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“You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, ‘you are free to compete with the others’ and still justly believe that you have been completely fair”.

- President Lyndon Johnson, 1965.
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The research problem in this study was to identify what mentoring strategies organisations can use to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). To achieve this objective a nine-phase theoretical model for organisational mentoring was presented. The presentation of the theoretical model consisted of the following three sub-processes:

- The first consisted of a survey of literature related to the development of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) and the implications of the Act for organisations.

- The second comprised surveying the literature dealing specifically with the impact of mentoring programmes on career development, organisational success and career satisfaction, particularly in terms of employees from designated groups.

- The third surveyed the literature dealing with various mentoring strategies and models used by organisations for facilitating management development.

The theoretical model served as a basis for drawing up a survey questionnaire to establish the extent to which individuals at different levels in
the organisations agree with the theoretical model developed in the study. The survey questionnaire was sent to a random sample of individuals employed in the automobile industries of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality and the Buffalo City Metropole.

The empirical results obtained from the survey indicated a strong concurrence with the theoretical organisational mentoring model presented in the study. These results were included in the theoretical model, leading to the development of an integrated model for organisational mentoring. From the survey literature and the study it became evident that if organisations plan to introduce mentoring strategies that will contribute towards facilitating their employment equity objectives, it is necessary to ensure that a transformational culture exists.

Many South African organisations are currently experiencing problems in recruiting, training and retaining individuals from designated groups. The introduction of a mentoring programme based on the integrated model for organisational mentoring cannot be considered as the sole strategy for alleviating these problems and for facilitating management development to achieve the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). However, when this programme is effectively managed and incorporated into the overall development programme of an organisation committed to transformation, the potential to ease
these problems and achieve the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) is greatly enhanced.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION, PROBLEM STATEMENT AND OUTLINE OF RESEARCH PROJECT

1.1 INTRODUCTION

More and more South African organisations are beginning to establish and implement measures aimed at meeting the requirements of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). Many are also moving from a focus on targets for external recruitment to the more qualitative aspects of employment equity – creating internal development opportunities and the creation of inclusive and supportive diversity cultures (Human, 2001, p. 4).

After being signed by President Nelson Mandela on 6 October 1998, the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) became law on 23 October 1998 with its publication in the Government Gazette. The aim of the Act, which is an ambitious attempt at social engineering of the South African workplace, is to undo the disparities in employment occupancy and income levels brought about by apartheid.

The Act attempts to establish equal opportunities for all employees and job applicants by firstly prohibiting unfair discrimination against them by all
employers. This will ensure that all individuals who meet the requirements of a particular job will be able to compete for it. It will also ensure that in future if two employees are treated differently in the workplace it will be because the one is, for example, better qualified or has longer service, and not because of differences based on race, gender and other irrelevant considerations. However, the Act goes further and requires designated employers to develop and implement affirmative action measures to achieve a diverse workforce broadly representative of the South African population. Those who stand to benefit from these measures (referred to as designated groups) are black people (i.e. Africans, Coloureds and Indians), women and the disabled. In terms of the Act, a designated employer is a person who employs 50 or more employees or whose minimum annual turnover is equal to or above a certain minimum set out in Schedule 4 of the Act. This ranges from R2million in agriculture to R25million among wholesalers and allied traders.

Paton (1998, p. 20) points out that the clause in the Employment Equity Bill stating that candidates from designated groups should still be considered for employment even when they lack the formal qualifications or experience, but have the potential to acquire the ability to do the job, caused much controversy in business. However, after a meeting between government and business, it was agreed that candidates would have to acquire the capacity to do the job ‘within a reasonable time’. The Act now reads:

“An individual may be suitably qualified for a job if that person has
• the formal qualifications for it, or
• the relevant knowledge or experience, or
• is able to acquire the ability to do the job after a reasonable period of probation and training."

Human (2001, p. 4) argues that many South African organisations are making the mistake of playing the ‘numbers game’ by bringing individuals into their organisations but failing to develop and promote them once they are there. Human maintains that these individuals will become frustrated and many will leave, thus negatively impacting on the organisation’s external recruitment attempts and souring the internal climate. Consequently, in order to motivate and retain competent designated group members, organisations will also need to concentrate on the internal development of staff. Berry (2000, pp. 4-8) points out that black managers who have been fast-tracked through their organisations have expressed fears of ‘being found out’ in terms of their competence levels, of not being able to live up to their role model status, and of having to forsake aspects of their culture in order to be fully accepted in historically white institutions.

The question that needs to be asked is: How can individuals with potential be given the appropriate training and development, career guidance and advice in order to do the job ‘within a reasonable time’? One of the approaches that can assist in facilitating an individual’s development is mentoring. Berry (2000, p. 5) advocates that intensive mentoring programmes for future
leaders, utilising experienced mentors, is a sound means of overcoming the fears of senior white managers who are afraid that they will be phased out of the system because of employment equity initiatives. A mentoring programme will also assist black managers who are worried about being ‘found out’. This view was previously advocated by Martin Nasser of the UNISA Business School who is quoted in the *Business Day* (1997, p. 12) as saying that “the use of mentors to develop managerial skills can increase the pace of a protégé’s development”.

A substantial amount of evidence suggests that having a mentor can facilitate successful psycho-social outcomes and lead to more frequent promotions, higher incomes and greater satisfaction with pay and benefits (Saal & Knight, 1995, p. 238). Tsukudu (1996, p. 15) supports this evidence by stating that several studies have found that mentoring relationships are a significant factor in career development, organisational success and career satisfaction. He suggests that the development of mentoring relationships would be an advantage for women and black managers who want to advance to powerful positions in organisations and argues that this further confirms the value of mentoring as part of managerial development and training.

With organisational ‘right-sizing’ being prevalent, mentoring as it was known may be changing. Ten years ago Shea (1992, p. v) concluded that “there is a new form of mentoring evolving that better suits downsized, high tech, globally competitive firms”. He added that the process of mentoring, through
co-operation and dual activities, would uncover latent potential. It does not aim at career mobilisation, but rather at individuals developing their own abilities, and thus becoming empowered. This seems to define the uncovering of a self-directed, confidant individual and not the typical corporate ‘lap-dog’, which may be perpetuated through a negative mentoring process. What appears to evolve is a partnership of learning which benefits both parties.

According to Beardwell and Holden (1997, p. 326), organisations that have introduced mentoring programmes have experienced that “mentoring facilitates the learning process of their employees, contributes to the process of meaning-making in the organisation and hence to its responsiveness to its environment, while meeting the developmental needs of the employees”. This encompasses both the organisational need for quick reaction to changing conditions and the individual’s need to learn what is relevant in a real environment. Nasser (1987, p. 12) found that both the mentor and mentee experience substantial growth as a result of the mentoring relationship and that through this process the organisation adds more expertise to its human assets. Furthermore, mentoring often overcomes the ‘political’ barriers prevalent in organisations. As Tosi, Rizzo and Carroll (1994, p. 549) mention, mentoring can be of value to those who generally fall outside of the typical business networks, including women, black males and disabled people. Fisher (1994, p. 1) also refers to an informal mentoring process within the ‘old boys’ network, which has existed for many decades.
The above discussion offers the basis for the exploration of the main problem of this study.

1.2 MAIN PROBLEM

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 95) believe that in order for employees from designated groups to receive every possible opportunity to develop, organisations should introduce mentoring programmes. Their research has indicated that mentoring programmes have been one of the keys to the success of employment equity initiatives, both internationally and locally. These programmes should cover aspects of training, development and career pathing of employees, their transfers and promotions, the identification of leadership and potential and the maintenance of high standards of performance.

Based on research that they conducted in selected organisations in South Africa in 1998 on behalf of the Department of Labour, Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 95) found that the reasons for failure of mentoring programmes was a lack of time and commitment on the part of mentors. However, they found that in one of the organisations that they researched respondents generally believed that the mentoring programme was a major reason contributing to affirmative action candidates being able to perform effectively according to standards. These candidates had also been able to
prove that as a result of the mentoring programme, they had subsequently been promoted on merit.

This leads to the following question, which represents the main problem that will be addressed by this research:

What mentoring strategies can organisations use for enhancing employee development to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)?

1.3 SUB-PROBLEMS

An analysis of the main problem allows identification of the following sub-problems.

Sub-Problem One

What mentoring strategies are revealed in the relevant literature that will assist organisations in developing individuals from designated groups?

Sub-Problem Two
What mentoring strategies are currently used by organisations to facilitate the development of individuals from designated groups?

Sub-ProBLEM Three

How can the results obtained from the resolution of sub-problems one and two (above) be combined into an integrated mentoring model, which can be used by organisations as a strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)?

1.4 DEMARCATION OF THE RESEARCH

Demarcating the research serves the purpose of making the research topic manageable from a research point of view. The omission of certain topics does not imply that there is no need to research them.

1.4.1 Management level

The study was limited to top and middle management level employees. Robbins and de Cenzo (2001, pp. 5-6) describe top management as a group
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of individuals responsible for establishing the organisation’s overall objectives and developing the policies to achieve these objectives. Typical titles of top management positions in organisations include chairman of the board, chief executive officer, and managing director. Middle managers include all employees below the top management level who manage other managers. These managers are responsible for establishing and meeting specific goals in their particular departments or units. Examples of job titles held by middle managers include financial director, sales director, divisional manager, group human resources manager and factory manager. Supervisory levels such as section leader, foreman and superintendent are excluded from the study.

1.4.2 Size of organisation

The study was limited to organisations employing 50 or more employees or fewer than fifty (50) employees, but who had a minimum annual turnover exceeding R25million.

1.4.3 Type of organisation

The scope of the research was limited to local and international automotive manufacturers and suppliers in a designated geographical area.

1.4.4 Geographical demarcation
The empirical component of this study was limited to organisations lying within the following geographical areas:

The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality and surrounding areas and the Buffalo City Metropole and surrounding areas falling within the Eastern Cape Province of the Republic of South Africa.

1.4.5 Mentoring

Based on the literature survey, the following working definition of mentoring was adopted:

Mentoring is the process by which the knowledge, skills and life experience of a selected, successful manager or other senior employee are transmitted to another employee in the organisational system, for the purpose of developing that employee for greater workplace efficiency and effectiveness.

1.4.6 Subject of evaluation

The field of mentoring can be divided into the following areas:

- Mentoring as an aid to facilitating management development
- The mentoring programme
- Competencies required by mentors and mentees
- An integrated model for mentoring
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1.4.7 Basis for the model

The aim of the research was to develop an integrated mentoring model by incorporating the essential elements of a mentoring programme described in current literature, with the elements of a mentoring programme as perceived by organisational respondents.

1.5 REASONS FOR AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH


It is against this background that South African organisations have needed to acknowledge the principles of building a non-racial, non-sexist and prosperous democracy. As a consequence, organisations are starting to realise that skills transfer, which stems from career development and procurement of the designated groups, is an integral part of empowerment.
Hutton (2002, p. 71) points out that much has been written about the need for a systematic approach to the development of human capital. Hutton (2002, p. 71) cites Meddows-Taylor (2000, pp. 7-9) who predicts that organisations of the future will be staffed by employees who are well educated and able to critically analyse and assess directions put before them. Hutton (2002, p. 71-72) believes that this will be achieved through developing employees to possess the competencies required to achieve competitive advantage. These employees will need to possess the necessary tools to make use of windows of opportunity, manage risk and create an environment of innovation.

In the light of the above, the scene is set for a concerted effort by organisations to upgrade the competencies of employees. Organisations have been all too aware of the need to develop designated groups to meet the requirements of the Act (Act 55 of 1998). From numerous discussions by the researcher with senior Human Resource managers and from articles in the press it appears that white males continue to dominate the South African corporate landscape. Kobokoane (1998, p. 3) refers to an address by Mr Rams Ramashia, Labour Department Director General, who stated that the shortage of black managers, as well as the shortage of managerial skills and talents in general, was the result of apartheid. Ramashia also cautioned organisations that the Department of Labour would take a hard line against companies that did not make an effort to implement the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) during 2001. Kobokoane (2000, p. 1) later points out that from a survey conducted on the top hundred South African organisations,
white males constituted 87.05 per cent of the directors, while black males constituted 8.43 per cent.

Organisations have become conscious of the need to develop employment equity plans that will assist them in achieving reasonable progress towards employment equity in their workplaces. However, the problem appears to be that these organisations are uncertain of what strategies they should implement to achieve equitable representation of people from designated groups, particularly at the middle and senior management levels.

Organisations are also currently experiencing problems in recruiting, training and retaining individuals from designated groups. The introduction of the mentoring model proposed in this study can play a major role in alleviating these problems and in enhancing accelerated development particularly at middle and senior management levels in the organisation.

1.6 OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of the research was to develop an integrated model of mentoring strategies that can be utilised by organisations to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). More specifically, the objectives of this research were to
• determine from relevant literature what mentoring strategies should be utilised to equip designated individuals with the necessary competencies for management positions

• develop a theoretical framework of mentoring strategies that can serve as a model for enhancing accelerated development of designated employees

• establish the extent to which organisations agree that the model can assist them in implementing a formal mentoring programme aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)

• make recommendations for organisations planning to introduce formal mentoring programmes to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

1.7 RESEARCH DESIGN

In this section the broad methodology that was followed in the study is described.

1.7.1 Research methodology

The following procedure was adopted to solve the main and sub-problems:
• A literature study was conducted to determine the mentoring strategies that can be used to enhance accelerated development of managers.

• An empirical study consisting of a mail survey was conducted among human resources and training and development practitioners, or alternatively, managing directors. A questionnaire was used to establish the extent to which they concurred with the nine-phase mentoring model developed by the researcher. Suggestions for improving the model were also requested. Human resources and training and development specialists were selected because it was believed that if the organisations surveyed had introduced mentoring programmes, these individuals would, more than likely, have been involved in the introduction and implementation of these programmes. In addition, it was assumed that they would have some knowledge of mentoring programmes because of their experience, training, or education and would regularly come into contact with various levels of management who participate, or have participated in mentoring programmes. In many instances the human resources practitioners had been involved in facilitating mentoring programmes, coaching or training mentors and mentees in the skills required for successful mentoring. In cases where the organisation had not appointed a human resources specialist, the managing director was chosen as an alternative respondent.
Respondents who indicated that their organisations used formal mentoring programmes to enhance employee development to meet Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives were contacted, and requested to ask managers acting as mentors to complete and return the questionnaire.

The researcher developed a comprehensive questionnaire for this research project to determine which mentoring strategies were utilised for facilitating the development of managers.

The results of the literature study were combined with the results of the empirical study to develop an integrated mentoring model that can be used by organisations to develop strategies for facilitating the development of middle and senior management employees.

1.8 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

The thesis includes the following chapters:

Chapter 1  Contains the problem statement and definition of key terms.
Chapter 2  Considers the legislative basis for mentoring.
Chapter 3  Examines why mentoring can be used as a strategy for management development.
Chapter 4  Discusses the mentoring process.
Chapter 5 Examines various models for mentoring and presents a theoretical model for organisational mentoring.

Chapter 6 Describes the empirical study and analyses the biographical details of respondents.

Chapter 7 Analyses and interprets the results of the survey and integrates the results with the theoretical model to develop an integrated organisational mentoring model.

Chapter 8 Reaches conclusions and makes recommendations for implementing the integrated mentoring model.

1.9 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this chapter was to place the study into perspective by stating the main problem of the research along with the sub-problems. The remaining chapters aim at addressing the main and sub-problems. Chapter 2 will discuss the legislative basis for mentoring in terms of the provisions set by the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998), its plans and the problems faced during its implementation.
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CHAPTER 2

LEGISLATIVE BASIS FOR MENTORING

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In terms of Section 8 of the South African Constitution everyone in South Africa has the fundamental right of equality. The Constitution furthermore recognises measures to ensure freedom from discrimination and also provides mechanisms to redress past imbalances. The Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998), hereafter referred to as “the Act”, is the government’s main instrument to correct the imbalances of the past, particularly in the work place.

The idea of the Act serving as a mechanism for correcting past imbalances is supported by Van Onselen and O’Connell (1999, p. 1) who state that in the modern world the guardians of political power must realise that their power to redistribute wealth and resources on a meaningful scale is largely a myth. Business is a more effective medium through which change can be effected, and the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) is the means.

This chapter discusses the development of a legislative basis for mentoring in terms of the provisions set by the Act, its plans and the problems faced in its implementation. The chapter will also consider capacity building through skills training and development and the Skills Development Act (Act 97 of 1998), which is the government’s main thrust in this regard.
2.2 THE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT (ACT 55 OF 1998)

Bendix (2001, p. 32) notes that the Act gives effect to Section 9 (3) of the Constitution which states: “National legislation must be enacted to prevent the prohibition of unfair discrimination”.

According to Mtayi (1999, p. 30), the aim of the Act is to promote equal opportunity through the elimination of unfair discrimination and to implement positive measures to correct the imbalances of the past for designated groups, that is, black people, women and people with disabilities.

The Act will have a great impact on business in South Africa, particularly at senior levels. Organisations will have to ensure that no unfair discrimination exists and that individuals previously excluded from the mainstream of business are given every opportunity to develop and advance to their highest potential (Thomas and Robertshaw, 1999, p. xi).

Van Onselen and O’Connell (1999, p. 1) believe that the Act is designed to

- alert business to its wider socio-political responsibilities,
- encourage the unilateral implementation of corrective and equitable practices (in accordance with the principles of collective bargaining),
- penalize businesses for failing to enthusiastically embrace the desired social transformation,
• eliminate discrimination in the workplace and
• advance certain disadvantaged groups through affirmative action programmes.

Mtayi (1999, pp. 30-33) draws attention to the following aspects of the Act:

2.2.1 Prohibition of unfair discrimination

It will not be considered unfair if, “employers were to discriminate for purposes of affirmative action. Nor will it be unfair for them to exclude, distinguish, or prefer any person on the basis of the inherent requirements of the job.”

2.2.2 Medical testing

Medical testing for any medical condition is unfair and such testing is prohibited by law unless it has been found justifiable by the Labour Court.

2.2.3 Psychological testing

The law prohibits all psychological tests unless proven to be fair and unbiased against a particular employee or group.

2.2.4 Employment equity plans
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Employers are required to conduct and develop employment equity plans, which are considered as positive measures to achieve employment equity for people from designated groups.

**2.2.5 Commission for Employment Equity**

The Act provides for the establishment of a Commission for Employment Equity to advise the Minister of Labour on, among other things, codes of good practice, regulations and policy matters.

**2.2.6 Monitoring and enforcement mechanisms**

The Act also allows for the establishment of monitoring and enforcement mechanisms which empower employees and trade unions to monitor compliance with the Act.

**2.3 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF EMPLOYMENT EQUITY PLANS**

According to Bendix (2000, p. 93), the main thrust of the Employment Equity Plan is to establish and implement measures which aim at ensuring that suitable people with the correct qualifications are selected from within the designated groups. It is also important that the Employment Equity Plan ensures that groups have “equal employment opportunities and are equally represented in all occupational levels.”
Mtayi (1999, p. 31) and Van Onselen and O’Connell (1999, p. 1) state that with regard to the Ac (Act 55 of 1998), the responsibility of designated employers is to consult with employees, conduct analyses, prepare employment equity plans, and report annually to the Director General of the Labour Ministry on progress with regard to these plans which, according to Bendix (2001, p. 136) and Mtayi (1999, p. 31), must contain the following:

- Affirmative action targets, that is, numerical goals
- Measures to identify and eliminate employment barriers
- Measures designated to promoting diversity based on equal dignity and respect for all people
- Measures to accommodate persons from designated groups to ensure that they enjoy equal opportunity and are equally represented in all employment categories
- Measures to retain and develop people from designated groups and to implement the necessary training in terms of the Skills Development Act (Act 97 of 1998):
  - The objectives for each year
  - A time table with proposed plans
  - The duration of the plan
  - Procedures for monitoring and implementation of the plan
  - Internal dispute procedures relating to discrimination

2.4 POSSIBLE PROBLEMS AND OBSTACLES REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EMPLOYMENT EQUITY PROGRAMMES
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As acknowledged by Alexander (1999, p. 5), employment equity is expensive to implement and maintain. It is essentially a management-driven process and requires transformation. It is therefore essential that management understand the business imperative for this transformation.

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 10) add to this argument by stating that “central to the effective leadership and management of the diversity created by strategies to address Employment Equity, is the establishment of sound business reasons that ensure the achievement of company objectives through the effective working together of diverse people.” The authors believe that the objective is to ensure a change in insight and ways of doing things that diversity brings to the organisation through creativity and different perspectives.

Furthermore, as a result of the changing marketplace, organisations will be dealing more frequently with black companies. Successful affirmative action policies provide a good public image and increase business opportunities.

Wingrove, (1995, p. 153) states that there are a number of issues relevant to all equal employment opportunity processes which may result in the following problems:

- A shortage of well-qualified, experienced blacks in all fields and at all levels.

  This problem is exacerbated by an increase in demand, resulting in unrealistic expectations and inflated remuneration. This causes “job-hopping” which has negative implications for both the employee and the organisation.
• Many organisations face opposition from their white employees regarding their employment equity programmes, as the attention given to the latter often leads to insufficient time and attention being given to on-the-job training.

• White employees may manifest uncertainty and resistance to employment equity programmes, if their fears are ignored.

• Lack of clarity regarding the benefits of participation and the implications of non-participation results in failure in accelerated training programmes as participants feel fearful, frustrated or threatened.

• Poor communication between people of different cultures and languages causes misunderstandings that can lead to failure.

• Motivational objectives may become confused as the black culture promotes the collective rather than the individual, which is in contrast to the Western culture of personal advancement, ambition and self-actualisation.

• Blacks do not want to be assimilated into a white culture, which leads to growing resistance to accepting the norms of Western business culture.
• Most processes are designed to incorporate blacks into an existing system and structure, instead of a new system that would satisfy black needs as well as the needs of the Western business world.

• Some employers become frustrated when they view low autonomy, lack of assertiveness or passivity as laziness, lack of ambition or the lack of a sense of responsibility.

• As a result of historic orientation or lack of exposure, some blacks have a low propensity to take risks and are therefore often reluctant to make decisions, resulting in employers forming a negative impression of black managers.

• A lack of genuine commitment from senior management and a lack of understanding concerning the impact of the employment equity process on the entire organisation, is intensified if the process is relegated to a training function.

**Alexander (1999, p. 28) highlights the following problems that are experienced by the employer in ensuring a business is equity compliant:**

• Lack of finances: Money is required for recruiting and training employees and managers, and for creating awareness of employment equity.
• Insufficient resource allocation: Attention must be paid to the allocation of resources with regard to time, budget and staffing for training.

• Increasing disputes: Disputes may arise out of the interpretation of the Act and the requirements of consultation with employees, the provisions relating to disclosure and unfair discrimination in the Act.

• Backlash of white males and loss of key staff: Problems arise when white males leave an organisation or immigrate, believing that this is the only alternative for advancement and recognition.

• Management apathy or indifference: Employment equity must be management-driven and ultimately remains a managerial responsibility without which, employment equity cannot be successfully implemented within an organisation, and equity compliance will fail.

• The need for developing an employment equity strategy: Implementation requires a change in both business and management techniques, as well as the implementation of non-discriminatory procedures.

• The speed of the employment equity process: Employment equity plans must be implemented within specific time periods.
• Countering direct and indirect discrimination: If recruitment differentiation occurs on the basis of race, sex, family, or responsibility, and it is intended to exclude certain sections of the labour market, then this amounts to discrimination. While the employer is entitled to differentiate between employees or groups of employees, the employer must ensure that this differentiation does not result in direct or indirect discrimination, which prejudices the objectives of employment equity.

• Racial attitudes and polarisation: These arise where employees perceive that they are now ‘working with the enemy’. Workers often view problems as race-related, whereas managers view them from a business perspective. When one considers cultural and stereotypical mindsets, it is understandable that the employer would face difficulties when attempting to change attitudes and address historical differences in the workplace.

However, according to Alexander (1999, p.31), “The focus remains on management to be the ‘engine of growth’ to power and facilitate employment equity within a business and apply the necessary strategies and practices that will ensure that an employer becomes equity compliant.”

Israelstam (1999, p. 15) highlights the problems and obstacles related to implementation of the Act under three headings:

(a) **Potential panic due to the employment equity legislation pressures:**
Section 34 of the Employment Equity Act empowers employees to report contraventions of the Act to labour inspectors, the Director-General of Labour, or the Employment Equity Commission, which advises the Minister of Labour. In the case of failure of an employer to comply with the Act’s provisions or with instructions from Labour Department officials, section 61 of the Employment Equity Act may impose a fine not exceeding R10,000 on persons who

- obstruct or try to influence improperly anyone exercising authority in implementing the Act
- knowingly give false information to the Director-General or Labour Inspector
- take any measures to avoid becoming designated employers (for example by splitting the company so as to reduce the number of employees to below 50).

Fines of between R500,000.00 and R900,000.00 will be administered where the Labour Court finds an employer guilty of failing to carry out its duties as stipulated in the Employment Equity Act. Furthermore, an employer’s tender for contract with a state body could be refused in the case of an employer failing to comply with the Act, and an existing contract could be terminated.

(b) Management prerogative:

Managers are often contemptuous of those who tell them how to run a business, how to discipline employees, and whom they may or may not employ. They feel it is their right to make such decisions as they have earned the authority and it is their responsibility to maintain profitability. With pressures such as international
competition, the rising cost of money, recessionary tendencies, investor jitters and a
general drop in business confidence, managers are finding it untenable to be told who
they can and cannot hire. While many recruiting managers take demographic factors
into account, they believe it is their prerogative to weigh up all the qualifying criteria
and make the final selection decision. Highly prescriptive literature in this regard
therefore results in strong resistance, especially where the manager is responsible for
delivering the financial results to the shareholders.

\[(c) \textit{Perceived victimisation of population groups:}\]

Israelstam (1999, p. 15) further points out that many white males believe they are
suffering as a result of affirmative action policies, and are therefore forced to leave
the country in order to maintain their standards of living. South Africa is thereby
losing valuable expertise.

Employees who do not resign but who are forced to move aside to make way for
designated groups may react in a number of ways:

- They may remain in the organisation until retirement, but covertly resist the
  implementation of employment equity plans.

- They may take a package and then return as a consultant to repair damage
  caused by loss of key skill, charging a fee three times their original salary.

- They may take their skills elsewhere and leave the organisation to fend for
  itself.
Barker (1999, p. 265) outlines issues that he believes form a strong argument against employment equity and affirmative action programmes. He argues that these programmes reduce efficiency because the best person for the job is not necessarily the person appointed to the position. It could further be assumed that recruitment standards are reduced and that competition based on market principles is negated. Barker adds that if such patterns are continued over a long period or permanently, a positive economic outcome is less likely. Furthermore, these practices would push the wages of the benefiting designated groups higher and higher.

Barker (1999, p. 265) adds that employment equity would be beneficial to both country and economy if South Africans were provided with the same “boots and straps”. This implies that employment equity would be beneficial if all employees were given the correct knowledge or skills to conduct the work they are employed to do.

Organisations need to give serious consideration to the possible problems and obstacles related to the implementation and achievement of the Act’s objectives. Failure to consider strategies for managing possible problems and obstacles can spell disaster for the organisation and the employment equity programme.

2.5 NUMERICAL TARGETS FOR ACHIEVING EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Although one of the main purposes of the Act is to correct numerical imbalances in all job categories and levels over a period of time, it is unlikely that the historically created workplace imbalances will be corrected overnight.
Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 56) note that the Act takes cognisance of this fact and therefore makes provision for companies, in conjunction with democratically elected employee representatives, to set their own numerical targets within their own internally agreed time frames.

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, pp. 59-60) make the point that target setting is not simply a case of randomly producing numbers, as it requires the deliberation and analysis of the strategic objectives of the department and of the company as a whole. They propose that the following considerations should be taken into account when setting targets.

Firstly, if the company is likely to expand over the next few years this provides an opportunity to recruit and promote new employees from designated groups.

Secondly, if there are any employees in key positions who are nearing retirement, this would present an opportunity to bring in individuals from designated groups to be trained into these positions over a period of time. However, current employees from designated groups who have displayed the potential for promotion should be given first priority for consideration.

Thirdly, employees who are promoted or transferred from one position to another will also provide openings to introduce employees from designated groups into various occupational categories and levels. As and when employees voluntarily leave the organisation vacancies thus created can be used to meet the employment equity objectives of the organisation.

Organisations that are not going through a period of growth or ones that are going through a phase of down-sizing may be limited in the extent to which they can employ the above strategies. These organisations may be forced to develop less ambitious plans that are in line with the realities of the situation.
2.6 SKILLS DEVELOPMENT ACT (ACT 97 OF 1998)

Bendix (2001, p. 136) and Mtyai (1999, p. 31) highlight that for employment equity plans to be effective, it is imperative to consider the Skills Development Act (Act 97 of 1998), which is a mechanism established to give credit to the Employment Equity Act.

According to Mercorio and Mercorio (2000, p. 50), there are a number of links between the Skills Development Act and the Employment Equity Act, which includes the fact that both Acts are about developing people and increasing their skills and knowledge thus facilitating career path progression. This can be linked to Noe’s (1999, p.238) definition of mentoring, which likens the duties of a mentor to those of a senior management person who helps develop a less experienced employee.

The Employment Equity Act makes references to the Skills Development Act in paragraph 15(2)(d): Skills development is regarded as an “affirmative action measure to retain and develop people from designated groups and to implement appropriate
training measures, including those in terms of an Act of parliament providing for skills development”.

The Skills Development Act replaced the existing Manpower and Training Act (Act 56 of 1981) (Bendix, 2001, p. 138). Its objectives, amongst others, are to

• develop the skills of the South African workforce
• increase the return on investments
• encourage employers to use the workplace as an active learning environment so that employees can acquire new skills and new recruits can gain work experience
• encourage workers to participate in learnership and other training programmes.

Mercorio and Mercorio, (2000, p. 50) outline the objectives of the Skills Development Act as:

• Providing an institutional framework to devise and implement national, sector and workplace strategies to develop and improve the skills of the South African workforce
• Integrating the strategies with those of the National Qualifications Framework contemplated in the South African Qualifications Authority Act, 1995
• Providing learnerships that lead to recognised occupational qualifications
• Providing for financing skills development
• Providing for and regulating employment services

Mercorio and Mercorio, (2000, p. 53) also state that the over-riding objective of the Act is to focus scarce resources accurately and to ensure that education and training is
driven by the demand of a rapidly changing, globalising economy. Van Dyk, Nel, Van Z Loedolff and Haasbroek (2001, pp. 36-39) support both Bendix and Mercorio and Mercorio’s viewpoints on the Skills Development Act.

2.7 MENTORING AS A STRATEGY FOR ENHANCING ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT OF DESIGNATED GROUPS INTO MANAGERIAL POSITIONS

This chapter has considered legislation that has been introduced to assist in correcting the imbalances of the past, particularly in the workplace. In order to understand the impact of mentoring as a possible strategy to correct these imbalances, it is necessary to acknowledge that this is dependent on the attitudes of employees within organisations and to consider the impact of gender and race on mentoring.

Murrel, Crosby and Ely (1999, p. 116) found from research undertaken in America that employees do not have a random pool of potential network members from which to choose mentors and sponsors. It was found that formal work arrangements influence who employees come into contact with and thus influence potential networks. Furthermore, race and gender segregation of jobs does not simply separate people according to race and gender, it also leads people to perform different types of work. White woman and people of colour are more likely than white men to occupy positions with low authority, prestige, complexity, chances for advancement and earnings. White women and people of colour are more likely to work with and thus
form developmental ties with workers who control few corporate resources and possess little power and status.

Murrel et al. (1999, p. 117) found that white mentees were significantly more likely than mentees of colour to have mentors who were supervisors and managers. They also found that women’s mentors were less likely to be supervisors and managers than men’s mentors. In addition, mentees of colour were less likely than white mentees to have mentors who made final decisions on important corporate matters, made large purchases on their own, and had access to confidential information. From these findings it is fair to assume that the white male mentees had access to mentors who had more “political clout” in the organisation. These mentors were strategically and politically well positioned to provide access to important networks and opportunities for growth for their mentees, which would assist in fast-tracking their careers in the organisation.

The questions that need to be asked are: In the South African context do mentees’ race and gender influence the likelihood that they will receive instrumental and psychosocial help from a mentor? How does the mentee’s race and gender affect the type of help (i.e. instrumental or psychosocial) mentors give? What other factors relating to the mentor or the mentee shed light on the associations found in the first two analyses?

Tsukudu (1996, pp. 13-18) addresses the above questions in detail and attempts to provide solutions to the current imbalances that impact on mentoring relationships.
He suggests that in South Africa mostly white males fulfill management roles as they hold up to ninety-eight per cent of all top positions in organisations. He notes that research shows that discrimination on the basis of race and gender is institutionalised in South African organisations, and white male managers as an elite group continue to maintain their privileged position by closing off opportunities to women and people of colour. Based on these research findings he questions whether white males have the commitment to allow others into their privileged domain. Tsukudu (1996, p. 15) points out that several studies have found mentoring relationships to be a significant factor in career development, organisational success and career satisfaction. From this it can be inferred that the development of mentoring relationships would be an advantage for women and black managers who want to advance to powerful positions in organisations.

However, Tsukudu quotes the results of a survey conducted among white male MBA students, which found that most respondents had serious reservations about women’s and black people’s capabilities to compete on equal terms with white males. These stereotypical beliefs will impact on attitudes towards affirmative action in the broadest sense. In order for mentors to confer legitimacy on their mentees (women and people of colour) positive attitudes will need to be inculcated to redress discrimination on the basis of race and gender in South African organisations. This will lead to quality mentoring relationships that promote the development and advancement of women and black managers into the highest positions of power. Without a paradigm shift among white males, affirmative action and employment equity programmes are doomed to failure.
Tsukudu (1996, p. 15) further points out that one of the problems that an organisation is likely to encounter in a mentoring programme is that many individuals will support the implementation of a mentorship/affirmative action programme while they remain unaffected by it. He suggests that the moment that it affects them directly, their opinions may alter and instead of voicing their concerns to the people involved, they opt for the soft route of scandalising. He argues that white male managers need to make a mental shift with regard to the importance of management development and training and the role of mentoring in organisations. They need to realise the importance of possessing both technical expertise and sound interpersonal skills to effectively perform a mentoring role. Training for mentors must thus address the issues of diversity of race and gender in the workplace and the multiskilled nature of mentoring.

Davies-Netzley (1998, p. 339) cautions that although diversity training is often conducted to ensure that differences are valued and celebrated, there is a real danger that gender and race stereotyping may be reinforced when these differences are emphasised. Tsukudu (1996, p. 16), on the other hand, suggests that mentor training should sensitize white mentors to the way in which assumptions and stereotypes may unconsciously influence their judgment in relation to black mentees. In the training process they also need to learn what their own prejudices and biases are. By being continually aware of their prejudices, they can allow for them when interpreting mentee behaviour and thereby avoid unfair discrimination in the relationship.
Kemp (1997, p. 70) cites Cox (1993, p. 255) who argues that there are not only career barriers to affirmative action caused by formal organisational structures. Not mixing in the same social ‘stream’ as the senior executives could be a barrier to the mobility of some employees. Organisations need to ensure that there is greater diversity in the informal networks as well. Kemp (1997) suggests that by exposing individuals to mentoring programmes, besides the career guidance and support that they are given they gain access to situations and information to which they would otherwise not normally be exposed. Through this exposure they are given the opportunity to prove themselves to the important decision makers.

Cox (in Kemp 1997, p. 71) further argues a case for mentoring for previously disadvantaged groups by stating that those individuals who are not exposed to mentoring programmes tend to be overlooked particularly if they come from a culture that does not emphasise expressiveness, or Western style assertiveness. He makes the very important point that this mentoring should not only extend to people from minority groups, but should include all employees with potential so that a stigma does not develop around mentoring.

A study conducted by Slavet and Butterfield (1999, p. 4) confirms that the presence (or lack) of mentors and role models is one of the most crucial distinguishing factors of women above and below the glass ceiling. Prussel (1999, p. 10) provides fifteen tips for women to use as personal strategies for breaking the glass ceiling. One of these tips is “Get a mentor: find a good mentor, male or female, ask advice and learn from them.”
However, Tsukudu (1996, p. 16) points out that research has found that there are a number of problems associated with cross-gender mentoring such as:

- Male mentors experience spouse jealousy when talking about their mentees at home.
- The problem of office gossip and snide remarks from co-workers falls more heavily on mentees than mentors as the male-female mentoring relationship is often misconstrued as an affair, which can cause undue stress on the mentee.
- Women mentees experience jealousy from their colleagues as the mentees may be perceived as getting preferential treatment from senior managers.

On the issue of cross-gender mentoring Tsukudu suggests counselling for both male mentors and their female mentees to help them cope with sensitive issues such as those mentioned above. Training should also be given to current and potential male mentors to prepare them for their mentoring role and to caution them to monitor their behaviour and avoid appearing too friendly with their mentees.

Both male mentors and female mentees need to be able to cope with the pressure of guarding their behaviour, which could put a constraint on their interpersonal interactions and inhibit the development of the friendship component of the mentoring relationship.

Willbur (1987, p. 38) provides a useful summary to the discussion on mentoring as a strategy for enhancing accelerated development of designated groups into managerial
positions by referring to several studies on mentoring. These studies indicate that, for females and members of minority groups entering management, the chances for career success improve when these individuals are exposed to mentoring programmes. However, he quite rightly points out that mentoring is not the sole determinant of career success. Wilbur (1987, p. 38) points out that the studies further indicate that successful women or minority group members who receive mentoring but who lack high achievement motivation find their ascents ascribed to politics alone. On the other hand, it appears that if they possess high-achievement motivation but receive no mentoring, they might appear to be overly aggressive. Individuals who receive both mentoring and exhibit high levels of achievement behaviour are the ones most likely to succeed.

2.8 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter the legislation impacting on organisations to address past imbalances was considered. Possible problems and obstacles regarding the implementation of employment equity programmes, numerical targets for achieving employment equity, the objectives of the Skills Development Act and mentoring as a strategy for enhancing accelerated development of designated groups into managerial positions were also discussed. Many organisations have made really meaningful efforts to date in developing equity policies and plans. They certainly deserve credit for these efforts. However, there are still some cynical senior executives who, short of asking what the fine is for non-compliance with the Act, view the legislation as a nuisance. To quote Zinn (2001, p. 2): “There is no question that we have the knowledge and the understanding to implement the Act. What is questionable is whether we believe in it sufficiently to translate it into meaningful action.”
It is the researcher’s belief, based on an analysis of research conducted, that both informal and formalised mentoring programmes, although by no means a panacea for aiding all recruitment, remuneration, succession planning, training and development and career planning initiatives, can go a long way to supporting employment equity objectives particularly at the management level in organisations. This statement is reinforced by Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 95) who argue that “mentoring has been shown internationally and locally (in South Africa), to be one of the keys to the success of employment equity initiatives.”

In the following chapter the question of why mentoring should be used as a strategy for management development, will be addressed.
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WHY MENTORING AS A STRATEGY FOR MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT?

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter Two the emphasis was on developing a basis for mentoring in terms of the provisions set by the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). In this chapter the emphasis switches to why mentoring can be used as a strategy for enhancing accelerated development of managers, particularly those from the designated groups. Before discussing why mentoring can be used as a strategy for management development it is useful to consider the history of mentoring as well as the impact of the changing world of work on organisations.

3.2 THE NATURAL HISTORY OF MENTORING

Mentoring as a topic enjoys much attention today. Individuals who are keen to climb the career ladder, which has fewer rungs than it had in the past owing to flatter organisational structures, are continuously seeking executives and other managers who can assist them to expedite their upward mobility. Stone (1999, p. 159) states that these individuals are searching for managers and executives who will encourage with “pep talks”, instruct about the power and political framework of the organisation, facilitate projects that are being worked on by making
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both resources and contacts inside and outside the organisation available, and influence the powers that be to promote them when a vacancy occurs.

However, before considering the role that mentoring can play in supporting individuals in their learning and career development, it is necessary to consider the history of mentoring. From all the sources researched it becomes evident that mentoring is not a new concept and that its roots go all the way back to Greek mythology. Mentor was an ancient Greek, chosen by the god, Odysseus, (Olyssesus) to look after his son, the young Telemachus, while he was away on his epic voyage of discovery. For Mentor there was more to the instructions than just keeping a paternal eye on young Telemachus. Grooming him for his eventual position as head of state was a priority. To achieve this Mentor acted as an advisor, encourager and teacher by promoting counselling, acting as a role model and by passing on the experience which he possessed as the older man to the younger man (Fisher, 1994, p. 1). In time the word ‘mentor’ became synonymous with trusted adviser, friend, teacher and wise person – a person who offers knowledge, insight and respective wisdom that is especially useful to the other person (Shea, 1992, p.3).

### 3.3 THE CHANGING WORLD OF WORK

In order to provide an explanation for the prominence of and necessity for mentoring it is necessary to consider the world of work. What is it about the
world of work that requires organisations to create and exploit new strategies such as mentoring for the development of employees?

Bell (2000, p. xi) argues that Peter Vaill’s term, “permanent white water”, has been used to characterize the feeling of workplaces today. He explains that revolutionary change renders skills and knowledge obsolete almost overnight and that organisational success comes through creative adoption and innovative breakthroughs. In today’s organisation high-level knowledge requirements are moving to lower levels of the organisation implying that smartness can no longer be the domain of senior managers only. Peters (1996, p. 382) quotes Shoshana Zuboff who stated that “learning is the new form of labor. It’s no longer a separate activity that occurs either before one enters the workplace or in remote classroom settings. Learning is the heart of productive activity.”

In the management of today’s progressive, successful organisations the emphasis is on being a ‘learning organisation’, meaning that the organisation has growth, learning, improvement and everlasting experimentation woven into the fabric of its culture. The organisation also values creativity over control. Another aspect of organisational life that has been undergoing a metamorphosis over the past few years has been the old model of the leader as authority figure and corporate parent, which has altered to one of supporter, enabler and even partner. With employees being given the opportunity to demonstrate that they are able to operate in a responsible,
mature way with delegated authority and limited supervision, empowerment has become a necessity rather than a fad. Those managers who are unable to allow their subordinates to function independently without excessive controls, are fast being replaced by the leader whose relationship with associates is that of liberator, barrier remover, facilitator and mentor (Bell, 2000, p. xii).

Lewis (1996, pp. 3-5) summarizes what it is about the changing world that requires organisations to create and exploit new roles such as mentoring:

- **The economy is changing**

  The economic boom that moved through the eighties and into the nineties has slowed down and is likely to remain so. Organisations have had to move quickly to keep up with the influence of the Information Age.

- **The market is changing**

  The focus in the market place has moved from basic commodity products to more sophisticated, added-value products and services with organisations having to compete by differentiating not just through technological innovation, but also by adding service and intangible elements to build brands. As a result of the technological changes, competitive advantages are likely to be
short-lived before they are copied, or produced more cheaply somewhere else.

- **Organisations are changing**

To meet the various challenges, organisations have been compelled to change radically and dramatically, moving to flatter and leaner structures, with line managers often being replaced by semi-autonomous or self-managed work teams. These changes are designed to distribute power, authority and initiative throughout the organisation.

- **The world of work is changing**

Organisations have moved towards empowering workers by delegating decision-making authority to all levels in the organisation rather than investing it in a chosen few at the top of the hierarchy.

- **Relationships are changing**

Employment is becoming more demanding and less stable as a result of the change from lifetime employment to jobs being outsourced and organisations regularly down-sizing or right-sizing. Although employment is likely to deliver a range of benefits to both the employer and the employee, it will become
increasingly temporary with employees moving on to the next stage of their careers of a short tenure at the organisation.

Before discussing why mentoring can be used as a strategy for management development, it is necessary to clarify the differences between coaching and mentoring.

### 3.4 Coaching Versus Mentoring

Two current methods of management development being advocated are mentoring and coaching. However, there is often much confusion as to whether coaching and mentoring are synonymous or whether coaching is one of the activities of mentoring.

Parsloe and Wray (2001, pp. 1-154) argue that mentoring and coaching are very similar activities with the only real difference being that the coach focuses on building the coachee’s ability to accomplish specific tasks, whereas the mentor has a wider perspective. They see the mentor as typically having a longer-term relationship with the mentee, or as a counsellor on a broader range of issues, at any given time.

Mullins (1999, p. 367) states that mentoring “represents an increasing trend towards helping the individual to take charge of his or her learning: the primary driver of the acquisition of knowledge and skill becomes the
employee; the coach or mentor is available to give guidance, insight and encouragement in the learning process”. Mullins (1999) describes ‘coaching’ and ‘mentoring’ as follows:

“Coaching brings out the ‘best’ in people, improving their skills. Mentoring involves a relationship with an experienced organisation member who can share, guide and provide feedback.”

Blanchard and Thacker (1999, p. 309) view mentoring as a form of coaching in which an ongoing relationship is developed between a senior and junior employee. The purpose of mentoring is seen as providing the more junior employee with guidance and a clear understanding of how the organisation goes about its business. Blanchard and Thacker believe that whereas coaching focuses on the technical aspects of the job, mentoring focuses more on improving the employee’s fit with the organisation. Coaching emphasises skills development while mentoring emphasises attitude development.

Stone (1999, p. 160), on the other hand, argues that whereas mentoring uses many of the same techniques as coaching, mentoring involves ‘going above and beyond.’ She amplifies this argument by stating that it is a relationship in which the manager or mentor does more than train employees to do their jobs well. Mentoring focuses on sharing experience, wisdom and political savvy to enable top performers to take on tasks designated in their job descriptions.
Stone (1999, pp. 161-162) suggests that the purposes of managerial mentors are fourfold. Mentors act as role models. When they practise the values that they and their organisations preach, mentees are likely to practise these values too. Mentors act as brokers. As mentees do not have a network of contacts both in the organisation and external to the organisation, it is the mentor’s role to make these contacts available. The mentor should serve as the corporate ‘uncle’ or ‘aunt’ for the mentee, making it possible for mentees to be in contact with key individuals who can aid them in achieving their career goals. Mentors act as advocates and become cheerleaders for mentees by creating opportunities for them to show others what they are capable of doing. In the coaching role the mentor helps the mentee to understand the organisation’s culture, political structure and vision. Mentors advise mentees how to function within the politics of the organisation and how to avoid the traps that could derail them from fast tracking their careers.

It can thus be seen that coaching is one of the activities performed by the mentor. But merely performing the coaching role would not be a sufficient contribution from the mentor to equip mentees to fast track their careers. The mentor should play a supportive role by standing behind the mentee and providing the help that they need whether that help means advice, information, materials, or just understanding and encouragement.

Mullins (1999, p. 375) notes the similarities and differences between coaching and mentoring by pointing out that

- coaching uses deductive techniques;
• the coach does not have to be an expert in the subject. A little knowledge can often help but it can sometimes be a hindrance;
• the prime beneficiary is the individual, but the organisation also benefits;
• a coaching session is measured in minutes;
• coaching can be an off-the-cuff session;
• coaching is usually informal, but can be formal;
• respect for the coach is usual, and
• rapport between coach and coachee helps.

On the other hand,
• mentoring uses a mixture of inductive and deductive techniques;
• the mentor must be an expert in the subject;
• the prime beneficiary is the organisation, but the individual also benefits;
• a mentoring programme is measured in months;
• the mentor must be available almost on demand, and at least on a regular basis;
• mentoring is more formal but can include informality;
• respect for the mentor’s knowledge of the subject is essential, and
• rapport between mentor and mentee is essential.

Mullins (2002, p. 375) attempts to provide further clarification of the confusion and differences of opinion that exist among individuals within organisations about coaching and mentoring. He describes coaching as “a process that uses deductive or ‘drawing-out’ techniques to increase an individual’s ability and willingness in a specific subject or problem area. Ideally the techniques are used in a structured
manner. The coach does not have to be an expert in the subject”.

Mentoring is described as “a process that uses a mixture of inductive (‘pushing-it-in’, or telling) and deductive (‘drawing-it-out’, or coaching) techniques to increase an individual’s ability, and sometimes willingness, in a specific subject. Ideally a structured approach is used and the mentor needs to be an expert in the subject” (Mullins, 2002, p. 375).

The difference between mentoring and coaching can be summarised as follows. Whereas the mentor relationship should provide a structured opportunity for the mentee to discuss his or her career plans, the coaching relationship is far more specific in terms of the objectives. While coaching remains an integral aspect of the mentoring function, the mentoring process involves many more activities.

3.5 WHY MENTORING IS NECESSARY AS A STRATEGY FOR MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

Van Slyke and Van Slyke (1998, p. 14) argue that as organisations flatten and move towards cross-functional and self-directed work teams they must also examine the modes of training and development designed to support these new ways of working. They suggest that mentoring can be an effective way to integrate employees into caring for the organisation, and can serve as a major communication link that reinforces the modes of interaction required to support the organisational culture.
Tyler (1998, p. 98) points out that according to a study conducted in America, professionals who have had mentors earn between $5,610 and $22,450 more annually than those who have not. She comments that presumably this occurs because mentoring develops management skills and helps make mentees visible to more senior people.

Frost (2001, pp. 4-5) makes a strong argument for implementing developmental strategies such as mentoring in organisations. He states that a knowledge economy depends on brainpower and brainpower is owned by much more discerning people who look increasingly critically at where they work and the conditions under which they work. He further states that research has indicated that the single biggest reason people leave an organisation is for personal development.

The question that can be asked is: What is the message for organisations and particularly human resources managers (or talent managers as Frost calls them)? There needs to be a realisation that individuals are not only focused on more money and better benefits; they are also focused on personal development. Therefore, retention and attraction strategies that include developmental opportunities (such as mentoring) are becoming increasingly important as South African organisations proceed at ever greater speed into a global knowledge economy that requires ever-increasing knowledge and skill to run these organisations.

3.6 BENEFITS OF MENTORING
Who gains or benefits from mentoring activities? Lewis (1996, p. 11) argues that all the research and information available on mentoring demonstrate quite strongly that everyone concerned gains from the mentoring relationship. However, it is necessary to consider specific interest groups to understand what mentoring can offer them in terms of potential pay-offs. The various benefits of mentoring to the mentee, the mentor (manager) and the organisation are discussed below. The discussion is a summary of the findings of Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 32-48), Kreitner, Kinicki and Buelens (1999, pp. 69-70), Lewis (1996, pp. 11-15) and Stone (1999, pp. 162-165).

3.6.1 Benefits to the mentee

The major benefit for mentees is that they receive support throughout the learning process. In order to define specific benefits for the mentee, it is necessary to consider the context of the mentoring relationship. For example, if the mentoring takes place in an informal/casual manner the benefits derived may differ from those arising in a systematic and structured programme.

The generic benefits that are likely to accrue for any learner include the following:

- **Personal benefits**
As a result of a healthy mentee-mentor relationship, mentees are able to satisfy their social needs such as affection, a sense of belonging and friendship. A healthy relationship can also assist mentees in satisfying self-respect and esteem needs and in building self-confidence and self-respect, as skills and capabilities increase.

- **Developing ‘learning to learn’ skills**

As mentees acquire greater knowledge and skills they become more confident and competent as learners and increasingly able to focus on their own learning processes, approaches and styles.

- **Greater understanding of the total organisational perspective**

By participating in the programme mentees are able to gain knowledge of the organisation outside of their own functional or business areas. If the mentor is more senior, mentees may pick up knowledge and understanding of how businesses work in general and they may also gain access to information, resources or other support structures within the organisation. Mentoring can also greatly assist the mentee to ‘read’ and understand the culture and the ‘politicking’ that occurs within the organisation.

- **Strengths and weaknesses**
Through regular feedback, and counselling and coaching sessions with the mentor, mentees are able to gain insight into their strengths and weaknesses.

- **Problem-solving and problem-solving approaches**

Mentees are equipped to more confidently tackle problems on their own as a result of their involvement in problem solving activities with their mentors.

- **Career benefits**

Through the intervention of the mentor, whether it is induction, orientation or career advancement the mentee derives career benefits which may become an explicit part of the mentoring relationship.

### 3.6.2 Benefits to mentors/managers

Many senior and experienced managers accept the responsibility of mentoring not merely out of duty but out of satisfaction and the personal benefits they may derive such as enhancing their own roles, skills and contributions.

As with the benefits gained by the mentees, the benefits gained by the mentors or managers will also depend on the particular context of the mentoring relationship. Lewis (1996, p. 13) believes that if the mentor is the
mentee’s line manager there ought to be specific pay-offs in terms of performance, efficiency or productivity.

However, there are substantial generic benefits:

- **Increased loyalty**

  Through mentoring efforts, mentees become aware that the mentor/manager cares for them beyond their ability to contribute to achieving work objectives. They come to realise that the mentor/manager is as concerned as they are about their future. This realisation often results in feelings of increased loyalty towards the mentor/manager and the organisation.

- **Role enhancement and the expansion of skills repertoire**

  Through the mentoring relationship the mentors can, if they are open enough to experience, learn from the mentees such things as different functional or technical skills. Mentees may also have different approaches or styles and may be strong where the mentors are weak.

- **Improved one-to-one communication and a sense of belonging to a team**
As the mentors/managers spend time with their mentees discussing plans for their futures, feelings of uncertainty that the corporate grapevine may have created can be reduced. Mentees are able to communicate group concerns to mentors/managers, thus placing them in a better position to focus on group ‘gripes’ in team problem-solving sessions, or other departmental meetings.

- **Sense of competence and self worth**

_Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 44-45) notes from all the surveys and reviews that he has conducted in recent years to evaluate the outcomes of mentoring programmes, that the most frequent and powerful benefits for mentors can be summarized as follows:_

Mentors learn from the mentoring experience, both when having to explain intuitive reasoning and when listening to a different perspective (that is, problems mentees have with their bosses often cause mentors to reflect on similar issues their direct subordinates may have with them).

Mentoring allows mentors the opportunity to take reflective space in a hectic daily schedule and they have the satisfaction of knowing that they have made a difference to someone else. They also benefit from the intellectual challenge of working on issues for which they do not have to take personal responsibility and that may take them into unfamiliar territory.

### 3.6.3 Benefits to the organisation
Lewis (1996, p. 15) argues that the benefits of mentoring for the organisation “depend[s] to some extent on whether the mentoring is a systematic approach within the organization to deliver specific outcomes – if it is, then the delivery of those outcomes will be to its own benefit.” He further argues that either way, there are some accrued and accumulative benefits within the organisation where there are individuals receiving mentoring support.

The generic benefits that are likely to accrue to the organisation from mentoring programmes include the following:

- **Reduced turnover at a time when quality recruits are hard to find**

When organisations have managed to recruit talented, competent individuals, they want them to stay with the organisation for a reasonable period of time. By providing mentees with advisers who are in senior positions in the organisation, they can be given the reassurance that they will not disappear into the corporate woodwork when the formal mentoring programme is completed. The mentees would not need to concern themselves about a lack of visibility and begin seeking another job shortly after joining the organisation.

- **More effective management development**
As organisations train and develop managers to participate in mentorship programmes it is not only the mentees who will benefit. The managers may well become more effective managers and adopt improved managerial development approaches with all their staff.

- **Empowered employees**

  Equipping mentees with self-development skills and setting them on the track of learning increases their capabilities and their willingness to take responsibility.

- **Enhanced communication**

  Mentoring increases the amount of vertical communication in an organisation and provides a mechanism for modifying or reinforcing organisational culture.

### 3.7 POTENTIAL DOWNSIDES FOR MENTEES AND MENTORS

Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 43-47) points out that despite the numerous benefits of mentoring relationships for both mentee and mentor, there are potential downsides that need to be considered.
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3.7.1 Disadvantages for the mentee

Mentees may become frustrated by mentors who are over-protective about allowing them to make mistakes and to learn from these mistakes. There is evidence that an overbearing mentor is often the cause of young graduates changing organisations. Tensions and conflicts between mentors and line managers may spill over into the mentee’s relationship with either or both. On the other hand, having a line manager and mentor who enjoy a close relationship may also result in the mentee feeling exposed and hesitant to be frank in mentoring discussions.

3.7.2 Disadvantages for the mentor

Clutterbuck (2001, p. 47) points out some of the possible downsides that mentors who try to perform their roles effectively may experience. Mentees may break confidentiality and mentors may resent the fact that similar time and effort is not being invested in their development as they are investing in the development of their mentees. Mentors may experience a loss of face when a succession of mentoring relationships fail (usually a sign of poor mentoring, but occasionally the result of a series of circumstances beyond the control of the mentor). Overdemanding mentees (for example, young graduates who visit their mentors several times a day for reassurance) may cause tension in the mentoring relationship.
Because of the above-listed possible downsides, Clutterbuck (2001, p. 47) advises new mentors to think very carefully before committing to multiple-mentee relationships, as these relationships may not do them justice.

Having considered the value of mentoring as a strategy for management development, together with the benefits of mentoring for the mentee, mentor and the organisation and the potential downsides of mentoring for mentees and mentors, it is necessary to consider the receptiveness of organisations to management development. The organisational climate will have a definite impact on the success or failure of the mentoring programme.

**3.8 RECEPTIVENESS OF ORGANISATIONS TO MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT**

Bell (2000, pp. 52-53) makes the point that we are living in times of turbulent change and many employees are almost daily being influenced by retrenchments, re-organisations, mergers and general uncertainty. He maintains that from these experiences employees may make use of rigid rules in dealing with customers. They may also display compliant behaviour instead of commitment, inflexibility rather than creativity and resistance in lieu of responsibility. Bell (2000) points out that there is one group of employees, the perpetual learners, who remain positive and focused, thriving on discord and turning dissonance into harmony. He further points out that learners are
not only happier employees but also are less likely to disconnect or depart in the face of change and confusion. Bell (2000) quotes philosopher Eric Hoffer who wrote that:

“In-times of massive change, it is the learner who will inherit the Earth, while the learned stay elegantly tied to a world that no longer exists”.

However, organisations are not made up of a majority of perpetual learners and in order to develop a learning climate and foster a culture that encourages learning, requires senior management to fundamentally alter their roles from corporate parent to compassionate partner – it also involves these managers adding coach or mentor to their repertoire.

Prior to commencing a mentoring programme with revenue that is aimed at assisting managers to develop, it is necessary to make a realistic assessment of the learning climate of the organisation. It is necessary for the senior management to compare their view of the organisation’s learning environment with the perception of it by the employees. What may be considered by the senior management to be a very supportive environment may not necessarily be seen the same way by the mentees.

In Session 3 - Organizational Context, designed and developed by International Management Centers (1999, pp. 1-3), the following issues are
proposed as indicators of an appropriate organisational learning climate, which is conducive to effective mentoring.

- Has senior management committed sufficient resources for the programme and agreed to accept the possible consequences of the process being undertaken?
- How willing is senior management to devote the necessary financial and time resources to the development process? An organisation that is unwilling to invest as necessary to run a programme or is unwilling to “surrender” its managers for the necessary time is unlikely to provide a stable and worthwhile learning environment.
- Are senior managers actively involved in the mentoring programme as counterparts?
- Is the programme seen as something that managers do in isolation and bring back to the organisation? It is essential that the organisation does not wash its hands of the development process by thinking that, having paid fees and expenses, the rest is up to the mentee.
- When problems arise at work does the organisation see them as too serious to use as a project on the programme? If sponsors see real problems simply as a way of employing the intelligence of managers and stimulating them, then the effectiveness of the programme is in serious jeopardy. Implementation of results is the key determinant as, for example, where an organisation selects problems or issues for mentees that are beyond their reach in terms of likely involvement in implementation.
• What plan has the organisation made for dealing with raised expectations among mentees? Raising abilities also raises expectations. This is a major source of stress between a mentor and the mentee’s manager. The probability of management development should be considered in advance, rather than reacting to disagreements or friction later in the course of a programme.

Finally, the organisation must show specific commitment to the individual. It is almost inevitable, however, that in raising the abilities of managers, expectations will also be raised. This may range from individual career expectations to a more fundamental questioning of the objectives, purpose and strategy of the organisation. Recognising and dealing with such changed expectations is a vital part of planning management development programmes.

Before concluding this chapter, it is necessary to consider strategies for identifying management development needs that can be addressed by mentoring programmes aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

3.9 IDENTIFYING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED BY MENTORING PROGRAMMES
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The mentoring programme cannot exist in isolation; it needs to function within the wider framework of employee development and human resource management. It is therefore necessary that in identifying management development needs for the organisation, strategic human resource plans, succession and employment equity and skills development plans are taken into consideration.

The following strategies can be adopted in order to identify specific management development needs:

3.9.1 Consider strategic human resource plans

Strategic human resource planning should be an integral part of business planning. Top management expects human resource activities to be closely aligned to the organisation’s mission.

Strategic human resource planning can add value toward achieving these goals. Armstrong (2000, pp. 311-315) maintains that this can be accomplished via the human resource planning function, which is the process of systematically reviewing human resource requirements to ensure that the required number of employees, with the required skills are available when and where they are needed. The human resource planning process, which is preceded by strategic planning, involves matching the internal and external supply of people with job openings anticipated in the organisation over a specified period of time.
Mondy et al. (2002, p. 102) indicate that specific quantitative and qualitative human resource planning which has two components, namely requirements and availability, is determined from organisational plans. These plans define projected changes in the type of activities carried out by the organisation and the scale of these activities. They also identify core competencies that the organisation needs to achieve its goals and therefore its resource and skills requirements. Human resource planning interprets these plans in terms of people requirements.

In undertaking the forecasting function of the planning process, attempts must be made to determine the number and type of employees needed by skill level and location. Once employee requirements and availability have been analysed, the organisation can establish whether it will have a surplus or shortage of employees.

### 3.9.2 Consider managerial succession plans

Because of the tremendous legislative and other changes that are currently confronting South African organisations, succession planning is taking on more importance. Hendry (1995, p. 117) maintains that the process, which involves ensuring that a qualified person is available to assume a managerial position once the position is vacant, should cater for promoting untimely deaths, resignations, terminations or the orderly retirement of organisational managers. These plans should be considered to assist in the selection of
individuals to participate in mentoring programmes that are designed to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

3.9.3 Consider employment equity and skills development plans

In Section 2.3 it was indicated that the main thrust of the Employment Equity Plan is to establish and implement measures that aim at ensuring that suitable individuals with the correct qualifications are selected from within the designated groups. It was also emphasised that the equity plans must ensure that groups have “equal employment opportunities and are equally represented in all occupational levels”. By making an analysis of the equity plans, the mentoring programme co-ordinator is able to establish the extent and emphasis of mentoring activities required to meet affirmative action targets with specific reference to numerical goals.

The mentoring programme co-ordinator can also use his or her knowledge of the Skills Development Act (Act 97 of 1998) to compile plans to retain and develop individuals from designated groups, in order to ensure that specific numerical goals, particularly at the management level, are achieved.

3.10 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this chapter was to consider the rationale for using mentoring as a management development strategy. The approach adopted to achieve this
The aim was to identify arguments supporting the adoption of mentoring as a developmental strategy. This was done by first considering the impact of the changing world of work. Secondly, benefits to be gained from mentoring activities by mentees, mentors and managers and the organisation were discussed. Potential downsides of the mentoring relationship for mentees and mentors were also considered. It was clear from this study that despite the possible downsides of the mentoring relationship for mentees and mentors, there are definite potential pay-offs to be derived from mentoring programmes if correctly instituted, managed and maintained.

In the next chapter various aspects of the mentoring programme will be discussed. Competencies required of mentors and mentees to ensure the success of the programme will be identified. Approaches for selecting mentees and mentors together with different approaches for matching mentees with mentors will also be considered. Various approaches to mentoring and suggestions for constructively ending a mentoring relationship will also be addressed. The chapter concludes with a critical analysis of mentoring and a presentation of guidelines for ensuring the success of formal mentoring programmes.
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THE MENTORING PROGRAMME

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter consideration was given to the history of mentoring as well as the impact of the changing world of work on mentoring activities. The chapter also considered arguments supporting mentoring as a strategy for management development. The benefits of mentoring for the mentee, mentor and the organisation were discussed as well as the role of coaching in mentoring.

This chapter addresses the various role players and aspects of the mentoring programme that need to be considered when developing the programme. The process of matching mentees with mentors, the various phases of the mentoring programme and the importance of mentoring relationships will be discussed. Alternative approaches to mentoring and the process for dissolving mentoring relationships will be considered. The chapter will conclude with a critical analysis of mentoring.
4.2 THE MENTOR

In order to understand how a mentoring programme functions, it is necessary to be aware of the characteristics of mentors and the different roles that they are expected to play.

4.2.1 Competencies of mentors

A vast number of articles and other written material about mentoring have appeared over the last few years. In this section a summary of the skills, qualities and attributes required of mentors is given (Bell, 2000, pp. 133-134; Clutterbuck, 2001, pp. 51-67; Lewis, 1996, pp. 38-39; Pegg, 1999, pp. 136-139; Stone, 1999, pp. 172-173; Tyler, 1998, pp. 98-103).

Mentors earn credibility generally by being older than their mentees, having a track record of success, being viewed as street-wise and knowing their way around the system, through their expertise. Mentors need good communication, interpersonal skills and the ability to tune into others’ ideas, views and feelings. In addition, mentors must be individuals who have management experience and competencies, or alternatively, who have developed an understanding of management practices and pressures through their experience of working with managers in the organisation.
Mentors must be able to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things, to contribute more fully and have a greater share in what is going on in their organisations. Mentors should be available to mentees as and when required. Besides being accessible, mentors need to be willing to commit time and emotion to the mentoring relationship. In this regard Bell (2000, p.133) argues: “Great mentors are not always rational beings; they are often flame seekers – they give passionate birth in the face of threatening circumstances.” There are occasions when the mentor needs to stir the mentee with fire rather than motivate with reasoning.

Mentors require a high degree of self-awareness in order to recognise and manage their own behaviours within the helping relationship and to use empathy appropriately. Clutterbuck (2001, p. 53) believes that good humour, and laughter when used appropriately by the mentor, is invaluable in developing rapport, in helping mentees to see matters from a different perspective and to release emotional tension. This quality or competency is most useful in assisting the mentor and mentee to enjoy the time that they spend interacting with one another.

By having clear personal goals, mentors are able to assist mentees in setting and achieving their goals. In addition, mentors need to have a genuine
interest in achieving through others and helping others recognise and attain their potential.

Mentors can assist mentees to manage their relationships by having reasonably good insight into behaviour patterns between individuals and groups of people. Mentors must also be able to be trusted and focussed on the needs of mentees, practice empathy and acknowledge and accept mentees' goals. Lastly, mentors should aim at empowering mentees by helping them to stand on their own feet as soon as possible.

In addition to the above-mentioned competencies, Berry (1998, pp. 7-8) identifies important criteria for mentors. He suggests that for the mentoring relationship to achieve its goal, the mentor needs to be in a position of authority and to have achieved a degree of success in the organisation. Berry (1998, p.7) argues that mentors must be authorities in their fields as mentoring aims partly at transferring knowledge and experience from a seasoned organisation member to an inexperienced one. However, the knowledge and experience that are transferred must be relevant, accurate and worthwhile. The mentor also needs to be in a position of influence. By having a recognised ‘voice’ in the organisation and by being close to lines of authority and power, mentors can impact on the success or failure of the mentee’s personal development programme.

Lastly, Berry (1998, p. 7) suggests that mentors should have a genuine interest in the growth of the mentee. The mentor must develop insight into the
mentee’s goals and ensure congruence of these goals with the organisation’s goals.

In the next section the various roles of mentors will be discussed.

4.2.2 The roles of mentors

From the literature it is quite apparent that the specific roles that mentors could be expected to play would to a great extent be dictated to by the organisational environment of the mentor. The roles and duties of mentors as defined from the research findings of Ganser (1997, pp. 1-11) and the guidelines for mentors developed by the South African Institute of Measurement and Control (1998) are summarised as follows:

- Support and encouragement

The primary role of the mentor is to help mentees to ‘find their own style’ of operating by encouraging them to indulge in some experimentation. Mentors can greatly assist mentees by willingly sharing their work experiences. Many of the individuals who participated in Ganser’s research project consistently highlighted the role of the mentor as being “someone who is always there and to whom the mentee can turn for support, encouragement and advice – someone to listen to them when they are frustrated and upset or discouraged” (Ganser, 1997, p. 8).
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- Guidance and advice on career planning, professional development and training opportunities

Mentors should provide advice on specific avenues that are available for the mentee’s future. The mentor should encourage mentees to participate in continuing academic education by attending specialist programmes related to their career plans.

- Guidance on networking within the organisation and their professions

From many years of working and related experience the mentor would have built up a valuable network of contacts. These contacts should be shared with the mentee as and when necessary.

- Advice on new challenges and new technologies

Mentors can use their knowledge and experience to guide the mentee to known experts or to reference books.
• **Support for achieving aspirations**

By developing a friendly, supportive relationship with the mentee, the mentor develops a climate in which the mentee feels free to consult him/her as necessary without fear of an inappropriate response.

Having considered the various roles of the mentor, it is necessary to point out that in order to avoid clashes between the mentor and the mentee’s line manager it is necessary for the mentor and the line manager to be clear about where the boundaries of their responsibility towards the mentee lie.

While considering the roles of mentors, it is necessary to realise that a natural tendency by mentors after they have been matched, may well be to rush into a process of setting personal short and long term developmental objectives for the mentee without the line manager (mentee’s superior) being involved in the process. Parsloe and Wray (2000, p. 84) make the important point that the final responsibility for the mentee’s personal development does not lie with the mentor but with the mentee and his or her supervisor.

Based on their studies of a structured mentoring programme introduced at Douglas Aircraft Company, Geiger-Dumond and Boyle (1995, p. 51) suggest that prior to mentees and mentors getting together to formulate developmental plans, mentees should firstly meet with their immediate
superiors for a personal-development discussion. This discussion should cover the mentee’s strengths and limitations, his or her development interests, specific skills that they will want to develop for the future and a development plan.

The involvement of the mentee’s immediate superior at this stage of the programme will ensure that the superior understands the goals of the programme and the roles of the mentor and mentee. Before the mentoring relationship commences between the mentor and mentee, it is necessary that the mentor makes direct contact with the mentee’s superior to discuss the mentee’s development objectives. During the meeting between the mentor and the mentee’s superior, they can use the opportunity to clarify where the boundaries of their responsibility towards the mentee lie. Clarifying these boundaries can assist in preventing a deliberate manipulation of the two of them by the mentee.

Once the mentee and his or her immediate superior have met to discuss the mentee’s personal development programme and the mentor and the mentee’s superior have met to clarify the mentee’s personal development programme, the mentor and the mentee can commence their mentoring relationship.

Geiger-Dumond and Boyle (1995, p. 51) reason that the objectives set by the supervisor and the mentee serve as the starting point for the first few discussions between the mentor and the mentee. These discussions can
assist in confirming the mentor and mentee’s expectations of the mentoring relationship. The discussion can also, in many cases, serve as an icebreaker, which can be particularly important if the mentor and mentee do not already know each other.

Together, the mentor and mentee can develop simple goals for the mentoring relationship, based on the objectives set by the supervisor and the mentee.

Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 88-89) believes that typical starting objectives might include the following:

- Introducing mentees to other parallel functions or departments whose work they will need to understand to progress. This exposure may open the mentee’s eyes to potential sideways moves in the organisation.

- Helping mentees to break down seemingly impossible or far-fetched goals into a series of more tangible tasks that they can begin to address.

- Having a planned route-map of the experience, skills and competencies they need to gather, mentees can enter onto a self-development or career management path with greater confidence and commitment.
• Helping mentees think through how to raise their personal profile where it matters in the organisation.

• Helping mentees to think through how to apply in practice what they are learning through theoretical study.

• Gaining a real understanding of the career choices that face mentees and the implications of each career choice.

As the relationship develops and as the mentee’s needs change, the objectives will be defined and adopted. There also needs to be a commitment to the ground rules that are established for the relationship.

Parsloe and Wray (2000, p. 84) emphasize that although the mentor may be involved at any stage during the preparation of the mentee’s development programme, the mentor has no direct responsibility or accountability for the mentee’s performance. The role of the mentor should be to confirm the personal development programme by providing guidance, access to information and acting as a sounding board to the mentee.

The following section will discuss mentees in terms of who would want to be mentored, the competencies of mentees and procedures for selecting mentees.
4.3 THE MENTEE

In selecting individuals to be mentored, it is important to consider who would want to be mentored and why, together with the competencies identified for mentees.

4.3.1 Who would want to be mentored and why?

Hamilton (1994, p. 12) asks: When does an individual not need a mentor? He argues that “it is not unreasonable to assume that unless the employee is over the age of thirty-five, there is never the situation where a mentor is not useful”. He does acknowledge though, that if individuals are content in their jobs and do not want to move up the hierarchy since they feel that they are receiving sufficient reward in their jobs, then they do not need a mentor. However, it is possible that under such circumstances, being exposed to a mentor can lead to greater satisfaction and perhaps new developments.

Hamilton (1994) further argues that another situation in which mentoring may not be necessary is when the organisational chart is firmly in place and everyone is in position. However, he notes that this is very infrequently the situation in any organisation and it may thus be wise for individuals to prepare themselves for any eventuality.
Laferla (1998, pp. 26-35) found that most managers do not fail because they lack financial acumen, marketing knowledge or management skills, but rather that the most common reason for their failure is an excessive ego drive characterised by misplaced ambition that is narcissistic and self-serving. Laferla’s (1998) findings also present an argument for effective mentoring at all levels of the organisation.

Bennet (2000, p. 1) makes a strong case for providing coaching and mentoring for individuals at the top of the organisational ladder. Personal development does not stop when people reach the top. She makes the point that it is often assumed that there is not much left to learn when an individual reaches the lonely pinnacle of his or her organisation and that asking for advice or guidance can indicate weakness or vulnerability. Bennet (2000, p. 2) believes that these assumptions can be very wrong as this is the time when an individual possibly “most needs a helping hand to weather the stresses and expectations of the top job, especially in the early days and in the context of today’s fast changing business environment.” Ironically, this is the time when individuals are least likely to receive coaching and mentoring.

Bennet (2000, p.3) suggests that coaching and mentoring programmes should not be ‘just another fad.’ If these programmes are used grandly and randomly or are not really clear or focused on the specific programme objectives, individuals will pay lip service to them. These days younger and
younger individuals are moving into executive positions equipped with certain specific skills but not the experience to lead and manage. Coaching and mentoring programmes have an important role to play in the war for talent as they continue to develop individuals who are already successful so as to retain them particularly at a time when organisations are actively poaching previously disadvantaged individuals to fill senior management positions.

4.3.2 Competencies of mentees

In section 4.2.1 the skills, qualities and attributes of an effective mentor were considered. It is now necessary to ask the question: What competencies are necessary for mentees?

Below is a summary of competencies suggested by Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 66-67) and Stone, (1999, p. 171). Mentors should: possess sound interpersonal skills while mentees must

- be able to make new alliances for the mentor and retain those that the mentor has already established,
- have a track record of success,
- be able to take risks and be keen to take on new challenges,
- have demonstrated their intelligence and initiative in previous jobs,
- have the ability to identify and rapidly solve business problems,
- be loyal to the organisation and committed to its values,
- share with their managers/mentors a desire to achieve results,
4.3.3 Selecting mentees

Tyler (1998, pp. 98-103) makes a valuable point which can serve as a useful guide to South African organisations when embark ing on mentoring programmes, particularly with the objective of fast tracking individuals from designated groups to meet employment equity objectives. She suggests that mentee candidates should be chosen on the basis of potential, not simply on race or gender. She argues that although mentoring programmes can be a useful and effective tool for increasing minority representation, limiting enrolment to one ethnic and gender group can cause resentment among employees and may result in some qualified candidates being overlooked.
Tyler (1998) recommends that if organisations are planning to embark on mentoring programmes, they should start with a diverse pilot group, for example, a group of graduate trainees or all new recruits. Once the programme has been completed and proved to be successful the organisation can move on to other specific work or task-related groups.

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, pp. 89-90) stress that in terms of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) the following should be borne in mind when recruiting individuals from designated groups:

“...suitably qualified for a job is determined by any one of or a combination of formal qualifications, prior learning, relevant experience or capacity to acquire within a reasonable time, the ability to do the job. Discrimination on the grounds of lack of relevant experience alone, is considered to be unfair discrimination.”

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, pp. 89-90) further advise that good practice in terms of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) regarding recruitment and selection includes the following:

- Advertising internally prior to advertising in the broader marketplace;
- Ensuring that the choice of advertising/recruitment agencies and media used for advertisements are compatible with Employment Equity principles.
• Ensuring that competencies are clearly defined (the potential of a prospective candidate to achieve an expected standard within a reasonable time must be considered);

• Ensuring that selection panels are sufficiently diverse across a range of criteria such as gender, race, functions etc. in order to fully capture the potential that a prospective candidate may have to offer the organisation;

• Targeting individuals from designated groups;

• Avoidance of psychometric or psychological tests or any other means of assessment that may not be culturally fair.

It is essential that organisations heed to the stipulations of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) when recruiting and selecting mentees to participate in the mentoring programme.

4.4 MATCHING MENTEES WITH MENTORS

In considering mentoring programmes and the factors that determine success or failure, it can be argued with reasonable confidence that the key determinant of success is that of finding a good match between mentor and mentee. Tabbron, Macaulay and Cook (1997, p. 9) support this argument by stating that matching of mentors with mentees is one of the key factors in successful mentoring programmes. In this regard two important questions that need to be asked are firstly: What is the definition of a good match in terms of
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whether or not the relationship from ‘the match’ supports and leads to learning on the part of mentor and mentee, and secondly, What approaches should be used by the organisation for matching mentors and mentees?

The literature suggests a range of approaches for matching mentors and mentees. Tabbron et al. (1997, p. 9) encourage mentees to self-select a mentor from a list of mentors or to use a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees with mentors based on registration forms. Hale (2000, pp. 223-224), on the other hand, notes that “some organizations will use a largely laissez-faire approach and allow mentor/mentee relationships to simply evolve and then offer support to allow relationships to hopefully flourish. Other organizations will take a very interventionist approach, using certain criteria to match the mentor with the mentee and the decision regarding pairing is actually taken by the third party, in many cases the Human Resources department”. Hale (2000) suggests that somewhere in between these extremes lies a middle ground where the third party facilitates the pairing of mentor and mentee by providing support and guidance but allowing the actual decision to be taken by the mentor and mentee.

Cox (2000, pp. 202-210) describes an approach used to recruit and select mentors for community based mentoring schemes. The approach could serve as a useful guide to organisations operating in the business arena. The following steps were used:
Individuals were invited to apply for the mentoring programme by means of a leaflet, which was sent to them. The wording on the leaflet was deliberately designed to appeal to the applicants’ sense of altruism with phrases such as:

- “A chance to help someone develop and move forward”;

- “Satisfaction from helping someone”;

- “Commitment to offer support and encouragement to others’. A mentor was defined on the leaflet as “someone who is open and accepting, supports and encourages, uses their own experiences in a positive way, empowers people to do things for themselves and helps people through an important decision”.

On receipt of the application forms, potential mentors were interviewed and assessed using an interview schedule.

One of the interviewers on the panel suggested that applicants could be graphically grouped as follows:
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Individuals in the first group who were not ready to be mentors, were often carrying a lot of emotional baggage and were in need of help and support themselves. They were described as “squares” and were seen as having a ‘chip on their shoulders’ or ‘needing the corners knocked off’ before they would be ready for development as mentors.
On the other hand, the second group, described as the “oval” people, already had a sufficient degree of personal integrity, self-control, self-confidence and ability to influence others. These individuals were considered to be ready for the type of training provided by the project, which would equip them to become fully functioning mentors.

The third grouping, were seen as having all the qualities necessary to effectively perform as mentors.

Cox (2000) maintains that the model suggests that for applicants to be ready to participate in the training, they needed to be operating at a level of what is called ‘emotional competence’; that is, having an understanding of self which could be equated with being comfortable ‘in your own skin’. Cox adds that individuals not yet ready to be trained as mentors are likely to need to work through the deficiencies of three forms of early learning which limit or undermine development: omitted learning, distorted learning and distressed learning. Megginsen (2000, p. 256) supports Cox’s intuition concerning emotional competence by arguing that mentors, even more than instructors and coaches, need a high level of emotional intelligence in order to use their own experience wisely in the service of the mentee.

Tabbron et al. (1997, p. 9) found that where the organisation matched a mentor with a mentee based on the assessment of the profile of the mentee, considerable dissatisfaction resulted. A revision to the selection process
resulted in the mentees selecting mentors and justifying their choices. An approach used by another organisation in assigning a mentor to a mentee, was to wait several months to get to know new employees before assigning them mentors.

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 96) believe that ideally mentors should be selected by the mentees themselves. Mentors should be individuals whom the mentees judge to be good role models of skill and competence, and ones who will support them in both career development and in the utilisation of unique skills, styles and insights that they bring to the organisation in the achievement of corporate objectives. Thomas and Robertshaw stress that where mentoring is used for development in order to achieve Employment Equity Act objectives, the relationship should be based on mutual respect, not paternalism. Because the process of matching mentees with mentors is considered the key determinant of the success or failure of the mentoring programme, careful consideration needs to be given to the strategies that the organisation will use in this process.

4.5 PHASES OF THE MENTORING PROGRAMME

Kram (1997) as cited by Kreitner, Kinicki and Buelens (2002, pp. 70-72) identified four phases of the mentoring process: (1) initiation, (2) cultivation, (3) separation and (4) redefinition (see Table 4.1).
As indicated in Table 4.1 the phases involve variable rather than fixed time periods. Kram (1997) believes that telltale turning points signal the evolution from one phase to the next. For example, when a mentee begins to resist guidance and strives to work more autonomously, the separation process begins. These phases are set out in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>TURNING POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIATION</td>
<td>A period of six months to a year during which time the relationship gets started and begins to have importance for both managers.</td>
<td>Fantasies become concrete expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations are met: senior manager provides coaching, challenging work, visibility; junior manager provides technical assistance, respect and desire to be coached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are opportunities for interaction around work tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTIVATION</td>
<td>A period of two to five years during which time the range of career and psycho-social functions provided expand to a maximum.</td>
<td>Both individuals continue to benefit from the relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for meaningful and more frequent interaction increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional bond deepens and intimacy increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATION</td>
<td>A period of six months to two years after a significant change in the structural role relationship and/or the emotional experience of the relationship</td>
<td>Junior manager no longer wants guidance but rather the opportunity to work more autonomously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior manager faces midlife crisis and is less available to provide mentoring functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job rotation or promotion limits opportunities for continued interaction; career and psychosocial functions can no longer be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blocked opportunity creates resentment and hostility that disrupts positive interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.1: Kram’s Four-Phase Mentoring Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REDEFINITION</th>
<th>Stresses of separation diminish and new relationships are formed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The mentor relationship is no longer needed in its previous form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resentment and anger diminish, gratitude and appreciation increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer status is achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An indefinite phase after the separation phase, during which time the relationship is ended or takes on significantly different characteristics, making it a more peer-like friendship.

Source: Kreitner, Kinicki and Buelens (2002, p.79)
By understanding the four phases of the mentoring process together with the telltale turning points in the phases identified by Kram (1997), in Kreitner et al. (2002, pp. 70-72), mentors and mentees can be sensitive to the need for possibly altering the way in which their mentoring relationship is functioning in order to accommodate changes and developments occurring with both the mentor and the mentee.

4.6 MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

Kreitner et al. (2002, pp. 78-80) have uncovered two key findings from research that has investigated the dynamics associated with the establishment of mentoring: Firstly, mentoring relationships were more likely to form when the mentor and mentee possessed similar attitudes, philosophies, personalities, interests, backgrounds and education. Secondly, the most common cross-gender relationship involved a male mentor and female mentee. Their belief is that this trend occurred for three reasons:

- There is an under-representation of women in executive-level positions.
- Women perceive more negative drawbacks to becoming mentors than did men.
- There are a number of individual, group and organisational barriers that inhibit mentoring relationships for diverse employees.

Tsukudu (1996, pp. 13–18) makes a strong case for making use of mentoring programmes to establish developmental relationships to provide much needed support for the enhancement of individual career development and organisational experience particularly for blacks and women managers who
are currently faced with a lack of upward mobility in South African organisations. Tsukudu (1996) examined the influence of race and gender in forming developmental relationships. He makes the following four suggestions for forming developmental relationships in the South African context:

- White male mentors need to make a paradigm shift if mentoring is to be effective in assisting women and black managers in their development and organisational upward mobility.
- Training programmes need to be developed for mentors.
- Women and black managers need to exert themselves in the mentoring relationship for it to be of mutual benefit.
- Women and black managers need to understand that mentors are at one end of a continuum of advisory or supportive relationships that facilitate access to powerful management positions.

Tsukudu (1996, p. 14) believes that mentoring relationships can serve a number of functions. For example, mentors can act as advisers and sounding boards for mentees and assist mentees to navigate the politics and culture of the organisation by serving as a conduit between the organisation and the mentee through providing special access to information, contacts and resources. Mentors can also exploit their established power base and use this power on behalf of the mentees to facilitate the expansion of the mentees’ spheres of influence within the organisation. In addition, mentors can serve as friend, role model, counselor and coach and act as a buffer between the mentee and the organisation by protecting the mentee against ‘corporate political’ attack.
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Hendricks (2001, p. 11) provides the following checklist that can be used by organisations to ensure that mentoring relationships have the best chance of succeeding:

- Participation is voluntary – the relationship can be terminated at any time without fear of punishment.
- The person being mentored can choose from a variety of qualified mentors.
- Mentors are selected on the basis of their track records in developing people, willingness to serve as a mentor, and evidence of positive mentoring, communication and listening skills.
- The purpose of the mentoring relationship is clearly understood by all involved.
- A minimum level of contact between the mentor and the person being mentored is specified.
- People being mentored are encouraged to make contact with one another and network to discuss problems and share successes.
- The mentoring relationship is evaluated – through interviews, questionnaires etc; information is gathered, analysed and interpreted and the results shared so that the appropriate corrective action can be taken.
- Staff/employee development is rewarded which sends a signal that mentoring (as well as other developmental activities) is worth the time and effort.

4.7 THE ROLE OF THE MENTORING PROGRAMME CO-ORDINATOR
In organisations where formalised mentoring programmes are introduced, there are usually four individuals involved in the process, constituting a mentoring quadrangle: the mentee, the mentor, the line manager, and the mentoring programme co-ordinator, who monitors the mentoring relationships and establishes resources for training opportunities. The mentoring quadrangle is depicted in Figure 4.2:

![Mentoring Quadrangle Diagram](image)
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Figure 4.2: The Mentoring Quadrangle

Source: Clutterbuck (2001, p. 74)

The roles of the mentor, line manager and mentee in the mentoring process have already been considered. However, it is necessary to consider the important role played by the mentoring programme co-ordinator. Many mentoring programmes fail because the organisation has not assigned a specific individual with the tasks of serving as a formal link between participants and top management, being the primary source of troubleshooting for relationships in difficulty, and providing support mechanisms.

Clutterbuck (2001, p. 97) suggests that the key activities of the mentoring programme co-ordinator include managing the publicity for the scheme and
the recruitment of mentors and mentees, arranging initial training and follow-up, and maintaining the website, where there is one. They can also administer the matching process and any reassignments that are needed, ensure that measurement and review processes take place, manage the budgets and quality control processes and act as the public face of the programme to audiences inside and outside the organisation.

Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 95–97) and Chesterman (2001, p. 88) both believe that there is a risk in the mentoring programme co-ordinator attempting to over-bureaucratise what is essentially an informal process through the drawing up of formal mentoring contracts. There is nevertheless a need for the mentor and mentee to discuss the relationship objectives, their expectations of one another and how they will manage the relationship.

Below is a brief summary of some of the issues that Chesterman (2001) and Clutterbuck (2001) suggest that the mentoring programme co-ordinator can discuss with mentors and mentees at an orientation session in order to establish the ground rules for their relationship:

• Are we clear about each other’s expectations?
• How often should we meet?
• Where should we meet?
• How formal or informal do we want our meetings to be?
• What topics will we discuss?
• Who will take primary responsibility for making meeting arrangements?
• Are we both willing to give honest and timely feedback?
• Do we both agree to abide by the rules of confidentiality?
• What are we prepared to tell others about our relationship/discussions?
• How long will the mentoring relationship last?
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- How do we ensure that the mentee’s line manager is supportive?
- What termination procedures can we use if either of us does not wish to continue with the relationship?

It is naive to assume that once the mentors and mentees have been selected and the process of matching mentors with mentees has been completed, the mentoring programme can be left to run itself. The programme needs to be maintained and consistently monitored to ensure that the mentor, mentee and the organisation all benefit from the programme. The mentoring programme co-ordinator can play a valuable role in performing this function, with the support of senior management.

4.8 ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO MENTORING

Organisations need to be aware of alternative approaches that can be used besides the traditional one-on-one, face-to-face mentoring approach that is used by most organisations. Below is a discussion of these alternative approaches.

4.8.1 Group mentoring

Kaye and Jacobson (1995, pp. 23-27) argue that “Despite the fact that organizational mentoring programs have gained widespread acclaim for the past two decades as a way to grow high-potential employees and to offer women and minorities advantages from programs which were generally reserved for the ‘old boys’ network,’ that acclaim was soon replaced by doubt and dismay.”
The reasons that they give for this doubt and dismay are the following:

- Many formal one-on-one mentoring programmes have trouble tapping into the subtle but essential personal chemistry found in successful, informal mentor relationships.

- Few organisational reward systems support the process.

- One-on-one relationships can actually narrow the opportunities for employees whose development requires diverse networks – including peer support.

- In many organisations there are a lack of potential mentors – particularly for women in need of mentoring. Same-gender mentoring support is simply not available from the higher levels of many organisations.

Kaye and Jacobson (1995, p. 24) suggest that there is a great need for some form of mentoring to accelerate the developmental process for individuals. Organisations need to consider developing mentoring strategies that build on the traditional organisational mentoring models, while curbing the disadvantages. An alternative approach to traditional mentoring, which normally functions with isolated twosomes, is interactive mentoring groups. The way that an interactive mentoring group would function is as follows:

A group of four to six less-experienced mentees are assigned to a successful organisation veteran. These individuals exchange ideas, analyse their development issues and receive feedback and guidance as a group. Through these group activities these individuals bond as a group and build team–
development skills and interpersonal-interaction skills that have important applications on the job.

This mentoring group becomes a ‘learning group’ with the members interacting with peers as well as gaining exposure to the mentor or learning leader. These groups show several advantages over traditional one-to-one mentoring systems.

Firstly, as the learning leader meets with a group of individuals, there is less chance of falling into dependency relationships that might become problematic, for example, when circumstances break up a twosome or when a mentor falls from grace in the organisation. The learning group can also diffuse issues of personal–chemistry mismatch. The mentor/mentee bond becomes a group bond, emphasizing interrelationships among all group members. The learning group approach spreads responsibility for learning and leading among many peers as well as the learning leader. The richness of experience is multiplied by the number in the group. Kaye and Jacobson (1995, p. 26) also believe that the selected groups should have a diverse racial and gender representation to foster different ways of thinking about careers and success.

With the learning group approach the learning leaders act as partners rather than ‘patriarchs’. Their experience and knowledge facilitates learning and group growth. They accomplish that task in many ways by:

- helping the group build agendas;
- offering suggestions for discussion topics and learning projects;
- asking questions to keep the dialogue thought-provoking and meaningful;
- offering advice from experience when asked;
• offering active support through connecting mentees with others in the organisation;

• providing candid feedback to individual group members.

4.8.2 Peer mentoring

While the value of formal mentoring processes (despite certain limitations) is recognised, the value of informal learning is receiving increasing recognition. One such approach that is appropriate for continuing professional development is peer mentoring. McDougall and Beattie (1998, p. 56), Peters (1996, p. 39), and Siegel (2000, pp. 243-253) make a strong case for the value of peer mentoring under certain circumstances. Their research findings and opinions related to peer mentoring can be summarized as follows:

Whereas traditional mentoring takes place between a more senior and experienced individual (the mentor) and a less experienced, more junior employee (the mentee), peer mentoring relationships involve individuals at the same career or professional level. These individuals meet on a regular basis and share experiences, ideas and concerns and engage honestly in reflective practice. The focus of their mentoring is on coaching and career and personal life development.

Siegel (2000, p.243) states that the attrition that generally accompanies corporate restructuring reduces the number of available mentors, which in turn reduces the amount of verbal communication. Peer mentors thus help fill this void by providing both critical horizontal communications and traditional functions. McDougall and Beattie (1998, p. 56) found that numerous learning and personal benefits accrue for individuals through peer mentoring relationships. These benefits include having a sounding board and confidante, giving support and a different perspective, confidence building, mutual learning, increased motivation, networking, friendship and help with managing stress. Siegel’s (2000, p. 243) research findings are somewhat in line with those of McDougall and Beattie (1998, p. 56). He found that particularly within the context of organisational and task uncertainty that a
merger creates, the functions that are formed by peer relationships are almost exclusively concentrated in the psycho-social area. These psycho-social functions involve the development of personal feelings of confidence, competence and job acceptance as well as assisting in the career enhancing function by strengthening the individual’s ability to become a leader in his or her profession.

Peters (1996, p. 39) makes a strong case for executives seeking out peers to coach and mentor them. The mentor can assist the executive to examine his or her strengths and less admirable qualities. Peer mentors can help executives to identify the changes that they need to make and help them to formulate approaches for growth and improvement. Using a coaching approach, the peer mentor can:

- Assist executives to identify meaningful and appropriate goals based on effective feedback.
- Provide feedback on the executive’s performance with regard to his or her goals.
- Help executives to interpret organisational issues surrounding their job functions.
- Act as a sounding board for new ideas that can assist the executives in accomplishing their goals.
- Set up exercises for enabling executives to practice new behaviours in low-risk situations.

Peters (1996, p. 39) states that by making use of a coaching model in mentoring an executive, the peer mentor can create a “performance partnership” with the executive – a partnership for a new behaviour, increased organisational effectiveness and enhanced personal productivity.

Siegel (2000, p. 244) cites Kram’s (1985) intensive review of pairs of junior and senior managers who were involved in mentoring relationships. The study found that subordinate and peer relationships could provide alternatives to mentoring relationships particularly when mentoring relationships ended, changed or failed to meet critical developmental needs.
From his study of relationships during corporate mergers in two large accounting organisations, Siegel (2000) found that peer interactions could be compared to mentoring relationships. He also found that individuals are likely to have more peer than mentor relationships in the rapidly developing, hierarchical, corporate culture resulting from mergers. Further findings from Siegel’s (2000, p. 249) study indicate that peer relationships:

- provide many developmental benefits, several of which are similar to those observed in conventional mentoring relationships;
- satisfy psycho-social needs and can support individuals’ notions of competence and confidence in their professional careers;
- often offer emotional support by mutual counseling during periods of rapid transition and stress;
- often offer peers the opportunity to provide personal feedback to one another to assist in understanding management style, learning how to influence other individuals in the organisation, and finding out how they manage their work;
- unlike mentoring, afford a degree of mutual relationship to help managers to be both receivers and givers of information during their careers, thus developing a continuing sense of competence and identity.

Siegel (2000, pp. 249-251) describes the following three categories of peer relationships that were identified from his studies:

- **INFORMATION PEER**

  This relationship is characterised by low levels of trust or commitment. In this category, individuals benefit most from exchanging information about their work and the organisation and receive only occasional confirmation and emotional support. The relationship offers a limited social function by providing some degree of familiarity or friendship. However, it offers almost no career or psycho-social support, which is dependent on the quality and quantity of information, relevance, reliability and other factors.

- **COLLEGIAL PEER**
This relationship is characterized by moderate amounts of trust and self-disclosure, which couples information-sharing with increased amounts of emotional support, feedback and confirmation. In this relationship individuals often participate in more intimate conversations about work and personal concerns, providing greater opportunity for confirmation and validation of self-worth. Aid is also provided in terms of career strategies, feedback and collegiality, as well as emotional support and confirmation.

- **SPECIAL PEER**

This relationship is characterised by a form of intimacy which uses self-expression and self-disclosure to provide the widest range of career-enhancing and psycho-social support. In this relationship individuals are able to talk through their frustrations, share successes and assist one another with major decisions and problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL PEER</th>
<th>INFORMATION PEER</th>
<th>COLLEGIAL PEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LATE CAREER</td>
<td>Maintaining knowledge</td>
<td>Assuming consultative role; seeking others as experts</td>
<td>Preparing for retirement; reviewing the past; assessing one’s career and life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CAREER</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Developing subordinates; passing on wisdom</td>
<td>Threats of obsolescence; reassessment and redirection; work/family conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>Preparing for advancement, gaining visibility</td>
<td>Gaining recognition; identifying advancement opportunities</td>
<td>Sense of competence and potential commitment; conformity vs. individuality; work/family conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTABLISHMENT</td>
<td>Learning the ropes; getting the job done</td>
<td>Demonstrating performance; defining a professional role</td>
<td>Sense of accomplishment and commitment; work/family conflicts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Siegel (2000, p. 251-252) identifies the dominant themes for each type of peer relationship at successive career stages of an individual’s career, which are particularly relevant in the case of a merger. These are depicted in Table 4.2 above.

A brief description of the peer relationships at different career stages is necessary to meaningfully understand the dominant themes of the different stages.

• **ESTABLISHMENT STAGE**

In the establishment stage individuals have a need to feel more self-confident and competent as they learn how to adjust to rapid changes in organisational life. They also have a concern for their professional identity role.

During the establishment stage the information peer relationship enables an inexperienced employee to learn how to work in the uncertain environment while the collegial peer relationship is characterized by assistance to adjust to evolving professional roles and performance. The special peer relationship provides intimate discussions about adjusting and committing to the new professional environment. It also serves as a mechanism to manage the stresses brought by the merger’s increased uncertainty and resultant anxieties about professional competence.

• **ADVANCEMENT STAGE**

In this phase, professionals become established and internalise their feelings of work competence, having worked through developing conflicts between increasing work pressures and family commitments. Information peers help them to understand the organisation’s rapidly changing structure while
collegial peers provide feedback on their performance and attempts to gain recognition. The special peers help individuals to deal with work and family conflicts and with concerns about adjusting to the demands of the working organisation.

- **MIDDLE CAREER**

In this phase individuals seem to focus on re-shaping old ways and learning new ways to approach the rapidly changing and uncertain private and career situations they now face. They rely increasingly on others to help them accomplish organisational tasks that, in turn, influence the dominant themes for relevant peer relationships. Special peer relationships can provide several psycho-social functions, such as assisting professionals to manage a fear of technical obsolescence as well as the process of reassessment and redirection that usually occurs during this phase.

- **LATE CAREER**

An important function of peer relationships during this phase is to assist the professional into retirement. Information peers enable individuals to stay connected with the firm and to continue to work effectively while the collegial and special peer relationships have become mechanistic thus enabling the mature professionals to assume a more consultative role and to pass on the new organisation's responsibilities.

It can be concluded from the research findings of McDougall and Beattie (1998, p. 56) and Siegel (2000, pp. 243-252), that peer mentoring provides a valuable source of learning that supports individuals in dealing with changing circumstances. It can be further concluded that informal peer relationships can fulfill different needs at different career stages for individuals and that by engaging in reflective discussions with peer mentors, individuals are helped not only in coping with change but in learning from the experience.

### 4.8.3 Virtual mentoring (e-mentoring)

*Chapter 5: Development of mentoring model*
Two of the biggest challenges of face-to-face mentoring are time and distance. Weber (2001, p. 29) suggests that the traditional model adopted by both mentor and mentee needs to be modified if mentoring is to retain its position in the new business order. He believes that emphasis will need to be placed on the shared capabilities that traditional mentoring and e-mentoring have to offer. Weber (2001, p. 29) describes e-mentoring as nothing more than online help (Internet/intranet-based with the support of e-mail) which assists a learner in making significant transitions in knowledge, work or thinking. This approach to mentoring brings fundamental information and resources to a learner with just a few clicks of the mouse. The real value of this approach lies in its being a ‘just-in-time’ performance support tool designed to specifically sustain a fast-moving business environment. With identified topics and supporting communication, e-mentoring can provide high quality, practical information that addresses the key challenges that learners face on a daily basis.

E-mentoring can be of particular benefit to mentees who are given overseas postings, which do not permit face-to-face contact between the mentor and mentee. Weber (2001, p. 30) advocates other advantages of this approach:

- Increased productivity – by providing just-in-time information which in turn enables the learner to increase performance and improve results.
- Better decision-making – by providing instant access to problem solving techniques which help to increase effectiveness of both teams and leaders.
- Inter-team mentoring – allows for inter-team mentoring across shifts or sites.
- Greater choice – allows for a greater choice of who to have in a mentored group and who to choose as a mentor because of its accessibility across distance and location.
- Feedback capability – mentors may be more inclined to give honest feedback to mentees when the feedback does not have to be delivered face-to-face.

Despite the numerous advantages to introducing e-mentoring, organisations should give careful thought to the context in which this approach is
introduced. The extent of the computer skills of the parties involved needs to be taken into consideration as this can contribute to their perceptions of the usefulness of different media, which in turn would determine their media preference.

4.8.4 Formal versus informal mentoring

The question that needs to be asked by the organisation before embarking on a mentoring programme is: Are we going to embark on a formal mentoring programme or are we going to encourage mentees to seek out their own mentors and allow informal mentoring relationships to develop? Clutterbuck (2001, p. 27–31) argues the various pros and cons of formal versus informal mentoring relationships. His research has produced conflicting results. He believes that because there is a contradiction in experience, emerging best practice in dealing with selection and matching of mentors and mentees centres around ‘guided choice’. The ‘guided choice’ approach involves providing the mentee with strong guidance on how to find and use a mentor, or it can involve providing a limited number of options selected by the mentoring programme co-ordinator against criteria which the mentee has provided or at least been involved in. The second of these approaches requires an existing pool of individuals who have volunteered and ideally been trained to be mentors.

Chesterman (2001, p. 55) diagrammatically sets out the characteristics of informal and formal mentoring relationships. These characteristics are depicted in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS</th>
<th>FORMAL MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 4.3: Informal and formal mentoring relationships

Source: Chesterman, 2001, p. 55

Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 27-31) emphasises the specific arguments for informal mentoring as follows:

- Provides some control over a process which, if left alone, may not always work to the advantage of the organisation or the majority of the individuals in it. Specific formal programmes aimed at designated groups such as previously disadvantaged groups can be instituted for breaking the glass ceiling in gender, race or disability.

- Ensures that the mentoring relationship has clear purpose. The formal scheme provides an umbrella purpose for the organisation, which helps the mentor and mentee establish more specific goals for their own relationship.
• Ensures that there is a practical framework of support for mentor and mentee, including initial training and, in good practice environments, some form of continuing review where mentors can address any further skills needs they identify. As a result of the training both parties understand what is expected of them, including who manages the relationship and what the boundaries are.

• Assists in weeding out ‘toxic’ mentors or individuals who have manipulative goals or values that the organisation is trying to move away from, or who have so many problems of their own that they end up transferring these to the mentee.

• Because informal relationships tend to take longer to develop and last longer overall, there is more opportunity to create strong trust and to achieve medium-term goals.

• As informal mentors assume their roles out of choice rather than from organisational pressure to become mentors as a way to ‘demonstrate their commitment to people development’, they are there because they want to be and are likely to be more committed to their relationship.

• Informal mentors tend to have better communication and coaching skills than formal mentors. Whereas in formal programmes that may create a high demand for mentors, competence criteria may be relaxed, in informal mentoring those individuals most likely to volunteer for the role (toxic mentors excluded) are those who have confidence in their own competence to perform the role.

Chesterman (2001, p. 56) provides a useful summary of the benefits and disadvantages of informal and formal mentoring relationships. These are set out in Table 4.4.
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### Informal Mentoring Relationships

**Benefits**
- Dynamic, flexible
- Can change in response to emerging events
- ‘Off-the-record'
- Mentee / mentor chooses someone with whom she/he is comfortable
- Merges with friendship
- Can ensure mentor is sympathetic to mentee’s point of view
- More control for mentee
- Lasts as long as situation demands
- Not an ‘obligation’

### Disadvantages
- May not happen especially for those excluded from informal networks of power who would most benefit
- May be hard to timetable
- Has no clear and explicit quality standards in place
- Over-familiarity may not stretch mentee
- Participants have no recourse if problems emerge

### Formal Mentoring Relationships

**Benefits**
- Extends the mentoring experience to those who may not readily find informal mentors
- Gives mentees contact with people outside area
- Can be assessed, monitored and linked with performance management
- Provides support and assistance for participants
- Has recourse for those with problems / difficulties
- Institution recognizes commitment
- Dedicated time

### Disadvantages
- May be perceived as threatening in socializing and inducting new staff
- Confidentiality needs to be secured
- Can impose time demands
- Can be rigid
Table 4.4  Benefits and disadvantages of informal and formal mentoring relationships

Source: Chesterman (2001, p. 56)

To summarise, in order for the organisation to get the best from a mentoring programme it needs to build on the best aspects of both formal and informal approaches. As can be seen from the arguments of both Clutterbuck (2000, p. 27-31) and Chesterman (2001, p. 55), a formal structure is essential as it can provide meaning, direction and support for the relationships. On the other hand, individual relationships will flourish best when allowed to operate as informally as possible. In many instances successful formal relationships may well develop into successful informal relationships.

4.9 NUMBER OF MENTORS

Moskowitz (publication date unknown) found that mentees can have two different mentors: one to help them gain technical experience, the other to give guidance on corporate culture and career issues. He also encountered situations where managers were routinely sent overseas for several years, yet assigned a mentor at their home office. This mentor’s role was to keep the manager informed of home office activities, to protect the manager’s interests there, and to simplify problems of re-entry. Moskowitz advocates the use of external paid mentors or consultants who can act as a confidant, sounding board and counselor to the mentee. Moskowitz further points out that researchers are today finding that mentoring need not be an exclusive activity. Instead of mentees searching for one great teacher/mentor, it may benefit them to find several mentors.
Van Collie (1998, pp. 36-42) suggests that in a working world characterized by change, mentees may need more than one mentor; often the other mentor may be positioned in another organisation. Mentees would therefore also require the skill of knowing how to go about finding mentors, learning from them and giving something back to them as well. Van Collie cites an example of a United States-based programme where the organisation provided additional mentors who were external to the organisation. A year-long programme matched senior level mentors (about half of whom were male) with a hundred highly motivated, mid-level female mentees from different organisations in an urban area. During the twelve-month programme mentees were guaranteed at least fourteen hours of one-to-one meetings with senior level mentors from another organisation. Mentees also participated in monthly or quarterly discussions and were lectured by experts in leadership, ethics and conflict resolution. They also had opportunities to network with other high-potential female professionals. To qualify for the programme, mentees needed to have eight to ten years of post-college professional experience, to be designated ‘high potential’ and likely to succeed to executive rank in their organisations. The mentees also needed above-average performance ratings. It was found that major benefits accruing from the cross-company programme were that mentees were given a chance to speak freely with successful business people and male mentors were given the opportunity to interact with high-potential females. This interaction was a great learning opportunity for the men.

4.10 DISSOLVING THE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP
Kram’s (1997) four-phase mentoring process (refer to Table 4.1) as cited by Kreitner et al. (2002, p. 79), indicates that separation in the mentoring relationship may occur because the mentee no longer wants guidance but rather the opportunity to work more autonomously, or the mentor may be facing a midlife crisis and is less available to provide mentoring support. Other factors such as job rotation or promotion may limit opportunities for continued interaction, and career and psycho-social functions may no longer be provided thus requiring that the mentoring relationship be dissolved (Clutterbuck, 2001, pp. 107-110).

Bell (2000, pp. 166-168) makes the following three suggestions for constructively ending a mentoring relationship:

- **CELEBRATE WITH FANFARE AND STORIES**

  The parting celebration does not need to take the form of a splashy affair; it can be in the form of a special meal together, a drink after work or a peaceful walk and chat in a nearby park or along the beachfront. The celebration is necessary to mark the end of the mentoring relationship; it is a rite of passage, a powerful symbol of closure and of moving on to the next learning plateau. The celebration should be rich in compliments and stories, laughter and joy. The mentee should depart with the mentor’s good wishes rather than warnings or words of caution.

- **SOLIDIFY LEARNING WITH NOSTALGIA**
The final meeting between the mentor and mentee can be used to give the mentee an opportunity to remember, reflect and refocus. Bell (1996, p. 167) suggests that the mentor can use ‘remembering and reflecting’ to facilitate the discussion toward the future, as merely reminiscing can mire the meeting in melancholy. The mentor needs to use effective listening skills during this time with the mentee.

**LET TIME PASS BEFORE FOLLOW-UP**

In order for the mentee to have a true feeling of ‘flying solo’ and independence it is important that the mentor allow a period of time to elapse before calling or visiting the mentee. The mentor may even wonder whether he or she should follow up at all. The answer is a very definite yes, but a weaning time should be allowed.

Bell (1996, p. 168) summarizes the dissolving phase of the mentoring relationship as follows:

“As rapport building is crucial at the beginning of a mentoring relationship, adjournment is equally important at its end. Letting go is rarely comfortable, but it is necessary if the mentee is to flourish and continue to grow out of the mentor’s shadow. In the final analysis, the upper limit of growing is ‘grown’, implying closure and culmination. Commemorate the moment by managing the adjournment as a visible expression of achievement and happiness”.

Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 109 – 110) suggests that it would be useful for the mentor and mentee to have at least one meeting before the final closure of the relationship to review:
• What the relationship has delivered in terms of expected and unexpected outcomes (changes in knowledge, behaviour, role etc) for both parties;
• What the relationship has not delivered;
• What they expect from the new (informal) phase of the relationship – if there is to be one;
• What future mentoring needs the mentee may have that may best be met by other individuals.

4.11 CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL FORMAL MENTORING PROGRAMMES

Various aspects of the mentoring programme have been considered in the previous sections of this chapter. In order to ensure the success of formal mentoring programmes, programme co-ordinators must bear in mind specific characteristics of successful formal mentoring programmes. Noe (2000, p. 239) provides the following useful guidelines for ensuring the success of formal mentoring programmes:
• Participation of the mentor and the mentee in the programme is voluntary; the relationship can be ended at any time without fear of punishment.

• The mentor–mentee matching process does not limit the ability to develop informal relationships. For example, a mentor pool can be established to allow mentees to choose from a variety of qualified mentors.
- Mentors are chosen on the basis of their past record in developing employees, willingness to serve as a mentor and evidence of positive coaching, communication and listening skills.

- The purpose of the programme is clearly understood. Projects and activities that the mentor and mentee are expected to complete are specified.

- The duration of the programme is specified. The mentor and mentee are encouraged to pursue the relationship beyond the formal time period.

- A minimal level of contact between the mentor and mentee is specified.

- Mentees are encouraged to contact one another to discuss problems and share successes.

- The mentorship programme is evaluated. Interviews should be conducted with mentors and mentees in order to obtain immediate feedback regarding specific areas of success and dissatisfaction. Surveys should be used to gather more detailed information regarding benefits received from participating in the programmes.

- Employee development is rewarded which signals to managers that mentoring and other development activities are worth their time and effort.
4.12 CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MENTORING

The benefits of mentoring as a developmental strategy have already been discussed in previous chapters. However, it is necessary to take a critical look at the process in order to consider the possible problems and limitations of mentoring.

Myers and Humphreys (2001, pp. 9-14) argue that it is paradoxical that the same process (mentoring) that launches successful careers can also generate serious problems. They list three potential problems caused by mentoring under the headings of selection problems, process problems and outcome problems. These problems will be discussed briefly.

- **Selection Problems**

Four categories of selection problems need to be considered:

- Pre-selection: This occurs when individuals are secretly selected for a mentoring programme but nevertheless proceed through the machinations of a competitive application process to confirm the choice. Myers and Humphreys (2001, p. 10) suggest that in previous years, particularly as far as South African organisations are concerned, pre-selection was not necessary as mentors selected their trainees without being concerned about a transparent application and selection process.
Most employees in the organisation understood and accepted that this process was being used. However, organisational goals, policies and procedures currently provide an equal opportunity component in the selection of individuals for mentoring programmes. These well-meaning efforts to promote equity can be subordinated to individual interests through pre-selection.

- The ‘old boy’ network: Mentees quickly learn to measure an organisation’s power structure and decide which potential mentors have goals similar to their own. Mentees then plan strategies to become affiliated with that mentor’s network. Through this process the mentee becomes an accepted member of the sub-group and receives preferential mentoring assignments. Often the goals of these sub-groups are in direct opposition to those of the organisation.

- Discrimination: Aspiring employees know which mentors have the best track records in helping employees succeed in the organisation. Trainees who are selected to work with these mentors are especially envied when the assignment results in a promotion or a position of high-level visibility. Individuals from previously disadvantaged groups become particularly sensitive to the mentee selection and placement process when all choice assignments are allocated to white males. The allocation of these assignments, which are sometimes blatantly unfair and can provoke employee discrimination
complaints can paradoxically hurt the mentee who the mentor intended to help.

- Nepotism: This may occur when executives or senior managers design career paths, including the assignment of mentors for their sons or daughters, which will ensure that they are fast-tracked through the organisation. This practice may also be used for cousins, nephews, nieces and even friends of the family who secure investment through the executive’s intervention.

• **Process Problems**

These are problems that can result from a mentor/mentee relationship. Mentor assignments are not always successful for several reasons. It may happen that the mentor and mentee have incompatible personalities. Mentees may also become frustrated because they are allocated menial or disagreeable work. Mentors may be so overburdened with duties that they are not able to allocate quality time to the mentee and thus keep the mentee active with ‘busy work’.

Successful managers may not have the necessary personality traits to perform effectively as mentors and are thus incapable of forming relationships with mentees. A possible process problem could be sexual harassment where female mentees are assigned to male mentors. Unfair rumour mongering could result from the relationships that develop.
A further mentoring process problem can occur when the trainee is taught incorrect procedures by an unethical or even a dishonest mentor. Although the technical knowledge and leadership skills of the mentor are considered, their personal habits and ethics also need to be taken into consideration in the process of selecting them to mentor to mentees.

Myers and Humphreys (2001, p. 21) suggest that mentors may also intentionally retard a mentee’s development or advancement in the organisation possibly because of over-possessiveness or a dictatorial attitude. The mentor’s possessiveness can be exasperating when it becomes oppressive for the mentee.

• **Outcome Problems**

If a mentee is assigned to a mentor for an extended period of time, the strong mentor/mentee relationship often results in careers becoming interdependent. The mentee’s career often depends upon the success or failure of the mentor’s career. The demotion of a mentor may well result in mentees finding that they are out of favour with the mentor’s superior. A mentee’s career may also be stalled or permanently halted if a mentor becomes sidetracked in the organisation.

Mentees’ careers can also be stalled if mentors do not permit them (as a result of possessiveness - discussed earlier in this section) to develop or be promoted to a job outside the mentor’s sphere of influence. The reverse may also be true in that the mentor’s career may be influenced by actions or decisions taken by the mentee. For example, if a mentee who is also being mentored by an external mentor decides to resign from the organisation, the
internal mentor may be chastised by senior management for failing to develop
the mentee’s loyalty to the organisation. In radical cases this could even
result in the demotion of the mentor.

From the above example cited by Myers and Humphreys (2001, p.13) it can
be seen that the strategy of using mentors to reduce turnover among newly-
recruited employees by building mentee loyalty to the organisation, is not
always successful. Under these circumstances, the mentor can become a
convenient scapegoat.

Mentees may have different mentors at various stages of their careers in an
organisation. On the other hand, mentees may have only one or two
mentors, which could create a problem when the mentee’s career successes
overshadow those of the mentor. It may even happen that the mentee
becomes the former mentors’ supervisor. Jealousy or even vindictiveness on
the part of the mentor may occur, particularly when there have been strong
attachments.

Lastly, mentors may become unfair advocates for mentees by possibly
favouring their mentees over other candidates in the case of promotions,
better job assignments and pay increases. This stance by the mentor is
understandable, but it can be considered as unfair when better skilled
individuals are denied their rights.

Hale (2000, pp. 223-234) provides further evidence of the possible limitations
of mentoring programmes as a developmental strategy. His action research
explored the dynamics of the mentoring process as a route to personal and
organisational learning. The findings of his research need to be considered by organisations embarking on mentoring programmes.

Hale (2000, p. 223) cites Mumford (1998) who stresses the importance of considering the learning purpose (knowledge, skills or insights) when selecting the method of development and suggests that mentoring is less appropriate in terms of skills development because there is limitation in terms of which skills the mentor can identify. Mumford believes that mentoring can be effective in developing knowledge, but the extent of the effectiveness will be limited by the knowledge of the mentor. However, Mumford (1998) in Hale (2000, p.223) acknowledges that mentoring can be viewed as a powerful means of helping the mentee to achieve insights.

Hale (2000, p. 234) also refers to the argument of Clawson (1985) that individuals who have a caring, committed mentor are less likely to take steps towards skills development as they tend to rely more on the relationship and inputs from the mentor. By contrast, where a good mentoring relationship does not exist, individuals are more likely to rely on their resources and take steps towards skills development in order to compensate for weaknesses in the relationship. This argument needs to be considered when countering the notion of mentoring as a beneficial process in terms of learning.

Tabbron et al. (1997, pp. 6-9) reviewed the experiences of best practice organisations’ mentoring and drew on a feasibility survey of managers in a 10,000 strong global engineering company. They concluded that despite the numerous benefits accruing to the mentee, the mentor and the organisation, there are substantial potential problems that may be encountered.
Typical problems that may be encountered and need to be addressed by organisations embarking on mentoring programmes include the following:

- Programme expectations and objectives may be misunderstood by both parties. To a great extent, the success of the programme depends on the quality of the relationships which are built up in the mentoring pairings and the chemistry that exists between the mentor and mentee. In the survey the respondents reported that three factors vital to the success of the relationship are honesty, rapport and confidentiality.

- In fitting a formal framework of mentoring into natural relationships within the culture of the organisation, special care needs to be exercised. For example, a mentor should not be forced onto a mentee; the mentee should have a choice. Tabbron et al. (1997, p. 8) make the point that some organisations find power distributed by the introduction of mentor into the manager–subordinate relationship. The outcome of this perceived power disturbance may well be managers reacting with hostility to what they consider as interference in their roles.

- As a result of organisations making use of flatter structures and managers being far more stretched than previously, it may be difficult to find mentors who are prepared to commit the necessary quality time to ensure success of mentoring programmes.

Conrad and Poole (1998, p. 363) argue that mentorship is not an easy answer or ‘quick fix’. They believe that like all relationships, mentor-mentee relationships are difficult to form and maintain, especially when mentees are from different gender, race, or ethnic background than their mentors.
Cherrington (1995, pp. 373–374) tends to support the arguments of Conrad and Poole (1998, p. 363) by stating that effective mentors teach their mentees valuable job skills, help them develop a network of contacts and most important, provide emotional support and encouragement. He adds that although mentoring is usually a valuable career-development activity, a mentoring relationship becomes overly dependent if the mentor resists freeing the mentee and if jealousy or romantic interests enter the relationship. Although mixed-gender matches have been utilized effectively, they can also be most destructive.

However, Conrad and Poole (1998, p. 363) argue that despite the problems highlighted above, there “seems to be widespread agreement that successful employees, regardless of race, gender or ethnicity have been able to establish close personal relationships with one or more senior employees early in their careers.” This is one of many similar statements supporting the success of mentorship based on actual cases.

4.13 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this chapter was to consider the various role players and aspects of the mentoring programme that need to be considered by the organisation in order to ensure the success of the programme. The chapter, which also considered the characteristics of successful formal mentoring programmes, concluded with a critical analysis of mentoring.

The following chapter will commence with a discussion on various models for mentoring and development. Thereafter, a theoretical model for
organisational mentoring will be presented. This model will be based on the legislative issues and arguments advanced for using mentoring as a strategy for facilitating accelerated development (Chapters 2 and 3), the various aspects of the mentoring programme discussed in Chapter 4 and the discussions on models for mentoring and development discussed at the start of the Chapter Five.
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*Chapter 5: Development of mentoring model*
5.1 INTRODUCTION

From the discussions in Chapters Two, Three and Four it became clear that mentoring can play a major contributory role in equipping individuals for management positions in organisations. The main objective of this study is to develop an integrated model of mentoring strategies that can be utilised by organisations to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). This objective has been pursued by firstly considering the legislative basis for mentoring as well as why mentoring should be used as one of the strategies for facilitating management development. The different aspects of the mentoring programme were also considered. A theoretical model for organisational mentoring is presented in this chapter. The model is based on the theoretical and empirical research findings presented in the previous chapters. Various models for mentoring and development discussed at the start of this chapter are also taken into consideration in the presentation of the model.

The theoretical model for organisational mentoring forms the basis for the design of the survey questionnaire used to establish the extent to which organisations agree or disagree that the model can assist them in implementing a formal mentoring programme aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). The results of the survey will be used to adapt, where and if necessary, the theoretical model presented in this chapter, to develop an integrated model for organisational mentoring which is presented in Chapter Seven. To achieve the aim of this chapter the following approach is adopted:

• Firstly, the concept ‘model’ is defined;
• Secondly, various models for mentoring and development are discussed;

• Thirdly, a theoretical model for organisational mentoring is presented.

Prior to discussing models for mentoring and development it is necessary to define the concept ‘model’.

5.2 A MODEL

Johannsen and Page (1995, p. 202) define a mathematical model as “an abstract representation of a situation such as in operational research or systems analysis”. Bennet (1992, p. 130) defines a model as “a representation of reality intended to reduce complex problems to a number of manageable variables, which the analyst may then study in depth”. Emory and Cooper (1991, p. 63) support Bennet’s definition by stating that a model is “a representation of a phenomenon which a researcher wishes to explain or study. A model differs from theory in that it only represents something; it does not in itself explain the phenomenon”.

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 125) argue that any proposed model is not without its problems, not least of which is that it can be interpreted as an attempt to reduce a highly complex issue into a simple schematic that can be used as a ‘blueprint’ of sorts. They further state that a model represents the way in which researchers have organised their thoughts. When using models they should be interpreted in terms of the uniqueness of each organisation, including its size, divisions, regions of operations, structures, systems and people. In addition the model should not be interpreted in purely linear terms as phases may run concurrently and loops back to previous phases may occur.
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The theoretical mentoring model developed in this chapter should be viewed in terms of Thomas and Robertshaw’s (1999, p.125) qualifying remarks on models discussed in the previous paragraph. Various models addressing mentoring and development will now be discussed.

5.3. VARIOUS MODELS ADDRESSING MENTORING AND DEVELOPMENT

5.3.1 Pegg’s “Five C” Mentoring Model

Pegg (1999, pp. 136-140) states that mentors gain credibility in various ways such as by their age, by being successful, by being viewed as being street-wise, by their expertise and by knowing their way around the system. Having gained credibility with their mentees, they need to establish an effective approach for passing on their wisdom and helping mentees to find answers to challenges.

Pegg (1999, pp. 139-140) developed the ‘Five C’ mentoring model to assist mentors in conducting structured sessions to get mentees to focus on their:

• challenges,
• choices,
• consequences,
• creative solutions, and
• conclusions.

This model is depicted diagrammatically as follows:

Mentors help mentees to focus on the:
Below is a brief description of the ‘Five C’ mentoring model that Pegg (1999, pp. 139-140) suggests the mentor should use for a structured session with the mentee:

- **Challenges**

  About one week prior to meeting with the mentee for the mentoring discussion, the mentor should request the mentee to forward a list of topics that he/she would like to discuss. These topics are used as agenda items for the meeting. At the meeting the mentee is asked to prioritise these items.

- **Choices**

  By working through the topics the mentor gets the mentee to list various options that may be considered to solve the problems or provide the necessary impetus to a planned action.

---
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• **Consequences**

The mentor and mentee then explore the pluses and minuses of possible actions. Once time has been allocated to highlighting the consequences of pursuing the various options they move on to the next step.

• **Creative Solutions**

In this phase the mentor not only plays the role of listener but also steers the mentee to arrive at ‘perfect solutions’. Pegg (1999, p. 140) says that “mentees are hungry to explore new ideas for achieving their picture of perfection, which is where mentors earn their corn”.

• **Conclusions**

During this phase the mentor facilitates the development of action plans linked to target dates, making use of the mentees’ specific strengths and talents. The mentee is then encouraged to pursue the formulated plans with confidence.

Pegg (1999, p. 140) believes that good mentors create a ‘stimulating sanctuary’ by helping mentees to build on their strengths, find solutions and achieve ongoing success.

The ‘Five C’ model provides a useful framework for a structured discussion between the mentor and mentee. However, mentors should adapt the model to fit their own personalities.
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5.3.2 Berry’s Mentoring Implementation Model

Berry (1998, pp. 1-18) proposes a seven-phase model for implementing organisational mentoring aimed at addressing employment equity objectives. Berry (1998, p. 5) suggests that critical success factors for organisational mentoring programmes include:

- Clear and specific goals;
- Time focused goals;
- Management support and commitment;
- Training and support for mentors and mentees;
- Regular evaluation and review of the programme and the functioning of mentor relationships.

The above suggestions are incorporated into his model, which is depicted in Figure 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Organisational needs analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Succession plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment Equity Plan /needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Selection of candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Competency criteria confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Candidates identified and selected (both mentors and mentees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Intent and aims of programme clarified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role clarification and definition of each parties’ responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mentoring contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incremental orientation (small group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Phase 4: Candidates’ needs analysis**

- Establish training and development needs of both parties to meet the competency criteria set

**Phase 5: Implementation**

- Determination of focussed development
- Relationship building between parties
- Learning projects and review sessions

**Phase 6: Feedback and evaluation of relationship**

- Monitoring and Auditing
- Coaching the mentor / mentor to the mentee
- On-going support

**Phase 7: Dissolving of relationship**

Figure 5.2: Berry’s Mentoring Implementation Model

Source: Berry (1998, p. 18)

Berry (1998, p. 16) believes that the following strategies can assist the team that is responsible for developing and introducing the mentoring programme in securing the support and commitment of management:

- Communicate the process to the management team, ensuring understanding by demonstrating the relevance of the process in obtaining organisational effectiveness;
- Obtain written (voluntary) commitment from those who are willing to be part of the process (as mentee or mentor);
- Gain insight into the management team’s concerns (misgivings) about the process; that is, know their main concerns around the process;
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- Clarify their understandings of the organisation’s strategy for the mentoring programme and obtain their views of how this could be improved or changed;
- Create an opportunity to address management’s concerns and convert these into action plans, as well as consolidating the strategic plans with new input;
- Implement the mentoring programme once management has demonstrated their support for the programme.

One of the major limitations of Berry’s (1998, pp. 1-18) Mentoring Implementation Model is that he does not include a final phase for evaluating the programme in its entirety. In phase 6 of the model he advocates that the mentoring relationship should be monitored and audited. However, it is essential that the organisation establishes a system for evaluating the programme in its entirety.

The opinions and suggestions of Lewis (1996, pp. 182-183) and Clutterbuck (2001, 2001, pp. 92-95) must be considered in terms of Berry’s (1998, pp. 1-18) Mentoring Implementation Model. Lewis (1996, pp. 182-183) points out that there are a number of issues that make evaluating a mentoring programme difficult. He questions whether programme evaluation should be done in terms of the perspectives of the individuals involved, or of the organisation and its goals and objectives. His answer is both, where possible and appropriate.

Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 92-95) supports Lewis’ views and illustrates the evaluation of the mentoring programme by means of a measurement matrix (refer to Figure 5.3).
Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 92-95) maintains that the programme should be evaluated in terms of relationship and programme processes and outcomes. The matrix is described as follows:

- **Relationship processes** – What happened in the relationship? For example, how often did the pairs meet? Did they develop sufficient trust? Was there a clear sense of direction to the relationship? Does the mentor or the mentee have concerns about his or her own or the other person’s contribution to the relationship?

- **Programme processes** – How many people attended training? How effective was the training? In some cases, programme processes will also include data derived from adding together measurements from individual relationships to gain a broad picture of what is going well and less well.

- **Relationship outcomes** – Have mentors and mentees met the goals they set?

- **Programme outcomes** – Has the organisation increased the retention of key staff, or raised the competence of mentees in critical areas?

Clutterbuck (2001) maintains that by measuring all four categories the organisation is given a balanced view of the mentoring programme. It also allows the mentoring programme co-ordinator to intervene, with sensitivity, where necessary.
Lewis (1996, p. 183) argues that evaluation of the programme at the organisational level can only be done if the objectives or goals set at the commencement of the programme were specific and measurable in the first place. He adds in the case of using mentoring programmes as an aid to fast-tracking individuals from designated groups, there is a clear means of measuring success. Lewis (1996) also argues that on a second look this may not be as clear or as simple as it appears. The easy solution would seem to be to count the number of individuals from designated groups in managerial positions before and after the mentoring programme. However, this may involve a number of difficulties as the organisation cannot control other variables in order to ensure that all individuals from designated groups who were promoted achieved their promotions as a result of the mentoring programme.

If at some future time it is established that there are significantly more individuals from designated groups at management levels, then the programme may be quite reasonably deemed to be a success. The question that needs to be asked is: How long would the organisation have to wait to do such a measurement? Lewis (1996, p. 183) reasons that “in such cases, the expected and desired outcome would be enough in itself, even if it were not possible to quantify that success – it should be remembered that mentoring is an additive model, so that any success can be considered a bonus, as to do it does not necessarily compete with other priorities”.

5.3.3 Johnson, Geroy and Griego's Mentoring Model: Dimensions in mentoring protocols

Johnson, Geroy and Griego (1999, pp 384-391) developed a mentoring model that blends human development with the dimensions of mentoring. They recognise three interactive dimensions that surround the mentoring interaction and which shape the mentor and mentee
relationship. These interactive dimensions are clarified as socialisation, task development and lifespan development. Johnson et al. (1999, p. 384) believe that the model (refer Figure 5.4) can be utilised as a diagnostic tool or as a training model to promote mentoring relationships by making individuals aware of the dynamics of a mentor-mentee relationship.

Figure 5.4: Johnson, Geroy and Griego’s Mentoring Model

Source: Johnson et al. (1999, p. 386).
The model is described in the following sections:

5.3.3.1 Aspects impacting on the mentor-mentee relationship

The three-dimensional model depicted in Figure 5.4 is intended to illustrate how the mentoring relationship is influenced by blending the constructs: socialisation, task and lifespan. The outer circle of the model represents the construct of socialisation which is the largest element in the model as it embraces the environment in which task and lifespan dimensions engage. The circle of the model indicates that socialisation, as a construct, occurs through three formative stages: pre-formative, formative and post-formative. The two ellipticals within the model depict task and lifespan development. Johnson et al. (1999, p. 386) argue that understanding what each dimension brings to the relationship and its influences aids individuals in understanding what makes a mentoring relationship either succeed or fail.

What follows is a brief discussion of the impacts of the constructs socialisation, task and lifespan on mentoring relationships.

A. Socialisation

Johnson et al. (1999, p. 386) describe socialisation in terms of Goldstein’s (1994) definition as “a learning process in which individuals learn the rules of behaviour specific to their culture”. The ‘socialisation ring’ embraces the concept that the mentor and the mentee exist within their specific socialisations. Within their work environments mentors and mentees are in one of three phases: pre-formative, formative, or post-formative.

Johnson et al. (1999, p. 386) describe these three phases as follows:

- Pre-formative – an individual entering a new environment is initially at a pre-formative stage. During this phase individuals adjust to their new environment
by having new experiences that are rich in learning ways to adapt to their new environments;

- Formative – in an environment that has a formative structure, the individual may encounter less choice and the organisation will usually assign a mentor to the mentee;
- Post-formative – in a post-formative environment, the individual experiences more choice in selecting developmental relationships. During this stage an individual’s internal locus of control provides momentum and they tend to become ‘masters of their own destiny.’

Johnson et al. (1999, p. 386) note that it is important to recognise that both mentor and mentee can be in one or more of the above three stages simultaneously at any given time. For example, a mentee may hold a senior position in a local service organisation (post-formative) while entering a new work environment (pre-formative). Knowledge of which stages the mentor and mentee are in can enhance an understanding of the mentoring relationship.

B. Task Development Dimension

Hall (1987), cited by Johnson et al. (1999, p. 386) recognises the two central components that occupy our life structures as work and family. Both components are incorporated as major facets of task development. Cognisance should be taken of which task (work or family) the mentor and mentee are in, to understand the mentoring relationship. These tasks (work and family) are described as follows:

- Work skill development: This can be defined as a certain set of proficiencies needed to compete for and achieve satisfaction within the work environment.
during the maturation process in the work environment. The mentoring relationship can be a key aspect of the process for the mentee acquiring these skills.

- Family skill development: This can be seen as acquiring skills such as coping with change, resolving personal conflict, handling stress, flexibility, communication and balancing work and family life. Cultural characteristics can play a major role in the teaching and learning of family skills and may have a major impact on the mentor-mentee relationship. Johnson et al. (1999, p. 387) note that an example of this would be the norms and values that individuals have internalized which can impact on their behaviour and likewise on the mentoring relationship.

C. Lifespan development

This refers to change and growth across an individual lifetime. When applying this focus to the mentoring relationship, the organisation can establish whether the mentor and mentee are equal or different in their life development stages. Johnson et al. (1999, pp. 387 – 388) argue that the way in which the mentor and mentee design their mentoring relationship is based on their individual level of lifespan development, which is crucial to their ability to stimulate change and growth in a purposeful relationship.

5.3.3.2 The mentor-mentee relational protocol
Johnson et al.’s (1999, p. 387) model is based on the essence of the mentor–mentee interaction. The relationship between the mentor and the mentee is contracted on protocols, which are shaped or determined by the interactive dimensions of socialisation, task and lifespan development that surround the relationship. The outcome of interaction can be a positive one in which the exchange results in positive growth-building activities or the result can be dysfunctional. Analysing the dimensions and how they align with both the mentor and mentee can assist in explaining why the relationship is either a success or a failure. The interaction acknowledges that people are not similar in all aspects of the model and that individuals in a mentor-mentee relationship should be aware of these differences.

The centre also represents a symbolic relationship in that one individual in a mentoring relationship has a need (to cope with a stressful situation – a task skill) while other individuals have the task capacity to (show how they have previously coped with the stress).

Johnson et al. (1999, p. 387) explain that at the heart of the model is the essence of the relationship – the interaction of two individuals who are brought together and are impacted on by the surrounding dimensions of their separate lives. Through this interaction skills are acquired to deal with work or family tasks. It is the centre force that develops the individual in concert with the surrounding dynamism (socialisation, task and lifespan).

5.3.3.3 Choosing a mentor

In any mentoring programme, mentors can be personally chosen or formally appointed. The mentoring model depicted in Figure 5.2 can be utilised to examine
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the outcomes of the relationships that develop between mentor and mentee. An analysis of the relationship will emphasise the differences and similarities ‘across’ the two individuals.

Johnson et al. (1999, pp. 389-390) clearly summarise the use of the model. They do not advocate that mentors and mentees are matched on the basis of the mentor and mentee being different or similar. There are pitfalls with either of these matching approaches that need to be known so that a balance can be achieved and a successful relationship developed. A mentor selected based on similarities may have the tendency for what Kanter (1977), cited in Johnson et al. (1999, p. 389) describes as ‘homsocial reproduction – the tendency for mentors to mould an image of their own’. In contrast a relationship rich in differences can lead to a dysfunctional interaction because of the inability to empathise. The choice of a mentoring relationship should result in an interactive exchange that stimulates a change in one or both individuals.

Johnson et al. (1999, p. 390) suggest that both mentor and mentee should assess the constructs of the model that interweave the relationship, realise differences and similarities and develop a relational protocol that will fulfill the objectives of the relationship.

Johnson et al.’s (1999, pp. 384-391) mentoring model relating to the dimensions in mentoring protocols provides new insights for the mentor and mentee to become aware of the dynamics of the mentoring relationship. An understanding of what each dimension brings to the relationship and the influence of these dimensions on the individual can assist mentors and mentees in understanding the variables impacting on the relationship.

5.3.4 Holistic Development Model
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De Beer (1998 p. 21) states that during the 1980’s most of the legislation inhibiting the career advancement of black employees was removed. However, black employees still did not progress fast enough to high-level positions. De Beer (1998) notes that despite the removal of the legislation, in practice black employees were still not able to compete for skilled and managerial positions on an equal footing with whites. De Beer (1998, p. 21) believes that white managers attributed the slow progress in black employee advancement to the skills gap that existed between black and white employees and the limited exposure that the individuals had to the modern organisation’s work ethic and managerial role models. He argues that to resolve these problems, human resource practitioners proposed that organisations should intervene directly in the employee’s basic developmental process by introducing special developmental programmes to ameliorate educational, modernisation and role model backlogs.

The need to activate more organisations into initiating black advancement programmes led to the development of the holistic developmental model. This came about as a result of Project Free Enterprises (1985), cited by de Beer (1998, p. 29) conducting a series of workshops in which representatives from various organisations worked together to develop a comprehensive model for black employee development (see Figure 5.5). The Holistic Development Model integrated the decisions and action steps that management had to take, as well as the sequence in which they had to be implemented. Prior to the development of this model, which could serve as a blueprint for black advancement, organisations initiated programmes that were fragmented and incomplete, with different organisations emphasizing different aspects of the development process.
De Beer (1998, p. 30) summarises the underlying suppositions of the Holistic Development Model as follows:

- Management does not always have the vision to formulate clear objectives regarding the development of black employees;
- Management tends to plan and act on short-term goals and often in a reactive manner where black employee development is concerned;
- Human resources are often under-utilised because of the mismanagement of the available human potential;
- Crisis management is often applied in the development of black employees and goes hand-in-hand with poor directives from management. There is a great need for setting clear objectives;
- The human resources function should provide the expertise to solve problems and apply the methods and techniques required for a successful development programme.

---
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The above listed suppositions underlying the Holistic Development Model tie in very closely with the researcher’s experiences and philosophies related to black advancement programmes conducted during the 1980’s, particularly in terms of the second supposition regarding management’s tendency to act on short term goals and in a reactive manner. Many black advancement programmes, particularly at the management level, were initiated with limited consideration being given to individual career planning and the provision of mentoring functions to provide the necessary support for the individual. These programmes, when not effectively implemented, created groups of individuals who became highly frustrated and left their organisations seeking challenging job opportunities where their talents could be better utilised.

Cheroux (1996, pp. 41-45) makes the important point that black employees moving through the ranks of the organisation into managerial positions face unique obstacles and have to break through real as well as imaginary barriers of resistance before they are accepted at that level in the organisation.

From research findings cited in previous chapters of this study it was pointed out that well-planned mentoring programmes can assist designated employees to break through the glass-ceiling and effectively function at the management level.

The Holistic Development Model (see Figure 5.5) sets out clear phases for incorporating mentoring into developmental programmes aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

5.3.5 Orpen’s Formal Mentoring Process Model
Orpen’s model (1997, pp. 53-60) (refer Figure 5.6) was developed during his study of the effects of a two-year formal mentoring programme on the work motivation, organisational commitment and job performance of mentees. The study involving 39 mentors and 39 mentees was conducted in a medium-sized manufacturing organisation in the United Kingdom. The model examines the significant differences that exist, even in the same organisation, in the opportunities that mentors have to interact with respective mentees. These differences are the main cause of variations in how often mentors actually meet with mentees during a mentoring programme.

Orpen (1997, p. 54) worked on the assumption that provided there is no animosity between mentor and mentee that cannot easily be overcome, the more often mentors interact with mentees, the closer their relationships are likely to become. In turn, such relationships influence the extent of work motivation and organisational commitment of mentees. Specifically, because mentors provide more support and assistance to mentees when their relationships with the latter are close rather than distant, closer relationships should cause mentees to be more motivated and committed.
Figure 5.6: The Formal Mentoring Process Model
Source: Orpen (1997, p. 53)

In terms of the model, work motivation and organisational commitment, in turn, influence the job performance of mentees. Provided mentees have the requisite abilities, they should perform better the more motivated they are in respect of their work and the more committed they are to their organisation. Because mentors would generally find or create more time for better performers a positive ‘reverse loop’ from performance to interaction opportunities develops.

The following results were obtained from Orpen’s (1997, pp. 59-60) research using his mentoring process model:

- The better the relationship between mentors and mentees in the formal mentoring programme, the more mentees were motivated to work hard and felt committed to their organisation.

- Mentees who were physically close to their mentors, who were under less time pressure and had work schedules that did not conflict with those of their mentors were more motivated and committed than those who were physically distant from their mentors, were under more time pressures and had work schedules that conflicted with those of their mentors. In addition, mentees were more motivated and committed
when their mentors on the programme liked and respected them, and enjoyed interacting with them.

- However, mentees with good, frequent interactions with their mentors were not judged to be more effective in their jobs than their counterparts whose interactions with their mentors were poorer or less frequent.

Based on these results Orpen (1997, p. 60) came to the following conclusions about the possible reasons why the quality of the mentor-mentee relationship in a formal mentoring programme has a positive influence on the work attitudes of mentees, without necessarily having much impact on how well they perform in their jobs:

- Employees often want to work hard ‘in return’ for being liked and respected by a manager they meet quite frequently out of a sense of equity or even gratitude to him or her;

- Employees are more likely to learn just what their organisation expects from them and how to go about achieving it from managers when they enjoy good, frequent interactions with them;

- Having good, frequent interactions with an important manager, for example, one who is also an assigned mentor, typically strengthens employees’ feelings of self-competence and enhances their sense that they are capable of doing well if they try.
Orpen (1997, p. 60) also concludes that there are two main reasons why a good relationship with the mentor should lead mentees to feel more committed to the organisation:

- Being shown respect and liking by ‘representatives’ of the organisation who also make it clear that they enjoy interacting with the particular employee, enhances the extent to which the employee’s need for affection is gratified at work, thereby strengthening the sense of attachment to the organisation.

- Having good relationships with important managers serves to make other aspects of their organisation more attractive to the employees involved, relative to what is on offer by other organisations. This relationship makes the mentees more willing to attach themselves to their present organisation, rather than taking up employment elsewhere; that is, it increases their sense of organisational commitment.

Orpen’s model (1997, pp. 53-60) stresses the importance of mentors and mentees interacting on a regular basis in order to develop close relationships which can influence the extent of work motivation and organisational commitment of mentees. The aim of the relationship should be to develop a commitment by the mentee to the organisation rather than to the mentor.

5.3.6 Hutton’s Integrated Strategy for Human Capital Development

Hutton (2002, pp. 259-262) developed an integrated strategy for human capital development that could form the basis of an integrated strategy model for establishing
human capital as a core competence in the East Cape Motor Industry Cluster, South Africa. The Cluster was formed in order to develop synergies to facilitate global competitiveness amongst automotive manufacturers and allied industries in the Eastern Cape Province. This integrated strategy model is depicted in Figure 5.7 below.

Figure 5.7: Hutton’s Integrated Strategy for Human Capital Development


Hutton’s model commences with the identification of competencies that are broken down into three categories, namely, job specific competencies, industry generic competencies and specific competencies that relate to the level of the organisation where the job is positioned. Having identified the competencies, a learning continuum is established thus making individuals aware of the progression that they must follow in order to achieve the appropriate competencies required for each job and level in terms of the organisation chart.

Hutton (2002, p. 236) notes that to ensure the transfer of training to the workplace a system of coaching at the lower levels and mentoring at the senior levels is essential.
to reinforce knowledge and skills acquired during any training or education intervention.

Hutton (2002, p. 237) suggests that an evaluation of the programme must be undertaken to ensure that required strategic objectives have been met. A continual process of review also needs to take place because of the dynamic nature of the industry and the continuously changing technology impacting on the processes. Hutton’s (2002, pp. 259-262) model provides a useful framework for mentors to assist mentees with the establishment and achievement of personal development plans.

Having discussed models which address various aspects of mentoring and development, it is necessary to consider the extent to which they can contribute to the development of an organisational mentoring model that can serve as an aid to facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). Pegg’s (1999, pp. 136-140) “Five C” model provides a useful framework for a structured discussion between mentors and mentees. Berry’s (1998, pp. 1-18) Mentoring Implementation Model sketches a seven-phase process that can be followed to implement mentoring programmes aimed at addressing employment equity objectives. However, a limitation of his model is that he fails to include a final phase of evaluating the programme in its entirety. Johnson et al.’s (1999, pp. 384-391) model provides new insights for the mentor and mentee to become aware of the dynamics of the mentoring relationship. The Holistic Development Model (de Beer, 1998, p. 30) sets out clear phases for incorporating mentoring into organisational affirmative action programmes. Orpen’s (1997, pp. 53-60) Formal Mentoring Process Model examines mentor/mentee relationships and the impact of quality relationships in formal mentoring programmes. Lastly, Hutton’s (2002, pp. 259-262)
Integrated Strategy Model provides a useful framework for mentors to assist mentees in establishing and achieving personal developmental plans. In his summary, Hutton (2002, p. 274) states that the results of his empirical study revealed that respondents agreed that coaching and mentoring were effective methods of on-the-job development.

What the researcher was not able to establish from the mentoring models discussed in this chapter was a step-by-step strategy that organisations can follow in order to introduce mentoring programmes into the organisation to form part of the human resource strategy aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998), particularly at the middle and senior management levels.

In the following section a theoretical model for organisational mentoring, which can serve as an aid to facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) will be presented. This model is based on the legislative issues and arguments advanced for using mentoring as a strategy for enhancing accelerated development (Chapters 2 and 3), the various aspects of the mentoring process (Chapter 4) and the discussions on various models for mentoring and development.

5.4 PRESENTATION OF A THEORETICAL MODEL FOR ORGANISATIONAL MENTORING

The purpose of this section is to present a theoretical model for organisational mentoring. This model is designed to provide a structured approach to mentoring in organisations to facilitate developing individuals from designated groups. It can also assist organisations in determining whether mentoring programmes have achieved their stated objectives and whether the programmes should be continued in their
present form, modified or discontinued.

Prior to discussing the model it is important to note the point made by Mondy, Noe and Premeaux (2002, p. 220) that in today’s highly competitive business environment, undertaking programmes simply because other organisations are doing it is asking for trouble. This argument is particularly pertinent to the introduction of mentoring programmes in organisations. A systematic approach needs to be followed to address the bona fide personpower (manpower) needs of the organisation at the management level through mentoring programmes.

The nine-phase theoretical mentoring model is presented in Figure 5.8, together with a comprehensive discussion of the model. This model forms the basis for the research study to develop an integrated organisational mentoring model.
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PHASE 1: DEFINE MENTORING PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES

In Section 4.12, one of the guidelines identified for ensuring the success of formal mentoring programmes was that the purpose of the programme is clearly understood. It is therefore necessary that clear, concise and measurable objectives are formulated for the mentoring programme by the team responsible for developing and implementing the programme. Without these objectives, designing meaningful mentoring programmes would not be possible. Worthwhile evaluation of the programme’s effectiveness would also be difficult at best.

The success or failure of the total programme will to a large extent be dependent on the support of senior management. An important strategy for the team responsible for developing and implementing the programme, is to secure the support of senior management for the programme objectives and the way in which these objectives will be achieved.

- **Secure senior management support**

Berry (1998, p. 16) suggests that the following strategies can be used to secure the support of senior management (refer to Section 5.3.2):

- Communicate the mentoring programme objectives and strategies to the management team to ensure that they understand the programme as well as its relevance to organisational effectiveness and the achievement of employment equity objectives.
- Gain insight into the management team’s concerns about the programme.
• Clarify management’s understanding of the organisation’s mentoring strategy and obtain their views on how this could be improved or changed.

• Create an opportunity to address management’s concerns regarding the programme and convert these concerns into specific action plans.

After obtaining management’s support for the programme, the mentoring programme team must ensure that specific management development needs that should be addressed by the mentoring programme to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998), are identified.

**PHASE 2: IDENTIFY MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE MENTORING PROGRAMME**

A mentoring programme aimed at facilitating employment equity objectives cannot exist in isolation; it needs to function within the wider framework of employee development and human resource management. It is therefore necessary that in identifying management development needs that can be addressed by the mentoring programme, strategic human resource plans succession and employment and skills development plans must be taken into consideration.

The following three strategies discussed in Section 3.9 can be adopted in order to identify specific management development needs:
Consider strategic human resource plans

Strategic human resource planning should be an integral part of business planning. Top management expects human resource activities to be closely aligned to the organisation’s mission. Strategic human resource planning can add value toward achieving these goals by ensuring that the required numbers of employees, with the required skills, are available when and where they are needed. The human resource planning process, which is preceded by strategic planning, involves matching the internal and external supply of people with job openings anticipated in the organisation over a specified period of time.

Specific quantitative and qualitative human resource planning which has two components, namely, requirements and availability, is determined from organisational plans. These plans define projected changes in the type of activities carried out by the organisation and the scale of these activities. They also identify core competencies that the organisation needs to achieve its goals and therefore its resource and skills requirements. Human resource planning interprets these plans in terms of people requirements.

In undertaking the forecasting function of the planning process, attempts are made to determine the number and type of employees needed by skill level and location. Once employee requirements and availability have been analysed, particularly in terms of employment equity plans, the organisation can establish whether it has a surplus or shortage of employees.
• **Consider managerial succession plans**

Because of the tremendous legislative and other changes that are currently confronting South African organisations, succession planning is taking on more importance. Succession planning ensures that qualified individuals are available to assume managerial positions once positions become vacant as a result of promotions, untimely deaths, resignations, terminations or retirements. These plans should be considered to assist in the selection of individuals to participate in mentoring programmes which are designed to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

• **Consider employment equity and skills development plans**

In Section 2.3 it was indicated that the main thrust of the Employment Equity Plan is to establish and implement measures which aim at ensuring that suitable individuals with the correct qualifications are selected from within the designated groups. It was also emphasised that the equity plans ensure that groups have “equal employment opportunities and are equally represented in all occupational levels”. By making an analysis of the equity plans, the mentoring programme co-ordinator can establish the extent and emphasis of mentoring activities required to meet affirmative action targets with specific reference to numerical goals.

Mentoring programme co-ordinators must use their knowledge of the Skills Development Act (Act 97 of 1998) when developing mentoring programmes aimed at retaining and developing individuals from designated groups to ensure achieving specific numerical goals, particularly at the management level.
Once the management development needs have been identified, the next phase in the mentoring programme involves selecting candidates to participate in the programme.

**PHASE 3: SELECT MENTORS AND MENTEES**

In the previous phase the management development needs were identified by considering strategic human resource plans, managerial succession plans and employment equity and skills development plans. In this phase of selecting candidates for the programme, competency criteria that will be used in selecting both the mentors and the mentees must first be confirmed. Once these criteria are confirmed, mentors and mentees can be identified and selected. Below is a brief discussion of the strategies that can be used for selecting mentors and mentees.

- **Confirm competency criteria for mentors and mentees**

  Both Berry (1998, p. 18) and de Beer (1998, p. 30) state that when selecting mentors and mentees the organisation needs to confirm the competency criteria that they will use in the selection process. Below is a list of mentor and mentee competencies that have been identified from the literature:

- **Mentor competencies**

  Competencies that have been identified as being necessary for mentors (refer to Section 4.2.1) include high credibility, good communication skills, sound leadership skills, the
ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things, a good sense of humour, good insight into behaviour patterns, a strong interest in developing others, the ability to assist mentees in setting goals, a willingness to serve as mentors and a commitment to their own learning.

- **Mentee competencies**

Competencies that have been identified as being necessary for mentees (refer to Section 4.3.2) include sound interpersonal skills, a track record of success, having demonstrated initiative in previous jobs, ambition, the ability to identify and solve problems, a willingness to accept greater responsibility, receptiveness to feedback and coaching, the ability to perform at one or more levels above their current positions, the realisation of their responsibility for their own career advancement and growth and an ambition to channel their abilities into career advancement.

Once the organisation has confirmed the competency criteria that they will use for selecting mentors and mentees, they can identify and select the mentors and mentees.

- **Identify and select mentors**

The organisation must have a clear understanding of who it wants to serve as mentors, why these specific types of individuals would be preferred, what specific criteria will be considered in the selection process and who will do the selecting. This information needs to be communicated to potential mentors. Although it is generally expected of managers to play a significant role in the development of their employees, it is important for
organisations to realise that not all managers are equipped to perform the mentoring role while others may be so preoccupied with their own development that they do not have the capacity or the inclination to devote to the development of mentees.

Managers should be invited to apply for the mentoring programme (discussed in Section 4.4). Cox (2000, pp. 202-210) suggests that a leaflet setting out the objectives of the programme and the way in which these objectives will be achieved should be drawn up for distribution to all managers. The leaflet should also appeal to a manager’s sense of altruism with phrases such as: “A chance to help an individual to develop and move forward; satisfaction from helping someone; commitment to offer support and encouragement to others.”

Applicants should be assessed and selected in terms of their willingness to serve as mentors and in terms of the competencies identified for mentors (see the previous section). The applicants can be classified in terms of ‘those who have all the necessary qualities to effectively perform as mentors, those who are suitable to serve as mentors but require further training and lastly, those who lack the emotional maturity and competencies to serve as mentors’. Selection of mentors can take place in terms of these classifications.

The process used for selecting mentors should be designed by the organisation to best suit the needs identified by that organisation. It is important for organisations to realise that managers who volunteer to serve as mentors generally make the best mentors.
• **Identify and select mentees**

The number and ‘type’ of mentees selected will be based on the management development needs identified from the strategic human resource plans, the succession plans and the employment equity and skills development plans. By analysing the needs identified by these plans, the mentoring programme co-ordinator is able to establish the level, number, race and gender of individuals to be selected as mentees. The mentoring programme co-ordinator is also able to establish from the human resource planning process whether mentees will have to be recruited internally or externally.

Once the ‘mix’ of mentees has been established, the organisation can select the mentees based on the competencies confirmed during Phase 3. Various approaches or techniques can be used in the selection process such as psychometric tests, case studies, role-plays and interviews.

In terms of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) it should be borne in mind that when recruiting individuals to participate in the mentoring programme, ‘suitably qualified for a job’ is determined by **any one of or a combination** of formal qualifications, prior learning, relevant experience or capacity to acquire within a reasonable time the ability to do the job. Discrimination on the grounds of lack of relevant experience alone is considered to be unfair discrimination.

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, pp. 89-90) point out (refer to Section 4.3.3) that in terms of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) good practice regarding recruitment and selection includes the following actions:
• Advertising internally prior to advertising in the broader marketplace;

• Ensuring that the choice of advertising/recruitment agencies and media used for advertisements are compatible with employment equity principles;

• Ensuring that competencies are clearly defined (the potential of a prospective candidate to achieve an expected standard within a reasonable time must be considered);

• Ensuring that selection panels are sufficiently diverse across a range of criteria such as gender, race and functions in order to fully capture the potential that a prospective candidate may have to offer the organisation;

• Targeting individuals from designated groups;

• Avoiding psychometric or psychological tests or any other means of assessment that may not be culturally fair.

Tyler (1998, pp. 98-103) makes the valuable suggestion (refer to Section 4.3.3) that it is important that mentees are chosen not simply on race or gender. Although mentoring programmes can be a useful and effective tool for increasing minority representation in the organisation, limiting selection to one ethnic and gender group can cause resentment among employees and may result in some qualified and competent individuals being overlooked. Organisations planning to embark on mentoring programmes should start with a diverse pilot group, for example a group of graduate trainees. Once the programme has been completed and proved to be successful, the organisation can move onto other specific work or task-related groups.
After suitable mentors and mentees have been selected for the programme, the next phase entails conducting an orientation session for them.

**PHASE 4: CONDUCT ORIENTATION SESSION**

During this phase the programme objectives, the roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees and the ground rules for the relationship should be communicated to the mentors and mentees. What follows is a brief discussion of these activities.

- **Communicate programme objectives**

In the discussion in Phase 1 (Define programme objectives), it was pointed out that to ensure the success of formal mentoring programmes it is important that the purpose of the programme is clearly understood by the management team and that clear and concise objectives for the programme are formulated. The objectives of the programme also need to be clearly communicated to the mentors and mentees. Besides clarifying the objectives, it is necessary to establish from the mentors and mentees in a training workshop what their specific expectations of the programme are. The mentoring programme co-ordinator needs to ensure that there is synergy between the programme objectives and the expectations of the mentees and mentors.

Once the objectives of the programme have been clarified with the mentors and mentees it is necessary to explain and define their roles and responsibilities in the mentoring relationship.
Clarify and define roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees

Berry (1998, p. 18) suggests that in this activity the mentoring programme co-ordinator will discuss the roles and responsibilities of both the mentor and mentee. The various roles of mentors were presented in Section 4.2.2. In many mentoring programmes the emphasis for the success or failure of the programme is placed on the role played by the mentor. Mentees also need to realize that they have certain responsibilities for ensuring the success of the programme. Mentees should be encouraged to take the initiative and seek out mentors rather than wait to be approached by a senior manager. Mentees need to realise the importance of being self-reliant and self-resourceful and being able to access multiple sources of support and learning.

Once the roles and responsibilities of the mentor and mentee have been clarified it is necessary to outline and obtain a ‘buy-in’ to the ground rules for the mentoring relationship.

Clarifying mentoring ground rules

Both Chesterman (2001, p. 88) and Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 95-97) believe that (refer to Section 4.7) at the orientation session it is necessary for the mentoring co-ordinator to get mentors and mentees to clarify their relationship objectives, their expectations of one another and how they will manage their relationship. The following checklist provides a set of questions that mentors and mentees can discuss in order to establish the ground rules for their relationship:

- Are we clear about each other’s expectations?
• How often should we meet?
• Where should we meet?
• How formal or informal do we want our meetings to be?
• What topics will we discuss?
• Who will take primary responsibility for making meeting arrangements?
• Are we both willing to give honest and timely feedback?
• Do we both agree to abide by the rules of confidentiality?
• What are we prepared to tell others about our relationship/discussions?
• How long will the mentoring relationship last?
• How do we ensure that the mentee’s line manager is supportive?
• What opt-out procedures can we use if either of us does not wish to continue with the relationship?

Having conducted the orientation session by clarifying the objectives of the programme together with the roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees and ground rules for the relationship, the next phase in the mentoring programme is matching mentors and mentees.

**PHASE 5: MATCH MENTORS AND MENTEES**

This phase in the mentoring process was discussed in detail in Section 4.4. From the discussion it became apparent that the key determinant of success in the programme is that of finding a good match between mentors and mentees. Organisations therefore need to be clear on which strategies they are going to use for the matching process.
• **Decide on matching process**

In deciding on the process to be used for matching mentors and mentees, consideration needs to be given to the various strategies that can be used.

The various strategies discussed in Section 4.4, include the following:

• Encouraging mentees to self-select a mentor from a list of mentors;
• Making use of a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms;
• Adopting a laissez-faire approach by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to simply evolve and then offering support to allow relationships to flourish;
• Making use of an interventionist approach by using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees. The decision regarding pairing is taken by a third party;
• Making use of a middle ground approach where a third party facilitates the pairing of mentor and mentee by providing support and guidance. However, the actual decision on the pairing is taken by the mentor and the mentee.

Besides being clear on what process will be used for matching mentors and mentees, organisations need to be clear on the role that will be played by the mentoring programme co-ordinator in the process (refer to Section 4.7). Consideration also needs to be given to the extent that mentoring programmes will be run on a formal or non-formal basis as this will impact on the nature of the matching process (refer to Section 4.8.4).
Once the matching process of Phase 5 has been completed, developmental plans can be established for the mentee.

**PHASE 6: ESTABLISH DEVELOPMENTAL PLANS**

Geiger-Dumond and Boyle (1995, p. 51) argue (refer to Section 4.2.2) that a natural tendency by mentors after they have been matched, may well be to rush into a process of setting personal short and long term objectives for the mentee without the mentee’s supervisor being involved in the process. As the final responsibility for the mentee’s personal development lies with the mentee’s supervisor, Geiger-Dumond and Boyle (1995, p. 51) suggest that mentees and their immediate supervisors should first meet for a discussion on the mentee’s development programme prior to the mentor and the mentee meeting.

- **Mentee and supervisor meet**

At this personal-development meeting between mentees and their supervisors, the discussion should cover the mentees’ strengths and limitations, their developmental interests, specific skills that mentees want to develop for the future and a development plan. Involving supervisors at this stage of the programme ensures that they understand the goals of the programme and the roles and responsibilities of the mentor and mentee.

Before the mentoring relationship commences between mentor and mentee, the mentor should make direct contact with the mentee’s supervisor to discuss the mentee’s developmental plans. At this meeting they can clarify where the boundaries of their
responsibilities towards the mentee lie. Once these meetings have taken place, the mentee and mentor can meet.

- **Mentee and mentor meet**

The developmental objectives set by the supervisor and the mentee can serve as a starting point for the first few discussions between the mentor and the mentee. These discussions can assist in confirming the mentor and the mentee’s expectations of the mentoring relationship. This discussion can also, in many cases, serve as an icebreaker which can be particularly important if the mentor and mentee do not already know each other.

Together the mentor and mentee can develop simple goals for the mentoring relationship based on the objectives set by the supervisor and the mentee.

In addition to developing goals with the mentee, the mentor can assist the mentee to break down seemingly impossible or far-fetched goals into a series of more tangible tasks that they can begin to address. By assisting mentees to develop a route-map of the experience, skills and competencies they need to gather, mentees can enter a self-development or career management path with greater confidence and commitment.

Mentors can also help mentees to think through how to raise their personal profiles where it matters in the organisation. Mentees can also be assisted to think through how to apply in practice what they are learning through theoretical study, and to gain a real understanding of the career choices that they face and the implications of each career choice.
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The major role of the mentor in the mentoring relationship is to confirm the mentee’s personal development programme by providing guidance, and access to information and by acting as a sounding board. It is important for the mentor to realise that a mentoring programme designed to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) should be based on mutual respect and not on paternalism.

In the next phase of the mentoring programme mentors and mentees provide feedback to one another and evaluate their mentoring relationship.

**PHASE 7: PROVIDE FEEDBACK AND EVALUATE RELATIONSHIP**

Berry (1998, p. 18) suggests (refer to Section 5.3.2) that it is necessary for the mentor and mentee to meet from time to time to formalise their communication regarding the mentee’s development programme and their relationship. At these sessions the mentor acts as a coach to the mentee. The sessions also provide the mentor and mentee with an opportunity to evaluate their relationship. These two activities are considered below:

- **Mentor coaches the mentee**

  The mentor’s ability to coach the mentee and clarify his or her sense of purpose and identity helps to improve the mentee’s sense of self worth. At the feedback session the mentor can also provide the mentee with additional work opportunities that will help to develop the mentee’s managerial skills and confirm and reinforce the mentee’s sense of competence and ability.
Mentors can gain a feeling of satisfaction from the knowledge that they have had an important effect on the mentee’s development. As mentees acquire additional knowledge and skills they can provide technical and psychological help and support to their mentors. The mentee may also recognise specific development needs for the mentor. When the relationship between the mentor and mentee has run for a reasonable period of time, feedback and discussion sessions centre less on defining objectives than on strategies and tactics to achieve them.

The mentor and mentee will also need to meet to review progress on project work set by the mentor and to agree on where improvements are necessary to qualify for the next career steps. In the discussion the mentor will direct the mentee towards additional sources of learning and challenge the mentee to prove the successes claimed.

- **Mentor and mentee evaluate relationship**

Both the mentor and mentee should be given the opportunity to talk openly about their relationship and to evaluate the benefits of the experience. The nature of the feedback from mentor to mentee and vice versa will be dependent on the relationship that has developed between the two of them. Feedback and evaluation meetings can be most rewarding for both mentee and mentor. In evaluating their relationship, the mentor and mentee can refer to the ground rules that were established for their relationship (refer to Phase 4).

*Clutterbuck (2001, pp. 95-97) believes (refer to Section 4.7) that it is necessary for the mentoring programme co-ordinator to establish whether mentors and mentees are meeting regularly and whether they have*
discussed the future of their relationship. Where appropriate the co-
ordinator might have to intervene in the relationship.

In section 4.11 various reasons for the dissolution of the mentoring relationship were
considered. If it is necessary to dissolve the relationship, Phase 8 of the mentoring model
is undertaken.

**PHASE 8: DISSOLVING THE RELATIONSHIP**

The mentoring relationship will reach a point for a number of possible reasons, where
mentor and mentee will have to dissolve the relationship:

- Should the mentor and mentee have to end the relationship rather
  suddenly because of unanticipated organisational changes such as the transfer of
  the mentor, their responses to the separation will differ depending on their
  preparedness for the separation. Mentees who feel that they are not ready to
  operate independently of the mentor may experience feelings of uncertainty and
  anxiety. However, those mentees who have developed sufficiently to be
  experiencing new independence and autonomy may welcome the opportunity to
  take charge of their own development.

- If the mentor has adopted a sponsorship mentoring approach with the
  mentee, the mentor may feel inclined to continue informally promoting the mentee
  at a distance and try to remain up to date on the mentee’s development in the
  organisation. Mentors may be hesitant to allow their mentees to move beyond
  their immediate influence and control, or may be resentful about the mentees
receiving career advancement opportunities. These reactions may be as a result of mentors feeling insecure in their own positions, or a concern that mentees may be advancing more quickly than they are in the organisation.

- If mentors have viewed their roles as being that of providing maximum development opportunities for mentees without a dependency relationship developing, winding down the relationship with these mentees is a relatively straightforward affair.

- If a formal time limit is built into the programme from the start it is natural for both the mentor and mentee to prepare themselves for ending the relationship well before the deadline date.

Before dissolving the relationship the mentor and mentee should allocate time to review the relationship.

- **Mentor and mentee review relationship**

It is useful for the mentor and mentee to have at least one meeting before the final closure of the relationship to review:

- The mentee’s possible feeling of uncertainty and anxiety over dissolving the relationship;

- What the relationship has delivered in terms of expected and unexpected outcomes (changes in knowledge, behaviour, roles etc) for both parties;

- What the relationship has not delivered;

---
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• What both expect from the new (informal) phase of the relationship, if there is to be one;

• The possibility of the mentor continuing to promote the mentee from a distance on an informal basis;

• What future mentoring needs the mentee may have that may best be met by other individuals.

In order to constructively end the mentoring relationship, mentors and mentees should meet informally off the job to celebrate the end of the mentoring relationship. They can use this occasion to give the mentee an opportunity to remember, reflect and refocus. The mentee should depart with the mentor’s good wishes rather than warnings or words of caution. Finally, in order for the mentee to have a feeling of independence, the mentor should allow a period of time to elapse before calling or visiting the mentee.

The final phase of the mentoring programme entails an evaluation of the programme in its entirety.

**PHASE 9: EVALUATE MENTORING PROGRAMME**

In Section 5.3.2 it was suggested that in this phase the programme should be evaluated in terms of relationship and programme processes and outcomes, as described below:

• Relationship processes – What happened in the relationships, for example, how often did the pairs meet? Did they develop sufficient trust? Was there a clear sense of direction to the relationship? Does the mentor or the mentee have concerns about his or her own or the other person’s contribution to the relationship?
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- Programme processes – How many people attended training? How effective was the training? In some cases, programme processes will also include data derived from adding together measurements from individual relationships to gain a broad picture of what is going well and less well;

- Relationship outcomes – Have mentors and mentees met the goals they set?

- Programme outcomes – Has the organisation increased its retention of key staff, or raised the competence of mentees in critical areas?

The programme can only be measured at the organisational level if the objectives or goals set at its commencement were specific and measurable.

Evaluating a mentoring programme designed to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) may not be as clear or as simple as it appears. The easy solution might be to count the number of individuals from designated groups in managerial positions before and after the mentoring programme. This approach may involve a number of difficulties as the organisation cannot control other variables in order to ensure that all individuals from designated groups who were promoted achieved their promotions as a result of the mentoring programme.

If, after a reasonable time lapse, it is established that there are significantly more individuals from designated groups at management levels, the programme may quite reasonably be deemed to be a success. Even if it were not possible to qualify that succession, it should be remembered that mentoring is an additive model: any success can be considered a bonus as mentoring does not necessarily compete with other priorities.
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5.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter four mentoring and two developmental models which include mentoring as a developmental strategy were discussed. These models, together with the legislative issues and arguments advanced for using mentoring as a strategy for enhancing accelerated development (Chapters Two and Three) and the various aspects of the mentoring process (discussed in Chapter Four), formed the basis for developing a theoretical nine-phase mentoring model.

By developing the nine-phase theoretical mentoring model, which was presented in this chapter, the first sub-problem of this study (identified in Chapter One), namely, what mentoring strategies are revealed in the relevant literature that will assist organisations in developing individuals from designated groups, has been resolved.

The second sub-problem (identified in Chapter One), namely, what mentoring strategies are currently used by organisations to facilitate the development of individuals from designated groups, was resolved by drawing up a survey questionnaire using the nine-phase mentoring model depicted in Figure 5.8 as the basis for the empirical investigation. The questionnaire and the research design for the study are described in detail in Chapter Six.
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6.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter Two the legislative basis for mentoring was discussed. The reasons for using mentoring as a strategy for facilitating management development and various aspects of the mentoring programme were examined in Chapters Three and Four. Chapter Five focused on a theoretical model for effectively implementing organisational mentoring. The theoretical model developed in Chapter Five was used as the basis for this research study.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology that was used during the study. The technical aspects of the study are discussed in order to justify the quality of the procedures that were used. The chapter also presents a quantitative analysis of the biographical data of the respondents in tabular and chart form.

6.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Leedy (1997, p. 3) defines research as the systematic process of collecting and analysing information (data) in order to increase our understanding of the phenomenon with which we are concerned or interested. Salkind (2000, p. 3) defines research simply as the process through which new knowledge is discovered. However, he augments this definition by stating that high-quality research is characterised by numerous different attributes, many of which tend to be related to one another and to overlap. In his opinion,
• is based on the work of others,
• can be replicated,
• is generalisable to other settings,
• is based on some logical rationale and tied to theory,
• is doable,
• generates new questions or is cyclical in nature,
• is incremental,
• is an apolitical activity that should be undertaken for the betterment of society.

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2000, p. 2) quote Esterby-Smith et al. (1991) who argue that three things combine to make business and management a distinctive focus for research:
• the way in which managers and researchers draw on knowledge developed by other disciplines;
• the fact that managers tend to be powerful and busy people and they are unlikely to allow research access unless they can see personal or commercial advantages;
• the requirement for the research to have some practical consequence which means it either needs to contain the potential for taking some form of action or to take account of the practical consequences of the findings.

The research design adopted in this study initially consisted of identifying the main
problem and breaking it down into three sub-problems. The main problem was:

**What mentoring strategies can organisations use for enhancing employee development to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)?**

In order to develop a research strategy to deal with and solve the main problem, the following sub-problems were identified:

1. What mentoring strategies are revealed in the relevant literature that will assist organisations in developing individuals from designated groups?

2. What mentoring strategies are currently used by organisations to facilitate the development of individuals from designated groups?

3. How can the results obtained from the resolution of sub-problems 1 and 2 be combined into an integrated mentoring model that can be used by organisations as a strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)?

**The following broad procedures were adopted to solve the main and sub-problems:**

(a) In Chapter Two a literature survey was conducted to determine the legislative basis for mentoring in terms of the provisions set by the Act to
facilitate employment equity objectives – particularly at the management level in South African organisations.

In Chapter Three the literature dealing with the rationale for using mentoring as a strategy for enhancing accelerated development of managers was surveyed. Literature on the various aspects of mentoring programmes was researched. These aspects as well as a critical analysis of mentoring were discussed in Chapter Four. In Chapter Five a theoretical model of mentoring based on the literature, was presented.

(b) In order to resolve sub-problem two, the theoretical mentoring model presented in Chapter Five was used as the basis for compiling the survey questionnaire (included as Appendix 6.1) to establish the extent to which organisations agree or disagree with the model developed in this study.

This aspect of the study was conducted by means of a postal survey. The questionnaire was designed so that the responses to the questions could be statistically analysed to determine the extent to which respondents concur with the theoretical model. The successful completion of this step resolved sub-problem two of the study.

(c) The results obtained in step (b) were used to adapt the theoretical mentoring model where and if necessary, to align it with the views of the majority of respondents. This resulted in the development of an
integrated model for organisational mentoring. Sub-problem three of the study was thereby resolved.

6.3 **CONDUCTING THE EMPIRICAL STUDY**

The empirical study was conducted by means of a postal survey. The questionnaire developed for this purpose served as the measuring instrument. The results of the questionnaire were statistically analysed using the Statistica Version Six and SPSS Version 11.0 programmes. Sampling procedures, the questionnaire, the pilot study, the postal survey, and the research response are discussed in detail below.

6.3.1 **Sample**

Prior to commencing the empirical study, it was necessary for the researcher to decide whether to study the entire population of elements or to study only a sample of elements taken from the population. Leedy, (1997, p. 204) emphasises that “the sample should be so carefully chosen that, through it, the researcher is able to see all the characteristics of the total population in the same relationship that they would be seen were the researcher, in fact, to inspect the entire population.” He argues that not all data lend themselves to sampling and that sampling is appropriate wherever large populations that have an outward semblance of homogeneity are to be investigated.

*Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results*
De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Delport (2002, pp. 198-199) define a population as “a set of entities in which all the measurements of interest to the researcher are represented, or alternatively, the total set from which the individuals of units of the study are chosen.” A sample consists of the elements of the population considered for actual inclusion in the study. Research data are usually collected from a sample as a complete coverage of the total population is seldom possible. There is not always sufficient time or resources to test a population and more accurate information is obtained from sampling a population.

In the light of these facts, a sample of the population was used to collect the data for this research study.

### 6.3.1.1 Sampling methods

Representativeness is an important aspect of sampling. According to de Vos et al. (2002, p. 201) representativeness indicates that the sample has approximately the same characteristics as the population. All methodologists agree that in order to ensure that a sample is as representative as possible, random sampling is the only method that ensures this condition is present. However, before deciding on this sampling method, it is prudent to obtain an indication of the use and value of other sampling methods.
Two major groups of sampling procedures exist: probability and non-probability sampling. De Vos et al. (2002, pp. 203-208) discuss these groups of sampling.

- **Probability sampling** determines that each person or other sampling unit in the population has the same known probability of being selected. The following types of sampling are found in this category:
  - Systematic sampling, where only the first case is selected randomly and all subsequent cases are selected according to a particular interval;
  - Stratified random sampling, which is suitable for heterogeneous populations because it ensures the inclusion of small sub-groups;
  - Cluster sampling, which is sometimes used when a sampling frame such as a list of names is not available;
  - Panel sampling, which involves the selection of a fixed panel of persons from the population.

- **Non-probability sampling** is not based on the occurrence of an equal chance of selection. This category includes:
  - Accidental sampling, which is based on any case that happens to cross the researcher’s path, that has anything to do with the phenomenon;
• Purposive sampling, which is a sample composed of elements that contain the most characteristic, representative, or typical attributes of the population;

• Quota sampling, which draws a sample that is as close to a replica of the population as possible;

• Dimensional sampling, which specifies all variables in the population that are of interest to the investigation;

• Target sampling, which involves developing controlled lists of specified populations within geographical districts;

• Snowball sampling, in which the researcher approaches a single case involved in the phenomenon to be investigated, in order to gain information on other similar person;

• Spatial sampling, which is used in cases of highly temporary populations such as sporting events, or the scene of an accident.

It is clear that for the purposes of this study, the most useful sampling method is that of random sampling, which is part of the probability group of sampling techniques. In making this choice, the researcher must also be aware of the sample size.

6.3.1.2 Sample size

A general dictum concerning sample size is that the larger the population, the smaller the percentage of that population the sample needs to be. Conversely, if the population itself is
relatively small, the sample should comprise a reasonably large percentage of the population. De Vos et al. (2002, p. 200) point out that sample size can impact on the statistical test by making it either insensitive at small sample sizes, or overly sensitive at very large sample sizes. In a case such as the sample linked to this study, where the population has been established at between 50 and 100, the authors suggest that the sample should consist of between 32 to 45 respondents.

### 6.3.1.3 Sampling error

An area of research that inexperienced researchers often overlook is that of sampling error. In a technical paper on sampling error by DSS Research (2001), the authors emphasise the importance of the fact that every survey contains some form of error. Even a complete census of all known members of a population is subject to random error or potential measurement error. The two major forms of sampling error that might be encountered in a survey are random error and systematic error.

*Random error* is the difference between the sample results and the true results. Even if all the aspects of the sample analysis are executed properly, the result will still be subject to a certain amount of random error, or random sampling error, because of chance variation. Although this error cannot be avoided, it can be
reduced by increasing the sample size. It is also possible to estimate the range of random error at a particular level of confidence (DSS Research, 2001).

The technical paper of DSS Research (2001) indicates that *systematic error* occurs when sample results consistently vary in one direction, either higher or lower, from the true values for the specific population. Two forms of systematic error are sample design error and measurement error.

Sample design results may be biased because of:

- Frame error, which emerges when the sampling frame does not represent a true cross-section of the target population;
- Population specification error, which results from an incorrect definition of the universe or population from which the sample is selected;
- Selection error, which involves a systematic bias in the manner in which respondents are selected for participation in the study;
- Measurement error, which manifests through several types of error that occur during the measurement process;
- Surrogate information error, which is the result of a discrepancy between the information sought by the researcher and the information required to answer a particular question;
- Interview error, which occurs when the respondent is influenced by the interviewer’s physical appearance or body language, to give inaccurate or untrue answers;
• Measurement instrument bias, which results from an ineptly compiled questionnaire;

• Processing error, which arises when mistakes are made in transferring information to computer data files;

• Nonresponse bias, which refers to the people who are selected to participate in a research study, but who fail to respond for some reason;

• Response bias, which is the result of survey participants deliberately falsifying or misrepresenting data when they are not certain of the facts.

The researcher has taken all the above details into account when making decisions regarding the research sample.


6.3.2 The questionnaire

The theoretical mentoring model developed in Chapter Five served as the basis for the development of the questionnaire (see Appendix 2). Specific aspects regarding the development of the questionnaire and the covering letter are discussed below:

6.3.2.1 Development of the questionnaire

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2000, p.279) make the important point that many researchers use a questionnaire to collect data without considering other methods such as examination of secondary sources, observation and semi-structured or in-depth interviews. They suggest that all possible data collection
methods should be evaluated and the method most appropriate to the research question and the achievement of the research objectives should be selected. Questionnaires are inappropriate for exploratory and other research that requires large numbers of open-ended questions. They are most suitable when standardised questions are used and the researcher is confident that all respondents will interpret these questions in the same way.

Leedy (1997, pp. 191-194), Salkind (2000, pp. 137-140) and Saunders et al. (2000, p. 282) offer practical guidelines that govern the use of the questionnaire as a tool in survey research. These guidelines are summarised as follows:

- The language must be unmistakably clear. What may be a meaningful question to the researcher may be meaningless jargon to the individual attempting to complete the questionnaire. Every attempt must be made to ensure that questions are not ambiguous. An astute researcher will conduct a pilot study to pretest the questionnaire with a group of colleagues in order to establish whether they have difficulty understanding any item or whether there are terms that do not ask exactly what the writer of the questionnaire is trying to establish.

- The questionnaire should be well formatted, clearly and neatly typed with adequate margins. The items and the questionnaire should be presented in an attractive, professional and easy to understand format. All questions and pages should be clearly numbered. The questionnaire should be as brief as possible (a maximum of 6-8 A4 size pages) and should solicit only those
data essential to the research project. Each item on the questionnaire
should be tested against the following two criteria:

(a) What do I intend to do with the information that I am soliciting?

(b) Is it absolutely essential to have this information to solve any part of the
research endeavour?

- The questions should be objective and ordered from easy to specific and
  transitions are used from one topic to the next. Finally, clear and specific
directions as to how it should be completed and returned to the researcher
must be given.

In addition to these practical guidelines the researcher must attach a self-
addressed stamped envelope for the respondents’ convenience in returning the
questionnaire. It is also courteous to offer to send respondents a summary of the
study should they wish to receive copies of the summary. When making use of a
postal questionnaire, it is advisable for the researcher to place a unique
identification number on each questionnaire. This number is then recorded on the
list of recipients, making it easier to check and follow-up on non-respondents.
However, the researcher should not use these unique identification numbers if he
or she has assured respondents that their replies will be treated anonymously.
Finally, even before constructing the questionnaire, the researcher must know
precisely how the data will be processed after the results are received; for
example should the researcher want to computerise the data, the questionnaire would be structured quite differently than if the data were to be handled in more conventional ways.

6.3.2.2 Reliability and validity of the measuring instrument

Salkind (2000, p. 106) argues that the reliability and validity of a measuring instrument are essential, since the absence of these qualities could explain why researchers act incorrectly in accepting or rejecting their research hypotheses. He further reasons that reliability and validity are the researcher’s first line of defence against spurious and incorrect conclusions – if these instruments fail, then everything else down the line fails as well.

Reliability

Salkind (2000, p. 106) maintains that a measuring instrument is reliable when a test measures the same thing more than once under comparable conditions, and results in the same outcome each time. Leedy (1997, p. 35) and Riley, Wood and Clarke (2000, p. 126) describe reliability in terms of whether the measuring instrument (in the case of this research project, the questionnaire) consistently measures what it is intended to measure.
Both Huysamen (1975, p. 406) and Singleton, Straits and Straits (1993, p. 121) agree that the reliability of the instrument may be improved through conducting exploratory studies in the area of interest or by conducting pretests on a small sample of persons similar in characteristics to the target group. In the case of this research study, this was achieved by using a pilot study (see section 6.3.3).

Validity

Salkind (2000, pp. 112-113) describes validity in terms of the research instrument simply as “does the instrument that the researcher is using actually measure what he/she needed to have measured.” Leedy (1997, p. 32) supports Salkind’s (2000) description of validity but adds that researchers should also establish how well, how comprehensively and how accurately the instrument will measure what they want to measure.

Huysamen (1975, p. 415), Leedy (1997, pp. 33-34), McBurney (1994, pp. 119-124) and Salkind (2000, pp. 113-116) describe various forms of validity that can be used to establish the trustworthiness of results from an assessment tool. These forms of validity are summarised briefly below:
Content validity refers to the accuracy with which an instrument measures the factors or situations under study. Simply stated, content validity is concerned with how accurately the questions asked tend to elicit the information sought.

Face validity asks two questions that researchers must answer in accordance with their best judgment:

(a) Is the instrument measuring what it is supposed to measure?
(b) Is the sample being measured representative of the behaviour or trait being measured?

McBurney (1994, p. 123) makes the important point that face validity is more a problem of public relations than of true validity. He argues that a test may have a high or low degree of validity regardless of its face validity.

Criterion validity is concerned with how well a research instrument either estimates present performance (concurrent validity) or how well it predicts future performance (predictive validity). The validity is determined by relating a performance measure to another measure (a criterion) that may be used as a standard against which results are measured.

Construct validity refers to the degree to which the questionnaire measures the construct being investigated – in the case of this study, mentoring strategies.
• Internal validity refers to the extent to which researchers form conclusions on the data obtained without influencing the data in terms of their personal bias.

• External validity refers to the extent to which the conclusions made from the research can be generalised to the broader population, different subjects, settings, times and so forth and not merely the sample studied.

Kemp (1997, p. 197) reasons that the three types of validity that particularly need to be considered in the use of a questionnaire such as a research instrument are content validity, construct validity and face validity. He further suggests that the evaluation of the validity of a questionnaire can be ensured by proper advanced planning of the questionnaire. He maintains that the evaluation of the validity of a questionnaire can be achieved by “a logical examination of the items to determine if they adequately represent the subject being investigated, if they relate to the construct being tested and if they appear, at face value, to be suitable.”

Great care was taken in the study to evaluate the content, construct and face validity of the questionnaire by subjecting the questionnaire to a pilot study. (Refer to Section 6.3.3).

6.3.2.3 Questionnaire covering letter
Most self-administered questionnaires are accompanied by a covering letter that explains the purpose of the survey (see Appendix 1). It is the first part of the questionnaire that the respondent will look at. Leedy (1997, p. 196) suggests that the initial letter should be carefully and thoughtfully structured and should stress the concerns of the person receiving the letter, rather than any selfish interests of the sender. He further states that some researchers forget this and, in so doing, betray their own self-centeredness without perhaps intending to do so.

Salkind (2000, p. 140) and Saunders et al. (2000, pp. 303-304) provide the following suggestions regarding the contents of covering letters:

- They must be typed on good quality, official letterheads which include the researcher’s telephone number.
- They must be personalised. They must not open with the words ‘Dear Participant’, but should state the recipient’s title and name, if possible.
- They must state the nature and value of the research.
- They must incorporate an assurance of confidentiality and anonymity.
- They must provide the name of a contact person who will deal with queries.
- They must offer a clear, physically separate expression of thanks.
- The researcher and the supervisor must sign the covering letter in blue ink.

6.3.3 Pilot study
Saunders et al. (2000, pp. 305-307) stress the importance of conducting a pilot study prior to using the questionnaire to collect data. They indicate that the purpose of the pilot study is to refine the questionnaire so that the respondents will have no problems in answering the questions and the researcher will have no problems recording the data. By making use of the pilot study the researcher will be able to obtain some assessment of the validity of the questions as well as the likely reliability of the data that will be collected. They suggest that the researcher should request a group of experts to comment on the representativeness and suitability of the questions and encourage suggestions for improving the structure of the questionnaire. This will make it possible to amend the questionnaire prior to pilot testing it with a group as similar as possible to the final group in the sample.

The approach used for the pilot study in this project consisted of two steps:

- The initial questionnaire was given to eight senior academics who have a good understanding of the functioning of mentoring programmes. Copies of this questionnaire were also given to the two statisticians who assisted with the statistical analysis. The inputs from these ten individuals were considered and necessary amendments were made to the questionnaire.

- The amended questionnaire was tested on a group of five human resource practitioners who were representative of the population used in the empirical study. Further refinements were made to the questionnaire based on the recommendations of these practitioners. Bell (1999) in Saunders et al. (2000, p.306) suggests a framework to test the
questionnaire used in the pilot study. Using these guidelines, specific feedback was sought from the human resource practitioners to establish the following:

- how long it took to complete the questionnaire;
- the clarity of instructions;
- which question(s), if any, were unclear or ambiguous;
- which question(s), if any, the respondents felt uneasy about answering;
- whether, in their opinion, there were any major topic omissions;
- whether the layout was clear and attractive.

6.3.4 Postal survey

A postal survey was used for the empirical study.

Saunders et al. (2000, p. 310) advise that the procedure for postal questionnaires should be split into the following six stages:

- Ensure that questionnaires and letters are printed and envelopes addressed.

- Contact recipients by post, telephone or e-mail and advise them to expect a questionnaire. Saunders et al. (2000, p. 119) believe that a pre-survey contact, which is often omitted for cost reasons, is necessary to establish contact with intended participants and to secure their co-operation, especially given any operational constraints that restrict their availability.
• Post the survey with a covering letter and a return envelope. It is advisable to ensure that the questionnaire will arrive at recipients when they are likely to be receptive. For most organisations, Fridays and days surrounding major public holidays have been shown to be a poor time for receipt of a questionnaire.

• Post (or e-mail) the first follow-up one week after posting out the survey to all recipients. When using questionnaires, this should take the form of a postcard designed to thank early respondents and to remind, rather than persuade non-respondents.

• Post the second follow-up after three weeks to individuals who have not responded. It is wise to include another copy of the questionnaire, a new return envelope and a new covering letter, which should be reworded to further emphasise the importance of completing the questionnaire. Unfortunately, if anonymous questionnaires are used, it is not possible to make use of a second follow-up as the researcher will not be able to tell who has responded.

• Use a third follow-up if time permits or the response rate is low. Under these circumstances it may be necessary to make use of registered post or a telephone call to emphasise the importance of responding.

6.3.5 Administering the questionnaire
The names and addresses of organisations operating in the automobile and automobile component industry in the Nelson Mandela Metropole were obtained from the Port Elizabeth Regional Chamber of Commerce. Similarly, the addresses of the organisations operating in the automobile and automobile component industry in the Buffalo City Metropole were obtained from the Border/Kei Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The questionnaire was posted to these organisations under cover of a letter (see Appendix 2). The researcher adhered strictly to all the guidelines relating to the development of the questionnaire, the covering letter and the postal survey (refer to Sections 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.3, and 6.3.4).

Based on the lists obtained from the Port Elizabeth Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Border/Kei Chamber of Commerce and Industry, each organisation selected as being part of the automotive and automotive-related industries and complying with the demarcated organisational size of 50 or more employees, or fewer than 50 employees but with a minimum annual turnover exceeding R25 million as stipulated in section 1.4.2, was contacted telephonically to obtain the name of the human resource or training manager in that organisation. The rationale for selecting human resource and training and development specialists was because it was assumed that these individuals would more than likely have been involved in the introduction and implementation of mentoring programmes. It could also be assumed that because of their experience, training or education, that they would have a knowledge of mentoring programmes. Where organisations had not appointed a human resource specialist, the names of the managing directors were obtained as it was believed
that these individuals would have a knowledge of previous and current mentoring activities in their organisations.

6.3.6 Response rate

Letters and questionnaires were posted to sixty-two organisations on 2 August 2002 and respondents were requested to return the questionnaire by 20 August 2002. The geographical dispersion of these organisations is shown in Table 6.1 and Chart 6.1.

**TABLE 6.1**

NUMBER OF COMPANIES SURVEYED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF COMPANIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo City Metropolitan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela Metropolitan and Municipalities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source: List of automobile and automobile component manufacturers supplied by the Port Elizabeth Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Border/Kei Chamber of Commerce.

**CHART 6.1**

NUMBER OF COMPANIES SURVEYED

![Pie chart showing 29% for Buffalo City Metropole and 71% for Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality.]

Source: Table 6.1 converted to a pie chart

**TABLE 6.2**

NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED ON OR BEFORE DUE DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo City Metropole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From Table 6.2 it can be seen that the response from the Buffalo City Metropole was extremely poor, reflecting that only one of eighteen questionnaires were returned. In the Nelson Mandela Metropole, responses numbered eight of the total forty-four questionnaires sent out.

Table 6.3 represents the total responses after the researcher had telephonically followed up with individuals who had not returned their questionnaires by the due date of 20 August 2002. Individuals who still had a copy of the questionnaire were requested to complete and return it by 10 September 2002. Those individuals who indicated that they did not have a copy of the questionnaire were sent a questionnaire by e-mail. They were requested to complete the questionnaire and e-mail it to the researcher by 10 September 2002. This elicited a total response of 15 from the Buffalo City Metropole (83.3 per cent) and 29 from the Nelson Mandela Metropole (66.0 per cent). A total response rate of 71 per cent was achieved.

| Source: | Responses from postal survey |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nelson Mandela Metropole</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>18.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6.3
NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED AFTER FOLLOW UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONDEES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffal City Metropole</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela Metropole</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Responses to postal survey

Saunders et al. (2000, pp. 158-159) suggest that although it is difficult for the researcher to estimate a likely response rate from a sample that has been sent questionnaires, one way of making this estimate is to consider the response rate achieved for similar surveys and base the estimate on that response. Saunders et al. (2000, p. 158) believe that a response rate of approximately 30.0
per cent for postal surveys is reasonable. Hutton (2002, p. 159) achieved a response rate of 41.6 per cent with a similar sample. The response rate of 71.0 per cent was therefore considered to be acceptable.

6.4 ANALYSIS OF BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Section A of the questionnaire required respondents to complete general biographical information. The questions were designed to highlight independent variables that could be used to facilitate comparisons between responses to the dependent variables in the responses to the questions in Sections B and C. The results of the questions posed in Section A of the questionnaire are presented in Tables 6.4 to 6.16 and Charts 6.2 to 6.17. A brief discussion of the data is offered immediately following the respective tables.

**TABLE 6.4**

**RESPONSES ACCORDING TO ORGANISATIONAL SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL SIZE</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 400 employees</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 – 500 employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 600 employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 – 800 employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 – 1000 employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 1500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 – 3000 employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001 – 5000 employees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 and more employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of size of the organisations.

**CHART 6.2**

**RESPONSES ACCORDING TO ORGANISATIONAL SIZE**

Source: Table 6.4 converted to a Pie Chart.

From Table 6.4 and Chart 6.2 it can be seen that organisations of all sizes across the spectrum were represented in the response. The highest percentage of responses (56.8 per cent) came from the smaller organisations, namely those with between 0-400 employees.
In the researcher’s opinion, this is indicative of the fact that numerous companies of a smaller size are engaged in the manufacture and supply of automotive components and related services. This is substantiated by the data produced in Table 6.5 and Chart 6.3, which indicate that the majority of the respondents are drawn from the automotive components area.

**TABLE 6.5**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO PRODUCT MANUFACTURED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT MANUFACTURED</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of products manufactured.
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**Chart 6.3**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO PRODUCT MANUFACTURED

![Pie chart showing responses according to product manufactured](chart.png)

Source: Table 6.5 converted to a Pie Chart.

**Table 6.6**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO POSITIONS CATERED FOR BY ORGANISATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL POSITIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Department</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/s responsible for Employment Equity Act programmes</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/s responsible for mentoring programme management</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/s responsible for career development</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Results obtained from analysis of positions catered for by organisations.

The results in Table 6.6 are portrayed in Pie Charts 6.4 to 6.7.

**CHART 6.4**

**ORGANISATIONS WITH HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENTS**

Source: Part of Table 6.6 converted to a Pie Chart

**CHART 6.5**

**ORGANISATIONS WITH POSITIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT PROGRAMMES**
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CHART 6.6

ORGANISATIONAL POSITIONS FOR MENTORING PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

CHART 6.7

ORGANISATIONAL POSITIONS FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Source: Part of Table 6.6 converted to a Pie Chart
Table 6.7
RESPONSES TO POSITION IN ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources/ Training Manager</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Part of Table 6.6 converted to a Pie Chart

Table 6.6 and Charts 6.4 to 6.7 inclusive indicate that the majority of the organisations surveyed have human resources departments (91 per cent) and positions with the responsibility for Employment Equity Act programmes (82 per cent). However, the survey reveals that most of the organisations reviewed in the automotive and automotive-related industries do not have positions with the responsibility for mentoring programme management (84 per cent). Sixty eight per cent of the respondents indicated that their organisations had positions responsible for career development.
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### Chart 6.8

**RESPONSES TO POSITION IN ORGANISATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager / Mentor</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>25.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of positions held in the organisation.
Source: Table 6.7 converted to a Pie Chart. The distribution and frequencies depicted in Table 6.6 and Chart 6.8 substantiate the researcher’s decision to select human resources and training and development specialists as survey material (see section 6.3.5).

**TABLE 6.8**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LENGTH OF SERVICE</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1 yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 5 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 + yrs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of length of service.

**CHART 6.9**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF SERVICE
The responses reveal that 59 per cent of the respondents have five years’ or less experience in their current positions.

**TABLE 6.9**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of gender of respondents.
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RESPONSES ACCORDING TO GENDER

Source: Table 6.9 converted to a Pie Chart.

From Table 6.9 and Chart 6.10 it can be seen that males comprise 65.9 per cent of respondents and females 34.1 per cent. No significance can be attached to this as it was not known how many males or females were in the population. It was, therefore, not possible to calculate what number of each gender actually received a questionnaire.

TABLE 6.10
RESPONSES ACCORDING TO AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Results obtained from analysis of respondents by age group.

**TABLE 6.11**
RESPONSES ACCORDING TO HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATION LEVEL</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 6.10 converted to a Pie Chart.

From Table 6.10 and Chart 6.11, it can be seen that 59 per cent of respondents were below the age of 40 and 82 per cent were below the age of 50. While it is interesting that only 18 per cent of respondents were aged between 50 and 60 years, no significance can be attached to this fact. No respondents were over the age of 60.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma / Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Tech / Honours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters &amp; Above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of educational qualifications of respondents.

#### Chart 6.12

**RESPONSES ACCORDING TO HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION**

*Source: Table 6.11 converted to a Pie Chart.*

It is interesting to note that 93 per cent of the respondents have some form of tertiary education, of which 32 per cent have a post graduate qualification. The researcher observes that while the sample size can be considered quite small (n=44), 18 per cent of the respondents have a M-5 (NQF level 7) qualification.
TABLE 6.12
RESPONSES ACCORDING TO MENTORING WORKSHOP/SEMINAR ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MENTORING WORKSHOP / SEMINAR ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of response rate according to mentoring workshop/seminar attendance.

CHART 6.13
RESPONSES ACCORDING TO MENTORING WORKSHOP/SEMINAR ATTENDANCE

Source: Table 6.12 converted to a Pie Chart.

Table 6.12 and Chart 6.13 reveal that only 41 per cent of the respondents indicated that they had attended mentoring workshops or seminars in the past three years. A lack of knowledge of the functioning of mentoring programmes and the
contribution that they can make to facilitating management development in order to achieve employment equity objectives, could be a factor influencing the non-introduction of mentoring programmes.

**TABLE 6.13**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT (ACT 55 OF 1998) WORKSHOP/SEMINAR ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT WORKSHOP</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of response rate according to Employment Equity Act workshop/seminar attendance.

**CHART 6.14**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT (ACT 55 OF 1998) WORKSHOP/SEMINAR ATTENDANCE

![Pie chart showing 87% Yes and 13% No]
Table 6.13 and Chart 6.14 illustrate that 87 per cent of the respondents had attended workshops/seminars on the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) in the past three years, indicating that organisations attach a high rate of importance to knowledge of the Act.

**TABLE 6.14**

**RESPONSES ACCORDING TO MENTORING EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE AS MENTOR</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of response rate according to mentoring experience.

**CHART 6.15**

**RESPONSES ACCORDING TO MENTORING EXPERIENCE**

Source: Table 6.14 converted to a Pie Chart
Although the theoretical discussion in chapters Two, Three and Four of this research study confirm the value of mentoring being used as a strategy for management development, almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of the respondents have never acted as mentors. In this context, the researcher assumes that this can be linked to the data indicated in Table 7.1, which reveals that 68 per cent of the responding organisations do not use formal mentoring programmes to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

**TABLE 6.15**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO YEARS SERVED AS A MENTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS AS MENTOR</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 + years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of response rate according to years served as a mentor.

**CHART 6.16**

RESPONSES ACCORDING TO YEARS SERVED AS A MENTOR
Table 6.14 and Chart 6.15 show that respondents who have acted as mentors are in the minority. Of these, three quarters (75 per cent) of respondents have less than five years' experience as mentors (see Table 6.15 and Chart 6.16).

TABLE 6.16
RESPONSES ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF MENTEES MENTORED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. OF MENTEES</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results obtained from analysis of response rate according to number of mentees mentored.

CHART 6.17
The final analysis of biographical details of the respondents reveals that almost 69.0 per cent of the respondents have mentored four or less mentees during their years of experience as a mentor. This low percentage is understandable when judged against the low percentage of respondents who have had mentoring experience (36.4 per cent as presented in Table 6.14 and Chart 6.15).

6.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this chapter was to document the research methodology that was used during the study as well as a quantitative analysis of the biographic details of respondents.
During the discussion on the methodology, special attention was given to the development and administration of the questionnaire and the selection of the sample. The discussion also explained the procedure that was used to glean information from the respondents, and the follow-up procedure that was used after the due date for responses in order to obtain an acceptable response rate.

An analysis of the biographical information (section A of the questionnaire) was provided by means of explanatory tables and charts.

The following chapter will take the research findings a step further by analysing and interpreting the extent to which organisations use formal mentoring programmes as a strategy to enhance employee development to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). The extent to which respondents concurred with the nine-phase theoretical mentoring model that was developed from the literature search is also examined in the next chapter. The chapter concludes with the development of an integrated model for organisational mentoring.
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7.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter the research methodology that was used during the study was described. The technical aspects of the study were discussed in order to justify the quality of the procedures that were used. In addition, the results obtained from Section A of the questionnaire, namely, the biographical data, were presented in Chapter Six.

The aim of Chapter Seven is to assist in resolving the second sub-problem: What mentoring strategies are currently used by organisations to facilitate the development of individuals from designated groups?

The results of Section B of the questionnaire are presented, namely, the use of formal organisational mentoring programmes as a strategy to enhance development to meet the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives. The results of Section C of the questionnaire, which addresses the Nine-Phase Mentoring Model, are also discussed.

The questions from Sections B and C were designed to survey the dependent variables as well as to verify the information sourced during the literature study described in Chapters Two, Three, Four and Five.
The research findings from sections B and C have been organised and presented in tabular form in the same sequence as the questions appear in the survey questionnaire (refer Appendix 6.1). These tables were compiled with the aid of computer printouts generated by the Statistics Department of the Port Elizabeth Technikon, using the Statistica Version Six and the SPSS version 11.0 programmes to process the survey data collected.

In order to generate more confidence in the results, the data were screened for asymmetrical distributions, data entered incorrectly, missing data, and outliers, which are scores with extreme values. Struwig and Stead (2001, p.158) state that the presence of any of these factors can provide the researcher with distorted statistics and incorrect conclusions.

Below is an analysis and interpretation of the research findings for Sections B and C of the questionnaire.

7.2 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF SECTION B OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The raw data were analysed into descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics produced measures of central tendency and dispersion of selected variables. The inferential statistics included parametric statistics, which determined the nature of the statistical tests applied to the raw data. According to Struwig and Stead (2001, p.160) parametric statistics have certain assumptions that must be met if they are used:
• The observations must be independent. The selection of one case should not affect the chances for any other case to be included.
• The samples must be drawn from normally distributed populations.
• These samples must have equal variances.
• The measurement scale should be interval or ratio.
• The distribution of scores should be symmetric, although many statistical tests are sufficiently robust to cope with moderate asymmetry.

The researcher ensured that these assumptions were met during the course of the analysis. The analysis consisted of univariate and bivariate tests.

The aim of question B.1 was to establish the extent to which organisations currently use formal mentoring programmes as a strategy to facilitate employee development to meet Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives. Question B.2 was designed to determine the reasons why some organisations do not use formal mentoring programmes to meet Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives.

7.2.1 Extent of mentoring programme usage

The distribution of organisations that use formal mentoring programmes as a tool to enhance employee development to meet Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives and those who do not, is categorised in Table 7.1
TABLE 7.1
EXTENT OF MENTORING PROGRAMME USAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORISATION OF PROGRAMME USAGE</th>
<th>RESPONSE FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section B.1

From Table 7.1 it can be seen that the number of respondents whose organisations currently do not use formal mentoring programmes to enhance employee development (68.2 per cent) is more than twice the number of those who use formal mentoring programmes (31.8 per cent).

7.2.2 Reasons for not using formal mentoring programmes

Table 7.2 shows the responses to question B.2 of the questionnaire, which required only those respondents who answered in the negative in question B.1 to complete.
REASONS FOR NOT USING FORMAL MENTORING PROGRAMMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS FOR NOT USING FORMAL MENTORING PROGRAMMES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from senior management</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers not prepared to commit time to mentoring</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers too busy to serve as mentors</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management believes that mentoring relationships will develop naturally</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of know-how on how to implement programme</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational climate is not conducive to introduction of programme</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous attempts at introducing programmes have failed</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section B.2

Table 7.2 indicates that the sample size has decreased from n=44 in Sections A and B.1 to n=30 in Section B.2 due to the fact that only those respondents whose organisations currently do not use formal mentoring programmes to enhance employee development to meet Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives were required to answer this question.

From Table 7.2 it can be seen that respondents agreed that the major reasons why their organisations do not use formal mentoring programmes are “managers are too busy to
serve as mentors” (63.3 per cent) and “a lack of know-how on how to implement the programme” (53.3 per cent).

Thomas and Robertshaw (1999, p. 95) found from their research that the main reasons for failure of mentoring programmes was a lack of time and a lack of commitment on the part of the mentors. This appeared to be the case irrespective of whether mentors were chosen from the same department as mentees, or from different departments.

Clutterbuck (2001, p. 121) states that in every survey of mentoring problems that he has seen, the lack of time allocated by mentors to the relationship is one of the top three issues. He further states that managers who have the most wisdom to pass on to potential mentees are likely to be among the busiest. The realisation that the mentoring relationship will require the commitment by managers to allocate quality time to mentees, may well be a reason for a lack of preparedness by these managers to volunteer to serve as mentors. This may particularly be the case when managers do not perceive the benefits that they can derive from the mentoring relationship.

One respondent indicated in the ‘Others’ column of the questionnaire that his organisation had never considered introducing a formal mentoring programme. One had never been requested to implement a formal programme and another indicated that because of numerous disputes, their organisation’s Employment Equity Committee had not been active, therefore, under the circumstances it was impossible for them to implement mentoring programmes aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

**TABLE 7.3**

*Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results*
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SECTION B.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from senior management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers not prepared to commit time to mentoring</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers too busy to serve as mentors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management believes that mentoring relationships will develop naturally</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of know-how on how to implement mentoring programme</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational climate is not conducive to introduction of programme</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous attempts at introducing programmes have failed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Descriptive statistics for Table 7.2

An analysis of the mean and standard deviation of each variable reveals an aggregate mean of 3.08. Table 7.3 indicates that the following variables are relatively distanced from the aggregate mean:

- Managers too busy to serve as mentors (mean = 2.60; co-efficient of variance = 0.43).
- Lack of know-how on how to implement programme (mean = 2.63; co-efficient of variance = 0.44).
- Previous attempts at introducing programmes have failed (mean = 3.70; co-efficient of variance = 0.28).

Although the mean of the variable “previous attempts at introducing programmes have failed” holds the greatest distance from the aggregate mean, the co-efficient of variance...
of 0.28 is relatively low. The co-efficients of variance of 0.43 on the variable “managers too busy to serve as mentors” and 0.44 on the variable “lack of know-how on how to implement programme” reveal that there is considerable difference of opinion between the respondents regarding the effects of these selected variables. The results of the statistical testing on the other variables in Section B.2 indicate greater agreement between the respondents.

**TABLE 7.4**

**CORRELATIONS FOR SECTIONS A.10 AND B.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managers too busy to serve as mentors</th>
<th>Lack of know-how on how to implement mentoring programme</th>
<th>Mentoring workshop attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers too busy to serve as mentors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of know-how on how to implement mentoring programme</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring workshop attendance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Correlation statistics for Table 7.2

The strength of the relationships between the variables “managers too busy to serve as mentors” and “lack of know-how on how to implement programme” was tested on the data received for question A.10 in Section A of the questionnaire by means of Pearson’s
correlation co-efficients at a significance level of $p = 0.05$. This data applied to the question: Have you attended workshops/ seminars on mentoring during the past three years?

Table 7.4 indicates very weak negative relationships with correlations of $-0.105$ and $-0.083$ for “managers too busy to serve as mentors” and “lack of know-how on how to implement programme” respectively, when tested against the data received for attendance at mentoring workshops or seminars. The correlation of $0.278$ between “managers too busy to serve as mentors” and “lack of know-how to implement programme”, although not strong, is meaningful and reveals the most significant relationship of those tested at $p = 0.136$.

The researcher also tested the strength of the relationship between the above-mentioned variables and the variables “nature of the organisation where the respondents are employed”, and “region in which the organisation is located”. Table 7.5 indicates a weak negative relationship ($-0.211$) between the nature of the organisation and the variable “managers too busy to serve as mentors” and virtually no relationship between the region where the organisation is located and the same variable.
### TABLE 7.5

**CORRELATIONS FOR SECTIONS A.2, A.3 AND B.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manager s too busy to serve as mentors</th>
<th>Lack of know-how on how to implement mentoring programme</th>
<th>Nature of organisation</th>
<th>Region in which organisation located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers too busy to serve as mentors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.278.136.30</td>
<td>-.211 .262.30</td>
<td>-.099 .601.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of know-how on how to implement mentoring programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.278.136.30</td>
<td>.126 .506.30</td>
<td>-.180 .341.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>.278.136.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of organisation</strong></td>
<td>.211.262.30</td>
<td>.126 .506.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.110 .479.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>.211.262.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region in which organisation located</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.180 .341.30</td>
<td>-.110 .479.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.099.601.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Correlation statistics for Table 7.2

**In Table 7.5 the correlation between the variables “lack of know-how on how to implement the programme” and the nature and the region where the organisation is located was calculated out at .126 (nature of the organisation) and out at -.180 (region where the organisation is located). These statistics indicate a weak positive relationship**
between the variables “lack of know-how” and “nature of the organisation”, and a weak negative relationship between the variables “lack of know-how” and “geographical region in which the organisation is located”.

In all the cases tested, the calculated p - levels fall outside the critical regions of \(-0.025 \leq p \geq 0.025\) indicating a lack of statistical significance at this level.

“Previous attempts at introducing programmes that have failed” (66.7 per cent), “organisational climate not conducive to introduction of the programme” (56.7 per cent) and “inadequate funds” (56.7 per cent) were given as the least likely reasons why organisations had not introduced mentoring programmes.

On the basis of these results, the researcher infers that if previous attempts had been made to introduce mentoring programmes, failure was not a reason why the programmes were no longer active. In addition, the organisational climate would have been conducive to the introduction of the programme. The researcher also accepts that adequate funds would be made available by organisations for the purpose of implementing and managing formal mentoring programmes.

It must be pointed out that numerous respondents were uncertain of the reasons why their organisations do not use formal mentoring programmes. For example, while 26.7 per cent of respondents were uncertain whether “lack of support from senior management” is a contributing reason, almost 37 per cent of respondents were not confident enough to
agree or disagree with the statement that “senior management believes that mentoring relationships will develop naturally”.

7.3 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF SECTION C OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The researcher is aware that it is prudent to take into account any variables that could influence the results of the research. In this study, those respondents who did not have mentoring experience and who completed the questionnaire in terms of their own perceptions and opinions could affect the responses.

The questions in Section C of the questionnaire were designed to determine the degree to which human resource practitioners and mentors concur with the nine-phase theoretical mentoring model that was presented from the literature search phase of this study. The sample size increased from \( n = 44 \) in Section A to \( n = 82 \) as all organisational mentors were requested to complete Section C together with the original respondents to Sections A and B.

7.3.1 Phase One: Define mentoring programme objectives

Table 7.6 shows the responses to Phase One of the mentoring model, which refers to the defining of mentoring programme objectives.
### TABLE 7.6
RESPONSES TO BENEFITS IN DEFINING PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING MENTORING PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to clearly define programme objectives</td>
<td>No. % 80</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined objectives aid in programme design</td>
<td>No. % 80</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined programme objectives aid in programme evaluation</td>
<td>No. % 77</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing the support of senior management to programme the objectives is essential for programme success</td>
<td>No. % 77</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section C: Phase 1

**From Table 7.6 it can be seen that respondents were in general agreement that clearly defined mentoring programme objectives serve as an aid to designing (97.6 per cent agreement) and evaluating (97.5 per cent agreement) the mentoring programme. There was strong agreement (93.9 per cent) to the need for securing senior management support to mentoring programme objectives in order to ensure the success of the programme.**
According to Berry (1998, p. 16) the support of senior management to the mentoring programme can be obtained by communicating the mentoring programme objectives and strategies to them, providing them with an opportunity to clarify their understanding and air their concerns regarding the organisation’s mentoring strategy. Berry (1998, p. 16) suggests that the mentoring programme co-ordinator should create an opportunity to address the concerns of senior management and convert these concerns into specific action plans that satisfy management’s concerns.

7.3.2 Phase Two: Identify management development needs

Table 7.7 shows the responses to Phase Two of the mentoring model. These responses indicate activities that can assist organisations in identifying specific management development needs that may be addressed by mentoring programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES TO ASSIST IN IDENTIFYING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED BY MENTORING</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic human resource plans</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession plans</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity plans</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development plans</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 7.7 it can be seen that there is high agreement with all four activities listed for assisting organisations in identifying management development needs to be addressed by mentoring. Responses range from 95.1 per cent for “Skills Development Plans” to 82.9 per cent for “Employment Equity Plans”. However, there is a degree of uncertainty and disagreement in all the areas listed, particularly in the areas of “Employment Equity Plans” (17.1 per cent) and “Strategic Human Resources Plans” (13.4 per cent). The uncertainty could be the result of responses from respondents who have not actually been involved in implementing mentoring programmes.

**TABLE 7.8**

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SECTION C.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic human resource plans</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession plans</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity plans</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development plans</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Descriptive statistics for Table 7.7

The aggregate mean of the variables stated in Table 7.7 is 1.72. The means of the variables are all relatively close to the aggregate mean, except for “succession plans’,
which has a mean of 1.52. The standard deviation of this variable (.590) is also relatively far from the aggregate standard deviation of .719 (see Table 7.8). This indicates a degree of uncertainty regarding the importance of this variable when selecting activities to assist in identifying management development needs. The z score of the variable is -0.28 and with p = 0.39, is not statistically significant at the 10% level (p = 0.05)

7.3.3 Phase Three: Selecting mentors and mentees

Table 7.9 shows the responses to Phase Three of the mentoring model, which refers to the selection of mentors in terms of specific identified competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCIES FOR MENTORS</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High credibility</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>78 95.1</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication skills</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>81 98.8</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound leadership skills</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>74 90.2</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>49 59.8</td>
<td>15 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good sense of humour.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>49 59.8</td>
<td>15 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good insight into behaviour patterns</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>75 91.7</td>
<td>5 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong interest in developing others</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>79 96.4</td>
<td>3 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to assist mentees in setting goals</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>77 93.9</td>
<td>5 6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 7.9 it can be seen that there is generally high agreement with eight of the ten competencies listed as being necessary for mentors. The agreement ranged from 98.8 per cent for “good communication skills” to 87.8 per cent for “commitment to their own learning”. The two competencies on which there was not high agreement were the “ability of the mentor to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things” (59.8 per cent) and “a good sense of humour” (59.8 per cent). Both of the variables show an equal and relatively high percentage of uncertainty (18.3 per cent) and disagreement (21.9 per cent). These variables were tested further by comparing their means and standard deviations with the aggregate means and standard deviations of the ten variables in this section.

### TABLE 7.10

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR MENTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High credibility</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound leadership skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good sense of humour</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good insight into behaviour patterns</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong interest in developing others</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to assist mentees in setting goals</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section C: Phase 2
The mean and standard deviation of the variable “good sense of humour” are calculated out at 2.68 and 1.095 respectively (see Table 7.10). This results in a difference of .95 from the aggregate mean (1.73) and a difference of .456 from the aggregate standard deviation (.639). When compared to the means and standard deviations of the other independent variables in this section, it appears that there is a significant statistical difference attached to the variable “good sense of humour” and because consensus is divided, attention should be given to the strength of this variable as a competency necessary for mentoring. The mean of 2.68 shows a great deal of uncertainty amongst the respondents as it is extremely close to the middle of the 5-point Likert scale, which was used throughout the survey questionnaire. This is worthy of comment as the respondents would rather indicate uncertainty than commit themselves to selecting agreement, or disagreement for the competency “good sense of humour”. The z score of 1.48 at p = 0.07 is not statistically significant at the 10% level.

Although the raw scores of the variable “ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things” are similar to the scores of the variable “good sense of humour”, the mean (1.59) and standard deviation (.497) are statistically close enough to the aggregate mean and aggregate standard deviation to accept that there is no significant difference between these scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to serve as mentors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to their own learning</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Descriptive statistics for Table 7.9

Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results
In order to determine if any relationship exists between certain selected variables and the variables of “length of time in the current position” and “gender of the respondent”, a Pearson correlation co-efficient was calculated between the aforementioned variables and:

- good communication skills;
- ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things;
- good sense of humour, and
- commitment to their own learning.

The result indicated virtually no relationship between any of these variables and they were not tested further.

Clutterbuck (2001, p.53) believes that good humour, when used appropriately by the mentor, is invaluable in developing rapport, in helping mentees to see matters from a different perspective and to release emotional tension. He also believes that this competency is most useful in assisting the mentor and mentee to enjoy the time that they spend interacting with one another. It is possible that respondents did not realize the value of a good sense of humour for creating a climate conducive to learning.

Lewis (1996, p. 39) indicates that one of the highly desirable qualities identified by mentors is an empowering orientation – creating a climate and the conditions in which it is safe for mentees to try out different ways of doing things to contribute more fully and to have a greater share in what is going on in their organisation. It is possible that, because this quality was not stated in full in the questionnaire, respondents did not completely appreciate the total value of this competency.
Table 7.11 shows the responses to Phase Three of the mentoring model, which refers to the selection of mentees in terms of specific identified competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCIES FOR MENTEES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound interpersonal skills</td>
<td>63 76.8 9 11.0</td>
<td>10 12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A track record of success</td>
<td>53 64.6 11 13.4</td>
<td>18 22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated initiative in previous jobs</td>
<td>64 78.1 11 13.4</td>
<td>7 8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>73 89.0 5 6.1</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify and solve problems</td>
<td>78 95.1 3 3.7</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to accept greater responsibility</td>
<td>81 98.8 1 1.2</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive to feedback and coaching</td>
<td>79 96.3 3 3.7</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to perform at one or more levels above their current position</td>
<td>71 86.6 7 8.5</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realisation of responsibility for their own career advancement and growth</td>
<td>81 98.8 1 1.2</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition to channel abilities into career advancement</td>
<td>79 96.3 2 2.4</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section C: Phase 3

Table 7.11 indicates that there is generally high agreement with the majority of competencies (nine of the ten) listed as being necessary for mentors. The agreement ranged from 98.8 per cent agreement for “willingness of mentees to accept greater responsibility” and “the realisation by mentees of their responsibility for their own career.
advancement and growth” to “sound interpersonal skills” (76.8 per cent) There appears to be some doubt concerning the validity of “a track record of success” as a competency. Besides the fact that 22.0 per cent of the respondents did not agree that this variable is necessary when selecting mentees, 13.4 per cent of the respondents were uncertain whether it should be considered during the selection process. A similar percentage of the respondents were also uncertain whether it is necessary for the potential mentee to have demonstrated initiative in previous jobs.

**TABLE 7.12**

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR MENTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound interpersonal skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A track record of success</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated initiative in previous jobs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify and solve problems</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to accept greater responsibility</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive to feedback and coaching</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to perform at one or more levels above their current position</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realisation of responsibility for their own career advancement and growth</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition to channel abilities into career advancement</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Descriptive statistics for Table 7.11

Table 7.12 offers a mean of 2.66 and a standard deviation of 1.010 for the variable “a track record of success”. When compared to the aggregate mean of 1.89 and the
aggregate standard deviation of .660, the researcher finds a difference of -.77 for the mean, and a difference +3.50 for the standard deviation.

The variable “a track record of success” was correlated with all the variables in Phase 5 of the model, that is, approaches used for matching mentors and mentees (refer to the questionnaire in Appendix 1). Table 7.13 indicates that there are no statistically significant relationships between these variables. The only relationship of note is a positive relationship of .379 at the p≤.05 level between “using a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms” and “using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees”.

### TABLE 7.13

**CORRELATIONS FOR COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR MENTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Encourage mentees to self-select a mentor</th>
<th>Use a support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors</th>
<th>Adopt a “laissez-faire” approach &amp; allow mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally</th>
<th>Use certain criteria</th>
<th>Use third parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results*
### Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track record of success</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Attachment of mentors and mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage mentees to self-select a mentor</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Attachment of mentors and mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use a support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Attachment of mentors and mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopt “laissez-faire” approach &amp; allow mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Attachment of mentors and mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use certain criteria to match mentors and mentees</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Attachment of mentors and mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use third party to facilitate pairing of mentor and mentee</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Correlations for Table 7.11
7.3.4 Phase Four: Conduct orientation activities

Table 7.14 shows the responses to Phase Three of the mentoring model, which refers to issues that should be addressed at an orientation session.

**TABLE 7.14**

**ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AT AN ORIENTATION SESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AT AN ORIENTATION SESSION</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the programme</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives to be achieved</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme expectations of mentors and mentees</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of meetings</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality/informality of meetings</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics to be discussed at meetings</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for making meeting arrangements</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to give honest and timely feedback</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement to abide by the rules of confidentiality</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of the mentoring relationship</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring mentee’s line manager support</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for discontinuing the relationship</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The range of responses in Table 7.14 lies between 75.6 per cent of the sample who believe that the formality/informality of meetings should be addressed at an orientation session, and 98.8 per cent of the sample who are of the opinion that the purpose of the programme, and the objectives to be achieved should be included in the orientation session. Most of the disagreement and uncertainty is attached to the matters of meetings and the mentoring relationship. The mean and standard variation of the variable “duration of the mentoring relationship” (2.20 and .851 respectively) are further from the aggregate mean (1.79) and the aggregate standard deviation (.655). However, these statistics are within acceptable limits and no significance can be attached to them.

7.3.5 Phase Five: Match mentors and mentees

Table 7.15 shows the responses to Phase Five of the mentoring model, which refers to approaches that can be used for matching mentors and mentees.
## TABLE 7.15

### APPROACHES USED FOR MATCHING MENTORS AND MENTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACHES USED FOR MATCHING MENTORS AND MENTEES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging mentees to self-select a mentor from a list of mentors</td>
<td>No. 39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 47.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms</td>
<td>No. 44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 53.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopting a “laissez-faire” approach by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally</td>
<td>No. 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 23.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees</td>
<td>No. 62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a third party who facilitates the pairing of mentor and mentee by providing support and guidance.</td>
<td>No. 39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 47.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section C: Phase 5

Table 7.15 indicates that there is considerable indecision and hesitancy in agreeing with the designated variables of this research item. Respondents who are uncertain regarding the applicability of these variables for matching mentors and mentees range from 13.4 per cent for “encouraging mentees to self-select a mentor from a list of mentors”, to 28.0 per cent for “using a third party who facilitates the pairing of mentor and mentee by providing support and guidance”. The spread of respondents in disagreement is considerably wider than those who are uncertain. Only 9.8 per cent of respondents do not feel that “using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees” is a valuable approach,
howevér 60.9 per cent of respondents oppose using the approach of “adopting a ‘laissez-faire’ approach by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally”.

Hale (2000, pp.223-224) points out that some organisations will use a largely laissez-faire approach to matching mentors and mentees by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to simply evolve and then offering support to allow relationships to hopefully flourish. He further argues that other organisations may take an interventionist approach, using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees; the decision regarding the pairing is actually taken by a third party, in many cases the Human Resources department. Hale (2000, p.234) suggests that somewhere in between these extremes lies a middle ground where the third party facilitates the pairing of mentors and mentees by providing support and guidance but allowing the actual decision to be taken by the mentor and mentee.

Each of the five items of this research question were correlated with the position of the respondent, length of time of the respondent in the stated position, gender, age and education of the respondent, whether the respondent had attended any workshops, or seminars on mentoring, and whether the respondent had ever served as a mentor. Table 7.16 identifies the significant relationships at the \( p \leq 0.05 \) level as follows:

- A negative relationship between the position of the respondent and “adopting a ‘laissez-faire’ approach by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally”.
- A positive relationship between “using a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms” and whether the respondent had attended workshops or seminars on mentoring.

**TABLE 7.16**

---

*Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results*
### CORRELATIONS FOR APPROACHES USED FOR MATCHING MENTORS AND MENTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Encourage mentees to self-select a mentor</th>
<th>Use a support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors</th>
<th>Adopt a &quot;laissez-faire&quot; approach &amp; allow relationships to develop naturally</th>
<th>Use certain criteria to match mentors and mentees</th>
<th>Use third party to facilitate pairing of mentor and mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage mentees to self-select a mentor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a &quot;laissez-faire&quot; approach &amp; allow relationships to develop naturally</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use certain criteria to match mentors and mentees</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using third party to facilitate pairing of mentor and mentee</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in position</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.969</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop attendance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results
### Table 7.17  
**Responses to activities associated with establishing developmental plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for Establishing Developmental Plans</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentees firstly meet with immediate supervisors for a personal development discussion</td>
<td>No 76.927</td>
<td>3 3.7</td>
<td>3 3.7</td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentees and supervisors discuss mentee’s strengths and limitations, development interests, and specific skills to be developed</td>
<td>No 76.927</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
<td>2 2.4</td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor meets with mentee’s supervisor to discuss mentee’s development objectives</td>
<td>No 76.927</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
<td>2 2.4</td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and mentee develop goals for the mentoring relationship, based on objectives set by the supervisor and mentee</td>
<td>No 78.951</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>4 4.9</td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor facilitates mentee’s developmental programme</td>
<td>No 71.866</td>
<td>5 6.1</td>
<td>6 7.3</td>
<td>82 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Correlations for Table 7.15

#### 7.3.6 Phase Six: Establish developmental plans

Table 7.17 shows the responses to Phase Six of the mentoring model, which refers to activities related to establishing developmental plans for the mentee.
Table 7.17 provides evidence of the high rate of agreement for the activities related to establishing developmental plans for the mentee. This is substantiated in Table 7.18, where the co-efficients of variance are between .40 (mentees and supervisors discuss mentee’s strengths and limitations, development interests, and specific skills to be developed) and 0.52 (mentor facilitates mentee’s developmental programme).

**TABLE 7.18**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ACTIVITIES FOR EstablishING DEVELOPMENTAL PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentees firstly meet with immediate supervisors for a personal development discussion</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentees and supervisors discuss mentee’s strengths and limitations, development interests, and specific skills to be developed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor meets with mentee’s supervisor to discuss mentee’s development objectives</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and mentee develop goals for the mentoring relationship, based on objectives set by the supervisor and mentee</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor facilitates mentee’s developmental programme</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Descriptive statistics for Table 7.17

7.3.7 Phase Seven: Provide feedback and evaluate relationship
Table 7.19 shows the responses to Phase Seven of the mentoring model, which refers to activities that should form part of the feedback and evaluation session held by the mentor and the mentee.
### TABLE 7.19
RESPONSES TO ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION SESSION

![Table 7.19](chart.png)

Source: Survey Questionnaire, Section C: Phase 7

Table 7.19 shows that the least support is for the variable “mentees provide technical and psychological help and support to mentors” (52.4 per cent) and this variable also manifests the highest degree of uncertainty and disagreement (24.4 per cent and 23.2 per cent respectively. The high rate of uncertainty may indicate that the respondents were not
sure of the meaning of this item. The number of respondents that disagree with this item (23.2 per cent) could indicate that they are not aware of the benefits of this variable.
TABLE 7.20

CORRELATIONS FOR FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION SESSION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentees provide technical and psychological help and support to mentors</th>
<th>Mentees provide technical and psychological help and support to mentors</th>
<th>Number of years as a mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentees provide technical and psychological help and support to mentors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years as a mentor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Correlations for Table 7.19

The Pearson product-moment correlation indicates a weak negative relationship between the number of years the respondents had spent as a mentor and “mentees provide technical and psychological help and support to mentors”. This relationship is statistically insignificant and it can be assumed that the length of time as a mentor does not influence the technical and psychological help and support that mentors expect from mentees.

7.3.8 Phase Eight: Dissolving the relationship

Table 7.21 shows the responses to Phase Eight of the mentoring model, which refers to issues that should be discussed by the mentor and mentee when dissolving the relationship.
In Table 7.21 responses range from 95.1 per cent for the variable “what the relationship has delivered in terms of expected and unexpected outcomes”, to 69.5 per cent for “possibility of mentors continuing to promote mentees from a distance on an informal basis”. This might indicate reluctance on the part of the respondents to engage in any kind of future mentoring relationship, even on an informal basis.
7.3.9 Phase Nine: Evaluate the mentoring programme

Table 7.22 shows the responses to Phase Nine of the mentoring model, which refers to issues that need to be considered by the organisation in evaluating the mentoring programme in its entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR EVALUATING MENTORING PROGRAMME n = 82</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did mentors and mentees meet often enough on specific mentor-related issues?</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did mentors and mentees develop sufficient mutual trust?</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there a clear sense of direction in mentoring relationships?</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many participants attended mentor/mentee training programmes?</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the impact of training programmes on mentors and mentees?</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did mentors and mentees meet goals they set?</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the organisation increased retention of key staff, particularly</td>
<td>No . %</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.22 provides evidence that nine of the ten variables have high support from the respondents, presenting a range of 86.6 per cent to 97.6 per cent. The only variable that respondents are reluctant to support is “How many participants attended mentor/mentee training programmes?” with a 67.1 per cent endorsement, 19.5 per cent uncertainty and 13.4 per cent disagreement. The mean of this variable is 2.36, with a standard deviation of .942. When these statistics are compared to the aggregate mean of 1.73 and aggregate standard deviation of .667, it is evident that the variance is substantial. It is possible that the respondents were confused by the way in which the item was worded.

The data in Table 7.22 indicates that respondents believe that the most essential variables that should be evaluated are whether the competencies of mentees have increased in critical areas, whether goals and objectives of the mentoring programme have been achieved, and whether measurable objectives or goals set at the commencement of the programme have been achieved.
7.4 REVIEW OF QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS WITH A VIEW TO ELIMINATING, ALTERING OR ADDING TO ASPECTS OF THE THEORETICAL NINE-PHASE ORGANISATIONAL MENTORING MODEL

A theoretical nine-phase organisational mentoring model (refer Figure 5.7), which was developed by a process of synthesis from information gleaned from various secondary sources that were consulted, was presented in Chapter 5. The model presented resolved sub-problem one of the study, which dealt with the mentoring strategies that are revealed in the relevant literature that will assist organisations in facilitating the development of individuals from designated groups.

The question asked in sub-problem two of this study was what mentoring strategies are currently used by organisations to facilitate the development of individuals from designated groups. Sub-problem two was resolved by compiling a survey questionnaire using the nine-phase organisational mentoring model as the basis for the questionnaire. Closed-ended questions were asked which forced respondents to state whether they agreed or disagreed with strategies and activities related to the different phases of the model. It was not presumed that the model was without limitations in terms of the sequencing of the phases or the activities related to the phases. Therefore, adequate space was allocated in each section being investigated to afford respondents the opportunity to propose the addition or elimination of strategies or activities related to each phase, competencies necessary for mentors and mentees, and any other issues which they believed could enhance the theoretical model.
The question posed in sub-problem three of the study, namely, how can the results obtained from the resolution of sub-problems one and two be combined into an integrated mentoring model which can be used by organisations as a strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998), will be answered in this section. The aim of this section is to integrate the results obtained from the empirical survey with the theoretical nine-phase organisational mentoring model developed from the literature research phase of this study. In order to achieve the aim of this section, the following approach will be used:

- The results of the quantitative analysis are reviewed to establish whether a lack of support from the respondents in the empirical survey warrants the removal of any of the strategies or activities related to each phase of the model as well as the competencies listed as being necessary for mentors and mentees.

- Thereafter, proposals from respondents for possible inclusion or alteration to the model (which were highlighted in the qualitative analysis of the results) are reviewed, with a view to integrating them with the model. The integrated model for organisational mentoring will resolve sub-problem three, identified in Chapter One, which read, “How can the results obtained from the resolution of sub-problems one and two be combined into an integrated mentoring model that can be used by organisations as a strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

### 7.4.1 Review of qualitative analysis of results with a view to eliminating strategies and activities related to each phase of the model
An examination of the qualitative results reveals that there was a trend of agreement/strong agreement with the various strategies and activities related to each phase of the model.

The only aspects of the qualitative results on which there was not high agreement related to the competencies for mentors (refer Table 7.10) and feedback and evaluation session activities (refer Table 7.21).

The analysis and interpretation of the statistical results relating to Table 7.10 indicated that the two competencies on which there was not high agreement were the “ability of the mentor to create a climate in which mentees feels confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things” (59.8 per cent) and “a good sense of humour” (59.8 per cent). As illustrated in Table 7.10, both of these variables showed an equal and relatively high percentage of uncertainty (18.3 percent) and disagreement (21.9 per cent)

These independent variables were subjected to rigorous mean and standard deviation testing. Only the variable “good sense of humour” displayed a significant statistical difference of .95 from the aggregate mean of 1.73, and .456 from the aggregate standard deviation of .639. Therefore it was decided to eliminate the competency “good sense of humour” and retain the competency “ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things”.

7.4.2 Review of qualitative analysis of results with a view to altering or adding to the strategies and activities related to each phase of the model
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As mentioned in Section 7.4.1, an examination of the qualitative results revealed that there was a trend of agreement/strong agreement with the various strategies and activities related to each phase of the model. In this section the proposed additions/alterations to the strategies and activities related to each phase of the model, as well as the competencies listed as being necessary for mentors and mentees are briefly discussed in Section 7.4.2.1.

7.4.2.1 Proposed additions/alterations to phases of organisational mentoring model

Each of the nine phases of the organisational mentoring model will be reviewed in terms of possible additions/alterations.

- Phase 1 – Define programme objectives

  No additions or alterations were proposed for Phase 1 by the respondents.

- Phase 2 – Identify management development needs

  No additions/alterations were proposed for Phase 2 by the respondents

- Phase 3 – Select mentors and mentees

Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results
No alterations/additions were proposed for Phase 3 by the respondents.

- Phase 4 – Conduct orientation session

This phase evoked interesting responses from the respondents. Various respondents indicated that there were far too many issues to be addressed at a single orientation session. They suggested that this phase should read “Conduct orientation sessions.” A number of other respondents, besides agreeing that more than one orientation session is held, believed that these sessions should serve as orientation and training sessions. Bell (2000), Clutterbuck (2001), Lewis (1996), Murrell, Crosby and Ely (1999) and Parslow and Wray (2001) all stress the importance of providing training for both the mentors and the mentees. This training might have to be provided for the mentees and mentors in separate groups in order to equip them with specific skills related to the roles that they need to perform in the relationship. Phase 4 of the theoretical model has been reworded to read “Conduct orientation and training sessions for mentors and mentees”, thus incorporating the suggestions from the respondents which is supported by the theory.

Two respondents indicated the need to clarify contracts between mentors and mentees. However, these suggestions are catered for in the activity in Phase 4 relating to “Outlining and obtaining support for ground rules for mentoring relationships”. It was therefore decided not to incorporate these suggestions in the model.
• Phase 5 – Match mentors and mentees

One respondent suggested the following approach for matching mentors and mentees: "Management assigns competent managers, who are regarded as ‘bench-mark performers’, to mentees. Mentees would then be encouraged to model themselves and align their activities with those of the mentor”. This suggestion overlapped with two of the approaches, namely: “using a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms”, and “using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees”. It was therefore decided not to include this suggestion as a strategy in Phase 5.

• Phase 6 – Establish developmental plans

No additions/alterations were proposed for Phase 6 by the respondents

• Phase 7 – Provide feedback and evaluate relationship

No additions/alterations were proposed for Phase 7 by the respondents

• Phase 8 – Dissolving relationship

No additions/alterations were proposed for Phase 8 by the respondents
• Phase 9 – Evaluate mentoring programme

No additions/alterations were proposed for Phase 9 by the respondents

7.4.2.2 The need for a transformational culture

From the reasons given by respondents for not using formal mentoring programmes as a strategy for facilitating employment equity objectives (refer to Table 7.2), it became apparent that it is not because of a lack of funds that organisations have not introduced mentoring programmes. The problem appears to lie with management who are too busy to serve as mentors, not prepared to commit time to mentoring or not willing to support the introduction of formal mentoring programmes.

South African organisations are being exposed to rapid environmental changes such as globalization, workforce diversity and technological innovation. These environmental changes force South African organisations to consider altering the fundamental assumptions and basic values that drive their organisations.

Enlightened managers have come to realise that they will have to make significant changes in the way that things are done if their organisations are to survive. The type of leadership that is currently required in South African organisations is what has been labelled as transformational leadership. Hellriegal, Jackson and Slocum (1999, p. 521) define transformational leadership simply as ‘leading by motivating’. They describe transformational leaders as individuals “who provide extraordinary motivation by appealing to followers’ ideals and moral values and inspiring them to think about
problems in new ways”. The influence of these leaders rests on their ability to inspire others through their words, visions and actions and making tomorrow’s dreams a reality for their followers. Osland, Kolb and Rubin (2001, p. 295) provide further understanding of transformational leaders by describing them as value-driven change agents who make followers more conscious of the importance and value of task outcomes. These leaders also provide followers with a vision and motivate them to go beyond self-interest for the good of the organisation. Nelson and Quick (1997, p. 350) support the description of transformational leaders offered by Osland et al. (2001) by describing them as individuals who inspire and excite their followers to high levels of performance, relying on their personal attributes instead of their official position to manage their followers.

If organisations plan to introduce mentoring programmes that are to contribute towards achieving their employment equity objectives, it is necessary to ensure that a transformational culture exists. This might require that the organisation undergoes transformational change in which the organisation moves to a radically different and sometimes unknown, future state. In transformational change, the organisation’s mission, culture, goals, structure and leadership may all have to undergo dramatic change (Nelson & Quick, 1997, p. 544).

Luthans (2001, pp. 591-592) explains that research has indicated that transformational leaders share the following characteristics:

- They identify themselves as change agents
- They are courageous
- They believe in people
- They are value driven
• They are lifelong learners
• They have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty
• They are visionaries

In summary, for a transformational organisational culture to develop, it is necessary that the majority of senior managers possess the qualities and characteristics of transformational leaders. From the description of the qualities and characteristics of transformational leaders offered by Hellriegal et al. (1999), Luthans (2001), Nelson and Quick (1997) and Osland et al. (2001) it becomes apparent that the organisational culture that will be created by these leaders will greatly enhance the chances of success of mentoring programmes aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

It appears that a transformational culture is the core of an organisational mentoring model, around which the nine phases revolve. It is thus prudent to include this concept in the integrated mentoring model.

7.5 INTEGRATED MODEL FOR ORGANISATIONAL MENTORING

The objective of this study was to develop an integrated model of mentoring strategies that can be utilized by organisation to facilitate the development of designated employees in order to achieve the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). That objective has been met by following a three-step process, broadly consisting of:
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(a) Developing a theoretical model for organisational mentoring from a study of the secondary sources that were used.

(b) Establishing from a sample of human resource practitioners (and in a few cases, managing directors), whether they agreed that the model could assist their organisations in implementing mentoring programmes to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

(c) Integrating the results from the empirical survey with the theoretical model to develop an integrated organisational mentoring model.

The extensive discussion in Section 7.4 relating to a review of strategies incorporated in the theoretical mentoring model, culminates in the nine-phase integrated organisational mentoring model which is presented in Figure 7.1. The details of each phase of the model are presented in Figure 7.2.
PHASE 1

Define programme objectives

Secure management support for programme objectives and strategies by ensuring that the following steps are actioned:

- Communicate programme objectives and strategies;
- Gain insight of concerns regarding programme;
- Clarify management’s understanding of the objectives and strategies;
- Obtain management’s views on how strategies can be improved and changed;
- Create an opportunity to address management concerns regarding the programme;
- Convert concerns into specific action plans.

PHASE 2

Identify management development needs

Ensure that management development needs are documented by undertaking the following steps:

- **CONSIDER STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE PLANS.**
  - Establish projected organisational changes, anticipated scale of activities and core competencies required;
  - Match internal and external supply of people with anticipated resource and skill requirements.

- **CONSIDER MANAGERIAL SUCCESSION PLANS.**
  - Establish plans to cater for promotions, untimely deaths, resignations, terminations or orderly retirement of organisational managers.
CONSIDER EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT PLANS.
- Use people requirements established from strategic human resource and succession plans to establish and implement measures (via skills development plans) to ensure that suitable individuals with correct qualifications are selected from designated groups to participate in mentoring programmes aimed at facilitating employment equity objectives.
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PHASE 3
Select mentors and mentees

Confirm competencies for mentors and mentees:
MENTOR COMPETENCIES.
- High credibility;
- Good communication skills;
- Sound leadership skills;
- Ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things;
- Good insight into behaviour patterns;
- Strong interest in developing others;
- Ability to assist mentees in setting goals;
- Commitment to their own learning;
- Willingness to serve as mentors.

IDENTIFY AND SELECT MENTORS
- Invite managers to apply for mentoring programme;
- Assess applicants in terms of:
  - their willingness to serve as mentors,
  - competencies identified for mentors.
- Select mentors in terms of:
  - those who have all the necessary qualities,
  - those who are suitable but require further training,
  - those who lack emotional maturity and necessary competencies.

MENTEE COMPETENCIES.
- Sound interpersonal skills;
- A track record of success;
- Demonstrated initiative in previous jobs;
- Ambitious;
- Ability to identify and solve problems;
- Willingness to accept greater responsibility;
- Receptive to feedback and coaching;
- Potential to perform at one or more levels above their current position;
- Realisation of responsibility for their own career advancement and growth;
- Ambition to channel abilities into career advancement.

IDENTIFY AND SELECT MENTEES.
- Analyse strategic human resource plans, succession plans and employment equity and skills development plans to establish:
  - Level, number, race and gender of individuals to be selected as mentees.
  - Establish from human resource planning whether to recruit internally or externally;
- Select mentees in terms of competencies identified and stipulations of Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).
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**PHASE 4**

*Conduct orientation and training sessions*

- COMMUNICATE PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES.
  - Clarify understanding of purpose;
  - establish mentors’ and mentees’ programme expectations to ensure synergy with programme objectives;

- CLARIFY AND DEFINE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF MENTORS AND MENTEES.

- OUTLINE AND OBTAIN ‘BUY-IN’ TO GROUND RULES FOR MENTORING RELATIONSHIP.
  - Frequency of meetings;
  - Formality/informality of meetings;
  - Topics to be discussed at meetings;
  - Who is responsible for making meeting arrangements;
  - Willingness to give honest and timely feedback;
  - Agreement to abide by the rules of confidentiality;
  - Duration of the mentoring relationship;
  - Need for ensuring mentees’ line manager support.

**PHASE 5**

*Match mentors and mentees*
Decide on matching process by using one of the following approaches:

- Encourage mentees to self-select mentors from a list of mentors;
- Use a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms;
- Adopt a “laissez-faire” approach by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally;
- Use certain criteria to match mentors and mentees;
- Use a third party who facilitates pairing of mentors and mentees by providing support and guidance.
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PHASE 6

Establish developmental plans

- **MENTEE AND SUPERIOR MEET FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSION.**
  - Discussion covers mentee’s strengths and limitations, development interests, specific skills to be developed and a development plan.

- **MENTOR AND MENTEE’S SUPERIOR MEET.**
  - Discuss mentee’s development objectives and plans and clarify where boundaries of their responsibilities to mentee lie.

- **MENTEE AND MENTOR MEET.**
  - Mentors and mentees discuss objectives set by supervisor and mentee;
  - Mentor and mentor develop simple goals for mentoring relationship (based on objectives set by supervisor and mentee) such as:
    - Introducing mentees to parallel activities which they need to understand in order to progress,
    - Helping mentees break down seemingly impossible or far-fetched goals into a series of tangible goals they can begin to address,
- Helping mentees to think through how to raise their visibility where it matters,
- Helping mentees to think through how to apply in practice what they are learning through theoretical study,
- Helping mentees to gain a real understanding of career choices that are available to them and implications of each choice.

PHASE 7

**Provide feedback and evaluate relationship**

At these sessions mentors:
- coach mentees and clarify their sense of purpose and identity;
- provide mentees with additional developmental assignments;
- and mentees review progress and agree on improvement for next career step;
- direct mentees towards additional sources of learning;
- challenge mentees to prove success claimed;
- and mentees establish whether they have developed sufficient rapport and trust to work together.
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PHASE 8

**Dissolving the relationship**
Mentor and mentee discuss the following issues:

- Mentee’s feeling of uncertainty and anxiety over dissolving the relationship.
- What the relationship has delivered in terms of expected and unexpected outcomes.
- Possibility of mentors continuing to promote mentees from a distance on an informal basis.
- What mentors and mentees expect from the new (informal) phase of the relationship – if there is to be one.

- **What future mentoring support needs mentees may have that may be best met by other individuals.**

**PHASE 9**

**Evaluate mentoring programme**

Issues to be considered for evaluating mentoring programme:

- Did mentors and mentees meet often enough on specific mentoring-related issues?
- Did mentors and mentees develop sufficient trust?
- Was there a clear sense of direction in mentoring relationships?
- How many participants attended mentor/mentee training programmes?
- Did mentors and mentees meet goals they set?
- Has the organisation increased retention of key staff – particularly designated employees?
- Have measurable objectives or goals set at commencement of the programme been achieved?
Did the organisational culture support the programme?

Figure 7.2
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7.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In Chapter Seven the results of the questions aimed at surveying the dependent variables relating to the theoretical nine-phase organisational mentoring model were discussed, as well as relating the results to the theory gleaned during the literature study in Chapters Two, Three, Four and Five. The results obtained from the empirical survey were incorporated into the theoretical model, resulting in an integrated model for organisational mentoring, contained in Figure 7.1. The process that was used to integrate the empirical results with the theoretical model was firstly, to review the quantitative statistics to determine whether a lack of support from the respondents in the survey justified the elimination of any strategy, activity or competency listed in the nine-phase theoretical model of organisational mentoring that was presented in the study. Thereafter, proposals received from the respondents for possible inclusion, or alternatives to strategies, activities and competencies were reviewed with a view to including them in the model.

The fully integrated model of organisational mentoring resolved sub-problem three of the study, namely: How can the results obtained from the resolution of the first two sub-
 problems be combined into an integrated mentoring model that can be used by organisations as a strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act
Conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the research are offered.
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CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This final chapter provides the opportunity for looking backward at the research endeavour and summarising into a few paragraphs precisely what has been accomplished by the research project. An attempt will be made to gather all loose threads and the conclusions that have been reached with respect to the problem and sub-problems will be stated as clearly as possible. Besides reiterating the main findings, the problems which were encountered in the research process and the limitations of the study will be described. Lastly, recommendations for future research and suggestions for application of the findings will be presented.

8.2 PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS

No major problems were encountered in conducting the study except those problems normally associated with the postal survey method of data collection. The problems encountered were:

- Lack of co-operation by a few organisations in returning the questionnaire by the deadline date stipulated. As it was anticipated that this might impede the research process, sufficient time was allowed for this delay in the planning of the project. Follow-up phone calls addressed this problem.
Misinterpretation of instructions and failing to answer certain questions in the Biographical Data section of the questionnaire by a limited number of respondents. Where it was established that instructions were misinterpreted or information was not supplied, respondents were contacted telephonically to clarify and if necessary, correct their responses on the questionnaire.

A limitation of the research endeavour was that the integrated organisational mentoring model developed in this study focused primarily on mentoring strategies to facilitate development at managerial level. Other ranks of employees in the organisational hierarchy were omitted from the research. This aspect is addressed in section 8.4 of the research study.

8.3 SUMMARY OF STUDY

The main problem identified in this study was,

What mentoring strategies can organisations use for enhancing employee development to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)?

The study was prompted by the fact that although South African organisations are aware of the need to develop designated groups, these organisations are experiencing difficulty in selecting individuals from designated groups and in establishing appropriate development strategies to achieve equitable representation of these individuals, particularly at
middle and senior management levels. The research findings of Clutterbuck (2001), Kreitner et al. (1999), Lewis (1996, Nasser (1997), Shea (1992), Stone (1999) and Tsukudu (1996) confirmed that effectively managed, formal mentoring programmes can make a major contribution to fast-tracking the development of individuals.

In order to resolve the main problem, sub-problems were developed and addressed in various chapters of this study. The sub-problems are listed below, together with a brief discussion on each sub-problem.

- **Sub-problem One**: What mentoring strategies are revealed in the relevant literature that will assist organisations in developing individuals from designated groups?

A literature study was firstly conducted to establish the legislative basis for mentoring in terms of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) and the Skills Development Act (Act 97 of 1998). The importance of mentoring for developing individuals from designated groups was emphasised. However, it was stressed that because of stereotypical beliefs which may impact on attitudes towards affirmative action in the broadest sense, in order for mentors to confer legitimacy on their mentees (women and people of colour), positive attitudes will need to be inculcated to redress discrimination on the basis of race and gender.

Chapter Three of the study considered why mentoring should be used as a strategy for management development. Despite potential downsides of mentoring for mentees and mentors that were considered in this chapter, the numerous benefits accruing to mentors, mentees and the organisation were highlighted. The importance of an
appropriate organisational climate which is conducive to effective mentoring was also considered. Chapter Four of the study addressed the various role players and aspects of the mentoring programme that need to be considered when developing the programme. The chapter concluded with a critical analysis of mentoring.

Chapter Five of the study was directed at an investigation of various models for mentoring and development. A theoretical nine-phase model for organisational mentoring was also presented in this chapter. This model was developed from the theoretical and empirical research findings presented in the previous chapters and diverse models discussed at the start of the chapter. The theoretical model developed formed the basis for drawing up the questionnaire used to resolve sub-problem two.

Sub-problem Two: What mentoring strategies are currently used by organisations to facilitate the development of individuals from designated groups?

The questionnaire developed from the theoretical model presented in Chapter Five was used to survey organisations operating in the automobile and automobile-component industries based in the Nelson Mandela and Buffalo City Metropoles. The data obtained was subjected to both quantitative and qualitative analyses. An examination of the results revealed that there was a trend of agreement/strong agreement with the various strategies and activities related to each phase of the nine-phase theoretical organisational mentoring model.

Suggestions from respondents for eliminating, adding or altering various activities or strategies related to the different phases of the model were used to resolve sub-problem three.
Sub-problem Three: How can the results obtained from the resolution of sub-problems one and two be combined into an integrated mentoring model which can be used by organisations as a strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)?

In order to provide answers to sub-problem three, the results of the qualitative analysis were reviewed in order to establish from respondents whether any strategies or activities related to each phase of the theoretical mentoring model should be eliminated or altered and whether any strategies or activities should be added to the phases in the model. An analysis of the statistical research findings indicated that a ‘sense of humour’ was not regarded as an essential competency for mentors. This competency was accordingly eliminated from Phase Three of the model. A number of respondents indicated that they felt that one orientation session was not adequate to address all the requirements and issues relating to the mentoring relationship. Respondents also suggested that additional training sessions should be provided to equip mentors and mentees with specific skills. Therefore Phase Five of the integrated mentoring model was amended to read, ‘Present orientation and training sessions’.

In section 7.4.2.2 the need for a transformational culture was identified as the nucleus of an organisational mentoring model which aims at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). The core concept of transformational culture was therefore incorporated into the integrated model for organisational mentoring as the foundation for the successful implementation of the nine-phase model.

8.4 RECOMMENDATIONS
Two final steps are necessary for the completion of this research, namely, (a) to make recommendations for the applications of findings and (b) to make suggestions for further study in those areas related to the research problem.

The objective of this study was to make a contribution in the field of affirmative action by conducting an evaluation of mentoring to develop a strategy which can be used by organisations to facilitate the objectives of Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

In order to achieve this objective it was necessary to adopt the following approach:

- Firstly, a theoretical model of mentoring strategies was presented. This model can serve as a basis for organisations wanting to introduce mentoring programmes to enhance accelerated development of designated groups at the management level, in order to meet the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

- Secondly, mentoring strategies employed by organisations were assessed in terms of the theoretical model. A questionnaire was used to undertake this assessment.

- Thirdly, an integrated mentoring model was developed. The integrated model can be used by organisations as an applied strategy for facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).
The researcher believes that the following three recommendations should be implemented in order for formal mentoring programmes to be introduced into organisations.

- Firstly, senior management should establish whether the organisational culture is conducive to the introduction of a mentoring programme aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998). If the culture does not support the introduction of the programme, the organisation’s mission, goals, structure and leadership may well have to undergo dramatic change.

- Secondly, the individuals and departments tasked with developing and introducing the mentoring programme, with the aim of using the programme to facilitate the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998), should ensure that the programme fits into the context of the wider organisational framework of employee development and human resource management. Should the programme exist in isolation it may be viewed as the only form of management development in the organisation. This could lead to employees assuming that those chosen to participate in the programme are automatically destined for senior management. The organisation could well be accused of having a management development programme which is based solely on favouritism. The mentoring programme should therefore be seen as only one dimension of management development.

- Thirdly, educational institutions such as universities and technikons should be approached to assist organisations with the introduction of mentoring programmes. These institutions can also assist in the training of mentors and
mentees and in the provision of practical guidelines and strategies for ensuring the success of the programmes. Academics from these institutions can also act as external mentors to the mentees and provide advice and guidance to mentees on upgrading their skills and qualifications.

Finally, since it is the nature of research that it always gives rise to more unanswered questions, it is necessary to make recommendations for future research. During the course of this research project, areas worthy of further investigation that are closely related to the research problem were recognised. Further investigation in the following areas is recommended.

- In as much as the research was restricted to the automobile and automobile-related industries in the Nelson Mandela and Buffalo City Metropoles, similar surveys could be conducted in other geographical areas and within other industries in South Africa in order to compare this data with the results obtained from the current research undertaking.

- In terms of the recommendation that senior management should establish whether organisational culture is conducive to the introduction of a mentoring programme, studies should be undertaken regarding the aspects of organisational culture that impact on and are supportive of mentoring programmes aimed at facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).

- The importance of mentoring relationships was documented during the course of the theoretical and empirical surveys and was incorporated to a greater or lesser
extent into Phases Four to Nine inclusive of the Nine-Phase Integrated Organisational Mentoring Model. Various elements of the mentoring relationship should be explored in order to understand:

- how the composition of the relationship affects its initiation, development and maintenance, particularly in matching mentees with mentors where this process is used for fast-tracking individuals from designated groups in order to meet the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)

- the dynamics of diversified mentoring relationships and other organisational members such as supervisors, work groups and informal networks and the differences in interactions between mentoring and networking for minority members with their majority organisational counterparts

- the interactive effects of group memberships relating not only to race, ethnicity and gender but also to sexual orientation, class, religion and physical and mental abilities and characteristics.

- This research activity has concentrated on the use of mentoring as an effective mechanism for facilitating the development of designated individuals. However, the most effective approaches for career planning, the retention of nominated employees and the conceptual differences in career and career stages for diversified groups should be studied by means of a longitudinal research design in order to ascertain the most effective mentoring functions for these groups.
• A pertinent research endeavour would be to investigate the appropriateness of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) as a device for ensuring that all previously disadvantaged individuals are empowered to enable them to gain access to and compete for all posts including those at senior management levels.

8.5 CONCLUSION

Having considered the various strategies that can be used in the introduction of mentoring programmes, the question can be posed: Can mentoring programmes be used by organisations to facilitate employee development to achieve Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998) objectives? The answer to this question is that organisations need to ask the following questions before embarking on the programme:

• Why do we want to introduce a formal mentoring programme? Is it for all staff or designated groups only?

• Is mentoring currently being used in the organisation, perhaps informally?

• Has the organisation previously tried to introduce formal mentoring programmes which have failed? If so, why did these programmes not get off the ground?
• Are there any aspects of the organisation that would mitigate against the introduction of mentoring programmes? Would the programme receive the support of top management?

• Does the organisation have sufficient resources to support the programme?

Only after getting clear answers to these initial questions, can the organisation consider further detailed planning such as:

• What kind of mentoring programme will be used – formal or informal (or a combination of the two), one-to-one paired mentoring, group mentoring, peer mentoring, virtual mentoring or a combination of these approaches?

• Which department or individuals will be responsible for developing, introducing and monitoring the mentoring programme?

• What approaches will be used for matching mentors and mentees?

There is sufficient evidence from research findings on mentoring programmes to indicate that for females and members of minority groups entering management, the chances of career success improve when these individuals are exposed to formal mentoring programmes.

Mentoring can obviously not be considered as the sole strategy for facilitating management development to achieve the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act
55 of 1998). However, when mentoring programmes are effectively managed and integrated into the overall development programmes of an organisation that is committed to transformation, these programmes can make a considerable contribution to facilitating the objectives of the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998).
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Dear

SURVEY OF MENTORING STRATEGIES USED TO FACILITATE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT OBJECTIVES

Your assistance in filling in and returning the attached questionnaire relating to the above will be greatly appreciated. It should take no more than a few minutes of your time.

This information is needed for the completion of my doctoral studies.

It would be appreciated if you complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the reply-paid envelope by 15 August, 2002.

If you wish to receive a copy of the summary of the findings please inform me.

Yours sincerely

DAVE BERRY
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
Research Title: An evaluation of mentoring strategies used to facilitate Employment Equity Act Objectives

Researcher: Dave Berry
Head of Department: Human Resources Management
P.E. Technikon

This study is based on research to identify what mentoring strategies organisations can use to facilitate Employment Equity Act objectives.

The researcher developed a nine-phase mentoring model which can assist organisations planning to introduce formal mentoring programmes.

This questionnaire is designed to test the degree to which you agree that the model can assist your organisation in implementing a mentoring programme.

A definition of mentoring developed for this study based on literature researched, reads as follows:

**Mentoring is the process by which the knowledge, skills and life experience of a selected, successful manager (the mentor) are transmitted to another**
employee (the mentee) in the organisational system, for the purpose of growing that employee for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

SECTION A: BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Please supply the following information regarding your organisation by indicating with an “X” in the appropriate box.

A.1 Approximately how many employees does your organisation employ?

........................................

A.2 In which region does the organisation in which you are employed predominantly operate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Mandela Metropole</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo City Metropole</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.3 Does your organisation manufacture the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufactured Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.4 Does your organisation have the following?
   (You can respond to more than one statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/s responsible for Employment Equity Act programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/s responsible for mentoring programme management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/s responsible for career development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.5 What position do you currently hold?

……………………………………………………

A.6 For how many years have you held this position?

…………………………………………

A.7 What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.8 What is your age group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.9 What is your highest educational qualification?

………………………………………………

A.10 Have you attended workshops/seminars on mentoring during the past three years?
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SECTION B: USE OF FORMAL ORGANISATIONAL MENTORING PROGRAMMES

B.1 Does your organisation currently use formal mentoring programmes as a strategy to enhance employee development to meet Employment Equity Act objectives?
If yes, proceed to section C
If No first complete B.2 and then proceed to Section C

B.2 Reasons for not utilising formal mentoring programmes

Please indicate the extent to which you agree that the following are reasons why your organisation does not use mentoring programmes as a strategy for enhancing employees to meet Employment Equity Act objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS FOR NOT USING FORMAL MENTORING PROGRAMMES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Inadequate funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Lack of support from senior management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Managers not prepared to commit time to mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Managers too busy to serve as mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Senior management believes that mentoring relationships will develop naturally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Lack of know how on how to implement mentoring programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Organisational climate is not conducive to introduction of programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Previous attempts at introducing programmes have failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Others (please specify) .................................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: NINE-PHASE MENTORING MODEL

PHASE 1: DEFINE MENTORING PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES

Please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree with the following statements regarding the defining of mentoring programme objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING MENTORING PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 It is necessary to clearly define programme objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Clearly defined objectives aid in programme design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Clearly defined programme objectives aid in programme evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.4 Securing the support of senior management to programme objectives is essential for programme success

1.5 If others (please specify) ………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………

PHASE 2: IDENTIFY MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree that the following activities can assist in identifying specific management development needs which may be addressed by mentoring programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES TO ASSIST IN IDENTIFYING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED BY MENTORING</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Strategic human resource plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Succession plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Employment Equity plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Skills development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Other (please specify)……………………………………………………………………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHASE 3: SELECTING MENTORS AND MENTEES

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree that the following competencies are necessary for mentors and mentees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR MENTORS</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 High credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Good communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Sound leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Ability to create a climate in which mentees feel confident to experiment with different approaches to doing things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Good sense of humour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Good insight into behaviour patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Strong interest in developing others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree that the following COMPETENCIES are necessary for MENTEES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR MENTEES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Sound interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 A track record of success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Demonstrated initiative in previous jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Ability to identify and solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17 Willingness to accept greater responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18 Receptive to feedback and coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19 Potential to perform at one or more levels above their current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 Realisation of responsibility for their own career advancement and growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21 Ambition to channel abilities into career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22 If others (please specify) ................................. ........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHASE 4: CONDUCT ORIENTATION SESSION**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree that the following issues should be addressed in an orientation session with mentors and mentees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AT AN ORIENTATION SESSION</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Purpose of the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Objectives to be achieved
4.3 Programme expectations of mentors and mentees
4.4 Roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees
4.5 Frequency of meetings
4.6 Formality/informality of meetings
4.7 Topics to be discussed at meetings
4.8 Who is responsible for making meeting arrangements
4.9 Willingness to give honest and timely feedback
4.10 Agreement to abide by the rules of confidentiality
4.11 Duration of the mentoring relationship
4.12 Ensuring mentee’s line manager support
4.13 Procedures for discontinuing the relationship
4.14 If others (please specify) …………………………………

PHASE 5: MATCH MENTORS AND MENTEES

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree that the following approaches should be used for matching mentors and mentees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACHES USED FOR MATCHING MENTORS AND MENTEES</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Encouraging mentees to self-select a mentor from a list of mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Using a mentoring support team to assist in matching mentees and mentors based on registration forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Adopting a “laissez-faire” approach by allowing mentor/mentee relationships to develop naturally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Using certain criteria to match mentors and mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Using a third party who facilitates the pairing of mentor and mentee by providing support and guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 If others (please specify) …………………………………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHASE 6: ESTABLISH DEVELOPMENTAL PLANS

Please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree that the following activities should form part of the process for establishing mentee developmental plans.
### ACTIVITIES FOR ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENTAL PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Mentees firstly meet with immediate supervisors for a personal development discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Mentees and supervisors discuss mentee’s strengths and limitations, development interests, and specific skills to be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Mentor meet with mentee’s supervisor to discuss mentee’s development objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Mentor and mentee develop goals for the mentoring relationship, based on objectives set by the supervisor and mentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Mentor facilitates mentee’s developmental programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>If others (please specify) ……………………………… ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE 7: PROVIDE FEEDBACK AND EVALUATE RELATIONSHIP

Please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree that the following activities should form part of feedback and evaluation sessions held by the mentor and mentee.

### FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION SESSION ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Mentors coach mentees and clarify their sense of purpose and identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Mentors provide mentees with additional developmental assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Mentees provide technical and psychological help and support to mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Mentors and mentees review progress and agree on necessary improvements for next career steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Mentors direct mentees towards additional sources of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Mentors challenge mentees to prove success claimed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Mentors and mentees establish whether they have developed sufficient support and trust to work together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>If others (please specify) ………………………………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE 8: DISSOLVING THE RELATIONSHIP

Please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree that the following issues should be discussed by the mentor and mentee when dissolving the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED WHEN DISSOLVING MENTORING RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Mentee’s feeling of uncertainty and anxiety over dissolving the relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 What the relationship has delivered in terms of expected and unexpected outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 What the relationship has not delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Possibility of mentors continuing to promote mentees from a distance on an informal basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 What mentors and mentees expect from the new (informal) phase of the relationship – if there is to be one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 What future mentoring support needs mentees may have that may be best met by other individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 If others (please specify) .................................................. .................................................. ..................................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHASE 9: EVALUATE THE MENTORING PROGRAMME

Please indicate the degree to which you agree/disagree that the following issues should be considered in evaluating the mentoring programme in its entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR EVALUATING MENTORING PROGRAMME</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Did mentors and mentees meet often enough on specific mentor-related issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Did mentors and mentees develop sufficient mutual trust?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Was there a clear sense of direction in mentoring relationships?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 How many participants attended mentor/mentee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>What was the impact of training programmes on mentors and mentees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Did mentors and mentees meet goals they set?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Has the organisation increased retention of key staff – particularly designated employees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Have competencies of mentees increased in critical areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Have measurable objectives or goals set at commencement of the programme been achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Did the organisational culture support the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Others (please specify) .......................... .......................... ..........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAME (OPTIONAL) .................................................................**

Thank you for your kind cooperation. Please place the questionnaire in the self-addressed, franked envelope which has been enclosed for posting the questionnaire back to the researcher.
REFERENCES


Bell, C.R. (February 2000). The mentor as partner. Training and Development. 52-56.


Pinetown: Knowledge Resources.


---

*Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results*


Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results


17-21.


Chapter 7: Analysis and interpretation of results

Johannesburg: SEIFSA.


Moskowitz, R. Can a mentor further advance a career?


Slavet, J. & Butterfield, D.A. (1999). *Looking through the glass ceiling: A comparison of attitudes and experiences between women at the top and middle levels of companies in the financial services industry.*

http://mars.acnet.wnec.edu/eam/AnnualMeetings/Philadelphia1999/Pap…/SlavetJames.htm


**The South African Institute of Measurement and Control. Guidelines for mentors/guidelines for trainees.**


