

The Application of Fit Characteristics to Mentor-Protégé Relationships

by

Victoria R. Brown

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science

Auburn, Alabama
August 9, 2010

Copyright 2010 by Victoria R. Brown

Approved by

Jacqueline K. Mitchelson, Chair, Assistant Professor of Psychology
Daniel J. Svyantek, Associate Professor of Psychology
Bryan D. Edwards, Associate Professor of Psychology

Abstract

To test the hypothesis that congruence of regulatory focus orientation would improve ratings of a mentor's effectiveness by a protégé, 110 participants completed a two part study in which they interacted with a potential mentor and provided evaluations of that mentor's effectiveness based on the initial interaction. The results of this study indicate that effectiveness ratings are not impacted by congruence of regulatory focus orientation, whether chronic or primed. Conscientiousness was not found to moderate this relationship.

Acknowledgements

This author gratefully acknowledges the work of her committee members, who were instrumental in the planning, execution and completion of this project. She would especially like to thank Dr. Jacqueline Deuling for being an incredible advisor, mentor, and role model. Thanks also to my research assistants for their role as confederate mentors: Virginia Clegg, Kyle Calhoun, Jessica Bailey, Rachel Folsom, Sam Hunter, Chris Tarnowski and Delisa Pugh. Extra thanks are due to Chiquita McClain and Molly Gutman for their help with data entry and for keeping me laughing. Thanks also to Libby Kongable, who helped me with formatting this document, keeping me focused, and sorting out my life.

I dedicate this to my mother, who would have been more proud than anyone, including myself, to see me complete my Master's. I love you Mommy, and I miss you every day. This work is also dedicated to my father and grandparents for their unending support.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Attraction - Selection - Attrition Model	2
Person - Organization Fit	3
Person - Supervisor Fit	4
A Review of Mentoring Literature	5
Mentor - Protege Fit	7
Regulatory Focus	9
Preference for Congruence	12
The Role of Conscientiousness	13
Methods	15
Results	20
Discussion	23
Implications for Future Research	25
References	28
Tables	33
Appendix A: Sample Interview Questions	38

Appendix B: Lockwood et al.'s (2002) Promotion/Prevention Scale	39
Appendix C: IPIP 60-item Personality Measure (Goldberg et al., 2006)	40
Appendix D: Demographic Measure	42
Appendix E: Effectiveness Measure	43
Appendix F: Mentor Descriptions	45
Appendix G: Sample Responses to Interview Questions	46

List of Tables

Table 1: Means for mentor effectiveness considering chronic and primed congruence with displayed confederate mentor behavior	33
Table 2: Observed and expected frequencies for mentor preference	34
Table 3: Correlation of conscientiousness, effectiveness and congruence	35
Table 4: Conscientiousness as a moderator of the relationship between congruence of primed regulatory focus orientation and displayed mentor behavior on effectiveness	36
Table 5: Conscientiousness as a moderator of the relationship between congruence of chronic regulatory focus orientation and displayed mentor behavior on effectiveness	37

Introduction

Everyone who enters the workplace has some goal in mind. Over the course of a career, these goals are certainly subject to change. Regardless of the target of a goal, every individual requires some form of motivation to reach it. For example, some individuals are motivated by a goal of achieving success, and others are motivated by a goal of avoiding failure. In reaching for the goal in question, individuals with more experience can often be of help. This assistance may take the form of a mentor-protégé relationship. The formation of this goal-oriented dyad raises an interesting question: how does the interaction between the motivational tendency of the mentor and the motivational tendency of the protégé impact the effectiveness of the mentor-protégé relationship? The current study posits that there is a unique type of fit specific to the relationship between a mentor and protégé's motivational style that can facilitate a more effective dyad.

The current study sought to accomplish three main goals. First, the literature on fit within a dyad is limited not only in terms of the number of studies, but also in regard to the scope of the literature. Specifically, it has recently been noted that there is a shortage of research in which fit is a dependent variable (DeRue & Morgeson, 2007; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). This study evaluates a new concept of fit, operationalized by a motivational theory known as regulatory focus which will be explained later in this manuscript. Next, this research proposes that regulatory focus has implications for dyadic fit, an assertion that has yet to be explicitly stated or thoroughly researched. While there is some evidence that congruence of

regulatory focus orientation is important for role models and mentors (Hirschfeld, Thomas, & Lankau, 2006; Lockwood & Kunda, 1997; Lockwood, Jordan & Kunda, 2002; Lockwood, Sadler, Fyman & Tuck, 2004), this congruence has not yet been proposed as a level of fit. Forming a union between dyadic fit and regulatory focus allows researchers and practitioners alike to utilize findings from the broader areas of fit and regulatory focus across topics. Finally, this study contributes to the literature on mentor-protégé relationships not only in terms of fit, but in terms of protégé preference for a mentor.

The concept of fit is based on the idea that individuals are in constant interaction with the environment around them. There are many different configurations of fit in the workplace, including the fit between individuals and their organizations and individuals and their supervisors. Other aspects of fit can include personality, values and motivational tendencies (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al, 2005; Verquer et al, 2003). Research on each of these types of fit ranges far beyond the scope of this review, but a basic summary of the principles and main findings are included below.

Attraction – Selection – Attrition Model

The idea of fit is exemplified by the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model made popular by Schneider (1987). Though many scholars had discussed the similarity-attraction hypothesis, Schneider added the attrition part and popularized the concept. The ASA model posits that potential job applicants are initially attracted to organizations whose current employees are perceived by the applicants to be similar to themselves in some way. Furthermore, organizations hire those applicants who are similar to the current employees. These two practices create a restriction in range of individual differences within an organization referred to as the homogeneity hypothesis. To add to this homogeneity, it is noted that those

employees who no longer perceive similarity to other employees or to organizational goals will leave the organization. The attrition of these dissimilar employees effectively creates homogeneity of employees within the organization. This process brings about the idea of fit; employees are attracted to organizations in which they anticipate high levels of fit, organizations hire those employees whom they feel will fit with current employees and organizational goals, if fit is not achieved, attrition occurs. In studying the ASA model, it becomes apparent that fit can occur at many different levels of analysis. Thus, it is helpful to explore these levels to further the collective knowledge of the attraction, selection and attrition model.

Person-Organization Fit

One level of analysis that can be considered is the individual's fit to the larger organization. Person-organization (PO) fit has been defined as "the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both" (Kristof, 1996, p 4). The fit between individuals and the organizations which employ them can take on many forms. When an organization and an individual experience congruence of these fundamental characteristics, this congruence is termed supplementary fit. In contrast, when the fundamental characteristics of organizations and individuals work to fill a void in at least one of these entities, the term complementary fit is used (Kristof, 1996). The focus of the present study is specifically on the congruence that typifies supplementary fit; therefore, a complete explanation of complementary fit will not be included (for a description of complementary fit, see Kristof, 1996).

PO fit has many implications in terms of attraction and selection of new employees (Kristof, 1996), and is commonly linked to the ASA model described above (Schneider, 1987). However, there are other areas in which understanding fit may be useful. Schneider and his

colleagues have suggested that fit occurs at many different levels (Schneider, Goldstein & Smith, 1995). Simply because two individuals both experience fit within an organization does not necessarily mean they experience fit with each other. Once attracted employees have been selected by an organization, more specific fit concepts can be examined.

Person-Supervisor Fit

A more specific level of analysis that is common in the workplace is a dyad, consisting of two people. One such dyad is comprised of individuals and their supervisors. A meta-analysis by Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found only 17 studies worthy of inclusion that focused exclusively on the area of person-supervisor (PS) fit, although there were many more studies in related areas such as leader-member exchange (cf. Liden, Wayne & Stillwell, 1993). This paucity in the literature seems to illustrate the need for additional research on fit relationships between members of a dyad. The authors of the meta-analysis also comment that congruence within a dyad is most often researched at the level of person and supervisor. If PS fit represents the most researched area of dyadic fit, yet only 17 studies were deemed acceptable for the Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) meta-analysis, a need for further research on fit within other less-studied dyads can be inferred.

A mentor and protégé comprise a special sort of dyad, unique in many ways from a supervisor-subordinate dyad. Although there has been substantial research on the effect of mentor-protégé relationships on outcomes such as career mobility (Scandura, 1992), socialization (Heimann & Pittinger, 1996) and work family conflict (Nielson et al, 2001) to name a few, there is little on motivational congruence between a mentor and protégé. The present study expands the dyadic congruence literature by contributing to the knowledge and understanding of the fit between a mentor and a protégé.

A Review of Mentoring Literature

The relationship between a mentor and protégé goes beyond that of a supervisor and a subordinate. Kram (1985) defined mentoring as a developmental relationship between supervisors and subordinates, or among peers. A mentor-protégé relationship is further defined as a personal interaction that should work toward gaining knowledge, offering support, and fostering professional development based on the mentor's previous experience (Berk, Berg, Mortimer, Walton-Moss, & Yeo, 2005). Note that this definition does not state that a mentor necessarily has what is known as legitimate power (Raven & French, 1958) over a protégé. In contrast, Godshalk and Sosik (2003) suggest that a mentor more often has referent power, which is power based on the protégé's identification with the mentor. This is an oft-neglected nuance, but it is important to remember that a mentor and a supervisor have very different roles. For example, in some instances it may make some sense for a supervisor to serve as a mentor. It has been found that supervisors who serve in a mentoring capacity are able to provide more career support than non-supervisor mentors, but not more psychosocial support (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). With a mentoring relationship, a mentoring supervisor obtains a clear knowledge of what sort of career support is useful to the protégé. Regarding a lack of psychosocial support, mentoring supervisors may hesitate to engage in social contact that may be seen as favoritism. This confound illustrates that sometimes it may be advantageous for a non-supervisor to serve as a mentor. In some instances, a mentor may even be outside of the protégé's organization. Although each organization may have different expectations of what a mentor should provide, there are some commonalities that help to define the role of the mentor.

In all organizations, a mentor is considered to have three goals in working with a protégé: to provide professional support, social support, and to serve as a role model (Kram, 1985; Scandura, 1992). According to Kram (1985), professional support consists of what is relevant to the career of the protégé, and success in this realm will guide the advancement of the protégé through the organization. Due to the mentor's experience and seniority within the organization, the mentor can introduce the protégé to professional contacts and facilitate networking with individuals who are in a position to advance the career of the protégé. Mentors can also offer protection from negative influences that may hinder the advancement of the protégé. In contrast, social support is more about the protégé's personal development and growth. Social support includes offering advice, offering praise, and forming a bond as a friend or colleague. The role modeling function is based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), and posits that protégés learn success by observing the success of the mentor. While a role model can certainly be a mentor, this is not always the case. Studies of role modeling may involve the recall of a factual role model from the participant's past, but often researchers describe a role model specific to the study at hand (e.g. Lockwood et al, 2002). This indicates that a role model does not always need to be someone with whom the participant has an interpersonal or face-to-face relationship. A mentor, on the other hand, is someone with whom the participant has interacted with extensively and, as such, could serve as a role model in some capacity.

Another way to define a mentoring relationship is to examine how it originated. There are two different types of mentors: formal and informal. Formal mentoring programs are arranged and mandated by the organization, whereas informal mentoring relationships tend to be more spontaneous. Regardless of how mentoring relationships originated, mentoring can be very beneficial if the proper effort is put forth. Indeed, to mentor or be mentored requires active

participation by both parties. Research has indicated that individuals higher in conscientiousness tend to have more involvement as mentors (Niehoff, 2006). However, protégés can also influence mentoring relationships. Turban and Dougherty (1994) found that individuals with high self-monitoring tendencies and an internal locus of control were more likely to be proactive in initiating an informal mentoring relationship.

Once a mentor-protégé relationship is formed and that effort is exerted, the benefits of mentoring become salient. It has been noted that institutionalized socialization tactics are more effective for individuals who engage in social relationships with higher-ranked employees during the socialization process (Kim, Cable & Kim, 2005). As formal mentoring programs are often included as an institutionalized socialization tactic (Heimann & Pittinger, 1996; Kim et al, 2005), this may have implications for the psychosocial support function of a mentor in fostering social relationships with higher-ranked employees. Mentoring, particularly the role modeling aspect, has been related to less perceived role conflict and role ambiguity (Lankau, Carlson & Nielson, 2006). In addition to reducing general role conflict, mentoring has also been found to reduce work-family conflict, specifically in the direction of family interfering with work (Nielson, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001). Relationships have also been found between more effective mentoring relationships and such tangible career outcomes as compensation, promotion, and reduced turnover intentions, as well as being related to more personal outcomes like job and career satisfaction (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz & Lima, 2004; Underhill, 2006). In short, successful mentoring relationships produce more successful employees. If the people really do make the place as Schneider proposed in 1987, the inference can be made that the employees produced by successful mentoring relationships in turn foster more successful organizations.

Mentor-Protégé Fit

By applying the principles of person-organization and person-supervisor fit to mentor-protégé relationships, congruence between mentors and protégés can be considered and answers a call for research issued by Lankau et al (2005). Specifically, to define the fit between a mentor and protégé, Kristof's (1996) definition can be applied. Mentor-protégé (MP) fit would be defined as the compatibility between a mentor and protégé that occurs when the relationship is beneficial to at least one party, the mentor and protégé share similar fundamental characteristics, or both. The present study examines the second part of that definition by determining how congruence between a mentor and protégé can create an additional dimension of motivational fit, leading to a more effective mentor-protégé partnership.

As is true of the conceptualization of fit at any level, there are many different aspects of fit to consider. Congruence may be operationalized in many different ways, such as fit based on shared values, goals or motivational tendencies. The most effective form of congruence will vary depending on the type of fit and the research question at hand; for example, the PO fit literature seems to focus on value congruence (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003). The study of congruence of personality as it pertains to fit relationships has come into vogue in recent years, perhaps due to the popularity and ease of use of the Big Five personality traits (cf. Resick, Baltes & Shantz, 2007). The current study operationalizes fit based on motivational tendency. In regards to motivational congruence, Godshalk and Sosik (2003) found that similarity in learning-goal-orientation between mentors and protégés resulted in higher levels of psychosocial and career support. Similarly, the current study posits that fit based on shared motivational orientation is imperative for an effective partnership. However, instead of learning goal orientation, the current study considers fit based on the motivational orientation referred to as regulatory focus.

Regulatory Focus

Motivation is a key aspect of understanding and shaping employee behavior. One particular theory of motivation that has been of recent interest is regulatory focus. Higgins (1997) introduced the formal concept of regulatory focus as the idea that some individuals are motivated by achieving success, which he termed as having a promotion focus, whereas others are motivated by avoiding failure, which is termed as having a prevention focus. The regulatory orientation of an individual can determine whether they are motivated by their ideals (promotion focus) or obligations (prevention focus; Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997; Shah, Higgins & Friedman, 1998). Research on promotion and prevention focused individuals has found that individuals primed with a promotion focused orientation use more affective reasoning, while individuals primed with a prevention focused orientation use more cognitive reasoning (Pham & Avnet, 2004; Avnet & Higgins, 2003). Additionally, the persistent trait-like aspect of regulatory focus, termed the “chronic” orientation of an individual, can have implications on language use. Semin, Higgins, de Montes, Estourget, and Valencia (2005) found that promotion focused individuals describe events using more abstract language, whereas their prevention focused counterparts provide more concrete examples.

However, it is important to consider the contextual implications of regulatory focus in addition to the chronic orientation of an individual. Previous research has shown that regulatory focus is not just a personal trait, but a situational state as well. For example, previous research indicates that employees can change their regulatory focus orientation to align with changes in the work environment, such as work climate, task demands, or leadership (Brockner & Higgins,

2001; Wallace & Chen, 2006). Because a mentor is a leader or peer with referent power, the creation of a mentoring relationship may cause protégés to change regulatory focus orientation temporarily if the protégés discover that their chronic orientation is less adaptive for the situation. Incongruence between the protégé's chronic state and this new temporary state brought about by the presence of the mentor may lead to complications that may make the mentoring relationship less effective, or even end the relationship. Thus, it is important to study regulatory focus as a temporary orientation as well as a chronic orientation. The literature recognizes the importance of studying both situational and chronic orientations, noting that chronic dispositional tendencies and actual behavior are sometimes inconsistent (Wallace, Little & Shull, 2008). Not only can regulatory focus orientation be changed by an individual, it can also be primed by changing situational aspects (Higgins, 2000). Previous research of regulatory focus has found framing to be an effective way of inducing temporary promotion or prevention orientation (Higgins, Roney, Crowe & Hymes, 1994; Lockwood et al., 2002). As such, framing is used in the current study.

When creating a mentor-protégé dyad, enhancing motivation by facilitating congruence between the regulatory focus goals of the two members could be advantageous. Previous research on regulatory focus and role models has indicated that congruence between participants and role models elevates motivation (Lockwood et al., 2002), whereas incongruence can undermine the ability of a role model to motivate a participant (Lockwood et al., 2002; Norem & Cantor, 1986). This suggests not only that congruence between a mentor and protégé could be beneficial, but that having an incongruent mentor-protégé partnership may be more damaging than having no partnership at all.

Regulatory orientation as a form of “fit” is not new. Regulatory fit has been described as an “it-just-feels-right” experience accompanied by increased motivation in the presence of congruence of regulatory orientation (Aaker & Lee, 2006; Camacho, Higgins & Luger, 2003). According to Higgins (2000), there are situational aspects where congruence may be important by proposing that certain goals are more compatible with a specific regulatory orientation, resulting in a higher level of regulatory fit. Additionally, Aaker and Lee (2006) note that this congruence can stem from engaging in activities or using strategies which encourage the use of an individual’s regulatory orientation, which indicates the importance of the person-situation interaction in studying regulatory focus. The idea that a situation may call for a temporary change in regulatory orientation is important for two reasons. First, it again illustrates the need to study both primed and chronic orientation in the same participants. More importantly, it may support the need for congruence of regulatory orientation between mentor and protégé. In an organization, employees may be assigned goals, given activities, or made to use strategies that do not align with their chronic regulatory orientation. If these employees are given mentors who are of a similar orientation, the mentors may be able to provide advice or serve as a role model for ways to adapt to situations in which congruence is not possible. A mentor of the opposite regulatory orientation may not be able to provide this advice or serve as a role model because in those instances, the mentor will be experiencing congruence and the protégé will be experiencing incongruence. These implications set the stage for further research on mentor-protégé relationships.

H1a: Effectiveness of the mentor, as rated by the protégé, will be higher in conditions where congruence of regulatory focus is present between the primed orientation of the protégé and the experimentally manipulated orientation of the mentor’s behavior.

H1b: Effectiveness of the mentor, as rated by the protégé, will be higher in conditions where congruence of regulatory focus is present between the chronic orientation of the protégé and the experimentally manipulated orientation of the mentor's behavior.

Preference for congruence

Researchers have considered role model preference as it relates to regulatory focus. It is noted previously that a successful mentor should always serve as a role model, but a role model need not serve as a mentor. Indeed, a role model may be someone with whom the protégé has never interacted, and possibly even someone with whom the protégé will never have the chance to interact. However, as role modeling does represent a dyadic relationship, research on regulatory fit and role modeling can help guide research on mentor-protégé fit (from here on referred to as MP fit). Lockwood and colleagues (2004) found that individuals do consider their own regulatory orientation when selecting a role model.

Research has also been conducted on approach and avoidance motivations in mentoring. Hirschfeld, Thomas, and Lankau (2006) examined how approach and avoidance motivation is related to the personal learning experienced by each party. However, these authors did not posit whether it was the motivational orientation of the mentor, the orientation of the protégé, or a combination of both that influences learning. Hirschfeld and his colleagues (2006) found that the highest level of learning occurred when there was congruence between the orientation of mentors and protégés, yet this result was only briefly touched upon en route to discussing overall trends related to the learning experienced by protégés themselves. This high level of learning in congruent conditions may be important in its own right, and furthermore these findings support the need for a model of fit in mentoring relationships.

Additionally, research has shown that supervisor influence strategies are more effective when the strategies fit the regulatory orientation of the subordinate (Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007). As a supervisor-subordinate relationship is often similar and sometimes identical to a mentor-protégé relationship, the results of the Kruglanski et al (2007) study imply that congruence of regulatory orientation may result in a more effective mentor-protégé partnership. These findings converge to indicate that preference for congruence of regulatory focus should be considered when creating a mentor-protégé dyad to ensure effectiveness of the mentoring partnership.

H2: Participants will select mentors who are described in a manner congruent with the chronic regulatory orientation of the participant.

The Role of Conscientiousness

Previous research has shown conscientiousness to be a moderator of fit between an individual and the organization (Resick et al, 2007). Specifically, Resick and his colleagues (2007) found that highly conscientious individuals were less likely to accept a job offer from an organization in which they did not perceive PO fit. This may suggest that highly conscientious individuals may be less likely to initiate mentoring relationships with potential mentors with whom they do not experience a form of fit. In situations where a formal mentoring program pairs two individuals who do not fit, this lack of congruence may lead to neglect of the mentoring relationship, or possibly the dissolution of the partnership entirely for highly conscientious employees. However, there is a general consensus in the mentoring literature that informal mentoring partnerships last longer and are deemed more successful than formal mentoring partnerships (Egan & Song, 2008; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). One possible explanation

for this phenomenon is that conscientious individuals may seek out potential mentors with whom they experience fit; specifically, potential mentors with whom they experience regulatory fit.

The importance of conscientiousness and perceived fit has been demonstrated (Resick et al., 2007), and there is evidence that the most successful mentoring relationships are informal. These informal relationships tend to be initiated by more conscientious protégés (Turban & Dougherty, 1994) and involve more conscientious persons as mentors (Niehoff, 2006). Additionally, Wallace and Chen (2006) found that conscientiousness is related to both promotion and prevention orientations, as highly conscientious individuals both achieve ideal goals and feel responsibility toward ought goals. To date, there are no studies explicitly studying conscientiousness as a moderator of mentor effectiveness. The present study begins exploration into this as yet under researched area with the following hypothesis.

H3: Conscientiousness will serve as a moderator of fit between a mentor and a protégé and the effectiveness ratings of a mentor.

Method

Participants

A total of 110 undergraduate students from a large public southern university completed the study, with an average age of 20.31 (SD=3.30). The sample was mostly female (73%) and Caucasian (77.5%), with 10.8% African American, 2.7% Hispanic, 1.8% Native American, 1.8% Asian American, and 4.5% identified as “other”. Freshmen (24.3%), sophomores (21.6%), juniors (21.6%) and seniors (30.6%) were fairly equally represented, and the average self-reported grade point average across all participants was 3.16. A majority of participants (77.5%) reported having someone in their life currently that they considered to be a mentor, and 45% reported that they were currently serving as a mentor for someone else. All participants were given extra credit towards a psychology course as compensation for their time.

Procedure and Materials

Participants signed up for the study via the university’s research participation website where they were given password protected access. First, participants completed three online measures in random order: chronic regulatory focus, conscientiousness, and a demographic questionnaire. At the end of this online survey, participants were asked to sign up for the lab-based portion of the study. The lab portion was advertised as a pilot study of a mentoring program to connect undergraduate students with upper level students in their academic major. All participants were told that the current research is a test for possible mentors who would participate as mentors in an upcoming mentoring program.

For the lab portion of the study, participants were given five minutes to provide a written description of an ideal or ought mentor. Next, participants were told that they have their choice between two mentors within their academic major. This stipulation was added because previous studies have indicated that a role model is only influential in a context that is considered important (Lockwood & Kunda, 1997), and it is assumed that the same phenomenon will apply to mentoring. Participants were asked to choose one of the two possible mentors from a written description. To prevent expectancy effects, participants were told that their preferred mentor may or may not be available.

Following the participant's selection of a mentor, a confederate entered the room. Upon introducing the participant to the confederate, this newly formed dyad was asked to complete a mock job interview task to ensure that they will be compatible as a mentor-mentee pair. Participant protégés were told that the mentor would ask a series of typical job interview questions and provide feedback on how to appropriately answer such questions. Mentor-protégé pairs were given 10 minutes for this task and the list of questions is included in Appendix A.

Upon completion of the task, participants were asked to rate the mentor's effectiveness using a measure designed for this study as well as completing a manipulation check. To conclude the study, participants were debriefed and the deception was fully explained. For any participants who are truly seeking mentors, information about the university's Graduate/Undergraduate Partnership was provided.

Regulatory focus. Chronic regulatory focus orientation was measured by Lockwood and colleagues (2002) 18-item measure, which utilizes a 9-point rating scale with endpoints labeled "not at all like me" (1) and "very true of me" (9). The full version of this measure is available in Appendix B. A sample item for prevention focus is "In general, I am focused on preventing

negative events in my life”, and for promotion focus, “I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future”. Averages were computed for both promotion and prevention, and participants were categorized by the highest average of these two scales. This categorization was considered to be the participant’s chronic regulatory focus, resulting in 12 prevention focused participants and 95 promotion focused participants. This dichotomization has been used by Lockwood and colleagues, and thus was used in the current study as well (e.g., Lockwood, Chasteen & Wong, 2005). Previous researchers have proposed a tendency toward promotion-focus in North American cultures (Lee et al., 2000; Lockwood et al., 2004) and student populations (Lockwood et al., 2002) so an even split between promotion and prevention focused participants was not expected. Scores on both scales showed acceptable internal consistency (promotion $\alpha=.86$, prevention $\alpha=.81$).

Personality - Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness was assessed using the 60-item measure of the IPIP (Goldberg et al., 2006), which can be found in Appendix C. This 60-item measure contains 10 items for four of the Big 5 personality domains: openness to experience, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism, and twenty items for conscientiousness. Only the results from the conscientiousness domain are of interest for this study, which is why an extra ten items have been included for that factor.

Demographics. Demographic information was also collected in the online measure, which is included in Appendix D. Participants were asked basic information such as age and gender, as well as questions about their previous experience as a mentor and their previous experience as a protégé.

Effectiveness. In the lab portion, mentor effectiveness was assessed using a measure that has been created specifically for this study and consists of items adapted from two previous

studies. Four items come from Liden, Wayne and Stillwell's (1993) leader appraisal of member performance. All items on this scale were reworded to reflect the assessment of a mentor rather than the assessment of a team. For example, an item that currently reads "What is your personal view of your subordinate in terms of his or her overall effectiveness?" was changed to "What is your personal view of this mentor in terms of his or her overall effectiveness?" The other items are selected from Loughry, Ohland and Moore's (2007) measure of team effectiveness. The reworded version of the Liden and colleagues (1993) measure and the items selected from Loughry and colleagues (2007) are both included in Appendix E. For ease of use, all items used on this effectiveness composite was rated using a similar 9-point Likert-type scale, with anchors of "Strongly Agree" and "Strongly Disagree". The effectiveness composite was reliable in the current study, $\alpha=.95$.

Manipulations

When being asked to describe a mentor, half of the sample was asked to describe their ideal mentor (promotion focus), and the other half to describe the sort of mentor they ought to have (prevention focus). The instructions for the written description were designed to prime the participants to think in either a promotion or prevention focused manner. After describing a mentor, the participants were given written descriptions of two mentors and asked to choose: one was an exemplar of promotion focus, and the other was an exemplar of prevention focus (see Appendix F). The descriptions of the mentor were phrased entirely in either a promotion or prevention-oriented manner. After choosing one of the two mentors, a confederate entered the room to serve as the "mentor." The confederates were undergraduate research assistants. The literature on role models (Lockwood et al., 2002) as well as mentors (Turban & Dougherty, 1994) suggests that there are no significant gender differences on mentor perceptions. Gender

was examined as a quasi-independent variable in this study to confirm these results. Males and females showed no difference in their effectiveness ratings, $t(107)=-.851, ns$. Assignment of confederate to participant in terms of gender was determined by the availability of undergraduate research assistants during the participant timeslots.

The confederate was given a standardized list of questions for each condition that they have practiced with the experimenter. A script of sample responses to these standardized questions, also tailored to each experimental condition, were reviewed prior to data collection (see Appendix G). Confederate verbal behavior was randomly assigned to either promotion focused or prevention focused condition, not matched based on the prior selection of a mentor description. This will create some dyads in which there is mentor-mentee congruence, and some dyads in which there is mentor-mentee incongruence. Promotion focused mentors used phrases like, “If you are asked this question in a job interview, an ideal answer is...”, whereas prevention focused mentors used phrases like, “If you are asked this question in a job interview, you should avoid an answer like...”.

Results

Chronic regulatory focus orientation was determined by mean score on each subscale of Lockwood et al.'s (2002) Promotion/Prevention scale. Using Lockwood's approach, whichever subscale had a higher mean score was considered to be that participant's chronic regulatory focus orientation. Thus, chronic regulatory focus is a dichotomous variable for all subsequent analyses. Primed regulatory focus was determined by the mentor description task, where those participants asked to describe their ideal mentor were considered to be primed with a promotion focus and participants asked to describe the sort of mentor they ought to have were considered to be primed with a prevention focus. This is in line with experimental manipulations used in the literature (e.g., Camacho, Higgins & Luger, 2003). As a manipulation check, participants were asked if the behavior displayed by the confederate mentor was similar to the mentor they described at the beginning of the session. However, most people indicated that the mentor was similar, regardless of whether the mentor displayed a regulatory focus orientation that was congruent with the essay prime. This may cast doubt on the impact of the experimental prime, an issue which is discussed in the limitations section of this manuscript. Because the effectiveness items came from multiple sources, a factor analysis was used to ensure that the items were measuring the same construct. Principal axis factoring showed all items loading on one factor with an eigenvalue of $\lambda=8.377$, accounting for 61.74% of the variance. Item factor loadings were all above .50.

The first hypothesis stated that protégés who experience congruence with their mentors' behavior will rate the mentors as more effective. Congruence was determined in two ways. First, the congruence between the participant's chronic regulatory focus orientation and the verbal behavior of the confederate mentor was considered. Additionally, the congruence between

experimentally primed regulatory focus orientation and the verbal behavior of the confederate mentor was assessed. The first hypothesis was tested by using the average of items on the effectiveness measure as the dependent variable in a 2 (regulatory focus orientation) x 2 (verbal mentor behavior) ANOVA. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1. To test hypothesis 1a, a 2 (primed promotion or prevention) X 2 (mentor promotion or prevention) ANOVA showed no statistically significant effects (prime: $F(1,103)=.045, p=.833$; mentor behavior: $F(1,103)=2.575, p=.112$; interaction: $F(1,103)=.836, p=.363$). To test hypothesis 1b, a 2 (chronic promotion or prevention) X 2 (mentor promotion or prevention) ANOVA showed no statistically significant interactive effect ($F(1,103)=.773, p=.972$), nor main effects (chronic: $F(1,103)=.004, p=.951$; mentor behavior: $F(1,103)=.011, p=.917$). Thus, hypotheses 1a and 1b are not supported by the data.

The second hypothesis, that participants will show preference to mentors with congruent regulatory focus, was tested using two chi-square goodness-of-fit test in which preference was considered the dependent variable. Forty-four participants indicated preference for the prevention focused mentor, and sixty-six participants indicated that they would prefer the promotion focused mentor. The data were weighted first by the observed frequencies of chronic regulatory orientation, of which 12% had a chronic prevention focus and 88% had a chronic promotion focus. Using these weights, a chi-squared goodness-of-fit test showed a statistically significant departure from the expected values, with a residual of 30.2, $\chi^2(1)=91.74, p=.000$. Next, the data were weighted by the observed frequencies of primed regulatory orientation. As primed regulatory focus was experimentally controlled, there was an even split between promotion and prevention orientation. Participants did show a departure from the expected even split when choosing their preferred mentor, with a residual of 11, $\chi^2(1)=4.40, p=.036$. Table 2

displays the expected and observed values for each group. Significant departures from expected values indicate that participants are not showing preference to a promotion or prevention oriented mentor based on either the chronic regulatory focus orientation of the participant or the prime to which they were exposed. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

The final hypothesis regarding conscientiousness as a moderator was tested using the Case 3 approach recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986). Two separate moderation tests were conducted: one for fit between the participant's chronic regulatory focus orientation and the verbal behavior of the confederate mentor, and one for fit between the primed regulatory focus orientation and the behavior displayed by the confederate. To provide a clear interaction term, the moderator should be uncorrelated with both the predictor and the outcome. A correlation matrix was obtained, and this assumption was upheld (see Table 3). The congruence between chronic regulatory focus orientation and mentor behavior was multiplied by conscientiousness to create an interaction term. Likewise, the congruence between primed regulatory focus and mentor behavior was multiplied by conscientiousness to create a second interaction term. Two separate hierarchical linear regressions were then used to test the incremental effect of this interaction term beyond the effects of congruence and conscientiousness on effectiveness. The results of these regressions are presented in Tables 4 and 5, but are not statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis 3 was also not supported by the data.

Discussion

The hypothesis that mentors would be rated more effective under conditions of congruence was not supported in this study. Neither congruence between chronic regulatory focus orientation and the verbal behavior displayed by the confederate mentor (chronic congruence) nor congruence between primed regulatory focus orientation and the verbal behavior displayed by the mentor (primed congruence) had a significant effect on ratings of mentor effectiveness. This suggests that congruence of regulatory focus orientation does not seem to make an impact on how effective that mentor is perceived to be in the initial mentor-protégé interaction. Working in an environment or on a project that may prime a regulatory focus orientation should also not impact the perceived effectiveness of a mentor. Participants do not seem to prefer mentors that are similar in regulatory focus orientation, nor to situational primes. Finally, the congruence-effectiveness relationship remains weak regardless of participant level of conscientiousness.

To better understand these null results, a number of factors can be considered, including the use of a student sample as well as halo effects. The student sample was used due to accessibility, and while this convenience allows researchers to investigate questions without imposing on an organization it may also be less representative of how these relationships would operate in organizationally embedded dyads. Students may also be insensitive to differences in regulatory focus orientation. Manipulation checks indicate that 88.2% of students agreed that the behavior displayed by the confederate matched the mentor they chose from the descriptions; however, only 52.7% truly did match. This may mean that students were only attentive to those

aspects of confederate behavior that were in accordance with their preferred mentor, ignoring or discounting the inconsistent behaviors. This insensitivity to regulatory focus orientation may also relate to the possibility that the experimental manipulation did not work. Given the current format of the manipulation check, we cannot tell if the prime truly failed, or if participants were merely answering favorably (and against the prime in some cases) to support the mentoring program.

Halo error seems to be an issue in the present study, as average effectiveness ratings are near eight on a nine-point scale. The extremely high average ratings given by participant protégés could be related to under- or over-investment in the experimental manipulation. Many students may have been less impacted by the experimental manipulation due to their strong desire for the extra credit compensation offered, and therefore under-invested in the study. These students may have rated the mentors well in an attempt to complete their study hours, receive extra credit and leave. Conversely, some other students may have become too invested in the idea of the mentoring program. During the initial explanation and again during the debriefing, many students expressed support for such a program. Indeed, a manipulation check question asking if a mentoring program for undergraduate students was a good idea was supported by 96.4% of participants. Some students expressed disappointment or agitation upon finding out that the proposed mentoring program was not an actuality. These invested students may have rated the mentors favorably to benefit the program. Additionally, the students who signed up for a study entitled “Mentor Training” may not be representative of all students at the university; it is likely that these students have an interest in mentoring that may impact their effectiveness ratings.

Finally, there may have been issues surrounding the use of confederates as mentors. Unfortunately there was quite a bit of turnover in confederate mentors, which added another source of variance. The type of students who are selected as undergraduate research assistants may have individual differences that were not accounted for by this study, such as communication skills, conscientiousness, agreeableness or extraversion. The use of multiple confederates may also have played a role in the unusually high effectiveness ratings, as participants may have rated attractiveness, friendliness or other interpersonal characteristics instead of how effective the confederate was as a potential mentor.

Directions for Future Research

A number of steps can be taken to improve upon the current study. Although research indicates that regulatory focus can be both primed and chronic, addressing both of these along with the verbal behavior of the confederate may have confounded the results. While it is realistic to expect protégés to experience incongruence, confederate behavior may have been a prime in itself, thus participants in the current study were “double-primed”, sometimes inconsistently. However, participants who were primed in the same direction as their chronic focus and also were exposed to the same confederate behavior ($N=33$) were compared to those that were subject to mixed orientations ($N=74$), and the results were still not statistically significant ($F(3, 103)=.965, p=.412$) in the current study.

In addition to using fewer confederate mentors for consistency, future research can measure qualities of the mentors to assess meaningful differences in the variance between mentors. Other outcome variables besides effectiveness may also be of interest, such as the effect of congruence on organizational commitment, job satisfaction or turnover intentions. For even more experimental control, students could rate videotaped interactions of mentors and protégés.

It should be noted that assessing videotapes would tap into a slightly different construct, as it would measure perceptions of congruence between mentor-protégé pairs that are completely external (and perhaps less meaningful) rather than experienced congruence in which the participant is active within the dyad. Some other issues, such as under- and over-invested participants, may not be easily addressed in laboratory research. In fact, these differences in investment in the dyad may represent true variance that is experienced by one or both members in other mentoring relationships. Studies addressing the investment of mentors/protégés could provide useful information on how varying levels of investment effect the tenure or effectiveness of a dyad, as well as organizational outcomes such as dyadic or individual performance.

Future research in this area should begin with a more thorough testing of student samples, archival data or other easily accessible data to determine if the MP fit construct exists before pursuing costly and time-consuming organizational data. These easily accessible samples can serve as a pilot study which can inform organizationally embedded projects for the future. However, if embedded dyads are readily available it is possible that there are effects within these existing dyads that cannot be measured in ad hoc dyads. The use of mentoring dyads outside of for-profit businesses may alleviate the concerns about wasting an organizations time, money and other resources by studying a phenomenon which may not exist. The use of other mentoring programs, such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, graduate students and faculty advisors, sponsors in Alcoholics Anonymous, could provide more information than undergraduate student samples without disrupting a for-profit organization. Additionally, mentoring relationships that are organizationally embedded can be studied longitudinally to see how mentor-protégé fit can have an effect over time, rather than just in the initial interaction as demonstrated in the current study. Another benefit to the use of existing mentoring relationships is that the regulatory focus

orientation of the mentor can also be assessed, rather than experimentally manipulated, to determine congruence.

In conclusion, the current study indicates that congruence of regulatory focus orientation between mentors and protégés does not seem to affect the perceived effectiveness of the mentor in the initial mentor-protégé interaction. That is not to say that mentor-protégé fit is not a useful construct; rather, the null results of this study indicate that it does not seem to affect students in their first exposure to a mentor. If practitioners are looking to set up mentoring programs, motivational congruence may not be a short-term consideration. The use of this construct in longitudinal mentoring relationships, organizationally embedded mentoring relationships, or in a lab setting with more rigorous control may show the hypothesized effect, which could be used to maximize the benefits of the mentor-protégé relationship.

References

- Aaker, J.L. & Lee, A.Y. (2006). Understanding regulatory fit. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33, 15-19.
- Allen, T.D., Eby, L.T., Poteet, M.L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 127-136.
- Avnet, T. & Higgins, E.T. (2003). Locomotion, assessment and regulatory fit: Value transfer from “how” to “what”. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 525-530.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Berk, R.A., Berg, J., Mortimer, R., Walton-Moss, B., & Yeo, T.P. (2005). Measuring the effectiveness of faculty mentoring relationships. *Academic Medicine*, 80, 2005.
- Brockner, J. & Higgins, E.T. (2001). Regulatory focus theory: Implications for the study of emotions at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 35-66.
- DeRue, D.S. & Morgeson, F.P. (2007). Stability and change in person-team and person-role fit over time: The effects of growth satisfaction, performance and general self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1242-1253.
- Egan, T.M. & Song, Z. (2008). Are facilitated mentoring programs beneficial? A randomized experimental field study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 351-362.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.G. & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*

- Research Methods*, 39, 175-191.
- Godshalk, V.M. & Sosik, J.J. (2003). Aiming for career success: The role of learning goal orientation in mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 417-437.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84-96.
- Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E.T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist*, 55, 1230-1243.
- Higgins, E.T., Roney, C.J.R., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal vs. ought predilections for approach and avoidance: Distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 276-286.
- Higgins, E.T., Shah, J., & Friedman, R. (1997). Emotional responses to goal attainment: Strength of regulatory focus as a moderator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 515-525.
- Hirschfeld, R.R., Thomas, C.H., & Lankau, M.J. (2006). Achievement and avoidance motivational orientations in the domain of mentoring. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 524-537.
- Kim, T., Cable, D.M., & Kim, S. (2005). Socialization tactics, employee proactivity, and person-organization fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 232-241.
- Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

- Kristof, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D., & Johnson, E.C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 281-342.
- Kruglanski, A.W., Pierro, A. & Higgins, E.T. (2007). Regulatory mode and preferred leadership styles: How fit increases job satisfaction. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 137-149.
- Lankau, M.J., Carlson, D.S. & Nielson, T.R. (2006). The mediating influence of role stressors in the relationship between mentoring and job attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 308-322.
- Lee, A.Y. & Aaker, J.L. (2004). Bringing the frame into focus: The influence of regulatory fit on processing fluency and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 205-218.
- Lee, A.Y., Aaker, J.L. & Gardner, W.L. (2000). The pleasures and pains of distinct self-construals: The role of interdependence in regulatory focus. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 274-285.
- Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J. & Stillwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study of the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 662-674.
- Lockwood, P., Chasteen, A. L., & Wong, C. (2005). Age and regulatory focus determine preferences for health-related role models. *Psychology and Aging, 20*, 376-389.

- Lockwood, P., Jordan, C.H. & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 854-864.
- Lockwood, P., Sadler, P., Fyman, K. & Tuck, S. (2004) To do or not to do: Using positive and negative role models to harness motivation. *Social Cognition*, 22, 422-450.
- Loughry, M.L., Ohland, M.W., & Moore, D.D. (2007). Development of a theory-based assessment of team member effectiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 67, 505-525.
- Nielson, T.R., Carlson, D.S. & Lankau, M.J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 364-381.
- Pham, M.T. & Avnet, T. (2004). Ideals and oughts and the reliance on affect versus substance in persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 503-518.
- Ragins, B.R. & Cotton, J.L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 529-550.
- Raven, B.H. & French, J.R.P. (1958). Group support, legitimate power, and social influence. *Journal of Personality*, 26, 400-409.
- Resick, C.J., Baltes, B.B., & Shantz, C.W. (2007). Person-organization fit and work related attitudes and decisions: Examining interactive effects with job fit and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1446-1455.
- Sassenberg, K., Jonas, K.J., Shah, J.Y., & Brazy, P.C. (2007). Why some groups just feel better: The regulatory fit of group power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 249-267.

- Scandura, T.A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437-453.
- Schneider, B., Smith, D.B., & Goldstein, H.W. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 747-773.
- Semin, G.R., Higgins, E.T., de Montes, L.G., Estourget, Y., & Valencia, J.F. (2005). Linguistic signatures of regulatory focus: How abstraction fits promotion more than prevention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 36-45.
- Shah, J., Higgins, E.T., & Friedman, R.S. (1998). Performance incentives and means: How regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 285-293.
- Turban, D.B., & Dougherty, T.W. (1994). Role of protégé personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 688-702.
- Underhill, C.M. (2006). The effectiveness of mentoring programs in corporate settings: A meta-analytical review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 292-307.
- Verquer, M.L., Beehr, T.A., & Wagner, S.H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*, 473-489.
- Wallace, J.C., & Chen, G. (2006). A multilevel integration of personality, climate, self-regulation, and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 529-557.
- Wallace, J.C., Little, L.M., & Shull, A. (2008). The moderating effects of task complexity on the relationship between regulatory foci and safety and production performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13*, 95-104.

Table 1. Means for mentor effectiveness considering chronic and primed congruence with displayed confederate mentor behavior

		Displayed Mentor Behavior	
		Promotion	Prevention
Primed	Promotion	8.10 (.27)	8.34 (.34)
	Prevention	8.10 (.27)	7.91 (.33)
Chronic	Promotion	7.97 (.12)	8.28 (.14)
	Prevention	8.24 (.33)	7.97 (.45)

Note: Standard Errors are displayed in parentheses.

Table 2. *Observed and expected frequencies for mentor preference*

	Primed		Chronic	
	Promotion	Prevention	Promotion	Prevention
Observed	66	44	66	44
Expected	55	55	97.7	12.3
Residual	11	11	31.7	31.7
χ^2	4.40*		91.74**	

Note: Values for observed are the same for both primed and chronic because they are the frequencies with which participants selected the promotion or prevention focused mentor from the descriptions (see Appendix F).

* denotes significance at $\alpha=.05$ level

** denotes significance at $\alpha=.01$ level

Table 3. *Correlation of conscientiousness, effectiveness and congruence*

	M	SD	1	2	3
1. Conscientious	3.67	.54			
2. Effectiveness	8.11	.89	.01		
3. Primed Congruence	--	--	.01	-.09	
4. Chronic Congruence	--	--	.01	-.17	.04

Note: Primed and Chronic Congruence are dichotomous variables indicating whether regulatory focus is congruent with mentor behavior; 0=incongruent, 1=congruent.

* denotes significance at $\alpha=.05$ level

Table 4. *Conscientiousness as a moderator of the relationship between congruence of primed regulatory focus orientation and displayed mentor behavior on effectiveness*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Conscientiousness	.158	.157	.096	.108	.225	.065
Primed Congruence	-.154	.170	-.087	-.52	1.175	-.294
Conscientiousness X Primed Congruence				.099	.316	.211
Adjusted R^2			-.002			-.010
F for ΔR^2			.91			.099

* denotes significance at $\alpha=.05$ level

Table 5. *Conscientiousness as a moderator of the relationship between congruence of chronic regulatory focus orientation and displayed mentor behavior on effectiveness*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Conscientiousness	0.194	0.160	0.116	0.077	0.228	0.047
Chronic Congruence	-0.308	0.171	-0.173	-1.152	1.195	-0.646
Conscientiousness X Chronic Congruence				0.228	0.320	0.484
Adjusted R^2			0.043			0.005
F for ΔR^2			2.330			0.509

* denotes significance at $\alpha=.05$ level

Appendix A

Sample Interview Questions

1. "Tell me about yourself".
2. "How would your friends describe you?"
3. "What is your greatest strength, and what is your greatest weakness?"
4. "What is your greatest accomplishment so far?"
5. "Why should we hire you?"

Appendix B

Lockwood et al's (2002) Promotion/Prevention Scale

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| Not at all
true of me | | | | Neither true nor
untrue | | | | Very
true of me |
1. In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life.
 2. I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations.
 3. I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.
 4. I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future.
 5. I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future.
 6. I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future.
 7. I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my academic goals.
 8. I often think about how I will achieve academic success.
 9. I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me.
 10. I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life.
 11. I am more oriented toward preventing losses than I am toward achieving gains.
 12. My major goal in school right now is to achieve my academic ambitions.
 13. My major goal in school right now is to avoid becoming an academic failure.
 14. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my "ideal self" –to fulfill my hopes, wishes and aspirations.
 15. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I "ought" to be –to fulfill my duties, responsibilities, and obligations.
 16. In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life.
 17. I often imagine myself experiencing good things that I hope will happen to me.
 18. Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure.

Appendix C

IPIP 60-item personality measure (Goldberg et al., 2006)

The following are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes **you**. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then choose a number on the scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

NEUROTICISM: 10-item scale (Alpha = .86)

- + keyed Often feel blue.
Dislike myself.
Am often down in the dumps.
Have frequent mood swings.
Panic easily.
- keyed Rarely get irritated.
Seldom feel blue.
Feel comfortable with myself.
Am not easily bothered by things.
Am very pleased with myself.

EXTRAVERSION: 10-item scale (Alpha = .86)

- + keyed Feel comfortable around people.
Make friends easily.
Am skilled in handling social situations.
Am the life of the party.
Know how to captivate people.
- keyed Have little to say.
Keep in the background.
Would describe my experiences as somewhat dull.
Don't like to draw attention to myself.
Don't talk a lot.

OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE: 10-item scale (Alpha = .82)

- + keyed Believe in the importance of art.
Have a vivid imagination.

Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.
Carry the conversation to a higher level.
Enjoy hearing new ideas.

- keyed Am not interested in abstract ideas.
Do not like art.
Avoid philosophical discussions.
Do not enjoy going to art museums.
Tend to vote for conservative political candidates.

AGREEABLENESS: 10-item scale (Alpha = .77)

- + keyed Have a good word for everyone.
Believe that others have good intentions.
Respect others.
Accept people as they are.
Make people feel at ease.

- keyed Have a sharp tongue.
Cut others to pieces.
Suspect hidden motives in others.
Get back at others.
Insult people.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS: 20-item scale (Alpha = .90)

- + keyed Am always prepared.
Pay attention to details.
Get chores done right away.
Carry out my plans.
Make plans and stick to them.
Complete tasks successfully.
Do things according to a plan.
Am exacting in my work.
Finish what I start.
Follow through with my plans.

- keyed Waste my time.
Find it difficult to get down to work.
Do just enough work to get by.
Don't see things through.
Shirk my duties.
Mess things up.
Leave things unfinished.
Don't put my mind on the task at hand.
Make a mess of things.
Need a push to get started.

Appendix D

Demographic Measure

Age _____

Sex _____ M _____ F

Is there currently anyone in your life whom you would consider a mentor? _____ Yes _____ No

How many people, in the past or at present, have served as your mentor? _____

Are you currently a mentor for someone else? _____ Yes _____ No

How many people, in the past or at present, have you mentored? _____

Appendix E

Effectiveness Measure

1. This mentor fulfills my expectations.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

2. This mentor makes important contributions to my growth.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

3. This mentor keeps trying when faced with difficult situations.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

4. This mentor offers help when it is appropriate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

5. This mentor communicates effectively.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

6. This mentor provides encouragement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

7. This mentor provides constructive feedback when it is appropriate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

8. This mentor motivates me to do my best.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

9. This mentor sets appropriate expectations.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

10. This mentor has the appropriate skills and abilities.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree				Neither agree nor disagree				Strongly Agree

11. Rate the overall level of effectiveness for this mentor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all Effective				Neither effective nor ineffective				Very Effective

12. What is your personal view of the mentor's overall effectiveness?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all Effective				Neither effective nor ineffective				Very Effective

13. To what extent do you feel that your mentor has fulfilled his or her role?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not at all				Indifferent				Completely

Appendix F

Mentor Descriptions

Please read the descriptions below and indicate which mentor you would prefer to work with. We will attempt to pair you with a mentor based on your preference, but bear in mind that your preferred mentor may not be available. All mentors are senior-level students participating in a mentoring program and will be interacting with you as part of their training.

Mentor 1: “I want to be a mentor to help others achieve their goals. I have always pushed myself to succeed and would enjoy being a role model for those who aspire to the same accomplishments. I think that creating positive energy is the best way to achieve your dreams. I’m eager to create change in creative new ways through this mentoring program. In an ideal world, we would all have mentors to help us grow, and we would all strive to mentor others to ensure that everyone can thrive.”

Mentor 2: “Mentoring is important because it is the responsibility of upper level students to guide others to ensure that they don’t fail. I never had a mentor during my college years so I couldn’t learn from their mistakes. Before graduation, there are many obligations that students may not be aware of, and careful planning for those requirements will give students a more stable course plan and reduce their stress. I think mentoring is a social duty that we all can provide.”

Please indicate which of the mentors you would prefer to work with:

_____ Mentor 1

_____ Mentor 2

Appendix G

Sample Responses to Interview Questions

PREVENTION

You ought to give an answer like...

Avoid giving responses that...

1. "Tell me about yourself".
 - I always complete my duties and responsibilities
 - I avoid losses as much as possible
 - I have lots of self-control
 - I take responsibility for my obligations
 - I avoid setbacks
 - Describe your responsibilities and obligations at home and with prior work experience
 - Avoid discussing personal topics
2. "How would your friends describe you?"
 - Vigilant, dutiful, responsible, self-controlled, secure, stable
 - He/she averts mistakes and setbacks
 - Doesn't like rejection or defeat
 - Protect your image and avoid responses that sound too arrogant
3. "What is your greatest strength?"
 - Preventing mistakes related to my responsibilities and obligations
 - Averting losses and failures
 - Safety-oriented
 - I am stable during times of uncertainty
 - Avoid giving an answer that puts you in a negative light
4. "Why should we hire you?"
 - I avoid negative outcomes and rejection
 - I assess my mistakes to avoid future failure
 - I will ensure that my duties are fulfilled safely and responsibly
 - Provide an answer that shows your ability to avoid disappointing setbacks or failures
 - I am responsible and self-controlled
 - Avoid answers that make you look like a setback to the company
5. "What is your greatest accomplishment so far?"
 - Not disappointing my parents or family
 - Securing enough money to live on my own
 - Avoid answers that are too general

PROMOTION

An ideal response would be...

You should strive for a reply like...

Seek to answer with...

6. "Tell me about yourself"
 - I approach situations with a positive attitude.
 - I strive to succeed in my education
 - I pursue advancements in my knowledge
 - I aspire to achieve success someday
 - I'm ambitious
 - I enjoy my area of study
 - Describe your accomplishments or any achievements that are especially important to you, as well as your aspirations or wishes for the future

7. "How would your friends describe you?"
 - Strives to better his/her education
 - Creative, ambitious, successful, eager, goal-oriented, nurturing, approachable, an achiever
 - Hopes to change the world
 - Strive to give possible employers a positive view of your nature outside the workplace

8. "What is your greatest strength?"
 - Highlight your creativity as well as an ability to adapt to change
 - Growing and changing to become a more successful person at everything I aspire to do
 - Aspirations and hopes to change the community

9. "Why should we hire you?"
 - Employers want to gain the sense that you are adaptive to change, creative, ambitious, and successful in your work
 - It would be a huge accomplishment to get this job
 - I aspire to do the best I can do
 - I seek a job with room for growth and development
 - I thrive in an atmosphere of change
 - I nurture others so we can all succeed together

10. "What is your greatest accomplishment so far?"
 - Outline your greatest achievement, focusing on your ambitions in the task and how it succeeded
 - Developing a thriving community through my approach to service
 - Achieving my degree and pursuing my education at Auburn University