations. These comments were initially grouped into 21 dimensions. Agreement between the two researchers when reclassifying into 21 dimensions was 86,45% ( $\kappa=.85$ ,  $t=33.81$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Subsequent discussion and revision about the classified comments resulted in a total of 19 dimensions. The participants' most frequently given reason for their mentor choice was sensing to have the same attitude as the chosen mentor. They assumed that they would get good and helpful support due to the similarity. For all created dimensions and the numbers of comments per dimension see Table 12 in Appendix D.

#### ***Subclassified by mentor choice***

When classifying the respondents' answers by the mentor choice, certain patterns were identifiable which allow inferences to the respondents' association of the four mentor types and to the general respondents' expectation from a mentor. In Table 4 the most frequently stated reasons for the mentor choice are listed, sorted by mentor choice.

Table 4: Reasons for mentor choice / participants expectations subclassified by mentor choice

| <b>Mentor choice</b>                       | <b>Categories</b>                    | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Total-internal mentor (10 participants)    | Support                              | 8                       | He will soon realize my abilities for the job and then he will try to tickle as much as possible out of me (and that's what I really need sometimes). (Interview 1.14)   |
|  | Same attitude                        | 7                       | I also think that you can make a lot of a job. (Interview 1.7)   |
|  | Motivational, role model             | 4                       | I wish I'd be like him, but I'm not (yet). (Interview 1.7)   |
|  | Commitment, dedication               | 4                       | Above all I want to do a job I really like. (Interview 1.21)   |
|  | Evolvements                          | 3                       | I think it is good to have a mentor with skills or attitudes I don't have so I can learn something from him. (Interview 1.10)  |
| Moderate-internal mentor (7 participants)  | Same attitude                        | 6                       | I like the mentor's attitude. It matches my own attitude. (Interview 1.2)  |
|  | Combination of luck /accomplishment  | 5                       | I've also learned that you can achieve good results with much dedication and good accomplishments, but sometimes you have to wait and see or trust in your fortune. (Interview 1.19)   |
|  | Support                              | 3                       | I expect, that the mentor has gathered a lot experiences and that I can benefit from him. (Interview 1.19)   |
|  | Good cooperation                     | 3                       | We would be on the same page and in this way we would work together more efficiently. (Interview 1.25)   |
|  | Commitment, dedication               | 3                       | Because I also do my job with much dedication and passion and it makes sense to me. (Interview 1.16)   |
| Moderate-external mentor, (5 participants) | Support                              | 4                       | I would rather have a kind of buddy as a mentor, with whom I be on first name terms, so I just can say something like you will help me in difficult situations with my work and you will get to know me better than a person who is more distant and who just cares about his own career. (Interview 1.11) |
|  | Combination of luck / accomplishment | 4                       | I think it's very realistic, what he says, that you need luck, but also people helping you and own qualifications. (Interview 1.18)  |
|  | Same attitude                        | 3                       | I have a feeling that I would be like him because we are similar in thinking. (Interview 1.11)   |
|  | Expertise                            | 2                       | The mentor has to give feedback, so I want to get qualified feedback. (Interview 1.3)  |
| Total-external mentor (1 participant)      | Same attitude                        | 1                       | Because we have the same attitude. (Interview 1.8)   |
|  | Good cooperation                     | 1                       | I think I could work with him the best. There wouldn't be many differences in opinion with him. (Interview 1.8)  |
|  | Content fate, luck                   | 1                       | I would agree: you can also achieve a lot based on luck. Up to now I have also achieved a lot based on luck, that's why I would choose him. (Interview 1.8)  |
|  | Relaxed work atmosphere              | 1                       | I don't want to stress myself or get in trouble with a strict mentor. This one doesn't seem to be too strict, he doesn't radiate to much pressure to perform, a little bit more relaxed... (Interview 1.8)   |

When looking at the participants who chose the total-internal mentor it is notable that they expect the mentor to give good support in terms of having a realistic estimation of the participants' skills and vitalizing and encouraging them in their development. Furthermore, they assume to have the same attitude as the chosen mentor with regard to work attitude, accomplishment and encouragement in terms of own effort and willingness to work including the importance of a joyful job. They rate the mentor as a high-skilled, likeable and positive-thinking person who can be a good role model in a motivational way (*"If he says, check out what I have accomplished - that would somehow animate me and is just my style how I would look for a job"*, Interview 1.6). Most notably, these participants focus on getting more individual support that aims at their personal development. For more comments see Table 4.

Most of the participants who chose the moderate-internal mentor reason their choice by perceived same attitude towards working, accomplishment, commitment but also in combination with accepted luck and fortune. They expect good support in terms of learning from the mentor's experience and getting helpful advice from a qualified person. Based on the same attitude (*"being on the same page"*, Interview 1.5) they anticipate an agreeable and equal cooperation with the mentor. Furthermore, the participants assume the mentor to be more tolerant based on the same attitude and to have as much commitment and motivation as they have themselves. In addition, they expect a mentor who asks accomplishment in a good and motivational way and who represents a good role model (for more comments see Table 4).

Most of the participants who chose the moderate-external mentor expect good support from the mentor. In this group, however, by 'support' the respondents meant more concrete help (*"The mentor has to help me"*, Interview 1.9). Moreover, these participants also reason their choice by a same perceived attitude towards opinions and thinking, especially towards the attitude of needing qualifications and most of all good luck and good connections for getting a fitting job. Additionally, both factors 'accomplishment' and 'luck' are mentioned as important in finding a job. Besides, the participants assume the mentor to be qualified, likeable, personal and easy-going.

The participant who chose the total-external mentor declares this choice by the perceived same attitude, particularly towards luck and its effect on the career. The participant assumes a good cooperation with the mentor due to the same attitude towards career planning. A relaxed cooperation without much pressure to perform, stress or annoyance is expected by choosing the total-external mentor type (see Table 4). For a more detailed overview of all given comments see Appendix D, Tables 13-16.



### **3.2.4 Describing the 'anti-mentor'**

Besides asking the participants which mentor they would like to have as their mentor and what the reasons for their choice were, the participants were asked to define the reasons for not choosing the mentor with the opposite locus of control of their chosen mentor. Thus, respondents who chose an internal-mentor type were asked why they did not choose the total-external mentor type and respondents who chose an external mentor type were asked why they did not choose the total-internal mentor type. In the following, the participants' reasons against their mentor type are described.

#### ***Total-internal mentor type***

Regarding the reasons against the total-internal mentor participants (N=6) made a total of 10 comments that was grouped into 7 dimensions. Agreement between the two researchers was significant at 80% ( $\kappa=.76$ ,  $t=6.19$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The participants who chose the moderate-external or total-external mentor most frequently announced the difference in attitude as main reason for the choice against the total-internal mentor type. Also the mentor does not seem to be qualified enough, because his statements are very global and seem to be phony. Additionally, the participants were afraid of getting demotivated by the mentor's charisma of being too driven, active and actually too perfect in his work. Another mentioned aspect was that the participants fear a bad cooperation with the mentor because of the dissimilar attitude and consequential lack of trust (*"To a person with the same attitude I would have a completely different confidence relation, I think to a person with a differing attitude it wouldn't be possible in such a way."* Interview 1.11). For more comments see Table 5. All given comments can be found in Appendix E, Table 17.

Table 5: Reasons against total-internal mentor (6 participants)

| Categories                        | No. of comments | Sample comments  |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Different attitude                | 3               | I don't really agree with the statement: A job is what you make of it, I have pretty clear ideas of what I want to do. (Interview 1.8)   |
| Incompetent                       | 2               | That's written in every animation guidebook, but most of the time it doesn't seem to be very helpful, that's why I don't like him that much. (Interview 1.9)   |
| Demotivating, too much dedication | 1               | This mentor says, that he's very active and performs well and so on, but I'm not that straight-A student and I'm afraid that such a great mentor would more probably demotivate me. (Interview 1.4)  |
| Difficult cooperation             | 1               | I would probably think that I really don't like everything he says, but I would grit my teeth and just do what he wants me to do, in some way I would adapt myself to his wishes, but I think I wouldn't feel that comfortable doing it. (Interview 1.8)   |
| Too much planning, too focused    | 1               | I always just accept everything as it is and that's why mentor 4, who is talking about the factor 'luck', is a better match than mentor 3, who seems to have planned everything already. I could imagine that he (mentor 3) would be more reserved, he would be too focused for my liking, I would be afraid that I couldn't build up such a confidence relation to such a person as to a person I'm more similar in attitude with. (Interview 1.11) |
| No sympathy                       | 1               | Somehow, I can't reconcile with his statements that much. (Interview 1.8)  |
| No trust                          | 1               | I would be afraid that I couldn't build up such a confidence relation to such a person as to a person I'm more similar in attitude with. (Interview 1.11)  |

### **Total-external mentor type**

The participants (N=17) who chose the total-internal or moderate-internal mentor had to explain why they did not choose the total-external mentor. Referring to the reasons against the total-external mentor type a total of 33 comments was gained. These comments can be grouped into 10 dimensions. Classification agreement between the researchers was significant at 84,84% ( $\kappa=.83$ ,  $t=14.4$ ,  $p<.01$ )

The main reason was: not wanting a mentor who seems to base everything on luck and good fortune because the respondents did not see any benefit for themselves in such a mentor. They describe him as unqualified, incompetent, unreliable and demotivating due to little involvement in his work. Furthermore, the participants rated the mentor as too focused on his own career to really support a mentee. As the participants assumed not having the same attitude as the mentor and did not experience him as very likeable, they fear a bad cooperation with the mentor because

of a consequent lack of trust. For an overview of the given reasons see Table 6. More comments can be found in Appendix E, Table 18.

Table 6: Reasons against total-external mentor (17 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                           | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| Demotivating, unreliable due to luck        | 8                       | For my liking, everything is too much based on luck and lucky coincidence, which I can't control and which doesn't help me. (Interview 1.14)         |
| Demotivating, no dedication                 | 5                       | That's why I rather have a mentor who at least mentions ,accomplishment'. I'm wondering what the rest has to do with his actual job. (Interview 1.5) |
| Incompetent                                 | 5                       | He doesn't seem to be very qualified. He more properly has got his job based on luck. (Interview 1.15)   |
| No evolvments                               | 4                       | I think he doesn't achieve anything he could teach me or equip me with, that I could achieve it, too. (Interview 1.10)                               |
| Too focused on career/ no enjoyment of work | 3                       | He is just interested in the power he can achieve and money he can make, he wouldn't care about having a pleasant job. (Interview 1.22)              |
| Different attitude                          | 3                       | I don't deem it right to calculate just on luck. (Interview 1.12)  |
| Difficult cooperation                       | 2                       | I would find it difficult to work with a person who just confides in luck and who doesn't really stick up for its job. (Interview 1.2)               |
| Impersonally                                | 1                       | The third mentor seems to be more personally, a probably more caring mentor, in a personal way compared to the first mentor. (Interview 1.21)        |
| Sloppy                                      | 1                       | I would expect him to be sloppy. (Interview 1.25)  |
| No sympathy                                 | 1                       | He sounds so arrogant, I find him most dislikeable of the four mentors. (Interview 1.15)   |

### ***Main findings***

In this first study participants who were not in a mentorship at this point, but in a phase of their study in which they had made up enough experiences to be able to predict what they would prefer in a formal mentoring, were asked about important mentor characteristics related to their own characteristics.

The outcomes of the two combined locus of control scales indicated that all respondents had an internal-directed locus of control. However, the results of the interview pointed out that there are differences in mentees' preferences of job settings and mentor characteristics. In summary, the respondents who chose the total-internal mentor type preferred working autonomously and lay the emphasis on individual and personal support geared to their individual needs and further their own developments.

The respondents who chose the moderate-internal mentor type found it important to have the possibility to work on their own ideas and to get support, contextual and scientifically, to improve their own skills. There were no distinct patterns in the answers of the respondents who chose the moderate- and the total-external mentor type. Though, there was a tendency that they focused on working on their own career, earning much money without preference in a certain job structure or job setting. In addition to that, they expect a mentor to provide assistance and support in more concrete terms. All in all, the majority of the respondents chose an internal-directed mentor type.

In the following, these results, referring to the initiation of mentoring, need to be compared with the experiences of mentees who are in a mentorship program. Thus, in the subsequent study the respondents need to be in a mentorship or have earlier experience with being in a mentorship. Further, it is interesting to compare their associations with the four manipulated mentor statements with the respondents' associations of the first study, what kind of expectations they have concerning the different mentor types and what kind of experiences they made with those different types. In the end it is important to detect which aspects of the mentor lead to higher satisfaction with the mentoring and to what extent the mentees' and mentors' locus of control correlates with it.

### **3.3 Method study 2**

Subsequent to the first study, the results of the second study are supposed to give answers to the question if the respondents' associations and expectations towards the four mentor types from the first study can be confirmed by respondents having experience with mentoring. A further issue of the second study is a more detailed description of the mentees' experience with mentoring. It is outlined which aspects lead to more positive or negative mentoring incidents.

#### **3.3.1 Participants**

The participants of the second study were 15 German students from the Saxion University of Applied Sciences in Enschede. This university offers all their students a mentoring program that is, depending on the course of study, either structured over time with defined learning targets or an unstructured, individual support. The courses the respondents were enrolled in were Social Education (part time study in combination with a practical work placement at a socially orientated institution; N=9), Business Informatics (N=2), International Business and Languages (N=2) and Small Business and Retail Management (N=2). The participants studying Social Education

had two mentors, one from the Saxion university and one from their practical work placement. The remaining respondents had only one mentor from Saxion university. Of the 15 students, 6 were male and 9 were female. The average age of the participants was 24 years, ranging from 21 to 27 years. All participants had certain experiences with the mentoring program for at least one year, the average number of years was 2.5 and ranged from 1 to 4 years.

### **3.3.2 Procedure and instruments**

For conducting an investigation with regard to the students' mentoring program, a multistep interview was created. In the first step personal details such as sex, age, course of study and academic year were requested. Concerning the mentoring the following characteristics were asked: context of the mentoring (component of the study course or component of the practical work placement), setup of the mentoring program (structured or unstructured), regularity of support and meetings, content of the support (what is discussed), students' estimation of the mentor's expert knowledge and the mentor's experience in advising and whether students chose their mentor on their own or if he was assigned to them.

In the second part of the interview, a critical incident technique was used to get more information about the mentor-mentee relationship, the mentor's skills in advising and supporting the mentee and the mentee's satisfaction with the mentor and the mentoring program as a whole. The critical incident technique is, among others, an established method for evaluations. The respondents are asked to describe a critical incident of the assessed context, including all involved persons and the succeeding consequences of the incident. This procedure assists collecting representative samples of data that are relevant for the analyzed content (Flanagan, 1954). In addition, a detailed analysis of the given critical incidents facilitates the identification of similarities, differences and patterns and provides insight into how and why people engage in activity (Chell, 1998).

In this section of the interview the participant was asked to report a decisive incident with the mentor. This incident can be of either very positive or very negative nature. Following the first description, further aspects of the incident were inquired. In case of not been mentioned before, the participant was questioned to give an overview of all persons involved, picture the consequences of the situation and give a classification of the occurrence (typical or untypical incident). To get a more detailed picture of the mentorship the participant was asked to delineate the mentor's behavior and characteristics that were either conducive or unconducive for the mentoring. Furthermore, students' wishes concerning the setup of the mentoring program and

concerning the mentor's behavior and support were requested and the student was requested to give a general rating of the mentoring.

The last section of the interview was used to get a more distinct characterization of the participant, the participants' real mentor and the participants' mentor by choice concerning the locus of control. Therefore, the four mentor statements, which were already developed on the basis of the locus of control scale of Spector (1988) and utilized in the first study, were used again. The statements were manipulated to describe each a total-internal, moderate-internal, moderate-external and total-external locus of control attitude. It was said that those statements were extracts of interviews with mentors about their career. The students were asked to read the four statements and decide which statement best displayed the attitude of their real mentor, their own attitude and which of the four mentors would be their mentor by free choice. Finally, the participants were asked to describe to what extent a difference or a similarity concerning the attitude of both the mentor and the mentee, is conducive or unconducive for the mentoring.

The interviews took place in a separate room with a comfortable surrounding. At the outset of the interviews, students were assured that their responses remained confidential and anonymous. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes. The interview was conducted in German, for an English version of the interview scheme see Table 19 in Appendix F.

### ***3.3.3 Data analysis procedure***

For analyzing the data from the interviews a multistep content analysis was undertaken. First, all comments were classified into the following six content segments: experiences and satisfaction with the mentoring, set-up of the mentoring program, regularity of the contact with the mentor, change requests regarding the mentoring program, defining the real mentor and self-perception by reference to the four manipulated mentor statements and associations with those four mentor statements. All comments were reviewed and sorted by similar meanings. Each content section was reviewed by a second researcher, who re-categorized the comments into clusters. In cases where the two researchers disagreed, reasons for categorizing were discussed and the comments were shifted to the most appropriate cluster. In two cases this resulted in deleting an unnecessary cluster in order to categorize the comments most accurately. After categorizing all the comments, the content sections were narrowed by condensing the clusters with the same underlying themes. Subsequently, the different sections were collated with one another in order to get more distinct results relating to the mentoring and the mentees' satisfaction with it.

## 3.4 Results study 2

The aim of the second study was to compare the outcomes of the first study with experiences students made in their mentoring. The focus of the first study laid on the initiation of a mentoring. In the second study interviews were conducted with respondents participating in a mentor program. Their and their mentors' locus of control, which was estimated by the participants, was related to a free mentor choice and a description of the different associations with the four mentor types. To get a better overview of the participants' actual experience with mentoring, the respondents were asked to tell a critical incidents which occurred during mentoring. These incidents are categorized and described in this chapter. Following, the different contexts of the mentoring are pictured and further participants' wishes concerning the mentoring are specified. In the subsequent paragraph the meaning of the mentors' and mentees' locus of control is lined out by comparing the mentees' self-perception to their mentor choice and giving an overview of the participants' associations with the four manipulated mentor types (total-internal, moderate-internal, moderate-external and total-external locus of control).

### 3.4.1 Critical incidents

To get a better insight into the participants' experience with mentoring they were asked to describe a decisive incident that had occurred during mentoring. Of the 15 participants 5 pictured a positive incident and 10 a negative one. The incidents can be classified into 3 groups: attitude concerning mentoring, mentor's characteristic traits and communication. Of the 15 incidents 6 dealt with the mentor's attitude concerning mentoring, 2 of them were positive and 4 were negative. Another 6 incidents related to the mentor's character traits, all of which were negative. The remaining 3 incidents concerned the communication with the mentor and were all positive ones. (For an overview see Table 7.) Following that, the incidents were further categorized by content, see Table 8. Agreement about the categorizing among the researchers was 86,6% ( $\kappa=.80$ ,  $t=4,382$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

Table 7: Total number of critical incidents for each factor

| Category incident             | No. of incidents | Positive | Negative |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------|----------|
| Attitude concerning mentoring | 6                | 2        | 4        |
| Mentor's character traits     | 6                | -        | 6        |
| Communication                 | 3                | 3        | -        |

Table 8: Examples of statements of the told critical incidents

| <b>Incident</b> | <b>Category incident</b>      | <b>Contentual category</b>                        | <b>No. of inci-dents</b> | <b>Sample comment</b>  |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| Positive        | Attitude concerning mentoring | Good, constructive feedback                       | 2                        | I could test myself; he let me handle the situation on my own. In the end when I thought that I needed help, he motivated me to do the rest on my own as well and gave good hints on what I could try out. (Interview 2.9)   |
|                 |                               | Trust in mentee, Motivating                       |                          |  |
|                 | Communication                 | Good cooperation                                  | 2                        | I can discuss every problem that I have with my mentor; together we always find a good solution. (Interview 2.8)   |
|                 |                               | Reflecting on communication                       | 1                        | At first, he didn't understand what my problem was and didn't help me the way I wanted. Afterwards, I confronted him with my point of view, in the end this incident led to an even better and closer mentor relationship. (Interview 2.11)  |
| Negative        | Attitude concerning mentoring | Insufficient support, no understanding            | 2                        | She has no understanding for my university tasks and didn't even try to assist me with them. (Interview 2.6)   |
|                 |                               | No interest in being mentor, no meetings          | 1                        | He didn't signal any willingness for mentoring me, so if I had a problem I wouldn't go to him for assistance. (Interview 2.15)   |
|                 |                               | No support, no understanding, Talking mentee down | 1                        | My mentor didn't even try to understand me; he just gave random advice and always talked me down. In the end I didn't ask him for anything and tried to solve my problems on my own. (Interview 2.13)  |
|                 | Mentor's character traits     | Too personal, determined feedback                 | 2                        | Sometimes she interprets my acting totally on her own without talking it over with me and has a determined and often false point of view of me. It's very stressful always being attentive that she understands things right and it makes me uncertain in my acting as well. (Interview 2.7) |
|                 |                               | Unreliable  | 2                        | I can't rely on agreements with my mentor and that often makes me insecure. (Interview 2.1)  |
|                 |                               | Too friendly, no decisive action                  | 1                        | He tried to help us to work more as a team, but it didn't help much. More authority and decisive action would have had more effect. (Interview 2.12)   |
|                 |                               | Too much control, too personal                    | 1                        | My mentor has my address, e-mail address, my cell phone number and he isn't afraid to use them all. That is too controlling for my taste. (Interview 2.14)   |



### **Positive incidents**

The participants who pictured a positive incident of their mentorship referred to the mentor's attitude concerning the overall mentoring, which contains especially good constructive feedback, the mentor's motivating behavior and the mentor's trust in the mentee. Furthermore, good and effective communication was stated as positive characteristic of the mentoring (*"The interchange and the communication with her is brilliant, it helps me to get a new viewing angle on my work every time."* Interview 2.3). For more sample comments see Table 8.

Further positive aspects of the mentoring mentioned by the participants were free space for the mentee to test own skills (*"He lets me have my own way and free space to test my own skills"* Interview 2.11), always being combined with good and constructive feedback. One issue all four respondents related to was that their mentors gave them a secure feeling and the confirmation of being skilled on the one hand and being allowed to make mistakes on the other hand (*"He helped me and gave me a secure feeling of being allowed to make mistakes. Although, I didn't make anything wrong, but I could test myself and afterwards in absence of the young people he gave me feedback."* Interview 2.10).

Moreover, the respondents stated their mentors to be friendly, esteeming, reliable, motivating, competent and interested in the mentee. For all positive comments see Table 20 in Appendix G.

Beside that, the study's participants were asked for further wishes related to their mentor and mentoring context. In this course they answered that they would like to get to know their mentor on a more personal level. Especially concerning telling the mentor own problems, they would like to know their mentor better to have more confidence in him. In addition, they would like to have more frequent meetings (*"still more feedback sessions"*, Interview 2.10) and clearer agreements (*"Altogether I would like to have more structure, that everything is more clearly regulated."* Interview 2.9). An overview of more sample comments is given in Table 22 in Appendix G.

When looking at the context of the mentoring and the mentors' existing experience, differences between the participants who stated mentoring as good can be noticed. Not all of them were in a structured mentoring program, but all respondents had regular meetings and were in consistent contact with their mentor. There were both experienced and inexperienced mentors as well in their professional field as in being a mentor. Respondents were satisfied with inexperienced mentors if they were in return motivated, dedicated and interested in the mentee and the mentee's problems. (*„No, I would say, he isn't that experienced in being a mentor, but in this context it*

*doesn't matter. He is very dedicated and together we always find a good solution for my problems.*" Interview 2.8.)

### **Negative incidents**

When looking at the respondents who described negative incidents that occurred during mentoring, it is conspicuous that although all being in a formal mentor program, 9 out of 10 were not in a structured mentor program. Their mentoring had individual arranged targets and support and meetings on demand.

Referring to the professional knowledge of the mentor, it was stated that their mentor is professionally experienced (*"His experience in his professional field was ok"*, Interview 2.2) and gives professional feedback (*"He can point out other aspects, I didn't think of."* Interview 2.1).

Nonetheless, these participants described negative incidents that occurred during mentoring. These incidents can be classified into the groups *the mentor's attitude concerning the mentoring* and *the mentor's trait characteristics*. Concerning negative incidents referring to the mentors' attitude negative points were no motivation or dedication in being a mentor (*"He didn't radiate being a motivated and enthusiast mentor, if I had a problem, he wouldn't have been my first choice person to speak to."* Interview 2.15) and little understanding for the mentees' problems (*"He couldn't understand my problems and just gave random advices"* Interview 2.13). See Table 8 for more sample comments. Negative characteristic traits were predominantly related to the mentor's behavior which made the mentee uncertain, like too much control (*"I often feel pressurized by the mentor"* Interview 2.4) in combination with little feedback (*"I totally lack the instruction"*, Interview 2.7) or not talking about problems immediately (*"She often talks late or too late about problems, or she first talks about those problems with another person and later on with me, instead of making it clear with me right away, that often makes me uncertain"*, Interview 2.7). More negative points about the mentor's characteristic traits were being too befriended and less authoritative (*"A more authoritative person probably would have helped better."* Interview 2.12) and unreliable (*"If we really had a problem, he just didn't want or maybe he even couldn't help us, but he also didn't take us serious."* Interview 2.5). For all negative comments see Table 21 in Appendix G.

When asking the participants about their wishes regarding the mentoring they primarily stated more frequent meetings with the mentor (*"I think with more regular meetings, some problems wouldn't have occurred"*, Interview 2.12), clearer agreements to rely on and more constructive feedback (*"I would wish more and more constructive, personal feedback"*, Interview 2.6). Additionally, they would like their

mentor to be more esteeming, assertive and giving them more free space. For all comments relating to the wishes concerning the mentoring see Table 22 in Appendix G.

In summary, all respondents regard their mentors as competent. However, that was not the critical aspect which brought on higher satisfaction with the mentoring. Positive aspects which made the participants more satisfied about the mentoring were: when the mentor provoked a feeling of security, like getting the confirmation of being skilled and at the same time being allowed to make mistakes. Additionally, a good and equal cooperation was stated with free space for the mentee and constructive feedback on the part of the mentor. Overall consistent contact with the mentor with clear agreements seemed to further the satisfaction about the mentoring and beside that those two points are the most wished improvements concerning the mentoring.

Matching these findings, as negative aspects of the mentor behavior was mentioned that led to mentees' uncertainty such as: too much control, little feedback, the mentor being unreliable, no confidence in the mentee and no understanding on the part of the mentor.

### ***3.4.2 Meaning of the mentors' and mentees' locus of control***

After analyzing and describing the different mentees' experiences with the mentor it is interesting to look at the role of the mentors' and the mentees' locus of control. Analyses regarding a connection between the mentees' and the mentors' locus of control, which was estimated by the participants, and a more positive or negative evaluation of the mentoring functions did not show any distinct outcomes. Concerning the estimated mentor's locus of control relating to the chosen mentor type, no distinct results were found. However, a match between the mentees' self-perception and their free mentor choice can be ascertained. For that reason, first the mentees' self-perception concerning their perceived own locus of control is compared with their chosen internal- or external-directed locus of control mentor type. Following, the respondents' associations with their actual mentor are compared to the expectations of the respondents from the first study, always related to the four different mentor types.

#### ***Match self-perception and mentor choice***

Besides associating the real mentor with one of the four manipulated mentor statements, the participants were asked to outline which statement describes their own attitude best and which of the four mentors they would have chosen in case of a free mentor choice. When comparing the respondents' self-perception and their

mentor choice there is a disagreement of 4 respondents. Of the 15 respondents 11 respondents' self-perceptions have total analogy with their mentor choice. The 6 respondents who perceive themselves as total-internal directed persons would choose the total-internal mentor type. Of the 7 participants who estimated themselves as moderate internal-directed, 4 would choose the moderate-internal mentor type, 2 the total-internal and 1 the total-external mentor type. The respondent who thought being a moderate external-directed person would choose the moderate-external mentor type. The participant who thought of himself as a total external-directed person would choose the moderate-internal mentor type. Thus, a tendency that mentees tend to choose a mentor with the same locus of control they ascribe to themselves – if they have a free mentor choice – can be noted. See Table 9 for an overview of the participants' self-perception and their mentor choice. In the following section '*description of the four given mentor types*' the participants stated reasons for their mentor choice and their associations of their actual mentors were formulated in detail.

Table 9: Match self-perception and mentor choice

| <b>Self-perception</b> | <b>No. of participants</b> | <b>Match self-perception / mentor choice</b> | <b>Variant chosen mentor type</b>        |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Total internal         | 6                          | 6  | -  |
| Moderate internal      | 7                          | 4  | Total internal (2)<br>Total external (1) |
| Moderate external      | 1                          | 1  | -  |
| Total external         | 1                          | -  | Moderate internal (1)                    |

### ***Descriptions of the four given mentor types***

In the first study, respondents were asked what they would expect from the four different mentor types. These expectations were compared to the description of the respondents from the second study regarding their own mentor and their preferred mentor type. Respecting those descriptions a total of 98 comments was identified. At first, these comments were classified into 30 dimensions. Agreement of the two researchers was significant with 87,76% ( $\kappa=.87$ ,  $t=46.4$ ,  $p<.01$ ). After discussing and revising the classification of the comments the two researchers did not agree on, comments were resorted in just 28 dimensions. For a better overview of the meaning of the mentors' locus of control and a better comparison with the results of the first study the comments were arranged by the four mentor types total-internal, moderate-

internal, moderate-external and total-external mentor type. Of the 15 respondents 6 could most identify with the total-internal mentor type, 7 with the moderate-internal, 1 with the moderate-external and 1 with the total-external mentor type. In case of a free mentor choice 8 respondents would choose the total-internal mentor type, 5 the moderate-internal, 1 the moderate-external and 1 the total-external mentor type. Based on the four mentor statements 3 respondents would describe their actual mentor as a total-internal mentor type, 6 as a moderate-internal mentor type, 4 as a moderate-external and 2 as a total-external mentor type (see Table 10). For a more accurate overview of the participants' self-perception, mentor choice and actual mentor type see Table 11. In this table the 3 categories are sorted by the participants' self-perception. In the following participants' associations with the different mentor types are lined out arranged by the four mentor types.

Table 10: Total amount of participants' self-perception, mentor choice and actual, real mentor type

| <b>Mentor type</b> | <b>Self-perception</b> | <b>Free mentor choice</b> | <b>Actual, real mentor type</b> |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Total-internal     | 6                      | 8                         | 3                               |
| Moderate-internal  | 7                      | 5                         | 6                               |
| Moderate-external  | 1                      | 1                         | 4                               |
| Total-external     | 1                      | 1                         | 2                               |

Table 11: Overview of participants' self-perception, mentor choice and actual, real mentor type, sorted by self-perception

| <b>Self-perception</b> | <b>No.</b> | <b>Free mentor choice</b> | <b>No.</b> | <b>Actual, real mentor type</b> | <b>No.</b> |
|------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| Total-internal         | 6          | Total-internal            | 6          | Total-internal                  | 2          |
|                        |            |                           |            | Moderate-internal               | 1          |
|                        |            |                           |            | Moderate-external               | 2          |
|                        |            |                           |            | Total-external                  | 1          |
| Moderate-internal      | 7          | Total-internal            | 2          | Total-internal                  | 1          |
|                        |            |                           |            | Moderate-internal               | 1          |
|                        |            | Moderate-internal         | 4          | Moderate-internal               | 3          |
|                        |            |                           |            | Moderate-external               | 1          |
|                        |            | Total-external            | 1          | Moderate-external               | 1          |
| Moderate-external      | 1          | Moderate-external         | 1          | Moderate-internal               | 1          |
| Total-external         | 1          | Moderate-internal         | 1          | Total-external                  | 1          |

#### *Having a total-internal mentor type*

The respondents (N=3) who viewed their actual mentor as a total-internal mentor type enhanced the attitude of wanting to optimize and to evolve situations and persons on the one hand (*"He always tries to optimize my ideas and to get me further. I like it, I think he can always point out more possibilities than I see."* Interview 2.11) and having the attitude of being successful by being dedicated and hardworking on the other hand (*"I know my mentor as a person who works a lot. He doesn't has to trust in luck or fate, he just gets where he wants to be by hardworking."* Interview 2.14). Furthermore, they described their mentor as strong-minded and focused, a person who sticks to his goals. For more comments see Table 12.

Participants from the first study, who would prefer a total-internal mentor type were most focused on getting more individual support that aims at their personal development, thus a mentor who would promote them and who would take over a motivational role. Furthermore, they reasoned their choice by assuming to have the same attitude in working hard for their goals.

#### *Chosen a total-internal mentor type*

The respondents (N=3) from the second study who had a total-internal mentor type would choose the same mentor type again because of the characteristics they termed. The remaining respondents (N=5) from the second study who would rather prefer a total-internal mentor type reasoned their choice by expecting the mentor to give good support in developing and improving own skills (*"I think he would be a great support with giving me specifically tasks for a good development."* Interview 2.10). Furthermore, they preferred the attitude of hardworking for success, being strong-minded and focused but also maintaining a positive way of thinking (*"I like the attitude, that you can achieve what you want independently from luck or fate but just with your own effort."* Interview 2.10). For an overview of the comments of the respondents of the second study who would choose a total-internal mentor type see Table 12.

As already delineated this characterization agrees with the expectations of the respondents from the first study who would also prefer the total-internal mentor type.

Table 12: Associations with the total-internal mentor type

| <b>Respondents</b>                      | <b>Categories</b>                      | <b>No.</b> | <b>Comment</b>  |
|---|--|------------|---|
| Having a total-internal mentor type     | Development potentialities, optimizing | 2          | My mentor always says that she wasn't always like she is now and that she has developed a lot, I find it very motivating. (Interview 2.7)   |
|   | Strong-minded, focused                 | 2          | My mentor has worked a long time under her level of qualification and payment to get there where she is now. (Interview 2.7)<br>He told me that he always knew that he wanted to do this work. That's why he didn't get his job by luck but by aspiring his goals. (Interview 2.11)         |
|   | Accomplishment, dedication, success    | 1          | In the end you have to use the given possibilities, you can have the best mentors and circumstances; if you don't use them it won't do any good. (Interview 2.14)   |
| Preferring a total-internal mentor type | Development potentialities, optimizing | 4          | I find the way of thinking very motivating that you can make the best out of things even if they are very small. (Interview 2.6)  |
|   | Accomplishment/success                 | 3          | I like the attitude that you can achieve your goals by dedication, independently from luck or fate (Interview 2.6).<br>Of course, dedication and accomplishment lead to great success. (Interview 2.13)   |
|   | Competent                              | 3          | I think that he would be able to teach me new things. (Interview 2.4)<br>I think that he made good experiences. It would be helpful for me if he would tell me how he managed things. (Interview 2.6)<br>He would allocate targeted tasks for a good mentee's development. (Interview 2.10) |
|   | Positive thinking                      | 2          | He seems to be very positive. (Interview 2.4)<br>I like the attitude, if you know what you want, you can achieve it. (Interview 2.8)  |
|   | Focused, strong-minded                 | 2          | He seems to be relaxed but also focused and knowing what he wants to achieve. (Interview 2.4)<br>I also know what I want, that's why I expect that I could achieve my goals. (Interview 2.8)  |
|   | Ability to support                     | 2          | I think that I could learn from his experiences. (Interview 2.6)<br>I would expect that he supports me in my attitude. (Interview 2.8)  |
|   | Relaxed                                | 1          | He would be more understanding and more relaxed and that is what I miss with my current mentor. (Interview 2.4)   |

### *Having a moderate-internal mentor type*

The respondents (N=6) who rated their mentor as moderate-internally underlined the attitude of being dedicated and being willing to perform well (*"I also think, that it's important to have good qualifications and good accomplishments for success. That was also an attitude from my mentor, he also achieved everything by own accomplishments and not by contacts."* Interview 2.2). Furthermore, they described their mentor as focused, confident (*"My mentor is very focused, he knows what he wants."* Interview 2.4), but also calm and understanding. The mentor was characterized as an autonomous and proactive person, who is motivated and interested in new knowledge. For more comments see Table 13.

Conforming with the expectations of participants from the first study, who preferred this mentor type, the respondents of the second study also valued following mentor characteristics: the attitude of working hard, being dedicated and focused, but at the same time acting calm and strategically.

### *Chosen a moderate-internal mentor*

Of the respondents (N=5) who would prefer a moderate-internal mentor type by free choice, 3 already had a moderate-internal mentor type and reasoned their choice by the already given characterization from above. Reasons for this mentor type from the other 2 respondents were the attitude of working hard and being dedicated and focused on one's success, but at the same time also relaxed enough to see other possibilities (*"Sometimes you need to wait to achieve your goals."* Interview 2.5). For an overview of the respondents' comments of the second study who would choose a moderate-internal mentor type see Table 13.

The reasons and expectations towards this mentor type also assort well with the expectations from the respondents from the first study who chose this mentor type as already delineated above.



Table 13: Associations with the moderate-internal mentor type

| <b>Respondents</b>                     | <b>Categories</b>                          | <b>No.</b>             | <b>Comment</b>   |
|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Having a moderate-internal mentor type | Accomplishment, qualification              | 4                      | My mentor also showed dedication and accomplishment during her studies. And I also aim at an excellent graduation. To my opinion that only works with great dedication and accomplishment. (Interview 2.3)                     |
|  | Focused                                    | 3                      | My mentor is very focused, he knows what he wants. (Interview 2.4)<br>My mentor has worked hard to get to this position, he always was very focused (Interview 2.10)   |
|  | Confident                                  | 2                      | I had the feeling that he was a confident person, with the attitude, I'm proud of attaining my goals' (Interview 2.2)  |
|  | Calm, patient                              | 2                      | My mentor is a person who also can await things. (Interview 2.10)<br>My mentor is a very patient person. (Interview 2.9)   |
|  | Interested in new knowledge, inquisitive   | 1                      | He is very experienced, he has been doing his job for about 20 years and he keeps picking up new knowledge. (Interview 2.9)  |
|  | Autonomous, proactive                      | 1                      | My mentor has a very autonomous way of thinking, he cannot wait until something happens, he is always proactive and tries to solve the problems. (Interview, 2.9)  |
|  | Motivated                                  | 1                      | He is always very motivated and tries to motivate us, too (Interview 2.9)  |
|  | Understanding                              | 1                      | My mentor always tries to understand our problems (Interview 2.12)   |
|  | Preferring a moderate-internal mentor type | Accomplishment/success | 3  |
| Relaxed                                |  | 2                      | But I also know that at some point you need to be able to be relaxed enough and not wanting too much. (Interview 2.5)  |
| Focused                                |  | 2                      | I think that you have to see what your strengths are and what you want to do in your live. I don't think that you can develop every job in a job you gonna like. Interview 2.5)  |
| Being proud                            |  | 1                      | I find it important that you also can be proud of attaining things. (Interview 2.5)  |
| Dedicated                              |  | 1                      | I find it important that a mentor is involved in mentee's projects and problems, mentor 2 seems to be that way. (Interview 2.1)  |
| Strategic                              |  | 1                      | I also made the experience that at some point you have to await some things, sometimes just pushing at doors doesn't have a positive effect and it's more effective to wait until the door is accidently open. (Interview 2.1) |

### *Having a moderate-external mentor type*

The respondents (N=4) who stated their mentor being a moderate-external mentor type described their mentor as a person who likes to present himself (*"My mentor likes to present himself very much, unfortunately that's not my style at all."* Interview 2.6). Furthermore, the mentor was characterized as a person with the attitude of needing both for success: qualifications and good luck (*"My mentor seems to have the attitude that you should stick to your promises, but that you need good contacts to fulfill them as well."* Interview 2.1). Moreover, the respondents pictured the mentor as satisfied with his situation and without further ambition and sometimes not seriously involved. Some respondents stated that their mentor is focused and has a realistic attitude (*"My mentor always has a realistic point of view, she doesn't respond to someone's dreams, she rather points out what is more possible to reach."* Interview 2.6), others rated the mentor as not focused and indecisive. For an overview of the given comments see Table 14.

Participants from the first study, who would prefer this mentor type, expected the mentor to have a realistic attitude in thinking that qualifications and good luck are crucial for getting a required job. Furthermore, they expected that the mentor would be an easy-going person. This can be the positive version of the description of being not seriously involved from the respondents of the second study.

### *Chosen a moderate-external mentor*

The respondent (N=1) who chose the moderate-external mentor type reasoned this choice by thinking this mentor is the most realistic of the four presented mentors (*"I think that he has a very realistic attitude. It needs luck to find a job which totally matches your interests and expectations."* Interview 2.9). Furthermore the respondent assumes that the mentor has the same work attitude of needing good qualifications for a good job. See Table 14 for more comments

Conformity with the respondents from the first study who would prefer a moderate-external mentor type was, that those also expected the mentor to have the most realistic attitude and that they also agreed to the attitude of needing both, good luck and good qualifications to find a fitting job.

Table 14: Associations with the moderate-external mentor type

| Respondents                            | Categories                            | No. | Comment   |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----|---|
| Having a moderate-external mentor type | Presenting oneself                    | 2   | My mentor likes presenting himself. (Interview 2.15)  |
|  | Combination of qualification and luck | 2   | For my mentor the personality and the strengths of the mentees are important, in her opinion you have to work for your goals and further trust in your luck. (Interview 2.6)  |
|  | Realistic                             | 2   | My mentor always has a very realistic view. If she sees a naive dream or expectation of one of her mentees, she points out the unlikeliness of getting to it immediately. She rather tries to spot what is more possible to reach for the mentee. (Interview 2.6) |
|  | No seriousness                        | 1   | Sometimes I have the feeling that he doesn't take his function very seriously and just banks on his luck and fate. (Interview 2.1)  |
|  | Contacts                              | 1   | He likes mentioning his contacts. (Interview 2.1)   |
|  | Satisfied, no ambition                | 1   | He doesn't put his heart and soul in it, but neither was he unsatisfied with his job. (Interview 2.1)   |
|  | Focused                               | 1   | My mentor is always so focused, she wouldn't believe in her fate. Either you use your qualifications or you won't go an easy way. (Interview 2.6)   |
|  | Indecisive, not focused               | 1   | I guess that in the beginning my mentor didn't know precisely what he wanted to do. (Interview 2.8)   |
| Preferring a moderate-external mentor  | Realistic                             | 1   | I think that he has a very realistic perspective. It needs luck to find a job which totally matches your interests and expectations. I don't think that you can say: "ok, I'm going to find my dream job now." I think that's very unrealistic. (Interview 2.9)   |
|  | Accomplishment, success               | 1   | I also believe that you need good qualifications to reach your goals and I always want to learn a lot. (Interview 2.9)  |

#### *Having a total-external mentor type*

Respondents (N=2) who stated that their own mentor matches most with the total-external mentor type described their mentor as an indifferent person with no ambition and dedication ("*My mentor always just waited for things to happen, he wasn't very ambitious or dedicated.*" Interview 2.5). Furthermore, they assumed that the mentor was incompetent and getting this mentor job was based on luck and good contacts.

That corresponds to the negative expectations respondents from the first study had. Respondents who would prefer a more internal-directed mentor related to a more external-directed mentor among others with incompetence, unreliability, no dedication, no involvements and sloppiness.

### *Chosen a total-external mentor*

The respondent who chose the total-external mentor thinks that this mentor is enthusiastic (“*I think he would be very enthusiastic.*” Interview 2.15), driven and active. Furthermore, the respondent thinks that the mentor is satisfied with his position and work-related situation (“*He seems to be very satisfied with the position of being a mentor.*” Interview 2.15) and that the mentor would have the same attitude of ‘wait and see’ as the respondent has (“*I am also the type person who rather awaits events.*” Interview 2.15). See Table 15 for an overview of the given comments.

These outcomes correspond to the positive expectation the respondent from the first study had who would prefer a total-external mentor type. The respondent expected the mentor to have the same attitude of believing in luck and not being too stressful and demanding.

Table 15: Associations with the total-external mentor type

| <b>Respondents</b>                      | <b>Categories</b>           | <b>No.</b> | <b>Comment</b>  |
|---|-----------------------------|------------|---|
| Having a total-external mentor type     | No ambition, no dedication  | 2          | My mentor has always been very satisfied with his job but without ambition or passion to get ahead. (Interview 2.13)  |
|   | No sense of responsibility  | 2          | I think as a mentor you have a responsibility for your mentees, but I don’t have the feeling that my mentor thinks much about those things. Sometimes he acts a bit wishy-washy. (Interview 2.5)<br>Sometimes, he didn’t take things seriously. (Interview 2.13)  |
|   | Incompetent, no experiences | 2          | He didn’t know from experience what it means to work hard for a goal. (Interview 2.13)<br>I think at some point you must have learned what it means to work for achieving a goal, that always sounds weird, but you must have learned to fight for things, especially if you are a mentor. If everything always just came to you, that isn’t an experience you can equip somebody with. (Interview 2.5) |
|   | Indifference                | 1          | It wasn’t his goal to become a mentor, it just happened. And that’s what his behavior is like. (Interview 2.5)  |
|   | Luck                        | 1          | I think at a certain point of life, he just had luck and got this job. (Interview 2.13)   |
|   | Contacts                    | 1          | He knew the right people to get ahead. (Interview 2.13)   |
| Preferring a total-external mentor type | Enthusiastic                | 1          | This mentor seems to be very enthusiastic and like he’s keen on being a mentor. (Interview 2.15)  |
|   | Dedicated                   | 1          | He seems to be dedicated and seems to take a stand for people. (Interview 2.15)   |
|   | Satisfied                   | 1          | He seems to be satisfied with his job. I think that he would deal with his mentees the same way. (Interview 2.15)   |
|   | Wait and see                | 1          | I also like to wait and see what is going on and decide then whether it’s good or bad. Afterwards, I can always change things anyway. (Interview 2.15)  |

### ***Main findings***

In summary, regarding the impact of the personality trait locus of control, certain differences and tendencies were notable. There is a tendency that mentees choose that type of mentor with whom they could identify with. Participants who saw themselves as an internal-directed person chose an internal-directed mentor type. It is difficult to state a preference of the participants who saw themselves as an external type because of the small group of 2 people.

With respect to the made associations and expectations concerning the four mentor types, distinct patterns can be pointed out. The total-internal mentor type is seen as a focused person who optimizes and evolves persons and situations and has an attitude of working hard. The moderate-internal mentor is characterized as a dedicated, focused, strategic and confident person who performs well and asks for accomplishment. The moderate external-directed mentor type was expected to have a realistic attitude of needing qualifications and luck to get a good job. Respondents who chose this mentor type described the mentor as easy-going, respondents who were not satisfied with having this mentor type characterized the mentor as not being seriously involved. The respondents who stated to have a total-external mentor type and were not satisfied with the mentoring described the mentor as incompetent, unreliable and without motivation and dedication. This matches with respondents' expectations from the first study who preferred an internal mentor type. Those respondents from the first and the second study who chose the total-external mentor type expected the mentor not to be too stressful, believing in luck with the attitude of 'wait and see'.

## 4. GENERAL DISCUSSION

This paper aims at providing insight into the role of the personal trait locus of control in mentor relationships. Based on earlier studies, it was hypothesized that by a free mentor choice similarity of the mentee's and the mentor's locus of control is preferred. Besides mentees' mentor preferences, outcomes of the interviews gave a more detailed insight into the different participants' associations of the four given mentor types and preferred mentor characteristics. The two studies were conducted using qualitative research methods. The outcomes admit conclusions concerning three main fields. To begin with, conclusions were made referring to the mentee's preference of a mentor with the same locus of control and perceived same attitude, also related to trust between the mentee and the mentor. Following this, different associations with the four manipulated mentor types are encountered. Finally, there are new outcomes referring to the setup of the mentoring which has positive effect on mentoring functions.

Firstly, as an important fact it can be concluded that same perceived attitude between the mentor and the mentee is a crucial reason for choosing a mentor. In general, this was the most stated reason for mentor choice and can be confirmed in both studies. Of the 15 respondents of the second study 11 respondents' self-perception had analogy with their mentor choice. As described in the theoretical section there is extensive research on the positive effects of interpersonal similarities, including a higher perceived validation of own opinions and attitudes (Byrne & Clore, 1970) and stronger relationships between mentors and their mentees with the result of higher satisfaction with participation in the mentoring program (Owen & Solomon, 2006).

These earlier findings can be ascertained by the participants' statements referring to the same locus of control. When the participants of this study reasoned their mentor choice by the same perceived attitude, they mentioned that they could identify themselves with the chosen mentor type. According to Ragins (1997), identification can be defined as the amount of projective self-image or value congruence that the mentee feels toward the idealized mentor. Building idealized and mutual trusting mentor relationships creates flexibility and commitment durability, creativeness and strong social ties within the dyad that supports the provision of mentoring functions. Thus, the same attitude and identification with the mentor are critical reasons for starting a mentor relationship and establishing a good future basis. Moreover, they signify critical factors for a successful mentoring. In the outcomes of

this study the above-mentioned criteria were the most stated reasons for starting a mentorship or rather for choosing a mentor.

As Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) stated, identification based trust is grounded in the expectation that the trustee will perform actions of importance to the trustor, without the trustor having to monitor or control the trustee. Shared values, congruent self-images and beliefs that have been tested over time provide a source of internal control that substitutes for external monitoring for compliance. The internal controls are important for building perceptions of consistency and reliability, which are key aspects of reciprocity and trust. These findings fit with both stated reasons against the not wanted mentor type of the first study and the outcomes of the *Critical Incident Technique* of the second study. Respondents of the first study feared that a dissimilar attitude could lead to a bad cooperation and lack of trust. Outcomes of the *Critical Incident Technique* showed that mentor's behavior which gave the mentee a secure feeling led to the mentee being more positive about the mentoring. Those respondents stated good cooperation, free space for testing own ideas and skills in combination with constructive feedback, trust in the mentee and mentor's motivational behavior. These outcomes can be confirmed by the negative critical incidents of the second study, which pictured a mentor's behavior that made the mentees uncertain.

As an additional important fact it can be concluded that mutual trust between mentee and mentor leads to better mentoring functions. Those aspects, stated by the participants as behavior, which gave the mentee a feeling of security and were crucial for successful mentoring, are the definition of trust in literature. According to Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt and Camerer (1998), trust in relationships is based upon positive expectations of the other person's intentions or behavior. Trusting the other party is linked with considering that person to be competent, consistent, benevolent, interested and open to communication. Reviews of trust literature have identified several factors of trustworthiness: ability, competence, benevolence, concern, openness, integrity and reliability. Trust may be gained when the mentor is perceived by the mentee as competent, concerned, open and reliable (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Webber & Klimoski, 2004). These are all factors termed in the first study as factors of a perfect mentor and in the second study relating to positive incidents with the mentor. In their research, Erdem and Aytemur (2008) found a relation between achieving desired results from a mentoring relationship and a mentor's professional competence, consistency, ability to communicate, interest in the mentee and readiness to share control. As described above, according to Rousseau et al. (1998) each of these dimensions determines the mentee's trust for their mentor to some extent. Consequently, trust between the mentor and the mentee – besides or even as a result of same attitude and identification - are necessary factors for a

satisfying and effectual mentoring. Moreover, mentors' aspects which lead to expectations of a trusting mentor relationship are important reasons for starting a mentoring.

Secondly, as additional insightful outcome of this study different perceptions of the four mentor types were delineated and described. The total-internal mentor type is seen as a focused person who optimizes and evolves persons and situations and has an attitude of working hard. Respondents who chose this mentor type prefer working autonomously and lay the emphasis on individual and personal support that is geared to their individual needs and further their own developments. In addition to that, they prefer a mentor who sticks to his goals.

The moderate-internal mentor is characterized as a dedicated, focused, strategic and confident person who performs well and asks for accomplishment. Respondents who chose this type of mentor want - above all - to improve their own skills and have the possibility to work on their own ideas. They lay the emphasis on accomplishment, commitment and contextual and scientific support.

It can be concluded that the respondents, who chose a more internal-directed mentor, were more focused on own strengths and weaknesses and rather asked for individual support for a better personal development. The participants, who chose the moderate internal-directed mentor type, also wanted to improve their skills but they had a more general idea of getting contextual and scientific support. These findings can be confirmed by other studies. As described in the theoretical section more internal-directed persons are more likely to attempt to influence their environment, to obtain job-relevant information and to expect that effort will lead to rewards (Spector, 1982). This assumption can be confirmed by Hammer and Vardi (1981) and Thornton (1978), who found that internal-directed persons acted on career planning and development information to a greater extent than external-directed persons did. In addition, internals are more likely to believe that they can improve their skills, that is why they are more likely to participate in developmental activities, such as mentoring relationships (Noe, 1988). Further, that can be a reason for the tendency of more internal-directed than external-directed participants being in the two conducted studies.

The moderate-external directed mentor type was expected by the participants to have a realistic attitude of needing qualifications and luck to get a fitting job. Respondents who chose this mentor type described the mentor as easy-going. Respondents, who were not satisfied with having this mentor type, characterized the mentor as not being seriously involved.



The respondents, who stated to have a total-external mentor type and were not satisfied with the mentoring, described the mentor as incompetent, unreliable and without motivation and dedication. This matches with respondents' expectations from the first study where the respondents preferred an internal mentor type. Those respondents from both studies who chose the total-external mentor type expected the mentor not to be too stressful, believe in luck with the attitude of 'wait and see'. That fit with the results of Cabral and Salomone's (1990), who found that when external-directed individuals are confronted with the unforeseen, they tend to wait for things to work out by themselves instead of actively approach them.

The respondents who would choose a more external mentor type mainly want to work on their career, earn much money and do not have a real setting preference. They prefer an available mentor who provides help and support in concrete terms. According to Rotter (1966), external-directed persons believe that work outcomes are beyond personal control and, therefore, attribute them to luck, fate or the actions of powerful others. Burns (1984) likewise added that individuals with an external locus of control do not only feel a lack of control over what happens to them, but they actively look for external control in their environment precisely for the feelings of incompetence. This behavior would explain the preference and expectation of getting help and support in more concrete terms.

As an overall conclusion concerning the associations with the different mentor types the more internal-directed mentor types accomplish the mentees' needs and preferences better than the more external-directed mentor types.

Thirdly, in addition to the conclusions concerning the locus of control of the mentee and the mentor, instructive implications referring to the setup of the mentorship can be stated. The outcomes of the second study showed that when a low fit between the mentor and the mentee exists, a structured mentoring program with clear agreements between the mentor and the mentee are helpful for the mentoring. Confirming these findings, the main stated wishes of the respondents of the second study regarding the mentoring were more frequent meetings and clearer agreements to rely on. That fits with the wished and preferred mentor characteristics relating to characteristics which give the mentee a feeling of security. When there is not a good fit between the mentor and the mentee to provide mutual trust or rather a feeling of security, it helps when clear guidelines for the mentoring are set up in order to absorb and compensate an unsecure feeling. This conclusion can be confirmed by the *Uncertainty Reduction Theory* of Berger and Calabrese (1975). When it is not possible to reduce uncertainty by getting in a more personal phase of the relation, in this case with the mentor, and when there is no match of the mentor's and mentee's attitude,

values and beliefs for a more freely communication, it is important to have rules and norms to guide the communication. According to the outcomes of this study, the *Uncertainty Reduction Theory* (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) can be transferred to the setup of a mentoring.

#### **4.1 Limitations, follow-up studies and practical implication**

When discussing the results, the limitations of the research should also be taken into consideration. Originally, the respondents' locus of control should be defined by the use of Spector's *Work Locus of Control Scale* (1982) and Miller's and Shevlin's *Career Locus of Control Scale* (2007). The outcomes of the analysis of these scales did not show any variance. According to these outcomes, all the respondents had an internal-directed locus of control, however, the qualitative data of the interviews showed differences with regard to the respondents' locus of control. Reasons for these findings can be respondents' social desirability, especially because the survey referred to their attitude concerning work. Work is always associated with accomplishment, commitment and success. Maybe persons are frightened to fill in the survey honestly and do not dare to admit that they rely on fate, luck or powerful others.

Rotter has already proposed in 1975 that the main limit to a general measure of control is its low degree of prediction for a wide range of situations. In addition to that and following Rotter's approach, Mischel and Mischel (1979) suggested that the locus of control should be considered a domain-specific construct. In this study the *Work Locus of Control Scale* of Spector (1988) and the *Career Locus of Control Scale* of Millar and Shevlin (2007) were used and both did not show any variance. In general the domain specific subjects of these two scales match with the subject mentoring. Thus, it is interesting for further research to pursue whether a survey is an appropriate method for determining a person's locus of control in general. Filling in a survey always means being confronted with inflexible and strong statements and facts, which might hinder an honest answer. Thus, the method of an interview might be more flexible and might admit more honest answers of the respondents. Another explanation can be that all the participants of the first study were internal-directed but had different preferences concerning mentor characteristics. That could also be a possible explication since they were all highly educated and at the beginning of their career. However, the outcomes of the interviews showed slightly more variance in the participants' locus of control than the outcomes of the locus of control scales did.

Additionally, there are suggestions for further research concerning the set up of the conducted studies. This study aims at providing more qualitative data to complete existing mentor research with reasons for mentees' different mentor preferences and

their associations related to internal-directed and external-directed mentor types. For further research it would be interesting to conduct a longitudinal study in which mentoring dyads are interviewed in regular intervals during the mentoring. This method would give additional and more detailed insight into the impact of both the mentor's and the mentee's locus of control. Moreover, it would add the mentor's perspective as well. In a longitudinal study the development of the mentor relationship can be considered more detailed. Regular interviews with both the mentee and the mentor can provide a more distinct overview of the aspects, which make a mentoring more successful during the whole mentoring process. That means, it would provide information about which mentor behavior in which situations or moments lead to better mentoring functions and how mentors and mentees perceive and evaluate those situations.

Although the Locus of Control Scale of the first study did not show any variance in the participants' locus of control, the qualitative data did. The interviews were conducted based on the created four mentor statements which differed in internal- and external-directed attitudes. The statements were developed on the basis of the Work Locus of Control Scale (Spector, 1988), no further pretests were conducted to validate the statements. The outcomes of the interviews based on these statements provided associations with the different mentor types which are consistent with existing research concerning the characteristic trait locus of control. In order to prevent other contextual side effects of the statements in future research further validation of the associations with the created statements is needed.

On the basis of the qualitative data a tendency can be noted that mentees prefer a mentor with a similar locus of control; with the same attitude. In further research these tendencies can be investigated in more detail. It would be interesting if the tendency of preferring a mentor with the same locus of control can be confirmed by experimental research. Aside from that, outcomes from these studies showed a tendency that mentees prefer a mentor with the same attitude. Further research, which focuses on similarities between mentor and mentee in attitude as job involvement and its effect on mentoring functions, would be interesting.

The outcomes of the Critical Incident Technique refer to the assumption that trust between mentor and mentee is an important factor in the mentor relationship. Wang, Tomlinson and Noe (2010) examined the relationship between mentor trust, mentee's internal locus of control and the mentoring functions in formal mentor programs in China reported by the mentees. They differentiated trust in affect-based and cognition-based trust. Their results showed that both mentors' affect-based trust and mentees' internal locus of control positively relate to the extent to which mentees

report receiving mentoring functions. Mentor cognition based trust is especially important for mentees who are lower in internal locus of control, or more external in locus of control, to receive mentoring functions. Referring to the differential crossover effects they found that mentors' affect-based and cognition-based trust lead to the suggestion to consider both dimensions of trust in mentoring research. Their research indicates that both dimensions of trust are important in mentoring relationships, but it does not display which aspects lead to mentors' trust and which impact the mentor's and the mentee's locus of control has on the development of trust. Which kind of factors lead to the development of trust, especially affect-based trust, toward the mentee and also toward the mentor? Is the mentor's and the mentee's locus of control or rather the similarity of their locus of control determined for building up trust toward each other? Those are questions which are not answered, yet, and which are interesting for further research.

This study was supposed to complete existing mentor research related to the personal trait locus of control with qualitative data about mentees' mentor preferences and their associations with internal- and external-directed mentor types. Concerning practical implications based on these findings it can be stated that mentees would rather start a mentoring with mentors they perceive as similar in attitude. Evidently, mentees have better expectations towards mentors they can identify with and in total estimate a mentoring relationship with a mentor similar in attitude as better and more successful. For a good basis of a mentor relationship it would be advisable to match mentor and mentee with the same attitude particularly towards their work. Concerning determining a person's attitude towards work there are validated scales which measure for instance a person's job involvement (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). In addition to that, outcomes of this study show that a structured mentor program with a clear guideline for both, mentee and mentor leads to more security for the two and in general to a more successful mentoring.

In sum, it can be said that mentoring is a sensitive field, the success of which is depending on many aspects. The personality and especially a good fit of the mentor's and mentee's attitude towards work and own locus of control are critical for the initiation and satisfaction of the mentoring, whereas the more internal-directed mentor types better accomplish the mentees' needs and preferences than the external-directed mentor types. In addition to that, the outcomes showed that if such a fit between mentor and mentee is not possible, a well-designed mentor program with clear guidelines for both the mentee and the mentor is helpful for successful mentor functions.

## REFERENCES

- Adkins, C. L., Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1996). Value congruence between co-workers and its relationship to work outcomes. *Group and Organization Management, 21*, 439-460.
- Allen, T. D. (2003). Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62*, 134-154.
- Allen, T. D. (2004). Protégé selection by mentors: Contributing individual and organizational factors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 469-483.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 127-136.
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L. & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The Mentor's Perspective: A Qualitative Inquiry and Future Research Agenda. *Journal of vocational behaviour, 51*, 70-89.
- Aryee, S., Chay, Y. W., & Chew, J. (1996). The motivation to mentor among managerial employees in the maintenance career stage: An interactionist perspective. *Group and Organization Management, 21*, 261-277.
- Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a development theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 99-112.
- Berscheid, E. (1994). Interpersonal relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 45*, 79-129.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1978). *Interpersonal attraction*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Burke, R. J., McKeen, C. A., & McKenna, C. (1993). Correlates of mentoring in organizations: The mentor's perspective. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 883-896.

- Burns, R. B. (1984). *The self-concept: Theory, measurement, development and behaviours*. New York: Langman Group.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D., & Clore, G. L. (1970). A reinforcement model of evaluative processes. *Personality: An International Journal*, 1, 103-128.
- Cabral, A. C., & Salomone, P. R. (1990). Chance and careers: Normative versus contextual development. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 39, 5-17.
- Chell, E. (1998). Critical incident technique. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research* (pp. 51-72). London: Sage.
- Davis, W. L., & Phares, E. J. (1967). Internal and external locus of control as determinants of information-seeking in a social influence situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 547-561.
- Duck, S. (1990). Relationships as unfinished business: Out of the frying pan and into the 1990s. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 5-28.
- Eby, L. T., Durley, J., Evans, S. C., & Ragins, B. R. (2006). The relationship between short-term mentoring benefits and long-term mentor outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 424-444.
- Erdem, F., & Aytemur, J. Ö. (2008). Mentoring – A Relationship Based on Trust: Qualitative Research. *Public Personnel Management*, 37, 55-65.
- Fagan, M. M. (1980). Locus of control and interpersonal attraction. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 36, 17-24.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1988). The power of a mentor: Proteges' and non-proteges' perceptions of their own power in organizations. *Group and Organization Studies*, 13, 182-194.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 327-358.

- George, J. (1992). The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Management, 18*, 185-213.
- Hammer, T. H., & Vardi, Y. (1981). Locus of control and career self-management among supervisory employees in industrial settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18*, 13-29.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology, 63*, 597-606.
- Jugde, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits-self-esteem, generalized self efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability-with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 80-92.
- Kram, K. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*, 608-625.
- Kram, K. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41*, 397-40.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 49*, 24-33.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust, *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 709-734.
- Millar, R., & Shevlin, M. (2007). The development and factor structure of a career locus of control scale for use with school pupils. *Journal of Career Development, 33*, 224-249.
- Mischel, W., & Mischel, H. N. (1979). Self Control and the self. In T. Mischel (Ed.), *The self: Psychological and philosophical issues*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Mullen, E. (1994). Framing the mentoring relationship in an information exchange. *Human Resource Management Review, 4*, 257-281.
- Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of control at work: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*, 1057-1087.
- Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479.
- Nowicki, S., & Blumberg, N. (1975). The role of locus of control of reinforcement in interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Research in Personality, 9*, 48-56.
- Owen, C. J., & Solomon, L. Z. (2006). The Importance of Interpersonal Similarities in the Teacher Mentor/Protégé Relationship. *Social Psychology of Education, 9*, 83-89.
- Palenzuela, D. L. (1988). Refining the theory and measurement of expectancy of internal vs external control and reinforcement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 9*, 607-630.
- Phares, E. J. (1976). *Locus of control: A personality determinant of behaviour*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Phares, E. J., & Wilson, K. G. (1971). Internal-external control, interpersonal attraction, and empathy. *Psychological Reports, 28*, 543-549.
- Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: a power perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 482-521.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: a comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 529-550.
- Reitz, H. J., & Jewell, L. N. (1979). Ex, Locos of Control, and Job Involvement: A Six-Country Investigation. *Academy of Management Journal, 22*, 72-80.
- Rotter J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80*, 1-28.



- Rotter, J. B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 56-67.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different at all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 393-404.
- Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.
- Seeman, M., & Evans, J. W. (1962). Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. *American Sociological Review, 27*, 772-783.
- Smith, J. B. (1998). Buyer-seller relationships: similarity, relationship management, and quality. *Psychology and Marketing, 15*, 3-21.
- Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin, 91*, 482-497.
- Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61*, 335-340.
- Thornton, G. C. (1978). Differential effects of career planning on internals and externals. *Personnel Psychology, 31*, 471-476.
- Wang, S., Tomlinson, E. C., & Noe, R. A. (2010). The role of mentor trust and protégé internal locus of control in formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 358-367.
- Webber, S. S., & Klimoski, R. J. (2004). Client-project manager engagement, trust, and loyalty. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 997-1013.
- Weiss, J. W. (1996). *Organizational behavior and change*. New York, NY: West Publishing.

## APPENDIX

### Appendix A: Interview scheme, Study 1

Table 1: Interview scheme of study 1

---

| <b>Nr.</b> | <b>Questions</b>   |
|------------|--|
| 1          | If you could choose between these four people for whom you would decide as a mentor?   |
| 2          | If you had to name reasons, why you did choose this mentor, what would you say?  |
| 3          | What was determining your choice?  |
| 4          | Why didn't you choose mentor X ( the opposite mentor)?   |
| 5          | Do you see yourself in the mentor you picked? Do you have the same traits in some part?  |
| 6          | If you would work with this person regularly which features has this person to have? (Not Qualifications) Can you name three features? Which of them are the most important ones?    |
| 7          | Why are these features the most important ones?  |
| 8          | You are near the end of your studies. If you imagined to search for a job, how would you proceed?<br>Where would you search for a job? How would you search for it?                  |
| 9          | If you are thinking about your first job, where do you see yourself? In what firm do you see yourself?<br>What structure does the firm have? In what department do you see yourself? |
| 10         | What kind of colleagues do you see yourself with?  |
| 11         | What kind of structure would your first ideal job have? What kind of job would that be? (Not substantial, but your field of duties and the responsibility you have)                  |

---

## Appendix B: Preferred job structure

Table 2: Favored job structure and job setting

| <b>Categories</b>           | <b>No. of comments</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Working autonomously        | 17                     | I like having more freedom in my own decisions. (Interview 1.15)   |
| Own ideas                   | 11                     | That my ideas would be implemented. (Interview 1.11)   |
| Given structure             | 10                     | Sometimes you need someone being above you, a chief you can talk to and discuss problems. (Interview 1.18) |
| Taking responsibility       | 8                      | I enjoy taking responsibility. (Interview 1.16)  |
| More work alone             | 8                      | In general I'd rather work alone. (Interview 1.7)  |
| Interchange with colleagues | 8                      | To speak about problems with colleagues and seek advice. (Interview 1.2)                                   |
| More teamwork               | 8                      | I would like to develop things together with a team. (Interview 1.20)                                      |
| Teamwork and work alone     | 5                      | Teamwork yes, but everyone has to have own fields of responsibility. (Interview 1.2)                       |
| Directing others            | 3                      | I would like to have my own projects, eventually with my own team. (Interview 1.23)                        |
| Getting advises             | 2                      | At the first job, I think it's important to have a person who guides you a little bit. (Interview 1.21)    |
| Career                      | 1                      | In some way I'm a career girl, but [...] (Interview 1.8)   |
| Indifference                | 1                      | I don't care, I just do, what I have to do. (Interview 1.8)  |
| Lack of knowledge           | 1                      | I don't know. (Interview 1.22)   |

Table 3: Chosen total internal mentor (10 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                  | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b>     | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Working autonomously               | 7                       | 7, 12, 14, 20, 21, 22, 24 | If you are a little bit more experienced, I would like to have more autonomy. (Interview 1.21)<br>In the end it comes down to the fact that you perform well on your own or rather that you are able to perform well. (Interview 1.24)  |
| Interchange with colleagues        | 5                       | 10, 12, 14, 20, 21        | I would like to get feedback (from my colleagues) and have the possibility to see how other solve their problems and also just for working together with other people to brighten cross-cultural skills and to find new perspectives solving problems. (Interview 1.12)<br>I like to be able to interchange and interact (with colleagues). (Interview 1.10)                          |
| Own ideas                          | 4                       | 7, 10, 12, 21             | I would like to do some creative work or to develop the structure or a new product. (Interview 1.7)<br>I would like to develop things myself and to play a part in contributing to change something. (Interview 1.12)   |
| More work alone                    | 4                       | 7, 14, 17, 21             | In general I'd rather work alone. (Interview 1.7)<br>I would rather work alone most of the time. (Interview 1.14)   |
| More teamwork                      | 4                       | 10, 12, 17, 20            | I would like to develop things together with a team. (Interview 1.20)<br>I would rather work within a team. (Interview 1.10)  |
| Taking responsibility              | 3                       | 6, 17, 24                 | I would agree to take responsibilities soon. (Interview 1.6)<br>I like bearing responsibility and delegating responsibility as well. (Interview 1.17)   |
| Given structure                    | 3                       | 12, 14, 17                | I would prefer having a person controlling me a little bit. (Interview 1.14)<br>I like having a structured workday to the effect that I can plan my free time or rather when I don't have to work. (Interview 1.12)   |
| Working autonomously and in a team | 2                       | 6, 24                     | I think I would like fifty-fifty, it's important for the kind of work I want to do someday to work within a team, to build something up. But I also like working alone because I can concentrate better this way. (Interview 1.6)<br>In certain situations a good team is very important, for instance when you need a good environment to perform well on your own. (Interview 1.24) |
| Getting advises                    | 2                       | 14, 21                    | At the first job, I think it's important to have a person who guides you a little bit. (Interview 1.21)<br>I would like having a superior who leads you to new ideas and who encourages me and who gives me new input to think about. I would like to have a person I can get advice and new input from. (Interview 1.14)   |
| Lack of knowledge                  | 1                       | 22                        | I don't know. (Interview 1.22)  |

Table 4: Chosen moderate internal mentor (7 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                  | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Working autonomously               | 6                       | 2, 5, 15, 19, 23, 25  | I want to have the possibility to decide independently what I do and what I'm interested in and so on. (Interview 1.2)<br>I like having more freedom in my own decisions. (Interview 1.15)  |
| Own ideas                          | 5                       | 15, 16, 19, 23, 25    | I want to have the possibility to develop (myself). (Interview 1.15)<br>I need the freedom to develop (myself) and what drives me forward. (Interview 1.16)   |
| Taking responsibility              | 3                       | 2, 16, 19             | I enjoy taking responsibility. (Interview 1.16)<br>Later on, I would like to take more responsibility. (Interview 1.19)   |
| Working autonomously and in a team | 3                       | 2, 5, 16              | Teamwork yes, but everyone has to have own fields of responsibility. (Interview 1.2)<br>60% working independently, 40% teamwork. (Interview 1.16)   |
| Interchange with colleagues        | 2                       | 2, 23                 | To speak about problems with colleagues and seek advice. (Interview 1.2)<br>[...], on the other hand, I would like to interchange with colleagues about technical subjects, but I like being a specialist in certain fields. (Interview 1.23) |
| More teamwork                      | 2                       | 15, 25,               | I find teamwork important. Just because of developing better ideas in a group. (Interview 1.15)<br>I find teamwork very important, because everyone has strengths and weaknesses. (Interview 1.25)  |
| Given structure                    | 2                       | 5, 19                 | A certain structure in the beginning would be helpful for me. (Interview 1.19)  |
| Directing others                   | 1                       | 23                    | I would like to have my own projects, eventually with my own team. (Interview 1.23)   |
| More work alone                    | 1                       | 19                    | I would rather work alone. (Interview 1.19)   |

Table 5: Chosen moderate external mentor (5 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>           | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Working autonomously        | 4                       | 4, 9, 11, 18          | I always want to enforce my position. (Interview 1.11)<br>My best case scenario would be, that nobody has to give me orders and I could work on my own. (Interview 1.4)                                   |
| Given structure             | 4                       | 5, 9, 18, 19          | Sometimes you need someone being above you, a chief you can talk to and discuss problems. (Interview 1.18)<br>I think in the beginning an element of structure would be good for me. (Interview 1.19)     |
| More work alone             | 3                       | 9, 11, 18             | In certain cases I better work alone, I am not the kind who wants to do everything within a team. (Interview 1.18)<br>I am not a good team worker; I always want to enforce my position. (Interview 1.11) |
| More teamwork               | 2                       | 3, 4                  | I would like a small team best, working together in a group of four, complementing each other, that everyone undertakes a part of the task. (Interview 1.4)<br>Rather within a team. (Interview 1.3)      |
| Own ideas                   | 2                       | 3, 11                 | That my ideas would be implemented. (Interview 1.11)<br>It would be nicer having the possibility to act or decide more autonomously or that it would be a more open task. (Interview 1.3)                 |
| Directing others            | 2                       | 11, 18                | Leading a smaller team, well, I could figure that to myself. (Interview 1.18)   |
| Taking responsibility       | 2                       | 9, 18                 | I like it, if everyone has his/her own field of responsibility. (Interview 1.18)  |
| Interchange with colleagues | 1                       | 18                    | If there's a problem or a bigger task, I would like to work in a team. (Interview 1.18)   |

Table 6: Chosen total external mentor (1 participant)

| <b>Categories</b> | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Career            | 1                       | 8                     | In some way I'm a career girl, but I don't want to adjust my whole life to my work. I would like working in a higher position, of course you have to take a little bit more responsibility then, but I want to have clear timelines. I don't know, being available 24 hours a day, that's not for me! (Interview 1.8) |
| Indifference      | 1                       | 8                     | I don't care, I just do, what I have to do. (Interview 1.8)   |
| Directing others  | 1                       | 8                     | It is my goal to have a leading position some day, therefore I'm studying. (Interview 1.8)  |
| Given structure   | 1                       | 8                     | To be completely free (unstructured), that's not a good way for me, I'm not a person who lives and breathe for working. (Interview 1.8)   |

## Appendix C: Requested characteristics of a perfect mentor

Table 7: Requested characteristics of a perfect mentor

| <b>Categories</b>                     | <b>No. of participants</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Feedback                              | 16                         | I'd like to get honest and clear feedback. (Interview 1.15)  |
| Motivation and willingness to support | 11                         | Good support and the willingness to help in case of problems (Interview 1.8)                                 |
| Ability to empathize                  | 8                          | I'd like him to cater for me. (Interview 1.20)   |
| Reliability                           | 8                          | The mentor should be reliable (Interview 1.25)   |
| Motivating                            | 7                          | Giving compliments and motivation (Interview 1.12)   |
| Availability                          | 4                          | The mentor should be available (Interview 1.21)  |
| Room for development                  | 4                          | Letting me think and work independently. (Interview 1.23)  |
| Rolemodel                             | 3                          | I'd like being able to learn of the mentor's experience. (Interview 1.2)                                     |
| Openess                               | 3                          | It should be an open mentor (Interview 1.25)   |
| Willingness for discussion            | 2                          | Willingness to discuss and to brainstorm. (Interview 1.12)   |
| Expert knowledge                      | 2                          | Good expert knowledge (Interview 1.25)   |
| Familiarity                           | 1                          | Familiarity (being on first name terms with the mentor) for a better sharing of information (Interview 1.25) |
| Taking the mentee seriously           | 1                          | I'd like a reliable mentor, who takes me seriously. (Interview 1.24)   |
| Individual                            | 1                          | I'd like a mentor, who includes my personality in his grading and evaluation. (Interview 1.10)               |
| Target-oriented                       | 1                          | I'd like deadlines and a mentor with the goal in mind. (Interview 1.17)                                      |

Table 8: Chosen total internal mentor (10 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                     | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Feedback                              | 5                       | 6, 7, 10, 12, 20,     | I'd like to get honest and clear feedback (Interview 1.6, 1.7, 1.10, 1.12, 1.20)  |
| Ability to empathize                  | 5                       | 7, 10, 17, 20, 21,    | I'd like him to cater for me. (Interview 1.20)<br>To have an understanding for mentee and mentee's problems (Interview 1.21)  |
| Reliability                           | 5                       | 14, 17, 21, 22, 24    | The mentor should be reliable (Interview 1.14, 1.17, 1.21, 1.24), on time (Interview 1.14), well prepared (Interview 1.14) and well-ordered (Interview 1.22)                              |
| Motivation and willingness to support | 4                       | 6, 14, 20, 22         | The mentor should back up my developments. (Interview 1.20)<br>The mentor should have the motivation to be willing to help me. (Interview 1.6)  |
| Motivating                            | 4                       | 12, 14, 17, 20        | Giving compliments and motivation (Interview 1.12)<br>Positive thinking (Interview 1.14), being motivating (Interview 1.14, 1.17, 1.20)   |
| Room for development                  | 2                       | 12, 22                | Open and tolerant, the mentor shouldn't try to force his way of thinking on me. (Interview 1.12)<br>Possibility to work on tasks autonomously, without too much control. (Interview 1.22) |
| Openness                              | 2                       | 12, 22                | I'd like an open mentor (Interview 1.12, 1.22)  |
| Availability                          | 1                       | 21                    | The mentor should be available (Interview 1.21)   |
| Taking the mentee seriously           | 1                       | 24                    | I'd like a reliable mentor, who takes me seriously. (Interview 1.24)  |
| Target-oriented                       | 1                       | 17                    | I'd like deadlines and a mentor with the goal in mind. (Interview 1.17)   |
| Willingness to discuss                | 1                       | 12                    | Willingness to discuss and to brainstorm. (Interview 1.12)  |
| Individual                            | 1                       | 10                    | I'd like a mentor, who includes my personality in his grading and evaluation. (Interview 1.10)  |



Table 9: Chosen moderate internal mentor (7 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                     | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Feedback                              | 6                       | 2, 5, 16, 15, 19, 23, | I'd like to get honest and clear feedback. (Interview 1.2, 1.5, 1.23)  |
| Motivation and willingness to support | 3                       | 15, 16, 23            | (expert knowledge) for helpful guidance and support (Interview 1.23)<br>New approaches and good hints (Interview 1.16) |
| Reliability                           | 2                       | 15, 25                | The mentor should be reliable (Interview 1.15), on time (Interview 1.25)   |
| Expert knowledge                      | 2                       | 23, 25                | Good expert knowledge (Interview 1.23, 1.25)   |
| Room for development                  | 1                       | 23                    | Letting me think and work independently. (Interview 1.23)  |
| Ability to empathize                  | 1                       | 5                     | Feedback, but in a kind way (Interview 1.5)  |
| Availability                          | 1                       | 25                    | The mentor should be available (Interview 1.25)  |
| Motivating (also with praise)         | 1                       | 19                    | I need compliments or praise. (Interview 1.19)   |
| Familiarity                           | 1                       | 25                    | Familiarity (being on first name terms with the mentor) for a better sharing of information. (Interview 1.25)          |
| Rolemodel                             | 1                       | 2                     | I'd like being able to learn of the mentor's experience. (Interview 1.2)   |
| Openness                              | 1                       | 25                    | It should be an open mentor. (Interview 1.25)  |

Table 10: Chosen moderate external mentor (5 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                     | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Feedback                              | 5                       | 3, 4, 9, 11, 18       | I'd like to get honest and clear feedback (Interview 1.3, 1.4, 1.9, 1.11, 1.18)  |
| Motivation and willingness to support | 3                       | 3, 4, 18              | Getting assistance and hints. (Interview 1.4)<br>The mentor should be able to point out new approaches. (Interview 1.18) |
| Ability to empathize                  | 2                       | 4, 9                  | I'd like the mentor to have the ability to empathize with somebody (Interview 1.4, 1.9)                                  |
| Motivating                            | 2                       | 4, 11                 | Compliments are important (Interview 1.4, 1.11)  |
| Rolemodel                             | 2                       | 3, 11                 | The mentor should share his own experiences (Interview 1.3)<br>Should be a role model to learn from (Interview 1.11)     |
| Willingness to discuss                | 1                       | 3                     | Good discussions and brainstorming (Interview 1.3)   |
| Availability                          | 1                       | 9                     | Being available and being free (Interview 1.9)   |
| Reliability                           | 1                       | 9                     | I'd like a mentor who is reliable. (Interview 1.9)   |
| Room for development                  | 1                       | 18                    | The mentor should be creative in thinking (Interview 1.18)   |

Table 11: Chosen total external mentor (1 participant)

| <b>Categories</b>                     | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Motivation and willingness to support | 1                       | 8                     | Good support and the willingness to help in case of problems. ( Interview 1.8) |
| Availability                          | 1                       | 8                     | The mentor should be available and should be free for me. ( Interview 1.8)     |

## Appendix D: Reasons for mentor choice

Table 12: Reasons for mentor choice and participants' expectations

| Categories  | No. of comments | Sample comments   |
|---|-----------------|---|
| Same attitude   | 17              | Because we have the same attitude (Interview 1.8)   |
| Support   | 15              | I expect, that the mentor will be at hand with help and advice for me. (Interview 1.23)   |
| Identification  | 8               | Yes, I can identify with this person the best. (Interview 1.8)  |
| Attitude combination of fate, (luck) / accomplishment | 9               | You need luck to find a job and of course you need the ability to work for it. (Interview 1.11)   |
| Commitment, dedication                                | 7               | He seems to be driven and dedicated, he's very positive about himself, but not too arrogant. (Interview 1.23)                             |
| Expertise   | 6               | I think he's very competent. (Interview 1.12)   |
| Content accomplishment                                | 6               | He asks for accomplishment. (Interview 1.5)   |
| Motivational, role model                              | 5               | I wish I'd be like him. (Interview 1.7)   |
| Good cooperation                                      | 4               | I picture a pleasant, equal cooperation with the mentor. (Interview 1.2)  |
| Room for development                                  | 3               | He should be flexible in his offer and not too close-minded in share-out of the tasks for instance. (Interview 1.22)                      |
| Sympathy  | 3               | He seems very likeable. (Interview 1.22)  |
| Evolvements   | 3               | I would choose him because he mentioned that development is important. (Interview 1.20)   |
| Understanding   | 3               | That he acknowledge my accomplishment, but also understands, if something isn't working at the moment as is it should be (Interview 1.25) |
| Content fate, luck                                    | 2               | It needs good luck to find a job you really like. (Interview 1.4)   |
| Positive thinking                                     | 1               | That he can turn it into something positive; a job is what you make of it. (Interview 1.21)   |
| Challenging   | 1               | I think being challenged is important. (Interview 1.5)  |
| Personal  | 1               | In this way he gets to know me better than a person who is more distant and who pays more attention to his own career. (Interview 1.11)   |
| Easy  | 1               | I think he is a very easy-going person. (Interview 1.11)  |
| Relaxed work atmosphere                               | 1               | I don't want to stress myself or get in trouble with a strict mentor. (Interview 1.8)   |

Table 13: Chosen total-internal mentor (10 participants)

| Categories               | No. of com-ments | Inter-view No.                | Sample comments   |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Support                  | 8                | 3, 10, 12, 14, 17, 20, 21, 24 | He will soon realize my abilities for the job and then he will try to tickle as much as possible out of me (and that what I really need sometimes) (Interview 1.14)<br>I think he would support me because I often need time to develop myself. I think he could point me in the right direction to develop myself in the right direction (Interview 1.3) |
| Same attitude            | 7                | 6, 7, 12, 14, 17, 22, 24      | I also think, that you can make a lot of a job (Interview 1.7)<br>I think that the mentor's way of thinking is very similar to mine (Interview 1.12)  |
| Motivational, role model | 4                | 6,7, 17, 20                   | I wish I'd be like him, but I'm not. (Interview 1.7)<br>If he says, check out what I have accomplished - that would somehow animate me and is just my style how I would look for a job. (Interview 1.6)   |
| Commitment, dedication   | 4                | 6, 12, 21, 24                 | Above all I want to do a job I really like. (Interview 1.21)<br>He (the mentor) says, that he has expectations and by expectations I understand being happy and having a pleasant job. (Interview 1.6)  |
| Evolvements              | 3                | 10, 14, 20                    | I would choose him because he mentioned that development is important. (Interview 1.20)<br>I think, it is good to have a mentor with skills or attitudes I don't have so I can learn something from him. (Interview 1.10)   |
| Expertise                | 3                | 10, 12, 22                    | I think he's very competent. (Interview 1.12)<br>Because I think he has good skills. (Interview 1.10)   |
| Identification           | 3                | 12, 21, 22                    | I would choose mentor 3 because I could identify with his way of thinking the most. (Interview 1.12)<br>I think I can identify with him the best. (Interview 1.21)  |
| Room for development     | 3                | 11, 12, 22                    | I don't want the mentor to be too prescriptive, but that it is possible to discuss things in cooperative way and that I will have room for development. (Interview 1.12)<br>He should be flexible in his offer and not too close-minded in share-out of the tasks for instance. (Interview 1.22)  |
| Content accomplishment   | 3                | 6, 12, 17                     | It always needs own motivation, strength and energy to do what you want to do. (Interview 1.12)<br>You always have to put yourself out fort he things, you want to do; you don't get a job for no reason. (Interview 1.6)   |
| Sympathy                 | 2                | 21, 22                        | I think, I find him most likeable. (Interview 1.21)<br>He seems very likeable. (Interview 1.22)   |
| Positive thinking        | 1                | 21                            | That he can turn it into something positive; a job is what you make of it. (Interview 1.21)   |

Table 14: Chosen moderate-internal mentor (7 participants)

| <b>Categories</b>                                      | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>  |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Same attitude  | 6                       | 2, 9, 16, 19, 23, 25  | Actually, it's a reflection of my attitude to work. (Interview 1.16)<br>Because I like the mentor's attitude. It matches my own attitude. (Interview 1.2)   |
| Attitude - combination of fate, (luck)/ accomplishment | 5                       | 2, 5, 15,19, 25       | On the one hand you have to perform well, on the other hand you can't always control everything ... or plan everything. (Interview 1.15)<br>I've also learned, that you can achieve good results with much dedication and good accomplishments, but sometimes you have to wait and see or trust in your fortune. (Interview 1.19) |
| Support  | 3                       | 16, 19, 23            | I expect, that the mentor has gathered a lot experiences and that I can benefit from them. (Interview 1.19)<br>I expect, that the mentor will be at hand with help and advice for me. (Interview 1.23)  |
| Good cooperation                                       | 3                       | 2, 19, 25             | We would be on the same page and in this way we would work together more efficiently. (Interview 1.25)<br>I picture a pleasant, equal cooperation with the mentor. (Interview 1.2)  |
| Commitment, dedication                                 | 3                       | 16, 19, 23            | Because I also do my job with much dedication and passion and it makes sense to me. (Interview 1.16)<br>He seems to be driven and dedicated, he's very positive about himself, but not too arrogant. (Interview 1.23)   |
| Understanding  | 3                       | 16, 23, 25            | That he acknowledge my accomplishment, but also understands, if something isn't working at the moment as is it should be (Interview 1.25)<br>Who is not just interested in getting my job done, but is interested in giving me the feeling of being accepted (Interview 1.16)   |
| Identification   | 2                       | 15, 25                | I've chosen mentor 2, because I was looking for someone I can identify with, that's why I've chosen mentor 2. (Interview 1.25)<br>I can absolutely identify with mentor 2. (Interview 1.15)   |
| Expertise  | 1                       | 19                    | I expect a good feedback of mentor 2. (Interview 1.19)  |
| Challenging  | 1                       | 5                     | I think being challenged is important. (Interview 1.5)  |
| Content accomplishment                                 | 2                       | 5, 23                 | He asks accomplishment. (Interview 1.5)<br>I also try to set to work with dedication and commitment. (Interview 1.23)   |
| Sympathy   | 1                       | 15                    | I find him most likeable (Interview 1.15)   |
| Motivational, role model                               | 1                       | 5                     | I've chosen him because I would wish him being my mentor (Interview 1.5)  |

Table 15: Chosen moderate-external mentor (7 participants)

| Categories                                   | No. of com-ments | Inter-view No. | Sample comments   |
|--|------------------|----------------|---|
| Support                                      | 4                | 3, 9, 11, 18   | <p>I would rather have a kind of buddy as a mentor, with whom I eventually be on first name terms, so I just can say something like you will help me in difficult situations with my work and you will get to know me better than a person who is more distant and who just cares about his own career. (Interview 1.11)</p> <p>The mentor has to help me, that's why I would choose mentor 4, because I think he has the ability to help me. (Interview 1.3)</p> |
| Combination of fate, (luck) / accomplishment | 4                | 3, 4, 11, 18   | <p>I think it's very realistic, what he says, that you need luck, but also people helping you and own. (Interview 1.18)</p> <p>You need luck to find a job and of course you need the ability to work for it. (Interview 1.11)</p>  |
| Same attitude                                | 3                | 3, 4, 11, 9    | <p>I guess I have the same attitude. (Interview 1.3)</p> <p>I have a feeling that I would be like him because we are similar in thinking. (Interview 1.11)</p>  |
| Expertise                                    | 2                | 3, 11          | <p>The mentor has to give feedback, so I want to get qualified feedback. (Interview 1.3)</p> <p>I have a feeling that he has plenty of grey matter. (Interview 1.11)</p>  |
| Identification                               | 2                | 4, 18          | <p>I can better identify with him. (Interview 1.4)</p> <p>I can identify with the statement that you have to take care of your abilities (skills). (Interview 1.18)</p>   |
| Personal                                     | 1                | 11             | <p>In this way he gets to know me better than a person who is more distant and who pays more attention to his own career. (Interview 1.11)</p>  |
| Content accomplishment                       | 1                | 18             | <p>I think it's important that you have good skills, I couldn't be just fine with the fact of getting jobs because of good connections or luck. (Interview 1.18)</p>  |
| Content fate, luck                           | 1                | 4              | <p>It needs good luck to find a job you really like. (Interview 1.4)</p>  |
| Easy   | 1                | 11             | <p>I think he is a very easy-going person. (Interview 1.11)</p>   |

Table 16: Chosen total-external mentor (1 participant)

| <b>Categories</b>       | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Same attitude           | 1                       | 8                     | Because we have the same attitude (Interview 1.8)  |
| Good cooperation        | 1                       | 8                     | I think, I could work with him the best. (Interview 1.8)<br>There wouldn't be much differences in opinion with him. (Interview 1.8)  |
| Content fate, luck      | 1                       | 8                     | I would agree: you can also achieve a lot based on luck. This one doesn't seem to be too strict, he doesn't radiate to much pressure to perform, a little bit more relaxed... Up to now I have also achieved a lot based on luck, that's why I would choose him. (Interview 1.8) |
| Relaxed work atmosphere | 1                       | 8                     | I don't want to stress myself or get in trouble with a strict mentor. (Interview 1.8)  |
| Identification          | 1                       | 8                     | Yes, I can identify with this person the best. (Interview 1.8)   |

## Appendix E: The Anti mentor

Table 17: Reasons against total-internal mentor (6 participants, group mentor choice moderate and total external-directed mentor)

| <b>Categories</b>                 | <b>No. of com-ments</b> | <b>Inter-view No.</b> | <b>Sample comments</b>   |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Different attitude                | 3                       | 8, 18, 11,            | I don't really agree with the statement: A job is what you make of it, I have pretty clear ideas of what I want to do. (Interview 1.8)<br>I think he's a person who says you must be able to make your point to achieve what you want to achieve. And that's not that important for me in the first place. (Interview 1.18)  |
| Incompetent                       | 2                       | 9, 18                 | That's written in every animation guidebook, but most of the time it doesn't seem to be very helpful, that's why I don't like him that much. (Interview 1.9)<br>I would rather have the impression that he's a competent mentor (and I don't have that impression), so he doesn't convince me very much, particularly if this person wants to support me with my work. (Interview 1.18)  |
| Demotivating, too much dedication | 1                       | 4                     | This mentor says, that he's very active and performs well and so on, but I'm not that straight-A student and I'm afraid that such a great mentor would more probably demotivate me. (Interview 1.4)  |
| Difficult cooperation             | 1                       | 8                     | I would probably think that I really don't like everything he says, but I would grit my teeth and just do what he wants me to do, in some way I would adapt myself to his wishes, but I think I wouldn't feel that comfortable doing it. (Interview 1.8)   |
| Too much planning, too focused    | 1                       | 11                    | I always just accept everything as it is and that's why mentor 4, who is talking about the factor 'luck', is a better match than mentor 3, who seems to have planned everything already. I could imagine that he (mentor 3) would be more reserved, he would be too focused for my liking, I would be afraid that I couldn't build up such a confidence relation to such a person as to a person I'm more similar in attitude with. (Interview 1.11) |
| No sympathy                       | 1                       | 8                     | Somehow, I can't reconcile with his statements that much. (Interview 1.8)  |
| No trust                          | 1                       | 11                    | I would be afraid that I couldn't build up such a confidence relation to such a person as to a person I'm more similar in attitude with. (Interview 1.11)  |



Table 18: Reasons against total-external mentor 1 (17 participants, group mentor choice moderate and total internal-directed mentor)

| Categories                                  | No. of com-ments | Inter-view No.              | Sample comments  |
|---|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Demotivating, unreliable due to luck        | 8                | 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 19, 20, 23 | I mean, it doesn't help me having a mentor with the attitude: ,when you are lucky, everything's gonna be all right and maybe you might write the right things'. (Interview 1.12)<br>For my liking, everything is too much based on luck and lucky coincidence, which I can't control. (Interview 1.14) |
| Demotivating, no dedication                 | 5                | 2, 5, 15, 23, 24            | He seems to assure his success more probably based on connections than based on his work itself. (Interview 1.23)<br>That's why I rather have a mentor who at least mentions ,accomplishment', I'm wondering what the rest has to do with his actual job. (Interview 1.5)                              |
| Incompetent                                 | 5                | 10, 15, 16, 19, 24          | He doesn't seem to be very qualified. He more properly has got his job based on luck. (Interview 1.15)<br>Mentor 1 appears to have the attitude ,everything's gonna be all right and that everyone just cheats his way through, he just doesn't seem to be very competent. (Interview 1.19)            |
| No evolvments                               | 4                | 10, 12, 14, 25              | He would define me just by my contacts and the people I know and he wouldn't get the best out of me. (Interview 1.14)<br>I think he doesn't achieve anything he could teach me or equip me with, that I could achieve it, too. (Interview 1.10)  |
| Too focused on career, no enjoyment of work | 3                | 16, 21, 22                  | His statements don't argue enthusiasm. (Interview 1.21)<br>He is just interested in the power he can achieve and money he can make, he wouldn't care about having a pleasant job. (Interview 1.22)   |
| Different attitude                          | 3                | 7, 12, 22                   | I think he doesn't match with me in terms of his attitude. (Interview 1.7)<br>I don't deem it right to calculate just on luck. (Interview 1.12)  |
| Difficult cooperation                       | 2                | 2, 17                       | I would find it difficult to work with a person who just confide in luck and who doesn't really stick up for his job. (Interview 1.2)  |
| Impersonally                                | 1                | 21                          | The third mentor seems to be more personally, a probably more caring mentor, in a personal way compared to the first mentor. (Interview 1.21)  |
| Sloppy                                      | 1                | 25                          | I would expect him to be sloppy (Interview 1.25)   |
| No sympathy                                 | 1                | 15                          | He sounds so arrogant, I find him most dislikeable of the four mentors. (Interview 1.15)   |

## Appendix F: Interview scheme, Study 2

Table 19: Interview scheme of study 2

| Nr. | Questions  |
|-----|--|
| 1   | To begin with the interview, I have a couple questions to your person. How old are you?  |
| 2   | Can you describe the context in which the attendance of your mentor happens? Do you have a mentor in your job or at university?  |
| 3   | What are you studying?   |
| 4   | How long did you study?  |
| 5   | How are you satisfied with your study How pleased are you with it?   |
| 6   | You did say, that you decided in a mentor program. Can you describe the structure of this program?<br>A. is there a solid structure in your program? Can you name the kind of structure?<br>B. How often do you meet with your mentor? How often do you have contact with your mentor (for example Mail)? Do you have an agreement on that, or do you call him if you have questions?<br>C. What are you talking about with him? In which way does he support you? What problems or difficulties are you discussing with your mentor?<br>D. Could you choose your mentor or did you get one? |
| 7   | Regarding your mentor,<br>A. what do you think how experienced is he in his field?<br>B. What do you think how experienced is he as a mentor? Has he done it a couple times in the past?   |
| 8   | Can you describe an important or critical incident with you mentor? It can be both a negative and a positive incident.<br>A. What happened?<br>B. Who else was involved?<br>C. What were the consequences?<br>D. Was that typical for your mentor or just an incident that happened ones?  |
| 9   | What kind of characteristics or manners do you like about your mentor? What kind of characteristics or manners are helpful in your work with your mentor?  |
| 10  | What kind of characteristics do you not like about your mentor? What kind of characteristics or manners are disturbing in the work with your mentor?   |
| 11  | If you could change your mentor program, what would it be? Why would you change that?  |
| 12  | If you could change some characteristics or manners in your mentor, what would it be? Why would you change that?   |
| 13  | How would you score your mentor program in a scale from one to ten, if one is the lowest?  |
| 14  | I have interview extracts of four different kind of mentors. Read the extract accurate and chose the mentor which resembles your mentor the most.<br>A. can you describe the resemblance?<br>B. What are the characteristics that don't fit in with your mentors'?   |
| 15  | If you could chose one of the four mentors described in the extracts, which one would that be?<br>A. can you describe your choice?<br>B. What do you expect from this mentor?<br>C. Why didn't you chose Mentor x ( Anti mentor)?<br>D. What did you apprehend with that mentor?   |
| 16  | If you could chose one of the four mentors described in the extracts, which one would that be?<br>A. can you describe your choice?<br>B. What do you expect from this mentor?<br>C. Why didn't you chose Mentor x ( Anti mentor)?  |

- D. What did you apprehend with that mentor?
- 17 If you compare yourself to your mentor you see resemblance and differences. Do you think, that is a good thing or do you think it is more obstructive?
- A. Can you describe what's good?
- B. Can you describe what's obstructive?
- 

## Appendix G: Describing of the critical incidents

Table 20: Positive describing aspects of the mentor

| Categories                  | No. of comments | Comment  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Good, equal cooperation     | 3               | I like my mentor's solution-orientated way of thinking. (Interview 2.8)<br>In feedback sessions he always asks for my point of view, what I think, what are problems, what would I like to improve and so on. (Interview 2.9)<br>He does not say what to do, but he gives me new ideas. (Interview 2.11) |
| Free space for own          | 2               | He isn't set in his ways, I always have the possibility to make suggestions. (Interview 2.3)<br>He motivated me very much, said that I can manage it on my own, he gave tips, but let me do it on my own and in my own way. (Interview 2.9)  |
| Give security, confirmation | 1               | After consultations with my mentor I feel safer and more confirmed. Afterwards I always know what to do next. (Interview 2.8)  |
| Friendly, esteeming         | 1               | He is very esteeming, I love to go to work and I have the feeling of being needed and esteemed. (Interview 2.9)  |
| Interested in the mentee    | 1               | He is very interested in people and open-minded. (Interview 2.10)  |
| Reliable                    | 1               | He's very reliable, you know, that what he says makes sense. (Interview 2.11)  |
| Good, constructive feedback | 1               | I like getting feedback from my mentor, what he thinks about my work and my strengths and weaknesses. (Interview 2.9)  |
| Motivating                  | 1               | I was very proud, he just motivated me in such a good way that I hung on and got out of the situation very happy. (Interview 2.9)  |
| Competent                   | 1               | He is very experienced, he has been doing his job for about 20 years and he keeps picking new knowledge up. (Interview 2.9)  |

Table 21: Negative describing aspects of the mentor

| Categories                         | No. of comments | Comment  |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Too much pressure, too controlling | 2               | In some way there is too much controlling, he has my phone number, my e-mail address, if I don't answer an e-mail fast enough, I can be sure to have already a voicemail on my phone. (Interview 2.14)<br>I often have the feeling of being observed but in a very critical manner (Interview 2.7) |
| No understanding                   | 2               | I think he can't understand how important this work is for me. (Interview 2.1)<br>It always feels like he doesn't care about me, but just wants to put through his own point of view. (Interview 2.2)  |
| Little feedback                    | 1               | I just miss personal feedback in concrete terms. (Interview 2.7)   |
| Easygoing                          | 1               | Sometimes he just was too easygoing, a more personal contact person with too little authority for university problems. (Interview 2.12)  |
| Uncooperative                      | 1               | She is very set in her ways, I rarely have the chance to suggest something new. Aside from that I don't get any support from my university tasks. (Interview 2.6).   |
| Making insecure                    | 1               | She often makes uncertain with her unpredictable behavior and evaluation (Interview 2.7)   |
| No motivation/dedication           | 1               | You could recognize that he just did what he had to do, but actually he didn't really want to be a mentor. (Interview 2.15)  |
| Unreliable                         | 1               | He didn't stick to our agreements or deadlines. (Interview 2.1)  |
| No confidence in mentee            | 1               | Even if I accomplished all the tasks and projects, he just kept on saying that I wouldn't accomplish the following tasks and he always talked me down. In the end I didn't turn on him anymore and solved my problems otherwise. (Interview 2.13)  |
| Patronizing                        | 1               | I couldn't stand his always patronizing manner to prescribe what I'm feeling and what I'm thinking. (Interview 2.2)  |
| Different work attitude            | 1               | I care a lot about my work and want to make it good, he's more the easy-going type and that drives me mad. (Interview 2.1)   |

Table 22: Mentees' wishes concerning mentoring

| Categories                           | No. of com-ments | Comment  |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| More frequent meeting                | 3                | In the beginning I had much more regular feedback sessions, I would wish to have that again that frequently. (Interview 2.9)<br>Would like to have more frequent and prepared feedback sessions. (Interview 2.6)<br>I would structure and plan more fixed meetings which has to be kept. That would have prevented some problems. (Interview 2.12)                             |
| Clear agreements                     | 2                | I would appreciate if there're more consequences. At the beginning we phrased our own learning targets what we would like to learn in this quarter. But we never talked about having reached them, phrasing new targets or something like that. (Interview 2.11)<br>I would like to have more clear agreements to have more certainty that I can rely on this. (Interview 2.1) |
| Openness, understanding              | 2                | I would wish that he would be opener and that he would listen more to my real problems (Interview 2.2)<br>I would wish that he react more to my own problems and not just working with a check list. (Interview 2.13)  |
| More free space                      | 1                | I would wish him to be more relaxed and not always so controlling. (Interview 2.4)   |
| assertiveness                        | 1                | More strictness would have been more effectful. He should have taken more drastic measures and shouldn't have been always so easygoing. (Interview 2.12)   |
| esteeming                            | 1                | I would wish her to more appreciate my effort. (Interview 2.6)   |
| Constructive feedback                | 1                | I would like to have more personal and constructive feedback (Interview 2.6)   |
| More reliability                     | 1                | I would like him to be more reliable. (Interview 1)  |
| More dedication                      | 1                | I would like if he were a bit more motivated to work with me especially concerning the contents (Interview 2.1)<br>I would wish a bit more commitment. (Interview 2.15)  |
| More seriousness                     | 1                | I would wish that he takes us more seriously (Interview 2.5)   |
| Get to know the mentor more personal | 1                | She principally gives a professional opinion always related to the work, I also would like to know her personal opinion once, so her personal estimation. (Interview 2.3)  |