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The “gate keepers” oversee the enforcement of the rules, set by the university, for those seeking tenure. This elite club decides what counts, how it is completed and evaluated, and where to set the equity bar. The pre-tenured librarian expects to be treated with openness and fairness but may be met with bias and secrecy. Without a network or mentoring system many early-career librarians are not reappointed, are denied tenure, and become dropouts in the last year of the tenure process.

This study explores mentoring functions as they relate to joining the “club” within an academic library. This study also identifies characteristics of mentoring that are similar to characteristics of a transformational leader and characteristics of mentoring that are similar to psychosocial support. This study was pursued with the belief that mentoring benefits the early career librarians who must navigate through the tenure process.

Because recruitment and retention are costly it is important for the library to retain library faculty and to assist them through the tenure process. It is equally important to replace departed library faculty. The pre-tenured librarian may enter the job market and profession with little or no academic experience so it is critical to provide a mentoring program to assist the librarian in professional growth.
This study provided evidence that mentoring programs assist the pre-tenured librarian in building a strong portfolio and developing confidence, while providing an overall easier time of becoming acculturated. This study also revealed that both mentors and mentees agree to the value of the support a mentoring program provides. It has been shown in the literature, that librarians who are not assisted through the tenure process most often do not become culturally savvy, do not receive promotions, or do not remain at the university.

The research questions were addressed through an explanatory sequential mixed method two phased approach. The first phase’s survey population was drawn from 113 Association of Research Libraries members. In the second phase of the study, data was collected through interviews with librarians from three tenure granting academic libraries.

T-test analysis indicated that there was no significant difference between mentees and mentors measured for three of the “Four Is,” of transformational leadership (inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, or intellectual stimulation). There was, however, a significant difference between the views of mentors and mentees for idealized influence. Sequential equation analysis supported the rejection of both null hypotheses.

The coded transcription provided supporting evidence that not all of the “Four I’s” are considered important. Three themes emerged. 1), idealized influence was marginalized by the interviewee’s responses. 2), individual consideration was confirmed as important. 3), the psychosocial support characteristic of trust was regarded as highly important by all interviewees.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The recruitment and retention of junior faculty is a long-term and costly commitment made by many universities and academic libraries nationwide. In the hiring process the university looks for candidates who are able to be successful in the tenure process. The tenure (i.e., reappointment) process normally extends over a six-year period. The third or fourth year is the critical reappointment period. Generally, when reappointment or tenure is not granted; the possibility of that person acquiring another position within an academic library is more difficult.

According to Dygert, Tumlin and Seamans (2004) over 10% of librarians working toward tenure are met with rejection or defeat. They add, however, when libraries have “really strict publication requirements” a greater percent of librarians do not make it through the tenure process.

In my observation at a midsize academic library, three out of five librarians made it to the third year only to find that one or more tenure criteria were not being met. This usually resulted in separation from the institution and the tenure track position. Another factor for librarians, who do not complete the tenure process, is that he or she is a poor fit with the library and its culture. In this situation, in the third or fourth year, the librarian is likely to pull-up-stakes and move on. These scenarios represent not only a problem for the library and the parent institution, but are also a disheartening experience for the early-career librarian. As a result many early-career librarians seek non-tenure track positions at public or private libraries, private college libraries, or libraries in private industry.
The tenure time clock provides the pre-tenured faculty an opportunity to demonstrate his or her ability to perform and meet the institution’s teaching, scholarship, and service criteria. The period leading to tenure also allows the pre-tenured faculty time to be productive, grow professionally, and demonstrate commitment (Drew, 2008). On the other hand, meeting the criteria for tenure in librarianship through publishing, professional development, and service can be daunting task for the early-career librarian.

Factors for success, according to Dygert, Tumlin and Seamans (2004), include: putting a dossier together, developing an academic career plan, finding a mentor, collegiality, and becoming politically savvy. The authors also indicate that manners, citizenship, and follow through are essential to collegiality. Networking and finding a mentor, along with collegiality, are highly beneficial at this point of the career path. (p. 255)

The tenure hurdles vary widely among departments and universities. Passing through the “tenure gate” (Whitten & Anderson, 2009) is the ultimate challenge that may be frustrating and anxiety ridden when expectations are unclear and conflicting information is received (Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, & Hill, 2006). The lack of information and resources, coupled with department climate, often produces an environment of overload and unexpected experiences for the early-career professional.

The tenure process within the academic setting may also be a lonely process. The early career librarian may not be familiar with the academia and tenure process. This unfamiliar territory may cause undue stress. Along with being alone in an unfamiliar situation, the tenure process may seem like a sorority or fraternity hazing. In the tenure track situation the pre-tenured librarian must meet with the approval of tenured librarians
who sit in judgment. “Getting past the tenure barrier requires [the librarian to use] strategic planning, tenacity, and political savvy” (Whitten & Anderson, 2009). They also indicate that “the reappointment and tenure process [for librarians] can appear to be arbitrary, irrational and capricious” (p. 2).

**Problem Statement**

The “gate keepers” (i.e., those who have tenure) oversee the enforcement of the rules, set by the university, for those seeking tenure. This elite club decides what counts, how it is done and evaluated, and where to set the equity bar. The pre-tenured faculty expects to be treated with openness and fairness but may be met with bias and secrecy. Exclusion from the mandarin circle reinforces the pre-tenured librarian’s feeling of isolation (Trower, 2008). Without a network or mentoring system many early-career librarians are not reappointed, denied tenure and become dropouts in the last year. The problem this study examines is navigating the tenure process, joining the club and achieving tenure. The study explores how mentees perceive the mentoring relationship; if there is a relationship between transformational leadership “Four I’s” (i.e., individualized consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics; and if there is a relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to explore mentoring functions as they relate to joining the club within an academic library. The study is pursued with the belief that mentoring benefits the early career librarians navigate through the tenure process. This is done through building trust and giving guidance. The study targets academic librarians in
the tenure process, to identify characteristics of mentoring that are similar to characteristics of a transformational leader and characteristics of mentoring that are similar to psychosocial support.

**Theoretical Perspective**

The concepts and framework of mentoring in practice and the mentoring relationship may be used to explain the growth and development of the early-career librarian. It is through mentoring theory principles that outcomes may be achieved. The principles help the new practitioner to overcome the stress and challenges encountered during a formative or transitional period. “A mentor is therefore someone who helps another person through an important transition such as coping with a new situation like a new job or a major change . . . or in career development or personal growth” (McKimm, Jollie, & Hatter, 2007).

During this transitional period mentoring programs may be incorporated for a number of reasons. Basically transition is “a period when a practitioner is in need of guidance and support in order to develop confidence and competence” (McKimm et al. p. 2). Other benefits include: improved retention, encouragement for underrepresented groups, support for organizational change, and personal development.

The mentor/mentee relationship may incorporate various activities to achieve the overarching goal. The mentor may provide assistance through technical instruction or by role clarification. Mentors may provide identification and analysis of learning situations, opportunities and gaps, as well as encouragement, reflection, and structure for unfamiliar situations.
The mentoring relationship may be affected by various characteristics and factors. Characteristics that influence successful relationships include: the mentor’s skills, attitudes, learning preferences, communication skills, feedback, and evaluation of the process. Factors that could impose barriers or be accelerators include: goodness of fit, acceptance, and maturity.

It is this researcher’s argument that transformational leadership and mentoring share many of the same characteristics. Burns defines leadership “as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations . . . the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations . . . of both leaders and followers” (Wren, 1995). Transforming leadership occurs when the relationship raises both participants to a “higher level of motivation” (p. 101).

\textit{Hypotheses}

\textbf{Figure 1.1 Hypotheses relationships.}
The relationship becomes linked through mutual goals and support, hence, having a transforming effect on both participants. Transformational leadership, according to Bass, is a one-way process. The influence acts to increase confidence and elevate expectations of success (p. 104).

The research questions addressed in this study are: 1) How do mentees perceive the mentoring relationship? 2) Is there a relationship between transformational leadership “Four I’s” (i.e., individualized consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics? 3) Is there a relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics? The following null hypotheses were considered in this study.

**Hypothesis 1**

There is no relationship between transformational leadership “Four I’s” (i.e., individualized consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is no relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics.

**Definitions**

**AACU.** Association of American Colleges and University

**AAUP.** American Association of University Professors

**ACRL.** Association of College and Research Libraries

**ALA.** American Library Association
**Case study.** The researcher explores in depth a program, an event, an activity, a process, or one or more individuals (Creswell, 2003).

**Cashing-out.** Balance between living and working (Hay p. 20).

**Cocooning.** Self-preservation (Hay p. 22).

**Developmental alliance.** Development through the process of an alliance (Hay p. 40).

Seven core values, People are OK, want closeness, change, want to grow, create own meaning, can make decisions, and behavior is purposeful

**Equals.** Everyone can have a mentor

**Innovators.** Challenge the status quo; better things (Hay p. 5).

**Mentor.** A trusted counselor or guide (Webster)

**Mentoring.** Is a developmental relationship that provides help for the less experienced (mentee) by an experienced person (mentor). The mentoring relationship fosters communication, the transmission of knowledge, and psychosocial support.

**MIS.** Master in Information Sciences

**Mixed methods.** Approach in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds (e.g., consequence-oriented, problem-centered, pluralistic). It employs strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems. The data collection also involves gathering both numeric information . . . as well as text information . . . so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information (Creswell, 2003).

**MLIS.** Master in Library and Information Sciences

**MLS.** Masters in Library Sciences
Physis. Growth nature (Webster) "approach that lets us grow in a direction we choose ourselves" (Hay p. 3).

Qualitative. Approach in which the inquirer uses strategies of inquiry such as narratives, phenomenologies, ethnographies, grounded theory studies, or case studies. The researcher collects open-ended, emerging data with the primary intent of developing themes from the data (Creswell, 2003).

Quantitative. Approach in which the investigator primarily uses post-positivist claims for developing knowledge (i.e., cause and effect thinking, reduction to specific variables and hypotheses and questions,. . . ) employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data (Creswell, 2003).

Sequential procedures. The researcher seeks to elaborate on or expand the findings of one method with another method (Creswell, 2003).

Tenure. ACRL Academic Status Committee: Tenure (continuous appointment) Tenure is defined as an institutional commitment to permanent and continuous employment to be terminated only for adequate cause (for example, incompetence: moral turpitude; retirement for reasons of age, mental or physical disability; bona fide financial exigency) and only after due process. Tenure (continuous appointment) shall be available to librarians in accordance with the tenure provision of all faculty of the institution.

A. The criteria for tenure are closely allied to the criteria for promotion in academic rank. The relationship between tenure and rank shall be the same for Library Faculty as for other faculty in the institution. These Criteria include:

1. effectiveness of performance as a librarian;
2. quality of scholarship;
3. effectiveness of professional service.

B. A member of the Library Faculty who is a candidate for tenure shall be reviewed
according to procedures set forth in established institutional regulations as applied to other faculty on the campus. These procedures shall be similar to those described … for promotion in academic rank. (Cottam, 1987)

**Transformation leadership.** The transformational leader nurtures the follower in a parental fashion by promoting the rise of the follower through the attainment of goals and increased levels of self-actualization. The leader engages with others in such a way that leaders and follower raise one another to a higher level of motivation and morality. The leader involves him or her in the relationship with followers and becomes fused in mutual support for a common purpose. Transformational interrelated factors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration.

**Transformational Mentoring.** Leader mentoring behaviors that promote the development of transformational leaders (Clair & Deluga p. 11).

**Significance of the Study**

This study is significant and of interest to a broad audience. First, the early career librarian may find guidance regarding the tenure system. By highlighting relevant literature and past trends the study alerts the librarian to possible pitfalls within the tenure process. Second, the study may provide evidence to administrators of the benefits of a mentoring program. Third, this study may add to the exiting literature regarding the relationship between mentoring functions and transformational leadership and mentoring functions and psychosocial support.

Transformational leadership characteristics have been studied by numerous theoreticians. These characteristics then are well established and identifiable in leader
behaviors. This study examines transformational leadership characteristics that, if found in a mentor serve to create an effective mentoring relationship.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

There is considerable literature documenting the desirable effects of the mentoring relationship within academia. Most of this literature, however, is relevant to academia at large and stops at the front door of the library. When the library mentoring issue is addressed, in the literature, the scope is usually relegated to paraprofessional library staff, underrepresented groups, or women as administrators. Another deficiency in the literature is the lack of quantitative or qualitative studies. The final gap is in the age of the articles focused on mentoring in librarianship. Eleven articles about mentoring the early-career librarian, through the tenure process, were found. Of these articles, eight were published five or more years ago, with only three published within the last three years. The inadequacies in the literature create the need for up-to-date research that investigates the mentoring relationship within academic libraries and provide new insights on the subject.

Recruiting

Problematic issues regarding recruitment abound within the academic environment. Academic libraries’ recruitment issues include many if not all of the parent-university issues plus those that are specific to the library profession. There are three levels of recruitment within academic libraries, to the profession, to the library, and finally, to the position within the library. Recruitment into the profession of librarianship is hampered by: low salaries, a female dominant field, and negative images of the librarian. This situation is further exacerbated by a flat or declining library school

Marketing campaigns that stress the value of librarianship and rebuild the image of the librarian may be one answer to this dim recruitment picture. In addition to salaries and image, applicants tend to consider geographical location, cost of living, housing, and tenure requirements as pluses or minuses when pursuing a career in an academic library.

It is a well-known fact that private industry is far more competitive regarding salary. This issue has been documented throughout the library and academic literature. Lower salaries are a fact of many academic departments and disciplines; however, academic library recruitment is also faced with competition from within the profession. This competition includes special libraries, public libraries, and state and private libraries none of which hold the librarian to the rigorous standard present in the academic faculty tenure process (ACRL, 2002). This is why it is especially important to publicize academic library positions while marketing them to stress the value of the librarian within the academic setting.

Libraries have three areas of personnel needs: replacement of retiring faculty, redeployment of positions, and new faculty recruitment. With the high turnover of senior faculty, whether for career change or retirement, libraries are finding it necessary to reinvent library work and identify and recruit entry-level faculty for new positions. It is often challenging, if not impossible, to match candidates with positions (Munde, 2000). The institution needs to consider several key issues during the recruitment process: geographic location, quick and timely searches, failed searches, rejected applicant’s attitude, and long periods of position vacancy.
It is reported, in the literature, that 75% of librarians currently in the profession are 45 years old or older. Within the next few years, between 40% and 66% of the library work force will retire. These statistics make it more important to identify and recruit qualified applicants. Due to the often-limited size of the applicant pool there may be an imbalance between the number of openings and the number of qualified candidates applying for the position. Recruitment and marketing strategies are therefore critical.

The ability to attract, recruit, and hire top candidates is the hallmark of a successful academic library . . . Hiring decisions are difficult to reverse and mistakes prove costly in terms of time, resources, and service quality . . . The major hurdle in finding the right people . . . moved away from patiently sifting through dozens of resumes . . . to creating efficient and effective models to identify, to recruit, and to hire top candidates (Raschke, 2003).

Finding a candidate who meets the institution’s needs is not easy. It takes time and resources to match the candidate’s talents, professional goals, and personality to the library environment. When recruiting, it is also important that the library meet the applicant’s needs. The top candidate will most likely seek mobility, promotion opportunities, challenges, opportunity to learn and use new skills, a competitive salary, and benefits. Matching the candidate to the institution may be achieved by providing congenial working conditions, job enrichment, and educational opportunities as well as a competitive salary.

Individuals in entry-level positions or in the first five to seven years of their career are likely to seek jobs based on beginning salary, job duties,
and potential to learn new skills or earn additional credentials . . . The goal should be to keep the librarian (ACRL, 2002).

Another major issue discussed in the literature, and related to recruitment and retention is “faculty status” (ACRL, 2002). Faculty status is the “single most distinctive aspect of academic librarianship” (p. 19). Entry-level librarians “do not care to enter organizations where librarians have faculty status” (p. 19). These cohorts of librarians neither have a “need or desire for faculty status and/or tenure” (p. 19).

Tenure

In the late 60’s and early 70’s, during the university and college growth period, tenure was granted routinely as a “rite of passage” (Verrier, 1993). Today, faculty on tenure track are met with a different climate that may seem like an “enduring trial” (p. 98) Institutions view the granting of tenure as a long-term commitment and expect the faculty to be a productive member of the college community. Tenure track is the “probationary period leading up to tenure” according to Drew (2008). This is the time, provided by the university, for the junior faculty to prove his or her worth by “demonstrating a pattern of accomplishment” (p. 2). The tenure process may be considered the courtship period, while tenure is the marriage between the faculty and the university.

Tenure ostensibly insures the right to due process, academic freedom, and collegiality. After faculty achieve tenure one may not be fired “without presenting evidence” (National Education Association, 2009) of incompetence or unprofessional behavior. Understanding what it “means to meet the criteria for tenure” (Drew, 2008) may shed light on the junior faculties’ fear of the tenure process. Tenure may be granted
because senior colleagues are convinced of ones’ ability to perform independently, at a high level, while taking pride in the end product.

From the first day on campus the tenure clock starts ticking and one must start preparing for the future. The tenure timeline is in place for several reasons. It allows time for the junior faculty member to be productive, grow professionally, and demonstrate commitment. The longer the tenure process the more evidence may be gathered to support a justifiable decision for granting or denying tenure. The tenure timeline is usually six to seven years.

Hambright and Diamantes (2004) discuss their observation of the process. The junior faculty often struggles to meet the criteria for tenure, which includes research and scholarship, service, and teaching as well as the demands of the job. Within the tenure system there is only success or failure with nothing in the middle. The process, in Hambright and Diamantes opinion, is anxiety laden, no matter if the process results in denial or granting of tenure. “The tenure process can be very rigid,” (National Education Association, 2009) and, in many cases, a great deal of ambiguity exists in what counts towards tenure.

There are many terms used to describe the junior faculty member in the tenure process. Tenure track, non-tenured, untenured, pre-tenured and junior faculty are examples of these terms, which serve to evoke the lower level ranking of the person and represent the attitude of the senior faculty. Some commonly used terms, which are found in the literature, are even more descriptive and emotionally charged. These terms include; tenure gate, ultimate challenge, tenure barrier, elite club, ultimate gate keepers, “good-ole-boy” network, exclusive club, passing initiation, hazing, unstable ground, trial by
innuendo, tribal membership, and tenurized. All of these pejorative terms enforce the fear factor and add to the anxiety and discomfort of the junior faculty member.

There are three factors, identified in the literature, which often cause the most stress and anxiety for the junior faculty. These factors are: the clarity of guidelines and information, the political culture, and socialization. The literature is riddled with accounts of the different issues that junior faculty face during the tenure process. Narratives of illusive, vague, and inconsistent guidelines further complicated by unclear and conflicting information cause the junior faculty stress anxiety and undo pressure. Junior faculties commonly share concerns regarding “what counts as research, how it is done, how it is evaluated, and the equity of support for it” (Tower, 2008).

Meeting the tenure criteria, for a new librarian who is unfamiliar with academia, results in high pressure during the first six or seven years. This pressure is magnified by the political culture and its overt and covert existence. Maneuvering through the complexity of departmental climate may seem to be an insurmountable task. Learning what collegiality means within the department, library, and institution, is also sometimes very difficult and illusive.

Socialization involves understanding what is required socially and may cause added concern for the junior faculty. In many situations the junior faculty is expected to know the “who, what, when, and where” by osmosis. The junior faculty is supposed to be able to read between the lines in this embodiment of a “don’t ask-don’t tell” surroundings. Osmosis would be a good skill to use if possessed. The junior faculty frequently responds to the tenure process with concern, frustration, and anxiety. The pressure of the often-ambiguous expectations regarding scholarship, promotion and job requirements, as well as the perception versus the reality of the process causes this
cathexis. The junior faculty meets the ambiguity with amazement, total dismay, or confusion (Trower, 2008).

The unspoken rules of collegiality, which generally seem only to apply to the untenured, are: “good manners, good citizenship, and follow through on committees and tasks” (Dygert, Tumlin, and Seamans, 2004). Unlike the U. S. Constitution, which “applies to all Americans, rules of collegiality do not apply to tenured faculty. Those who have it decide who else gets it” (Trower, 2008). Bias in the tenure process and peer review is a reality. The junior faculty expects to be met with openness, equity, and fairness. Instead, the junior faculty may find secrecy that may mask bias, whims, cronyism, and isolation. This exclusion from the “good-ole-boy network” is a key factor in the number of female faculty who drop out of the system (p. 3).

Verrier (1993) describes the tenure process as the ‘rite of passage,’ which is laden with uncertainty and torment. The socialization experience for the junior faculty is like, “trial by innuendo, subchiefs of the tribe exert their authority in judging whether the academic ‘neophyte’ is worthy of tribal membership” (p. 96). The new “rite of passage” is framed in each person’s ability to make “sense of their situation based upon their beliefs [and] background,” (p. 98) along with their experiences and values.

The perception of interpersonal relationships among faculty colleagues is influenced by interactions and is viewed through the lens of academic rank and the labels placed upon the pre-tenure junior faculty. The “unconscious psychological effect” of having to do what is “politically correct” such as “sucking up” to stay in good standing or holding ones tongue, so as not to offend a senior faculty member on a divisive issue, effects ones ethical well-being. This is standard operating procedure; however, as the junior faculty cannot chance alienating a senior colleague. The junior faculty must walk
the tightrope of the tenure process with eyes wide open and with strategies for success in both hands for balance. These strategies need to include: planning, tenacity, and political savvy (Whitten & Anderson, 2009).

At this point it seems the odds are stacked against the junior faculty receiving tenure. The literature, however, reveals that mentoring within the academic library may provide relief for the junior faculty. This hope is encouraged by solutions based on needed changes in the tenure criteria and how specific criterion is communicated. According to Whitten and Anderson (2009) tenure standards need to be defined and clarified, and a reasonable and equitable path to tenure established (p. 2). Clarifying ambiguities in the tenure policies, while leaving room for interpretation and flexibility, will help alleviate junior faculty confusion. Clarification may also be achieved through written contracts that are quantified and transparent (Trower & Gallagher, 2008). Using a point system to quantify the criteria provides absolute measures and establishes a system for junior faculty to know when they are meeting expectations and standards (Drew, 2008). The junior faculty needs and deserves timely progress reports and acknowledgements from the chair and colleagues (Trower & Gallagher, 2008).

The majority of the responsibility, however, for making it through the tenure process rests with the junior faculty. It is their responsibility to put together a convincing argument for the granting of tenure (Drew, 2008). This is achieved by presenting a portfolio with no areas of concern or weakness. It is also the junior faculty’s duty to make senior faculty comfortable, via an effective portfolio, with their body of work (Trower & Gallagher, 2008). It is important for junior faculty to have “contract rules and length clarified . . . to address constraints of the timetable, understand personal dynamics, and separate one’s self from competitive or defensive reactions of others” (Verrier, 1993).
Knowing, what to know, where you stand, where you belong, and who to trust are the keys to self-assurance and balance in an unstable and unfamiliar situation (p. 113-115).

Dygert, Tumlin, and Seamans, (2004) provide six factors for success:

1. succeeding in the application process;
2. putting a file/dossier together;
3. developing your academic career;
4. finding a mentor;
5. the importance of collegiality;
6. understanding the political culture of your institution (p. 255).

The University of Natchitoches, Louisiana found a “possible solution to the tenure problem” by establishing the Professional Advancement Group to “share tenure experience, support grant writing and publishing, and provide a sounding board for ideas” (Cox, Landry, & Kwak, 1999). This group “set a good example for the not-yet-tenured members . . . [by sharing] the research and grants they are currently producing” (p. 3). Through providing a safe atmosphere of support, cooperation, and collaboration for research, junior faculty are able to express and alleviate their fears.

**Theories**

It is my contention that mentoring shares many characteristics with transformational leadership. Yukl, (2006) an authority on organizational leadership, discusses research performed by Kram and Noe, which identify two distinct types of mentoring relationships: psychosocial and career facilitation. Sosik and Godshalk (2000) juxtapose the transformational leader with mentoring, and highlight the similarities. In a table comparing the transformational leader construct, they divided behavior characteristics into three categories tasks, mixed, and relationships as seen in Table 1. They make a comparison between transformational leader constructs and mentoring constructs; career development and psychosocial support. This comparison highlights the
similar characteristics of the two constructs. The similarities brought to light are; transformational leader behaviors; planning, clarifying, monitoring, motivating, supporting, developing, networking, recognizing, and rewarding as they overlap with mentoring construct characteristics. Nine out of 14 of Yukl’s leadership behaviors are similar to the mentoring construct.

Table 1.
Approximate conceptual similarities and distinctions between leadership behaviors and mentoring functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader behavior (Yukl, 1990)</th>
<th>Primary behavior orientation</th>
<th>Mentoring function (Noe, 1988)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying roles &amp; objectives</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Challenging assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Role modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and inspiring</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing &amp; mentoring</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Challenging assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing conflict &amp; team building</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Exposure/visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Sponsorhip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Acceptance/confirmation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Primary behavior orientation based on Yukl (1994). Specific mentoring function indicates area of overlap with leadership behavior.


The mentor is a transfer agent, who shapes “values, acts as an example, and defines meanings” (Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). These functions are similar to the idealized influence behaviors of a transformational leader. According to the authors, the main difference, between the transformational leader and the mentor, is that leadership involves a one to many relationship and is formal, overt, and direct; whereas, mentoring may be either [formal] or informal, subtle, and indirect. Leadership is generally task
related, whereas mentoring performs both task and developmental functions. According to Sosik and Godshalk (2000) transformational leadership is about “forming a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders” (p. 369). The “Four I’s” that Bass and Avolio identify: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence are part of this comparison. “Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) suggest that transformational leadership is consistent with requirements for effective mentoring” (Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). The transformational leader: (a) builds trust (i.e., is trustworthy, a symbol of success, and accomplishment), (b) gives individual consideration (i.e., the transformational leader spends time, treats others as individuals, helps others develop, and listens), (c) intellectual stimulation (i.e., the transformational leader encourages others to reformulate assumptions), and (d) intellectual development (i.e., assists in developing a long-term vision and attaches meaning and importance). Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) argue that:

Conceptualized supervisory mentoring as a transformational activity involving a mutual commitment by mentor and protégé to the latter’s long-term development, as a personal, extra organizational investment in the protégé by the mentor, and as the changing of the protégé by the mentor, accomplished by the sharing of values, knowledge, experience, and so forth (p. 1589).

Clair and Deluga (2001) contend that there are “logical ties between traditional mentoring activities and the Four I’s” (p. 2). The authors consider “transformational mentoring” as containing two primary aspects: career development and psychosocial support. Career development is broken down into five activities; sponsorship, challenging
assignments, exposure, coaching, and protecting. Psychosocial support has four activities; role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The authors align their theory of transformational mentoring with Burn’s (1978) theory. The transformational leader encourages the results of “mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. Transformational leaders align follower self-interest in development with the larger interest of the group, organization, or society” (Clair & Deluga, 2001). They continue by emphasizing the connections between the “Four I’s” of transformational leadership and mentoring.

Individualized consideration is the emphasis on an individual’s need for achievement, growth, and career development. The mentor and transformational leader provide new learning opportunities and a supportive climate. Transformational mentoring is not a controlling style but provides feedback and guidance and communication runs both directions. According to Clair and Deluga (2001) the transformational leader concept is “directly linked to mentoring activities” (p. 11) when individualized consideration is part of the mentoring relationship. Idealized influence is also appropriate behavior within the relationship, where the leader/mentor demonstrates respect, trust, esteem and confidence. These are attributes that the protégé is likely to adopt. Aspects of inspirational motivation include the leader motivating and inspiring, while providing challenging assignments and encouragement to the protégé. Inspirational motivation works through enthusiasm and optimism. The intellectual stimulation is where the leader aids the protégé in honing innovative and creative skills. The transformational mentor, questions assumptions and reframes problems to encourage the protégé to develop new ideas. This is done through coaching and the avoidance of public criticism.
The traditional model of mentoring emphasizes career success. "Two of the five career development behaviors identified [sponsorship and visibility] . . . are directly consistent with . . . transformational mentoring model" (Clair & Deluga, 2001). The other three development behaviors: coaching (i.e., to help discovery), protecting (i.e., to transform from blame to praise), and challenging (i.e., to develop skills) are indirectly connected to the mentoring model. Psychosocial support is directly connected through specific behaviors of role modeling, accepting and confirming, and friendship. Through modeling behaviors the mentee is encouraged to take risks. The accepting and confirming behavior assists the mentee to feel confident with innovative ideas that challenge and change the status quo. Friendship behavior elements include social interaction and mutual likes. As discussed above, the "theoretical relationship between the activities engaged in by transformational leaders and mentors helps clarify the relationship between these two constructs" (p. 18).

As in other leader relationships, transformational mentoring has obstacles, barriers, and limitations that need to be addressed. According to authors, Clair and Deluga (2001), these obstacles include; negative relationships, sabotage, submissiveness, and harassment. Other barriers identified are: goals or lack of goals, organizational culture, individual assumptions, and attitudes. Limitations were broken down as mentee based or leader based. The two mentee based limitations discussed were a lack of commitment and a lack of vision. These limitations are huge and may lead to enormous personal cost in time and relationships.

The Clair and Deluga (2001) article discussed several limitations that are leader based. They are; willingness, stereotypes, and tacit knowledge. Willingness to groom ones predecessor involves feeling ones authority and prominence to be in jeopardy.
Sharing the power and limelight is far too threatening. A lack of willingness may be a symptom of a narcissistic leader, insecurities, reluctance, or jealousy.

Stereotype limitations are concerned with the mentor’s attitudes that impact who receive mentoring. “Mentoring is also affected by some demographic factors such as age, gender and race” (Yukl, 2006). Yukl, also includes other forms of stereotypes that create limitations: “appropriate behavior, concern about intimacy with men, awkwardness about discussing some subjects, lack of appropriate role models, resentment by peers, and exclusion from male networks” (p. 407). Tacit knowledge, another leader limitation, may be described as the difficulty for the mentor to communicate or articulate clearly in order for the mentee to understand.

Hay developed a new vocabulary and approach to mentoring, which is called “transformational mentoring.” Her theory, called “developmental alliance” introduces “a new approach which will make the benefits of mentoring available to anyone who wants them” (Hay, 1995). This approach matches mentor skills with mentee’s inner drive for growth and development (i.e., “physis”, defined as growth nature). Hay discusses

Figure 2-1. Three-cornered contracts (Hay, 1995)
environments where boundaries are common, where it is recommended to stay in one’s place, and “physis” is discouraged. Hay introduces two new limitations, which she terms cashing-out and cocooning. A mentor who has cashed-out is “less likely to give their all” and a “cocooner” is in self-preservation mode.

In Hay’s “developmental alliance” theory the role of the mentor/mentee is equal. In this equal relationship, a “hierarchical arrangement will no longer be appropriate” (Hay, 1995). The role of mentor as advisor is to develop opportunities and the terms old/young, expert/novice, and friend/comrade are interchangeable. Transformational mentoring in the “developmental alliance” theory becomes a three-cornered contract between the organization, mentor, and mentee as seen in Figure 2-1.

**Mentoring Untenured Librarians**

In the 1990’s a number of university libraries realized the need for a formal mentoring program to assist junior faculty through the tenure process. During this time period various infrastructures for mentoring emerged. Programs were generally put into place to address the wasting of junior faculty talent. Colley and Thorson (1990) provide an account of what they called the height of social irresponsibility wherein junior faculty were not properly counseled and were met with inappropriate demands and unacceptable research paradigms.

According to Colley and Thorson (1990) in 1987, the University of New Mexico Library began a program to help junior faculty meet tenure goals. This program, called the “Faculty Sponsor Program,” was designed to assure that junior faculty had fair expectations for success and to help them through the bewilderment and rigors of tenure and promotion. The administration of the project fell to the Library promotion and tenure committee. The committee was charged with establishing mentor/mentee guidelines. The
guidelines included: fairness and impartial treatment, the mentor/mentee must be from different departments, and the mentor could not be responsible for the mentee’s evaluation. The program was put in place to help mentees with research and publishing, to promote the dissemination of information about opportunities, to publicize junior faculty work, and to help junior faculty network with colleagues. Response to the program varied from support to disapproval.

The mentees reported that a role model decreased the feeling of isolation. The negative feedback, however, included: lack of mentor time or availability, uncertainty about requirements, lack of information about the program, and lack of a reporting mechanism. It was also clear from the feedback that the mentor selection process could be problematic.

In her article, Elizabeth Cox (2007) lists eight “do’s and don’ts” for new librarians. The “do” list includes:

1. Meet people and get involved
2. Cultivate relationships
3. Cultivate mentors
4. Document what you do
5. Get training and stay up on literature in your area
6. Read
7. Keep notes on what you read, and
8. Keep your resume/curriculum vita up-to-date

Karen Evans’ (2004) article addresses the skills and abilities needed to serve as a mentor. She also recommends using the mentoring experience as a means to rejuvenation for senior faculty. This was accomplished by tapping into the junior faculty’s enthusiasm. According to Evans the role of mentor is to establish expectations, discuss the duties and
goals of the mentoring relationship, and provide time to introduce tenure track responsibilities.

The article by Lee (2005) “Mentoring the untenured librarian” at the Mississippi State University libraries, involves introducing the junior faculty to research requirements and identifying possible impediments to success, such as lack of socialization or inadequate preparation. In this scenario, a research committee is charged with the development of the program, sponsorship of informal discussions, informing junior faculty about conferences and deadlines, providing mentoring as needed, providing recognition of publications, and recommending program improvements. Workshops are provided on topics such as research issues, review processes, resources, and evaluating research articles. Showcasing faculty achievements on the libraries web site, which includes full descriptions of research interests, sponsoring a retreat that highlights how to do research and research concerns proved to be helpful to the junior faculty.

The article by Keyse, Kraemer, and Voelck (2003) make reference to the process as “seeking the way to the Holy Grail of tenure” (p. 378). The problem is:

Finding someone who is in the know, and someone who can be trusted not to note in one’s personnel file the depth and breadth of the stupidity of the inquiry . . . [allowing] one to bare our professional souls (p. 378).

The Keyse, Kraemer, and Voelck article discusses the implementation process of an informal mentoring group. In 2001, a new program, spearheaded by the Associate Dean, at Oakland University, Kresge Library the ‘Untenured Librarians Club’ was formed. The focus of this group was to discuss the tenure process, goals, concerns, and frustrations. The process also incorporated “duties found in our position descriptions . . . [along with the] daunting and ever present expectation of publishing peer-reviewed
articles.” (Keyse, Kraemer, & Voelck, 2003) The club guidelines outline the 10 elements of a successful leader/mentor:

1. Casual and neutral environment
2. Share feelings, experiences, and impressions
3. Encourage active participation
4. Share writing and research findings
5. Provide financial means
6. Provide advice and critiques of writing
7. Provide quantifiable guidelines for tenure
8. Be an advocate
9. Help the untenured mentor each other
10. Encourage the tenured to research and publish

Author Kuyper-Rushing (2001) discusses how Louisiana State University (LSU) Libraries in 1998, established a formal mentoring program to help junior librarians meet the requirements of tenure and promotion. A key issue to success that was identified indicated that mentoring partners are found not assigned. The roles of the senior mentor included teacher and coach, interpreter and adviser, foster interpersonal relationships, be an advocate, and assist with professional development.

The mentor opened doors for the junior faculty librarian by empowering and nurturing skills, attitudes, and confidence. Mentors also assisted the junior librarian to find a research area, and help the mentee get involved in service. The primary goal of the LSU Libraries program was to assist tenure-track librarians in participating successfully in professional service, and in identifying research arenas in the field of librarianship that are appropriate for the individual (Kuyper-Rushing, 2001).

Components of the program include: administrative responsibility, supervisors do not serve as mentor, tenured librarians are required to participate, workshops, scheduled
meetings, and a first year pilot program. When the program was introduced there were some negative reactions from the faculty which included not being allowed to give input, overburdened with current work load, did not have a voice in the selection of committees, mandatory participation, and the number of required meetings. During the evaluation “newer librarians expressed frustration at having been promised a mentor, but not being assigned to anyone until several months into their employment” (Kuyper-Rushing, 2001).

At the University of New York, Albany, according to Van Avery’s (1992) article, a yearly debate was held regarding the libraries official tenure document and qualification of librarians. The main bone of contention revolved around peer reviewed versus external review, publishing and research, and the librarian’s ability to demonstrate excellence in librarianship. In 1987, in order to address these issues, the Library Professional Activities committee was formed to “bring our criteria more truly in line with the rest of the University, and to accept the fact that they would become more demanding” (Van Avery, 1992). During this process the problems of formalizing a mentoring program became apparent. The committee was naïve and made the assumption that “the essence of mentoring program is in the mentor/mentee [relationship] . . . mentors would know what to do and the program would ‘run itself’, and forming pairs is truly a delicate matter, and one needs to be ultra-sensitive” (p. 124-125).

“Peer mentoring”, by Level and Mach, (2005) describes the situation that caused Colorado State University Libraries to develop a mentoring program. “From 1998-2003, there were 13 new library faculty hired and nine retirements in a total faculty pool of 29. In 2003, the number of tenure-track faculty [at Colorado State University Libraries] accounted for about 45 per cent of the total library faculty” (p. 306). Formalizing a mentoring program in 1999 was the first step toward creating a system to assist junior
faculty. The volunteer program had two goals; to assist “in vita/dossier preparation and assist librarians in building a record of professional activity” (p. 306). Program activities included professional development opportunities, introduction to colleagues, and encouragement to attend professional development workshops. Because of the number of junior faculty the mentoring relationship changed from one-to-one to one-to-many.

In addition, the mentors had typically received tenure five to 20 years earlier in their careers, under very different rules. Informal discussions among tenure-track librarians uncovered different mentors and supervisors doling out different, sometimes contradictory, advice for the tenure process. (p. 306)

The peer support group, in addition to one-to-one mentoring, provided support in a safe and non-threatening environment. The peer group encouraged sharing ideas and strategies, provided feedback, and increased collegiality among members of the group.

According to the authors Ghouse and Church-Duran, (2008) at the University of Kansas Libraries, the mentoring “relationship can go beyond a senior colleague steering and shielding new faculty and can provide a safe environment for questions, explorations, informed guidance, and, in some cases, stress relief” (p. 373). The mentoring relationship may also provide social support. The University of Kansas program seeks to provide satisfaction for both mentoring parties. The process works by defining the roles and expectations “participation provides an opportunity to build professional relationships with new colleagues and enhances personal satisfaction” (Ghouse & Church-Duran, 2008).

The main focus of the program is on a support system for pre-tenure librarians in the areas of research, scholarship, and service, while embracing the commonly held philosophy
that providing support for tenure enhances all areas of the mentee’s professional life. . . . In principle, [the program act to] . . . build a comprehensive and diverse support system (p. 377), while actually creating an environment that fostered leadership and networking.

Building a rapport within the mentoring relationship was facilitated by time, knowing one’s colleagues, and by allowing spontaneous pairs to develop. In this type of relationship the mentor is not responsible for the outcome, but rather serves “as an advisor and an advocate, the mentee takes final responsibility for . . . career goals and priorities” (Ghouse & Church-Duran, 2008). An unresolved issue was the lack of connection between the mentoring pairs. It was also noted that the program was slanted toward organization goals rather than mentee’s needs.

In 2009, Farmer, Stockham and Trussell wrote about revitalizing an existing mentoring program at the Kansas State University (K-State) libraries. The article begins by stating what junior faculty need to know; “specific expectations, routines, standards, and organizational culture” (p. 8) and identifies the key responsibility to help pre-tenured junior faculty prepare portfolios. The K-State guidelines for mentors cover general topics and the mentors and mentees are always from different departments. The program sets the guidelines to ensure a level of trust, confidentiality and a safe and open environment. The mentor’s “role is to respect individual work styles and encourage mentees to develop research ideas . . . successful mentoring is about exercising good leadership skills, challenging both mentor and mentee and creating a cycle of support” (Farmer, Stockham & Trussell, 2009).

Issues may still arise regarding relationships. While some relationships were rewarding, other mentors did not have the time or inclination to provide adequate
mentoring. Apathetic mentors also caused mentees to become frustrated with the relationship. To resolve these issues K-States adopted many of the concepts that Van-Avery and Kuyper-Rushing outlined in their article. K-State used the concepts in forming written guidelines for a structured mentoring program. The concepts include:

1. The program is voluntary
2. Mentors must work to develop all aspects of professional life
3. Pairs are matched based upon similar interests
4. Formal written guidelines are provided which include regular meeting and relationship expectations
5. Pairs are free to ask to be reassigned

The guidelines also outlined the criteria in which both mentor and mentee are responsible for timelines and activities.

In 1999, Barbara Wittkopf surveyed ARL member libraries to identify those with existing mentoring programs. The survey results are reported in the SPEC (System and Procedures Exchange Center) Flyer 239. Wittkopf defines a formal mentoring program as one that “requires that a mentee formulate goals agreed upon by the mentor, which also meet institutional goals” (Introduction).

**Summary**

The literature has revealed that universities make a substantial investment in recruitment and retention of faculty. Many junior faculties are faced with the tenure-track process for the first time. As the literature indicates, the pursuit of tenure can be a process filled with anxiety and stress. The junior faculty may be met with a series of ambiguous situations which may revolve around unclear cultural and political issues. These issues may be complicated by the often confusing guidelines and criteria for achieving tenure.
As indicated by the literature review, academic libraries are in a competitive market. Many potential librarians shy away from academia due to concerns about meeting tenure criteria. The literature also provides evidence that after entering the profession and the tenure process, pre-tenured librarians meet with an uneasy socialization experience. Pre-tenured faculty often faces ambiguity and uncertainty. This places him or her on a tightrope of ethical dilemmas adding stress to the induction period.

Mentoring theory construct and transformational theory constructs share many similar behaviors (Yukl, 2006; Sosik & Godshalk, 1998; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994; Clair & Deluga, 2001; Hay, 1995). It is also the researcher’s belief that mentoring shares many of the same characteristics of the “Four I’s” as identified by Bass and Avolio, along with characteristics of mentoring that are similar to characteristics of psychosocial support construct.

Transformational leaders may share many favorable characteristics also found in a mentoring relationship. Characteristics such as coaching, protecting and modeling were reported by Sosik and Godshalk as aspects of a mentoring relationship. Scandura and Schriesheim also considered “supervisory mentoring as a transformational activity” (1994). Clair and Deluga, indicate there are “logical ties” (2001) between the two constructs. Yukl compares transformational leader’s primary behavior to mentoring functions (2006); and Hay merges the two approaches together to form a new vocabulary “transformational mentoring” (1995).

A deeper look at the literature reveals multiple library’s that agree with these theories and have implemented mentoring programs which contain aspects of transformational leadership qualities. Libraries with mentoring programs have realized the need to assist junior faculty through the tenure process. Libraries designed a program
to help the pre-tenured through the bewilderment and rigors of tenure and promotion.

Many programs were put in place to insure fairness and impartial treatment. Each program was structured a little differently from the other, but each provided the pre-tenured faculty with guidelines to success.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Overview

Much of the research conducted in the past 30 years consists mainly of mono-method studies. During this time period, research purists would perform either quantitative research or qualitative research. A third methodology, however, emerged, which integrated the two different study methods into one concurrent or sequential study. This study design is known as mixed methods. The emergence of this integrated methodology has gone through multiple stages of acceptance and refinement. There are four strategic designs a mixed method may incorporate: triangulation, explanatory, exploratory, and embedded. Each design may be further fine-tuned by sequence, phases, and stages of research development. The current research study incorporates explanatory sequential design.

Mixed Methods Approach Rationale

Defining the characteristics of a mixed method study is the best response to the question “why should a researcher use mixed method methodology?” First, both quantitative and qualitative research methods have aspects that may compromise an individual method study’s strength. In the quantitative method it is difficult to get a clear picture of the context in which the responses are set. Qualitative research provides the contextual interviews that may be aligned with results from a quantitative study. Contextual interviews clarify the study setting; hence, the single research weakness is reduced or eliminated. One weakness of the qualitative study involves the researcher’s biases, which may be imposed on the interpretation of respondent’s interviews. With the
addition of a quantitative component to the qualitative process, however, biases are reduced through statistical evidence.

The second characteristic of a mixed method study, which supports using a multiple data collection method, is the comprehensive evidence provided by the dual data collection. Third, dual data collection facilitates the researcher’s ability to answer complex questions in a dynamic manner (Creswell, 2003). Complex questions which cannot be addressed by a single quantitative or qualitative study alone may become clearer through the evidence. Fourth, the mixed method study encourages collaboration among researchers and the use of multiple worldviews. Finally, a mixed method provides a degree of freedom for the researcher to utilize all strategies possible to respond to the research question.

The mixed method design, that best fits the needs of the current research study is explanatory sequential. (Figure 3-1) The strengths of an explanatory sequential study are in its straightforward nature and two-phase process. “It is characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data” (Creswell, 2003). Because the design is simple, one individual rather than a team may perform implementation, analysis, and report writing. The two-phase process provides evidence to aid understanding from multiple angles. This allows the researcher to achieve better understanding of the results and allows for an in-depth interpretation of results. Although there are logical advantages to this method there are also disadvantages. The disadvantages include the extensive time commitment, participant selection, and institutional internal review board (IRB) approval (see Appendix A approval letters).
Phase I

Data Collection

**Procedure**
Format survey inst.
Likert scale (5 point)
Administer via web
Sample 113 libraries

**Product**
Mostly numeric data some qualitative data

Identify case study libraries and development interview questions to gather qualitative data to use to explain quantitative differences

Data Analysis

**Procedure**
Description analysis
Frequencies analysis
SPSS
Inspect trends

**Product**
Descriptive & Frequencies Statistics, Emergence of trends

Report results in article

Results

**Procedure**
Summarize stats.
Charts & tables
Demographics
Significant-non-significant
Statistical results

**Product**
Report results in article

Phase II

Qual Data Collection

**Procedure**
One-on-one interviews and observations
case study library
10 participants

**Product**
Coded text, stories, and quotes
Individual voice
Similar & different themes

Mixed method study is used to explain quantitative results through the gathering and analysis of qualitative data.

**Figure 3-1: Explanatory Sequential Design**
Phase One Quantitative

Population and Sample

The population for this study was originally composed of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members. It is a non-probability population of convenience. There are 113 academic libraries that are members of ARL. From this population of libraries the researcher would like to collect survey responses from three to five librarians from each of the 113 libraries.

The survey was designed to glean responses from non-tenured faculty who may or may not be in a mentor relationship; tenured faculty who may or may not have been mentored or are currently acting as a mentor; and administrators who oversee a program and may or may not have been in a mentoring relationship. Participation during quantitative data collection stage was voluntary, so the only permission needed was from the IRB to administer the survey instrument.

Instrument Design

The survey instrument was a compilation of three previously tested instruments. A questionnaire by Sosik and Godshalk (2000), in which they measured leadership, mentoring, and stress, was used to inform 39 questions. These questions are divided into five sections. The first four sections include the transformational leader’s “Four I’s” inspirational motivation (4 questions), idealized influence (6 questions), intellectual stimulation (3 questions), and individualized consideration (5 questions). The fifth section harvests responses regarding psychosocial support. This section of the survey instrument provided a basis for responding to questions regarding transformational theory as it relates to mentoring and psychosocial support as it relates to mentoring.
Questions were also taken from the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey on tenure track faculty job satisfaction. The COACHE survey was “designed, tested, and validated in focus groups and a rigorous pilot study” (COACHE, 2005). The COACHE survey was organized in five sections to measure: tenure; nature of work; policies and practices; climate, culture, and collegiality; and global satisfaction. Twenty-six questions were selected from the COACHE survey for use in the current instrument. Nine of the questions gather participant attitudes about general tenure issues, six questions assemble response regarding policies and practices, and eleven questions ask about climate, culture, and collegiality.

The Medical Library Association (MLA) created the last survey consulted (Kwasik, Fulda, & Ische, 2006). The questions extracted that are relevant to the current research, measure: mentoring program structure, mentoring relationship characteristics and relationship type (i.e., formal or informal).

The combined instrument was comprised of 134 questions. The instrument primarily collected numeric data via closed-ended questions. The combined questionnaire (see Appendix B for full list of survey questions) was divided into six sections.

The fourth and fifth sections (i.e., transformational leadership and psychosocial support) use the Likert scale “to determine the relative intensity of the different items” (Babbie, 2004) through numeric responses. This 5-point scale produces a simple index with five-response categories that corresponds to assigned points. The point assignment for each question ranges from (1) “not important” to (5) “very important”. The survey was powered by the Skylight Matrix Survey System, a web-based instrument that solicits and collects participant responses.
Table 2
Operationalize Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/s focus</th>
<th>Survey numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine existence of a mentoring program.</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine how the mentoring program is structured.</td>
<td>10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine satisfaction with mentoring relationship.</td>
<td>23-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine importance of trust in a mentoring relationship.</td>
<td>29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine importance to career development</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine characteristics of mentoring as it relates to transformational leader construct</td>
<td>33-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine mentoring as it relates to psychosocial support</td>
<td>51-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine characteristics of mentoring in relation to the tenure.</td>
<td>73-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine demographic characteristics of librarian</td>
<td>1-6,100-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 provides an overview of how the questions on the survey were operationalized. Operationalizing questions, allows one to see how they were used to answer or respond to the research focus. The instrument was pilot tested for readability. It did not, however, go through reliability or validity testing prior to be used for the first time.

Survey Instrument Pilot

On November 11th, 2009 the IRB pilot project approval form was submitted (see Appendix A for project approval letter). The approval process went very smoothly with only minor changes to the announcement email and the addition of a follow-up email. IRB instrument approval for the pilot was received November 24, 2009 (see Appendix B for survey questions). The announcement email to pilot participants went out on December 4th 2009. The follow-up email was sent on Friday December 11th and the pilot survey closed on December 18th.
There were seven participants who responded to the pilot survey. The feedback received involved clarifying questions, adding point scales to several questions, and allowing multiple selections from the menu for other questions.

- Question four was changed from “Does the library in which you work have tenure status,” to Do Librarians have tenure status at the library in which you work?
- The phrase “tenure process,” in questions five and six, was changed to tenure-track.
- Questions 90 through 98 originally asked respondents about satisfaction level. It was recommended by pilot participants to change it to ask how important satisfaction is.

The recommendations for change were incorporated into the final survey instrument before research study IRB approval was requested.

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

The revised survey went live March 23rd, 2010. The survey was made available to participants through June 28th, 2010. The results were recorded and analyzed by using IBM SPSS 19 software and Mplus Version 6.11 Structural Equation Model. The questionnaire results were used for demographic, descriptive, and frequency measures of participant responses.

**Case Study Selection Process**

The data collected during the quantitative process was used to identify participants and questions for the second qualitative phase (see Appendix C for interview questions). The demographic information was used to identify libraries, from the 113 libraries, that fit the selection criteria. The criterion includes libraries that currently have
an active mentoring program and librarians on tenure track. The library must grant permission for onsite interviews. This selection process supplied purposeful, feasible, and efficient sites willing to participate in the qualitative phase of the research project.

*Phase Two Qualitative*

**Case Study**

Phase two, qualitative case studies, was conducted in three libraries. The in-depth data collected from interviews in libraries with a formal program, informal program and no program was used to elaborate and extend the quantitative results. In this stage the researcher conducted one-on-one interviews with participants who were mentors in a mentoring relationship, mentees in the tenure process, early career librarians who had recently been granted tenure, and program coordinators. The data collection process included 24 one-on-one, face-to-face, interviews comprised of 5 mentors, 9 mentees, 4 program coordinators/mentors and 6 tenure track faculty.

An amended request for IRB permission was submitted for this phase of the study. Generally, IRB requires an explicit outline of procedures and processes. They also expect participants to be identified before they are known. Specific questions to be used during the interviews were not created, however, until after the analysis of the quantitative results. The qualitative questions were not identified until sometime after the initial IRB request was approved. Therefore, an addendum was submitted to clarify the second phase of the research and outline future processes and decisions.
Data Collection and Analysis

Methodology

As a novice researcher my strategy for this study was one of discovery. This active learning style places the researcher in the position of explorer rather than expert. Through collecting participant perspectives the process was holistic and inductive, allowing the researcher to gain an understanding of the system that was studied. According to Richards and Morse, qualitative methods are appropriate “if the purpose is to make sense of complex situations . . . [or] the purpose is to learn from participant’s experience” (Richards & Morse, 2007). The qualitative case study research provides in-depth perspective on the topic (i.e., mentoring in an academic library).

Case studies are suitable when the process is explored or when discovery is important. A qualitative case study may be categorized or typed by discipline or an orientation such as ethnographic, historical, psychological, sociological, or educational. Case studies may also be guided by intent such as descriptive, interpretive, or evaluative. Sociological case studies were used because of the nature of the topic (mentoring in academic libraries). The characteristic of a sociological case study involves a bounded system and the study of an existing unit or instance.

Case studies have both strengths and limitations. The strength of case studies is that the findings may be used to predict similar instances. A limiting factor of case studies is the amount of time and money it takes to acquire the rich narratives.

Case Study Sample

The sampling method for this study was purposeful. The various types of purposeful sampling are: typical (reflect the average instance), unique (rare occurrences),
maximum variations (widely varying instances), convenience, snowball, chain or network (referrals). The main criteria for sample selection was a library or libraries that currently provide a formal mentoring experience for new library faculty. Ideally the program should have been in place between five to ten years. This time span should be adequate to have numerous newly tenured librarians who participated in the program. The interviewees were early career librarians involved in a mentoring program, librarians who have been involved in the program for over two years, newly tenured librarians, and librarians with the role of mentor and program coordinators.

Data Collection

For this study the data collection strategies incorporate interview methods. There are three basic types of interview styles: informal (conversational in nature), formal (structured and in depth in nature), and standardized (predetermined questions). All three interview styles were incorporated during the study. The formal interview was used during one-on-one sessions. This form of questioning provides flexibility and researcher control. Formal interview sessions were scheduled for the participant’s convenience. Sessions were scheduled for 45 minutes with at least one follow-up member checking. Formal interview sessions were taped and later transcribed using a professional transcriptionist (see Appendix D for confidentiality statement). Informal interviews were also used for data collection. These informal sessions were not recorded. The settings include group lunches and coffee breaks.

Data Analysis

Qualitative research, inductive by nature, requires the researcher to interpret synthesize, categorize, compare, reduce and code the gathered data. The process of data
interpretation may use one of several methods that include: open coding, axial coding, or selective coding. For this project, MAXQDA 10 software was used for open coding method of data analysis. One of the characteristics of open coding involves the review of raw data. Hatch (2002) refers to this as the “systematic search for meaning” that involves multiple levels of comparison.

Chesler (1987) breaks the coding process into seven levels of synthesis. The first level, searching for meaning, may be nothing more than underlining key phrases. The second level restates the key phrases, while the third level reduces “the wording of the key phrases and organizing them into clusters” (p. 11). The fourth level of comparison involves the reduction of clusters and advance interpretation to make “decisions about which entries go . . . into which cluster [this] involves more implicit and explicit comparisons” (p. 13). Chesler includes three advanced levels of reduction that are: generalization, generating theory, and integrating mini-theories. The categories and subcategories were pre-regulated by the constructs measured by the survey.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical considerations of concern to the researcher include: personal bias, participant risk, confidentiality, informed consent, and the storage of records. Within a phenomenological study a researcher will face personal biases. Recognizing the nature of one’s biases, and then acknowledging and bracketing them are good ways to keep the biases in check. Frequently the researcher’s bias is the very impetus for the research project and may act to inform the nature of the study. Question formation and coding are two areas that may be skewed by the researcher’s bias.

The researcher acknowledges that her point of view was biased. During my career as a library paraprofessional I observed three librarians who were not mentored and did
not make it through the tenure process. I believe that by using an unbiased survey instrument and gearing the questions to answer only the questions that are not clear from the participant’s responses the researcher will avoid injecting personal bias.

As the research project developed it was important to understand and to be aware of the risk involved for the participants. If the interview process was to be taped or otherwise recorded it was important to obtain signed consent forms. The consent form was a legal and ethical obligation to protect the participant and the researcher. Consent forms include information about: risk, confidentiality, compensation, procedures, the opportunity to ask questions, and the freedom to withdraw from the study. (Appendix E for interview protocol form) Other information that may be included on the consent form was project identification and the description of benefits that may be derived from the study.

Validation Procedures

Validating data was an integral part of research, and serves to check the “quality of the data and the results” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Validity of quantitative data means that inferences about the population are meaningful. Consistent numerical responses are an assurance that reliability is high. Instrument reliability and validity are measured through past use and consistent scores, as stated the instrument was not tested for reliability and validity.

Qualitative data validity was somewhat harder to pin down and reliability has a lesser role in the overall integrity of results. Validity for qualitative data has to do with verifying accuracy. Checking data’s accuracy may involve member-checking, triangulation, or peer review. The use of several forms of data collection will produce a triangulation effect that will enhance internal validation. Member checking involves the
participant reading the interview transcription for accuracy. The replication of this study is contingent upon the number of libraries found to have a mentoring program in place; however, repeating the study at several libraries would support the reliability of the study. Producing dependable and consistent findings was also a good test of a studies’ reliability. For this study member-checking was the only method used to establish validity.

“Validity in mixed methods research is challenging because the researcher combines both quantitative and qualitative research, each with its own forms . . . of validity” (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2008). Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006) believe that the strength of combining the two research forms is in minimizing the weaknesses of either. However, validity is usually related to one or the other method, with its own language, to document the validity.

The main premise of this two-phase study was to examine the mentoring relationship as it facilitates the tenure process. The first phase of the study involved collection and analysis of quantitative data. The second phase of the study includes open-ended questions used to collect qualitative data that was then analyzed. The interpretive stage of the study brought the two phases together by using the qualitative findings to elaborate on the quantitative results.
CHAPTER IV
Quantitative Results

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was to explore mentoring functions as they related to joining the club within an academic library. The study is pursued with the belief that mentoring benefits the early career librarians as they navigate through the tenure process. This study examines the relationship between the mentoring function and transformational leadership and the mentoring function and psychosocial support. The study targets academic librarians in the tenure process, by identifying characteristics of mentoring that are similar to characteristics of a transformational leader and characteristics of psychosocial support. This study process involved both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

The study began with a letter, sent out in February 2010 to 113 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) academic libraries. The letter asked for three to seven email addresses of possible participants to be forwarded by the Dean of each library. Twenty-eight library administrators responded, via email, to the introductory letter. Nine of the responders indicated they would not participate. (see Appendix F for correspondence) The reasons cited for not participating included; librarians do not have faculty status, librarians are not on tenure track, and the library does not have a formal mentoring program. Eighteen library administrators contributed the email addresses of possible participants. The sample included a total of eighty-six email addresses of possible participants. On March 23, 2010, emails with the online survey URL were sent to the 86 participants.
Sample Demographics

The survey was available from March 23rd to June 18th 2010. In April an amended list of institutions was submitted to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Institutional Review Board (IRB). Included were six libraries that are not ARL libraries, but are identified as having mentoring programs. Permission was received to contact the Dean of these libraries. A phone call was made asking for his/her library’s participation in the study. The addition of the six libraries was added to the sample. In order to accommodate the new participants the survey close date was extended. During this extended time period five of the six new libraries responded with email addresses. A total of 15 new responses were received. This increased the number of responses from 34 to 49 (48.5%) from the 101 librarians in the sample. One librarian responded to the demographic questions and provided these general comments:

“Sorry that we did not participate in the survey due to librarians not appointed on the tenure track at Minnesota. We do have informal mentoring relationships for new librarians and for librarians who move into leadership responsibilities.”

The remaining participants were from 16 (89%) of the 18 libraries that provided email addresses. Louisiana State University had the highest response rate with seven librarians participating. The University of Washington had six respondents, and there were five responses from Southern Illinois University-Carbondale. Other library participation ranged between one and three respondents.

Of the responding librarians 34 (69%) are involved in a formal mentoring program, 11 (23%) are involved in an informal mentoring program and three reported that the library did not currently have a mentoring program. Forty-six (94%) of the
respondents indicate that librarians are granted tenure status. Seventeen librarians are currently on tenure track. When asked if they are tenured 27 (55%) responded yes and 21 (43%) responded no. The sample includes 37 (76%) female respondents and 12 (24%) male respondents Table 3.

It is important to note that result percentages are frequently skewed by the missing data (i.e., skipped question factor). Questions nine through 22 take into consideration the existing mentoring program at the responding library. The number of participants who contributed to the missing data, (skip rate) for these questions range from 15 (31%) to 21 (43%).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Demographics (49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other questions throughout the survey have skip rates below the 6.2 average. The main questions skipped were the open-ended questions that solicited comments. Open-ended questions, such as, number 120: “Please include other characteristics of the tenure process that are important,” were skipped by 44 (90%) of the participants.

The data was analyzed using IBM SPSS descriptive analysis, t-test, and Mplus Version 6.11 Structural Equation Model. The t-test analysis is used to determine if the means of two groups are statistically different, so are therefore significant. Question three
is used to identify participants who are in a mentoring relationship. “Have you ever been in a mentoring relationship?” Yes (30), currently (14), and no (4).

**Transformational Leadership**

The “Four Is” construct was examined in comparison to mentor, mentee, and total responses. A Likert scale was used to collect responses for questions 57 to 74. In this scale one is equaled not important (NI), two is equaled less important (LI), three is equal to undecided (U), four is equaled important (I), and five is equaled very important (VI).

By using a true mid-point (undecided), participants may be grouped by either for the construct or against the construct. Participants who selected important or very important are considered in support of the construct. Participants, who selected undecided, neither supported nor unsupported the construct, and participants who selected not important or less important represent a lack of support for that construct.

The numbers of participants responding to the 18 questions about transformational leadership varied. Forty-seven respondents answered ten questions, 48 responded to seven questions, and one question had only 46 responses. The results indicated that 27 to 28 mentors responded to the questions regarding transformational leadership and 19 to 20 mentees to the same sets of questions (see Appendix G for descriptive analysis statistics).

**T-test Results**

For this test the alpha level was set at .05 to show significance. Questions 27 have you had a formal mentor in your career? yes (28) and no (20) and question 29, have you ever been a mentor? Yes (31) and no (17) are tested for significance regarding transformational leadership “Four I’s” questions 57 to 74 of the survey (Appendix B).
Table 4
Question 29, have you ever been a mentor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Menteen</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>3.9533</td>
<td>3.9647</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>-.01137</td>
<td>.17870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>4.3778</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.04444</td>
<td>.16209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.8790</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-.514</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-.12097</td>
<td>.23539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>3.5871</td>
<td>3.3529</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.23416</td>
<td>.26209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD appear in parentheses below M

The results, as shown in Table 4, indicate that there is no significant difference in the participant response for question 29.

Table 5
Question 27, have you had a formal mentor in your career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Menteen</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>3.8429</td>
<td>4.1263</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-1.669</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.28346</td>
<td>.16980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>4.3214</td>
<td>4.4211</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>-.630</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>-.09962</td>
<td>.15814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.8839</td>
<td>3.9750</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.09107</td>
<td>.22861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>3.2571</td>
<td>3.8500</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-2.459</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.59286</td>
<td>.24109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD appear in parentheses below M

Question 27, however, did show significant difference as shown in Table 5, between the mentors and mentees responses, when compared to the idealized influence construct.

Inspirational motivation was also an area that indicated the mentors and mentees were at odds.

Mplus Results

Mplus v. 6.11 (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2010), software is a structural equation model. The purpose of structural analysis is to represent the operation of causality through factor analysis by discovery of simple patterns of relationships among the variables. In particular, it seeks to discover if the relationships between observed variables (indicators) can be explained largely or entirely in terms of a much smaller
number of unobserved variables called factors. “Factor loadings estimate the direct effects of factors on indicators and are interpreted as regression coefficients” (Kline, 2011). A rule of thumb often used to indicate that an item loads on a factor, is a standardized factor loading of .7 or greater. Factor loadings, however, should be interpreted according to the theory, not according to arbitrary levels imposed as cut-offs and should be used to explain the percent of variance and how factors relate to the portion of variability.

To determine whether there is a relationship between Hypothesis 1 (mentoring function and transformational leaders constructs “Four I’s”) and Hypothesis 2 (mentoring function and psychosocial support), mentor and mentee responses were recorded and analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to study the relationships between a set of observed variables and continuous latent variables. The observed dependent variables are referred to as factor indicators and the continuous latent variables are referred to as factors. The reliability and dimensionality is assessed using CFA under the maximum likelihood estimation in Mplus v. 6.11 (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2010).

By setting the independent variable factor to mean 0 and the continuous latent variance to 1 the models are identified. Factor loadings and residual variances were estimated. Model fit statistics reported include the obtained model $X^2$ (degrees of freedom) its associated p-value of $> .05$, comparative fit index (CFI), where .95 value equals good fit, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) where $< .06$ values equals good fit. These measures were used because they are known to produce better fit results when analysis is performed on a small sample, which was the case for this study.
Hypothesis 1 There is no relationship between transformational leadership “Four Is” construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics.

Figure 4.1. Mentoring Functions Relation to Transformational Leader Behavior

In this confirmatory factor analysis model the observed variables are taken from the “Four I’s” (individualized consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) constructs. Each of the “Four I’s” overarching indicators is computed by summing several indicators to create parcels. The parcels (sums of several) load onto the latent construct. In Figure 4.1, the larger squares are the observed variables representing the “Four I’s.” and the circle represents the latent variable that is explained by the observed variables. The set of relationships of the two variables is explained by the relationship of the item with the latent factor. That relationship, however, is not perfect as indicated by the error variance.
Table 6
Factor Loading for Confirmatory Factor Model of Mentoring Function as it relates to Transformational Leader Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>(P(2\text{-tailed}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstandardized factor loading measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized factor loading measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (IF)</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 6, a review of the standardized factor loadings section reveals that the first three measures, individualized consideration, idealized influence, and intellectual stimulation, factor loadings, represent over fifty percent of the variance. The factor loading explains the variance of the parcel variance as demonstrated in Figure 4.2. Inspirational motivation, factor loadings, represents only 33% of the variance as demonstrated in Figure 4.3. At this percent the factor is not as highly related to the factor.
Table 7
Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Hypothesis 1: Mentoring Function as it relates to Transformational Leader Construct (N=48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no relationship between transformational leadership “Four ‘s” construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics</td>
<td>2.673</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2628</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine whether there is a relationship between mentoring function and transformational leadership constructs, mentor and mentee responses were gathered, analyzed, and recorded in Table 7. The results for the test conducted were significant and reflect good fit, $X^2 = 2.673$, which means the null hypothesis, there is no relationship between transformational leadership “Four Is” construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics, was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 There is no relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4.3. Psychosocial Support Relation to Transformational Leader Behavior**

In this hybrid model the observed variables are part of the psychosocial support constructs. The construct indicators were summed to create parcels that were measured for goodness of fit.
In Figure 4.3, the larger squares are the observed variables that represent the relationships between mentor and mentee. The circle represents the latent variable that explains the relationship among the observed variables. For a one standard deviation increase in the mentoring function variable, there is a .394 standard deviation increase in the psychosocial support variable.

Table 8
Factor Loading for Hybrid Model of Psychosocial Support Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized factor loading measures</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>P (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentee relationship with Mentor</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor relates to Mentee</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor is encouraging, shows empathy, &amp; respect</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized factor loading measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee relationship with Mentor</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor relates to Mentee</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor is encouraging, shows empathy, &amp; respect</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 8, the standardized factor loadings section, the mentee relationship with mentor indicator represents 29% of the variance. The other two indicator’s factor loadings represent over 50% of the variance.

Table 9
Factor Loading for Hybrid Model of Psychosocial Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized factor loading measures</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>P (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>&lt; .013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 9, the standardized factor loadings, psychosocial support represent just at 15% of the variance.

Table 10
Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring characteristics (N=48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring characteristics</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2624</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine whether there is a relationship between the mentoring function and psychosocial support constructs, mentor and mentee responses were gathered analyzed
and recorded. The results for fit shown in Table 23, indicate good fit, $X^2 = 2.676$, which means the null hypothesis, there is no relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics, was rejected.

**Expected Results**

From the participants’ responses, one may conclude that the majority of the mentors and mentees agree that transformational leadership characteristics play a part in the mentoring relationship. In order to understand this phenomenon a close look at the descriptive statistics proves valuable. As argued by Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) it is important that transformational leadership characteristics be found in the mentor. The transformational characteristics are “consistent with requirements for effective mentoring” (Sosik & Godshalk, 2000).

Examining the constructs of transformational leadership, as it relates to mentoring, provides a basis for identifying effective mentors. This is particularly important in today’s economic climate, where the cost of recruitment is high and retention of librarians is challenging. The profession is also faced with the “googlization” of information and the need to stay relevant in a digital age. Mentoring the future librarian, replacing us, and keeping the profession relevant, are challenges the library profession faces.

Sosik and Godshalk (2000) reported results of their study in an article “Leadership style, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: a conceptual model and preliminary study.” The study takes into consideration theories regarding transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles as they relate to mentoring functions received and job related stress.
Sosik and Godshalk’s study took place at a public university. Participants were full-time corporate employees enrolled in a master’s program. Most of the respondents were in informal mentoring relationships. Their data was analyzed using Partial Least Squares (PLS), which is a structural equation modeling technique.

The Sosik and Godshalk’s study measured four hypotheses. The results produced by this study indicated there is a relationship between transformational leadership “Four I’s” and mentoring function, hypothesis 1 of the current study, and psychosocial support and mentoring function, hypothesis 2 of the current study. Because of these findings it is expected that the current study results should also produce results that indicate a relationship between leadership styles and mentoring functions as defined by the two hypotheses.

**Discussion**

The Hypothesis1 (descriptive statistics results) indicated that mentors and mentees supported three of the four transformational leadership constructs. They are inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Findings show, for idealized influence, however, a split in the results for the two groups. The majority of the mentor’s responses 118 out of 167 (70.65%) are in support of idealized influence. These results are in contrast to the mentees response, where in only 48 out of 119 (40.33%), less than half, supported the construct.

The descriptive findings are echoed by the *t*-test results, where the significance level for idealized influence is only .025 far lower than the .05 alpha. The descriptive results for hypothesis 2 indicated that both mentor and mentee support psychosocial activities. Both mentors and mentees overwhelmingly support trust to be an important characteristic.
The descriptive analysis along with the $t$-test results highlighted a lack of support for the idealized influence construct by the mentees. This construct deals with values, beliefs, purpose, morals, and ethics. One can only speculate as to why mentees do not support this construct, while mentors, do. A possible explanation could be the mentees felt these characteristics over stepped the role of mentor and into an area they deem to be personal.

The Mplus structural equation model (SEM), is also used to measure goodness of fit for both hypotheses. According to the results, there is a relationship between mentoring functions and transformational leadership characteristics. The SEM results also indicate that there is a relationship between mentoring function and psychosocial support. The results reinforce Sosik and Godshalk’s findings.

**Implications**

The results of this study can have a wide impact on the tenure process for librarians seeking to be tenured and for libraries that wish to retain quality employees. This study lays a foundation for the qualities that mentors should possess to be able to be effective. This implies that institutions who wish to have a successful mentoring program will need to incorporate some basic understanding of the characteristics of a transformational mentor. In addition to the transformational aspects of mentoring, the psychosocial skills should also be included in a pre-mentor program.

The pre-tenured librarian may enter the profession with little or no academic experience since the terminal degree for a librarian is the Masters in Library Science (MLS). Generally, the curriculum for the MLS does not include instruction to assist the
librarian in scholarly and creative activities, making the results of this study even more important for pre-tenure librarians.

This study provides evidence that mentoring programs assist the pre-tenure librarian in building a strong portfolio, developing confidence, and having an easier time becoming acculturated.

This study revealed that both mentors and mentees agree on the value of the support a mentoring program provides. It is through a mentoring program that early career librarians are assisted in developing as professionals, in becoming better university citizens, in taking on a leadership role, and in becoming politically savvy, all of which aids the library in retention of the librarian.

The findings provide evidence as stated by Sosik and Godshalk that transformational leadership characteristics demonstrated by mentors make for an effective mentoring relationship. The results also support mentoring relationship research performed by Bass, 1998; Scandura and Schreisheim, 1994; Skosik and Dionne, 1997; and Yukl, 1994, “which suggested that effective mentoring relationships may be predicted by development-linked leadership qualities of the mentor” (Sosik and Godshalk, 2000).

Limitations

The sample size for this study did not represent an adequate amount of the population; hence, inferences to the general library community cannot be made. The study documented results for mentor relationships, both formal and informal, and librarians who had never had a mentoring relationship. The mentoring relationship or lack thereof, was not a limiting factor. The letter asking for participation did exclude libraries and librarians from participating by its specificity.
Exert from letter:

It is my goal to receive responses from at least one participant in each category, from each library as described below. In order to reach these participants I am asking that you forward 3 to 7 email addresses to me of possible participants who fit into the criteria below.

The survey is designed to collect responses from a sample that includes:

- **Tenure-track librarians**: who may or may not be in a mentor relationship;
- **Librarians in a mentoring relationship**: who may not be tenure-track;
- **Tenured librarians**: who may or may not have been mentored;
- **Mentors**: currently in a mentoring relationship;
- **Coordinators**: who oversee a mentoring program; that may or may not have been in a mentoring relationship.

The survey includes questions regarding: formal mentoring program structure, mentoring relationships and characteristics, and characteristics of the tenure process.

Future studies should be open to all library populations. This would insure the broadest population base.
CHAPTER V
Qualitative Results

Case Studies

Twenty-four library faculty at three universities were interviewed. The Dean’s from these libraries were identified as supporting mentoring programs and were invited to participate in the case study phase. (see Appendix F Dean’s invitation letter) The responding libraries were asked to provide a contact name to help with on-site arrangements. The contact person was responsible for finding volunteers and setting up the interview schedule. The interviews were face-to-face in prearranged private offices. The three universities were selected for their different level of mentoring programs (i.e., formal, informal, and none). All of the libraries were at tenure granting universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Case Study Context (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Granting University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11, provides details of the case study participants. At two of the universities, faculty were reappointed yearly until the sixth year when they went up for tenure. One of the universities had a nine year process. Faculty at this university are hired at the senior instructor level. After two years a review is performed and then the senior instructor is transferred to a tenure track position. Halfway through the tenure track stage there is a comprehensive review. In the seventh or finally year, a tenure review is performed.

Four of the participants interviewed had the role of both program coordinator and mentor. Five participants were mentors and nine participants were mentees. Six of the interviews were with faculty at a library that did not have a mentoring program. Six of the interviewees were male librarians and 18 participants were female librarians. Ten librarians held the rank of assistant professor, ten librarians were at the rank of associate professor, and four librarians held the rank of full professor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th># of Mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Pre-tenured</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 shows the demographics of the sample used for qualitative analysis. Of the 24 interviews nine mentee transcriptions were selected to be coded. The nine transcriptions were selected from participants from the two libraries that had either formal or informal mentoring programs. It was important to capture the view points of the mentees who were still in a mentoring program. Along with participation in a program, the criteria for selection included faculty who are still on tenure track or have recently been granted tenure. The programs had been in place for ten years or longer.

There were three male interviews coded and six female interviews coded. Several of the mentees were in the process of putting tenure folders together, which indicates he/she is in the last years of the process. Two of the interviewees had recently received tenure. One of the participants, despite the fact that a mentor program was available, had “opted out” of the program and did not request a mentor. There was one participant who was in the informal program for ten years and had transitioned from mentee to mentor in the last two years. A review of Table 12 shows that the majority of the participants were in a program for at least two years and up to eight years.

Interview Participants

The interview participants were drawn from two national academic research libraries. One of the libraries is within a flagship university and the other is within a land grant university. There were nine librarians who volunteered to participate in the case studies. The first case study took place at the land grant university and five librarians participated.

Becky is a pre-tenured faculty librarian. She is the Scholarly Communications Librarian and is at the rank of assistant professor. Becky has been on tenure track and in a formal mentoring program for three years. This is her first academic appointment.
Brice is a pre-tenured faculty at the rank of assistant professor. He is the Research Development Librarian. Brice’s background is in the technology industry and this is his first position in an academic setting. He has been on tenure track and in the formal mentoring program for two years.

Paula is tenured at the rank of associate professor. She is a Metadata Librarian who has been in the formal mentoring program, as a mentee, for three years.

Esther is a pre-tenured faculty at the rank of assistant professor. She is the Community and Undergraduate Services Librarian. She has been on tenure track and in the formal mentoring program for six years.

Chris is tenured at the rank of associate professor. He is the Head of Instruction and Research Services and has been in the formal mentoring program for eight years.

The second case study took place at the flagship university and four librarians participated.

Jeff is tenured at the rank of assistant professor and is the Director of Serials and Electronic Resources Metadata Creation. Jeff has been at the institution for ten years and did not participate in the informal mentoring program, although there is one available. Jeff was not promoted at the time that he received tenure.

Whitney is pre-tenured at the rank of assistant professor, and is the Electronic Resources Librarian. She has been in the informal mentoring program for seven years.
Brenda, is pre-tenured and is in the process of preparing her folders to go up for tenure. She is the liaison librarian responsible for Life Sciences. Brenda has been in the informal mentoring program for seven years.

Ben is a pre-tenured faculty. He has only been with the library for a few months. He has not yet participated in the program but plans to attend the mentoring meetings in the future. Ben is an assistant professor and is in charge of the Libraries Information Technology System. This is Ben’s first academic position.

**Interview Coding**

Each participant was asked a set of fifteen questions. (see Appendix C for interview questions) Frequently the participants’ response triggered an additional question, which was also asked. The interviews were professionally transcribed. Segment coding was performed using MAXQDA10 software. See Table 26 for detailed analysis of coded segments.

Two hundred thirteen segments were coded for comparison to transformational leadership “Four I’s” and psychosocial support. The variables used for coding were pre-regulated by the five constructs incorporated in the quantitative phase of the study. For details of the quantitative survey (see Appendix B survey instrument).
Table 13 presents the five constructs, coding frequency, and overall percent of the coded text. Psychosocial support had the most coded segment (80). This was followed by individualized consideration with 69 coded segments. Idealized influence had the lowest number of coded segments (14). Inspirational motivation had 26 coded segments and intellectual stimulation had 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized Consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities &amp; Aspirations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Treatment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Mission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Consequences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Consequences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Purpose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest New Ways</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at Problem from Different Angel Perspectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Critical Assumption</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision of Future</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychosocial Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total segments coded</strong></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychosocial support had six subcategories; general (7), encouragement (9), challenge (11), trust (42), admiration (2), and respect (9). Segments regarding trust were identified, in the text, 42 times. This is 52.5% of the 80 segments coded for the psychosocial support construct.

The individual consideration construct had the second highest number of segments coded (69). This construct has five subcategories; strength (1), abilities and aspirations (9), individual treatment (27), coaching (27), and teaching (5). Individual treatment and coaching each had 39% of the 69 coded segments in this construct. Inspirational motivation has four subcategories: goals (10), vision of the future (6), optimism (9), and enthusiasm (1). This construct only had 26 segments coded. The coded segments are fewer segments than either of the subcategories in the individual consideration construct, individual treatment and coaching. This trend was also prevalent with the intellectual stimulation construct. It had a total of 24 segments coded for the four subcategories; suggest new ways (2), look at problem form different angle (4), different perspective (14), and challenge critical assumptions.

A quick look at the coding statistics reveals the constructs that were supported: psychosocial support and individual consideration. Within the two constructs, the subcategory trust was articulated most frequently, hence, considered very important by participants. The participant support also showed support for individualized treatment and coaching. The participant’s narratives are numerically coded to insure anonymity.

Qualitative Analysis

There are three themes that emerged regarding transformational leadership “Four I’s” and psychosocial support. First, the idealized influence construct, subcategories importance were marginalized by the interviewees responses. Second, the individual
consideration construct had two subcategories (i.e., individual treatment and coaching) that were reinforced as important by the interviewees’ responses. And finally, the psychosocial support construct subcategory, trust, was regarded as highly important to the mentoring relationship by all of the interviewees.

*Idealized Influence*

Idealized influence deals with the mentor being able to communicate to the mentee a sense of mission, moral and ethical decision consequences, and purpose. This construct also includes the mentor’s ability to talk about values and beliefs that guide the mentee through the tenure process.

None of the interviewees considered this construct to be relevant. The mentor’s ability to communicate about moral or ethical consequences was not important. The mentees seemed to believe that the responsibility for achieving tenure lay at his or her feet. Responsibility for the mentees achievements is also shared by the mentor.

Brenda, “You have to carry the burden. It is share to some extent but you have to be a critical thinker in the process.”

Values and mission, according to the mentee’s responses, should be used to assist them to achieve tenure. From time to time achieving tenure was hindered by the mentoring relationship.

Brenda, “But for some darn reason, she just doesn’t have the interpersonal skills to communicate, and had no clue that she basically derailed me. But I just about quit, you know. It was that serious.” Brenda, “I didn’t know why I was on the tenure track, and I absolutely felt like I should be lookin’ for another job. I mean, it just derailed me at comprehensive review.”
So even though idealized influence was not directly discussed by the interviewees it is clear to see that this construct has little bearing on mentoring relationships. Frequently, the mentor/mentee relationship brought together a different experience than expected.

_Individualized Consideration_

Individualized treatment and coaching are subcategories of the individualized consideration construct. Nine of the interview participants articulated thoughts about individual treatment. Eight of the nine participants put into words the need for the mentor to coach them through the tenure process.

_Individualized Treatment_

A function of individual treatment was according to participants, to provide a safe place for the mentee to express fears and concerns.

Brenda, “She helped me to write my self-statements and, you know, more-or-less she let me cry in her office and she said, ‘You’ve gotta get down to brass tacks. You’ve gotta write this self-statement and this is where we’re goin’ with it.’ And it worked. I mean, it was fine.”

Esther, ”Because it’s in my head, ‘How do they know what I’m thinking?’ Because so much of it is psychological. A lot of this is just … support. Just being supportive. Having someone to talk to when you’re confused, you’re having a bad day, or you’re excited about something or you’re considering taking on an new role or a new project or something.”

Overall, mentees believed that the mentor’s role should take the form of advocacy. In this role the mentor was charged with speaking on behalf of the mentee.
Whitney, “She’s really helped me in writing supportive statements that supports my decisions to publish where I published.”

Becky, “I’m kinda ready for a someone I know I can count on to be my biggest supporter after my supervisor, or maybe before my supervisor.”

The need for the mentor to provide the mentee with feedback and purposeful emotional support was also brought out as a key factor to achieving tenure.

Ben “I would like someone who will, ah, both let me do what I want ah, understand that I might ignore them, but um, also will give me, um, appropriate feedback.”

Chris, “She was really helpful in terms of, like she would go over my notebook and tell me, ‘OK, you need to phrase this like this’ and, you know, ‘Let’s these 5-year goals that you have listed, um, you know, maybe you could be a little more far-reaching.’ So, um, she gave me a lot of insight.”

Chris, “But then the other level, which is so important and was really good for me, was that emotional level, just knowing there was someone there who supported you, was your champion, was your cheerleader.”

Brice, “And that is really helpful. We have a reappointment, ah, thing every year. And mine’s coming up. And she will look at my portfolio and give me; you know, ah, constructive criticism or just basic help, just to help me make a better portfolio. And it’s nice to have someone in, from the tenure committee view, ah, give you know, ah, advice on how to make the portfolio better.”
Coaching

The value of coaching was also considered to be important by the interview participants. They vocalized the need for the mentor to provide encouragement, guidance, and feedback to keep them on track.

Brenda, “it keeps you on track, [the mentor] makes sure you understand what is expected of you.”

Ben, “so I think also it’s, helpful to have a mentor to help me know whether I’m,OK, they’re not gonna be able to say for sure, but at least coach me in whether I’m, ah, balancing my portfolio.”

Chris, “These areas that you have to perform in to get tenure are so, um, sort of mysterious and undefined at that point, and it was, it’s really good to have a mentoring program to help.”

Chris, “There’s sort of the coaching on, in terms of ‘OK, this is what you need to do to get tenure. You need to focus on this – the real technical this is what you need to do.’”

Paula, “The mentor is one of those people who helps the mentee stay on track and make sure that the portfolio and requirements are met.”

Psychosocial Support

Trust

Participants touted trust as a significant factor within the mentoring relationship. Trust is a subcategory of the psychosocial support construct. The participants voiced several meaningful viewpoints regarding trust including, trust that privileged information shared by both mentor and mentee, would not be divulged outside the relationship. Many
of the views promoted by the mentees indicated that trust strengthened the relationship between mentor and mentee. The mentees agreed that trust should flow both ways between the mentor and mentee. A trusting relationship establishes the mentee with an environment that fosters confidence.

Chris, “So we could speak very frankly, and she was helpful in giving me insight on the politics of the library.”

Paula, “I felt very comfortable with my mentor and that things worked out well, um, you know, we talked about a lot of different issues and things. And there was definitely, um, trust involved in the relationship.”

Becky, “And, so I think you need to be able to trust that you can go to that person and that person is not going to turn around and tell the world.”

A trusting relationship includes a sense of confidentiality that runs between the mentor and the mentee.

Interviewer, “Would you say that confidentiality was both directions?”

Chris, “You know, I was just gonna say that actually because I could see the trust went both ways. Not only did I feel comfortable talking to her, but I felt that she trusted me because she would state things very frankly at times and, like things I had not ever heard her say in the greater, in bigger circles. And so, I felt that she trusted me to handle the information she was giving me. With the political situation or just about people and, um so feeling that she trusted me really helped build my trust in her.”

Confidence is instilled in the mentoring relationship when the mentee trusts the mentor and is able to talk openly, allowing the mentee to express concerns without fear of judgment or retaliation.
Whitney, “So, I have to explain why there’s 18 months with nothing published. The trust in our relationship is important so that I can, feel like I can talk to her about things like that and that she will give me an honest answer.”

Brenda, “You just hope that what you say in that relationship, if it does lead into other things, that, it stops there. And I guess I believe that’s the case. Um, but you also have to trust that they know, they do know where you should be publishing and they don’t steer you wrong.”

Brice, “Trust is very important, I think. And that’s why here we make sure that the, mentor is not a supervisor, you know. So we can talk about our immediate job, ah, concerns, you know, if necessary.”

The mentees also articulated their feelings about the importance of being able to trust the opinions of their mentor.

Ben, “So there’s that part of trust, um, that they know what they’re talking about. Um, and then there’s, um, sort of the other part of trust that would be important to me is that they would, in fact, not necessarily be a capital A advocate, but that they would, you know, having gone through this process with me, that they would represent well the, um amount of thoughtfulness that went into building a tenurable record.”

Jeff, “I think trust would be important. Um … yeah. And I don’t see, it wouldn’t be much value if you didn’t trust the, guidance offered by the mentor.”
One mentee expressed frustration with their mentor, and they indicated that the mentoring relationship had never gotten off the ground. So, what if a trusting relationship is never established, and how does trust for colleagues help?

Becky, “My, um, mentor is someone who, um, I think that this year the final straw was as I was working on putting together my notebook; I realized that this person wasn’t a person I could give my notebook to. I had given it to him twice in the past and through outside problems that were, you know, not things he had control over . . . he just, never had the chance to look at it. ‘I’m not gonna have the chance to look at it. I’m gonna give it back to you so you can turn it over to other people.’ And, um, that kind of coupled with the whole we weren’t doing stuff together and, um, I really didn’t feel like he was someone that I could turn to.”

Chris, “A perspective that was different from our department’s perspective and helped me, um, to realize that, you know, that I could trust more than just people in my own department, um, just because of the comfort level I had with them.”

Esther, “That helps me to trust in the process. I really feel those are signs to me that our tenure committee and our administration, they are committed to assisting pre-tenures in this job of earning tenure and giving us as much guidance and support as they can.”

Summary

The case studies took place at three libraries and included 24 participants. The interviews were professionally transcribed. Coding was performed with the assistance of
MAXQDA 10 software. The coded sequences reveal that there are three prevalent themes.

The strongest theme that emerged is trust. There is overwhelming evidence that trust, a subcategory of psychosocial support, is considered a significant factor in establishing confidence in the mentoring relationship. This is consistent with the rejection of hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics.

The next subcategories supported by the interviewees are combined as one theme, individual treatment and coaching. They are part of the individual consideration construct. The last theme that emerged was the lack of support for idealized influence construct.

Intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation characteristics had a modest number of coded segments. This is evidence that the participants generally spoke of these characteristics as being somewhat important. The coded transcript segments are evidence that not all of the “Four I’s” are considered important as was expected.

The three constructs highlighted by participants, that supported the rejection of hypothesis 1 are individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. The participants’ interview transcriptions did not highlight idealized influence as important.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

This study tested and evaluated the perception that there is not a relationship between mentoring characteristics, as they relate to transformational leadership characteristics, and psychosocial support. The overarching research questions for this study were (a) “How do mentees perceive the mentoring relationship?” (b) “Is there a relationship between transformational leadership ‘Four I’s’ (i.e., individualized consideration, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) constructs and mentoring construct?” and (c) “Is there a relationship between psychosocial support and mentoring construct characteristics?”

The research questions were addressed through an explanatory sequential mixed method approach. This approach incorporated two independent study phases. The first phase was a quantitative online survey that collected numeric responses. The second phase of the study consisted of qualitative case studies.

Each library, for the case studies, was selected for its unique mentoring program structure. The libraries’ programs were either formal or informal. Mentoring is a developmental relationship that provides help for the less experienced (mentee) by an experienced person (mentor). The mentoring relationship fosters communication and the transmission of knowledge, and provides psychosocial support. The formal programs included structure, guidelines, expectations, and evaluations, whereas the informal programs have less structure. In the informal program the emphasis is on the mentee to establish the mentoring relationship.
Discussion

Descriptive and t-test analysis of quantitative data of the Four I’s indicates that mentors and mentees were not in agreement regarding idealized influence construct. Three findings emerged from the data (1) mentors and mentees disagree on the relevance of idealized influence in a mentoring relationship, (2) the mentee needs to be able to trust the mentor, and (3) the mentor needs good listening skills. The quantitative findings and qualitative themes that emerged from the data analysis provide evidence to support a relationship between transformational leader behaviors and psychosocial behaviors with mentoring functions.

Finding 1: Mentors and mentees disagree on the relevance of idealized influence in a mentoring relationship. These findings raise the questions regarding the nature of the behaviors that make up idealized influence. There are six culturally based behaviors in this construct: talk about the most important values; talk about the most important beliefs; specify the importance of a strong sense of purpose; consider the moral consequences of decisions; consider the ethical consequences of decisions; and emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

The majority of the mentors supported five out of six of the idealized influence behaviors. “Consider the moral consequences of decisions” was supported by only half of the mentors. Sosik and Godshalk (2000) argue:

exhibiting idealized influence, transformational leaders may be viewed by their followers as a trustworthy symbol of success and accomplishment . . . perceived as trustworthy, respected and admirable role models, mentors who exhibit idealized influence may enhance their protégé’s ability to undertake calculated risks to advance their careers (p.370).
They also indicate that mentors should be trained to use idealized influence behaviors, which is contrary to the current study findings.

There were only two of the idealized influence behaviors that were supported by mentees. Half of the mentees indicated it was favorable for the mentor to communicate regarding the importance of a strong sense of purpose and the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

One can only speculate as to the reason behind the difference in attitudes toward this construct. Perhaps these behaviors, when exhibited by the mentor, place the mentor in the controversial role of moral change agent. In this role it is easy to see how the mentor may consider it his or her responsibility to guide the mentee behavior. According to Clair and Deluga (2001) career development and psychosocial support are two primary aspects of transformational mentoring. Idealized influence, however, delves into personal behavior and places the mentor in the role of “moral agent” (Burns, 1978), which is outside the developmental function considered to be mentor behaviors.

The mentor as moral agent, however, would be seen as indoctrinating the mentee into the organization’s culture through manipulation. “Even more controversial is an attempt to change the underlying values and beliefs of individual followers . . . this type of leader influence is clearly unethical, even when the intended outcome is to benefit followers as well as the organization” (Yukl, 2006). Yukl further states, “framing the issue in terms of leader indoctrination and manipulation of followers may be appropriate for religious cults, but it obscures the complexity of leadership processes” (p. 425). As a recipient of the indoctrination the mentee may resist and resent being acculturated into the organization in regard to values, beliefs, and ethics.
Finding 2: The mentee needs to be able to trust the mentor. Trust is a characteristic of psychosocial support and was supported by mentors and mentees in both quantitative and qualitative findings. Mentees consider trust the glue that cements the relationship together. Trust that flows both directions establishes an environment that fosters confidence. It is important that the mentee can trust in the mentor’s knowledge, opinions, and advocacy. Without trust the mentee could be left floundering regarding feedback and direction.

Trust is tricky: it’s easy to lose but hard to build up . . . Trust in others—and in oneself—is at the foundation of an ethical culture. Without trust, anyone, any group can fall into easy justifications for actions that would otherwise be seen as unacceptable or just plain wrong (Cheney, Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004).

Finding 3: The mentor needs good listening skills. Good listening skills are selected by all of the mentors and all but one of the mentees. This skill relates to aspects of mentoring such as individual treatment and coaching. Being a good listener means the use of active listening skills, which include: paying attention, providing feedback, deferring judgment, and responding appropriately. When the mentor shows he or she is listening an environment of respect is created. Respect is also a bonding agent for the relationship. A respectful regard for the other person’s dignity is considered as a behavior that should be mutually aligned. It is through active listening that the mentor learns how to provide appropriate, purposeful feedback and to become an effective advocate, who articulates accurate information.
**Significant Findings**

Sosik and Godshalk analyzed their study data using partial least squares, which is a structural equation model. This type of analysis combines the data, so it is unable to draw out individual details of each construct. By performing a t-test and descriptive analysis on the current findings, detailed results were “teased out”. These details were not noticed in the Sosik and Godshalk study. The details include; there was no significant difference measured between the mentors’ responses and the mentees’ responses for inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, or intellectual stimulations. There was a significant difference between the views of mentors and mentees for idealized influence.

**Observations**

In order to gain better insights into the quantitative results, an evaluation of the mentees views is appropriate. The quantitative findings are congruent with mentee responses during the qualitative inquiry. The mentees spoke of the importance of trust, individual treatment, and coaching. They also articulated the need for the mentor to provide a different perspective and to demonstrate a sense of confidence. The themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis are aspects of individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and psychosocial support and uphold the quantitative findings.

Idealized influence themes that were discussed by mentees, concerned mentors sharing a sense of mission and purpose. All idealized influence characteristics, however, were marginalized during the interviews with the mentees. This is consistent with the participant’s quantitative responses.
Lessons Learned

Writing a dissertation is not about creating perfection, perfect research, perfect data analysis, or great report writing. It is about the process of learning. Learning how to complete research, analyze data and then write effectively. I would now like to share a few of the lessons I learned.

First, research timelines should be like a rubber band: very flexible. I am a huge proponent of using the Gantt charts for timelines. I quickly established deadlines for each step of my dissertation research process. This included time from topic approval to qualitative case study visitations. As presented in Appendix H, there is as much as a year difference from the time projected time to the actual time it took to accomplish each stage of research. Even though I considered my plan to have allocated ample time to each stage, when one is dealing with the unknown one needs to increase the amount of time for each stage. A few of the unknowns that I ran into include:

- Time for IRB approval
- Software changes, updates, or purchases.
- Slow response to invitation letter announcing the study
- Sample response time
- Lack of responses
- Time for data analysis

Even though IRB only took a month it was time that I had to wait. After my pilot program, the software that I was using migrated to a different format. This caused me to study and learn the new software and migrate the questions to it.

I expected the library administrators to respond quickly to the invitation letters. It took over a month for many to reply and send participant email addresses.
The survey was originally open from March 23, 2010 to June 4th, 2010. During the first few weeks, it became apparent that many of the 86 possible participants were not planning to take part in the study. This meant that the number of participants was going to be small. At that point, I amended my IRB proposal to include six non-ARL libraries to the sample. Permission was granted. Phone calls were made to the six new libraries, and 15 more participant emails were added to the sample list. In order to give the latest volunteers ample time, the survey time period was extended to June 18th, 2010. Overall, data were then collected from 49 participants.

In July, I identified six libraries to contact to participate in the case studies. I submitted an amended IRB proposal to include the two libraries. As soon as approval was received, I began contact with the library deans. The next step was to schedule the visits. This was placed in the hands of the coordinators of the mentoring program from each of the libraries. By mid-August, arrangements for the first library visit were in place. The first visit took place September 27th to 29th, 2010. The second library visit took place October 18-20, 2010.

I began the in-depth look at my quantitative data late in November after the two case study visits. Little did I know that it would take two campus departments and three months to finalize the data analysis! After the research problem was identified, the next step was to determine the best way to answer or solve the problem. This aids in a clearly defined survey that focuses on the questions. This also insures the questions address the problem and can be measured. Surveys that include everything, including the kitchen sink, only work to confuse, bore, and overwhelm the participant (learned that too late).

My preferred line, when talking about my research after my survey closed, was “I have a lot of data.” And, I did, but it should have been focused on addressing the problem at
hand, not every issue that popped up and seemed important at the time. Focusing the survey would mean targeting a broader number of participants and concisely addressing the problem. This would have aided in data collection, analysis, and reporting results. It would also have been helpful for creating questions for the second phase.

My survey instrument was made up of 134 questions. Twenty-three questions asked participants about tenure, while measuring faculty satisfaction with the tenure process at his/her library. Forty-seven questions were specifically about mentoring program structure and funding. The survey, therefore, included 70 questions that were not relevant but resulted in a lot of data. Neither section of the survey sections was used to test the hypotheses studied.

Another limiting factor was the specificity of the letters requesting participation. The adage, “less is more” applies to this stage of research. Because the criteria automatically deselected potential volunteers, hundreds of librarians opted out of the survey.

I alluded to another issue with the timeline, which is time itself. Obviously, every stage of the process takes time. Creating the survey, learning new software, and migrating to new software were part of the time involved in the study. Waiting for responses, sending and receive correspondence, scheduling interviews, waiting for schedules to be finalized, travel, interviews, transcriptions, and coding all took time.

There are other costs that need to be considered when planning. These include the cost of travel, lodging, meals, software, and equipment. (see Appendix H for interview expense) The number of interviews and the transcription cost are all to be considered. Three library’s faculty participated in my case studies. I interviewed 24 librarians. The interviews ran between 40 minutes to just over an hour. The cost to have them professionally transcribed was twenty-five dollars per hour.
It took 56 hours to transcribe the interviews. It did not dawn on me until too late that the length of the interviews directly corresponded to the number of questions being asked. The number of questions is important, but is less important than asking the right questions. This is imperative in getting the right answers. This became painfully clear during the coding process.

Software was purchased to code the transcripts. The software cost very little compared to the transcriptions expense or the time it took to learn to use the software was excruciating. My expectations were for the software to do the coding. Imagine my surprise when I discovered the software was not a magic wand that could be waved over the transcripts and the coding was done.

Question number one and two of the interview (Appendix C for interview questions) both combined several questions into one. These two questions, had they been asked separately, were the heart and soul of the problem studied. Other extraneous questions took prominence over the interview and derailed the responses.

Earlier in the dissertation, in the Ethical Consideration section, I discussed the importance of the researcher’s ability to bracket his/her bias. Bracketing keeps the researcher from influencing the interviewee. In many interviews during the case studies, I was able to restrain myself from injecting my personal feelings, but there were also several instances when I could not keep from adding my “two cents”. A review of the transcripts shows that my bias was brought to the surface of many in the conversations.

A final lesson learned that I would like to add, was the importance of statistics and knowing how to perform analysis, read the results, and correctly interpret the statistical meaning. I admit it would be easier for me to learn a foreign language than to understand statistics. I do, however, understand the importance that statistics play in an empirical study.
**Limitation**

After the research problem has been identified, the next step is to determine the best way to answer or solve the problem. This aids in a clearly defined survey that focuses on the questions. This also insures the questions address the problem and can be measured. Surveys that include everything, including the kitchen sink, only work to confuse, bore, and overwhelm the participant (learned that too late).

My preferred line, when talking about my research after my survey closed, was “I have a lot of data.” I do have a lot of data, but it should have been focused on addressing the problem at hand, not every issue that popped up and seemed important at the time. Focusing the survey would mean targeting a broader number of participants and concisely addressing the problem. This would have aided in data collection, analysis, and reporting results.

My survey instrument was made up of 134 questions. Twenty-three questions asked participants about tenure, while measuring faculty satisfaction with the tenure process at his/her library. Forty-seven questions were specifically about mentoring program structure and funding. The survey, therefore, included 70 questions that were not relevant but resulted in a lot of data. Neither section of the survey was used to test the theories studied.

Another limiting factor was the specificity of the letters requesting participation. The adage, “less is more” applies to this stage of research. Because the criteria automatically deselected potential volunteers, hundreds of librarians opted out of the survey.

I interviewed 24 librarians. The interviews ran between 40 minutes to just over one hour. It took 56 hours to transcribe the interviews. It did not dawn on me until much too late that the length of the interviews directly corresponded to the number of questions being
asked. The number of questions is important, but is less important than asking the right questions. This is imperative in getting the right answers. This became painfully clear during the coding process.

Question number one and two of the interview (Appendix C for interview questions) both combine several questions into one. These two questions, had they been asked separately, were the heart and soul of the problem studied. Other extraneous questions took prominence over the interview and derailed the responses. Changing the question from “how does the mentoring …” to “does the mentoring...” would have provided an avenue for a broader response.

Earlier in the dissertation, in the Ethical Consideration section, I discuss the importance of the researcher ability to bracket his/her bias. Bracketing keeps the researcher from influencing the interviewee. In many interviews, during the case studies, I was able to restrain myself from injecting my personal feelings, but there were also many instances when I could not keep from adding my “two cents”. A review of the transcripts shows that my bias was brought to the surface throughout the conversations.

A final limiting factor, that I would like to add, was the importance of statistics and knowing how to perform analysis, read the results, and correctly interpret the statistical meaning. I admit it would be easier for me to learn a foreign language than to understand statistics. I do, however, understand the importance that statistics play in an empirical study.

*Future Directions*

As outlined by the limitations, there are several issues to take into consideration for future studies. First, the population was originally drawn from 113 ARL member libraries. There are 3,827 academic libraries in the United States with over 27,030 librarians. A general mailing to a random sample would increase the potential for participation. Second, the letter
soliciting participation should be generic and merely announce the survey. By including only information needed to introduce the survey to a greater number of librarians, might increase the number of participants. Third, the survey should include only relevant questions that speak to the hypothesis being tested. This would shorten the survey and encourage more participation. Fourth, qualitative questions should be limited to those that address the hypothesis, get to the point, and are relevant to the study. Fifth, in order to address ethical consideration and eliminate bias, interviews should be conducted by a trained interviewer. Finally, statistical analysis should be considered when creating the survey. Knowing what data will be generated by certain types of responses, and how that data may be used, is paramount to formulating research questions and understanding the data analysis results.

Recommendations

There are a number of recommendations for mentoring program that are supported by the study data. The recommendations include: those directed at the pre-tenured librarian, ones for the mentor, those for coordinators of a program and, those for the library administrator.

Pre-tenured:

1. It is your responsibility to achieve tenure
2. Trust is essential in the mentoring relationship
3. Not all mentors have your best interest at heart
4. Network with other librarians
5. Do not underestimate the importance of political savvy

Mentors

1. Do not volunteer unless you really believe in the program
2. Know your own skill level
3. Seek training for weak areas
4. Know your limitations
5. Be a coach and advocate
6. Help the mentee foster interpersonal relationships
7. Be a good listener

**Program Coordinators**

1. Set clear goals
2. Provide training for mentors and mentees
3. Provide avenues for sharing research and scholarship
4. Evaluate the program

**Administrators**

1. Provide infrastructure for the mentoring program
2. Provide financial and resource support
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Abstract

This article is based upon a quantitative study performed to examine the characteristics of mentoring that are similar to the characteristics of transformational leadership within an academic library perspective. Partial Least Squares was used to analyze the data, which revealed a negative relationship. Examining the two constructs relationship is particularly important as the cost of recruitment is high and retention is challenging. The profession is also faced with a large number of retirements as well as the “googlization” of information and the need to stay relevant. Mentoring the future librarian, replacing ourselves, and maintaining relevancy are challenges the library profession faces.
Mentoring as it relates to Transformational Leadership “Four I’s”: a Study from an Academic Library Perspective

Introduction

Within the academic library system a substantial number of librarians do not complete the tenure process. According to Dygert, Tumlin and Seamans (2004) 90 percent of librarians, who go up for tenure, are successful in their bid. This means that over 10% of librarians going up for tenure are met with rejection. They add, however the exception is when libraries have “really strict publication requirements.” In my observation at a midsize university library, many librarians make it to the 3rd year only to find that one or more tenure criteria are not met. Another factor for librarians, who do not complete the tenure process, is they are a poor fit with the library and its culture. In this situation, in the 3rd or 4th year the librarian will pull-up-stakes and move on. This is not only a problem for the library and the university, but it is also a disheartening experience for the early-career librarian.

The recruitment and retention of junior faculty is a long-term and costly commitment for many universities and academic libraries nationwide. In the hiring process the university looks for candidates who are able to be successful in the tenure process. The tenure/reappointment process normally extends over a six-year period with the third or fourth year being the critical reappointment period. Generally, when tenure is not granted; acquiring another position within an academic library may become more difficult. Because of this difficulty many new librarians seek positions at non-tenure granting public, community or private college libraries.
The tenure time clock provides the pre-tenured faculty an opportunity to demonstrate his or her ability to perform and meet the institution’s teaching, scholarship, and service criteria. The period leading to tenure also allows the pre-tenured faculty time to be productive, grow professionally, and demonstrate commitment (Drew, 2008). On the other hand, meeting the core areas of tenure in librarianship, through professional development and service, can be a daunting task for the early-career librarian. Factors for success, according to Dygert, Tumlin and Seamans (2004), include: putting a dossier together, developing an academic career plan, finding a mentor, collegiality, and becoming politically savvy. The authors also indicate that manners, citizenship, and follow-through are essential to collegiality. Networking and finding a mentor, along with collegiality, are highly beneficial during ones’ early-career path. (p. 255)

The tenure hurdles vary widely among departments and universities. Passing through the “tenure gate” (Whitten and Anderson, 2009) is the ultimate challenge that may be frustrating and anxiety ridden when expectations are unclear and conflicting information is received (Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, and Hill, 2006). The lack of information and resources for success, coupled with department climate, often produces an environment of overload and unexpected negative experiences for the early-career professional. The tenure process, within the academic setting, can be a lonely process. Unfortunately, the early-career librarian may not be familiar with academia or the tenure process. This unfamiliar territory may cause undue stress.

**Problem Statement**

The “gate keepers” are those who have tenure. These gate keepers, individually or by committee, oversee the enforcement of the rules, set by the university, for those seeking tenure. This elite club decides what counts, how it is done and evaluated, and
where to set the equity bar. The pre-tenured faculty expects to be treated with openness and fairness but may be met with bias and secrecy. Exclusion from the club reinforces the pre-tenured librarian’s feeling of isolation (Trower, 2008). Again, without a network or mentoring system, to assist in dealing with the “club”, many early-career librarians are not reappointed, denied tenure, and drop out of academia.

*Purpose Statement*

This article is based upon a study performed to examine the relationship between mentoring in the tenure process in an academic library and to identify the characteristics of mentoring that are similar to the characteristics of a transformational leader. As stated the study was twofold; however, this analysis only takes into consideration the responses for questions regarding mentoring as it relates to transformational leadership.

*Theoretical Perspective*

The concepts and framework of mentoring in practice and the mentoring relationship will be examined in regard to the growth and development of the early-career librarian. It is through the use of mentoring theory principles that outcomes may be achieved and these principles help the new practitioner to overcome the stress and challenges encountered during a formative or transitional period. “A mentor is therefore someone who helps another person through an important transition such as coping with a new situation like a new job or a major change . . . or in career development or personal growth” (McKimm, Jollie, Hatter, 2007).

During this transitional period mentoring programs may be established for a number of reasons. But, basically the transitional period is “a period when a practitioner is in need of guidance and support in order to develop confidence and competence”
Other mentoring benefits include: improved retention, encouragement for underrepresented groups, support of organizational change, personal development, and assistance during a time of transition.

The mentor/protégé relationship should incorporate various activities to achieve the overarching goal. The mentor may provide assistance through technical instruction, role clarification and the identification and analysis of learning situations, opportunities and gaps, as well as encouragement, reflection, and structure for unfamiliar situations.

The mentoring relationship may be affected by various characteristics and factors. Characteristics that influence successful relationships include: mentor skills, attitude, learning preferences, communication skills, feedback, and evaluation of the process. Factors that could impose barriers or be accelerators include: fit of mentor/protégé, acceptance, and maturity of both mentor and protégé.

It is this researcher’s argument that transformation leadership and mentoring share many of the same behaviors. Burns defined leadership “as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations . . . the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations . . . of both leaders and followers” (Wren, 1995). Transforming leadership occurs when the relationship raises both participants to a “higher level of motivation” (p. 101). The relationship becomes linked through mutual goals and support, hence, having a transforming effect on both participants. Transformational leadership, according to Bass, is a one-way process. The influence acts to increase confidence and elevate expectations of success (p. 104).
**Hypothesis**

There is a relationship between the “Four I’s” of transformational leadership (individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) construct characteristics and mentoring construct characteristics.

**Sample Limitations**

The sample was drawn from a list of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members. One limitation that has been identified relates to the sample and current programs within libraries outside ARL membership. By selecting only ARL member libraries, for convenience, libraries with active mentoring programs were not included in the sample. A formal letter, announcing the up-coming survey, was sent to the ARL Libraries on the list. This was followed by an email announcing the beginning of the survey. Both were sent to the identified library administrator at each library. The administrators were asked to distribute the email and questionnaire URL to their faculty who fit into one or more of the categories of a mentoring relationship. The categories include mentors, protégés, and coordinators of a mentoring program. Mentors should be faculty within the system that may or may not have been mentored but fit the within the role of mentor. Protégés should be early-career faculty who may or may not be in a mentor relationship, and coordinators could be a person who is overseeing a current program or the implementation of a new program and may or may not have been in a mentoring relationship. Because the letter outlined library and participant criteria, it acted to discourage libraries without tenure or formal mentoring programs from participating.
The survey included questions regarding: formal mentoring program structure, mentoring relationships and characteristics, and characteristics of the tenure process. It was also anticipated the individual respondent may not follow instructions carefully or he or she may be confused as to their relationship to the question, and not respond to all questions that pertain to a mentoring relationship.

*Literature Review*

There is considerable literature documenting the desirable effects of the mentoring relationship within academia. Most of this literature, however, is relevant to academia at large and stops at the front door of the library. When the library mentoring issue is addressed, in the literature, the scope is usually relegated to paraprofessional library staff, underrepresented groups, or women as administrators.

The final gap in the literature is in the age of the articles focused on mentoring in librarianship. Eleven articles about mentoring the early-career librarian through the tenure process were found. Of these articles, eight were published five or more years ago. The remaining three were published within the last three years. There clearly is a need for up-to-date research to shed further light on the subject.

*Recruiting*

Problematic issues regarding recruitment abound within the academic environment. Academic libraries’ recruitment issues include many if not all of the parent-university issues plus those that are specific to the library profession. There are three levels of recruitment within academic libraries, to the profession, to the library, and finally, to the position within the library. Recruitment into the profession of librarianship is hampered by: low salaries, a female dominant field, and negative images. This
situation is further exacerbated by a flat or declining library school graduation rate (Hewitt, Moran, & Marsh, 2003; Association of College and Research Libraries 2002).

Marketing campaigns that stress the value of librarianship and rebuild the image of the librarian may be one answer to this dim recruitment picture. In addition to salaries and image, applicants tend to consider: geographical location, cost of living, housing, and tenure requirements as pluses or minuses while pursuing a career in an academic library. It is a well-known fact that private industry is far more competitive regarding salary. This issue has been documented throughout librarianship and academic literature. This is true of many academic departments and disciplines; however, academic library recruitment is also faced with competition from within the profession. This competition includes special libraries, public libraries, and state and private libraries none of which hold the librarian to the rigorous standard present in the academic faculty tenure process (ACRL, 2002).

This is why it is especially important to publicize academic library positions while marketing them to stress the value of the librarian within the academic setting.

Finding a candidate who meets the institution’s needs is not easy. It takes time and resources to match the candidate’s talents, professional goals, and personality to the library environment. Within the recruitment process it is also important that the library meet the applicant’s needs. The top candidate will most likely seek mobility, promotion opportunities, challenges, opportunity to learn and use new skills, a competitive salary, and benefits. Matching the candidate to the institution may be achieved by providing congenial working conditions, job enrichment, and educational opportunities as well as a competitive salary.

“Individuals in entry-level positions or in the first five to seven years of their career are likely to seek jobs based on beginning salary, job duties, and potential
to learn new skills or earn additional credentials. . . . The goal should be to keep
the librarian” (ACRL, 2002).

Another major issue discussed in the literature and related to recruitment and
retention is “faculty status.” (ACRL, 2002) Faculty status is the “single most distinctive
aspect of academic librarianship” (p. 19). Entry-level librarians “do not care to enter
organizations where librarians have faculty status” (p. 19). These librarians neither have a
“need or desire for faculty status and/or tenure” (p. 19).

Theories

Mentoring theory construct and transformational theory constructs share many
similar behaviors (Yukl, 2006; Sosik and Godshalk, 1998; Scandura and Schriesheim,
leadership, discusses research performed by Kram and Noe, which identifies two distinct
types of mentoring relationships: psychosocial and career facilitation. Sosik and
Godshalk (2000) juxtapose the transformational leader with mentoring, and draw out the
similarities of the transformational leader construct with mentoring functions. Their
comparison of career development and psychosocial support highlights the similar
characteristics of the two constructs and provides an overview of the overlapping
behaviors; planning, clarifying, monitoring, motivating, supporting, developing,
networking, recognizing, and rewarding.

The mentor is a transfer agent, who shapes “values, acts as an example, and
defines meanings” (Sosik and Godshalk, 2000). These values are the idealized influence
behaviors of a transformational leader. According to the authors, the main difference
between the transformational leader and the mentor, is the fact that leadership involves a
one to many relationship and is formal, overt, and direct; whereas, mentoring may be
either [formal] or informal, subtle, and indirect. Leadership is generally task related, whereas mentoring performs both task and developmental functions. Sosik and Godshalk (2000) article discuss, transformational leadership as it “involves forming a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders” (p. 369).

The “Four I’s” that Bass and Avolio (1994) identified: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence are part of Sosik and Godshalk’s comparison. “Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) argued that transformational leadership is consistent with requirements for effective mentoring” (Sosik and Godshalk, 2000). Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) argue that:

“Conceptualized supervisory mentoring as a transformational activity involving a mutual commitment by mentor and protégé to the latter’s long-term development, as a personal, extra organizational investment in the protégé by the mentor, and as the changing of the protégé by the mentor, accomplished by the sharing of values, knowledge, experience, and so forth” (p. 1589).

Clair and Deluga (2001) contend that there are “logical ties between traditional mentoring activities and the “Four I’s” (p. 2). The authors consider “transformational mentoring” as containing two primary aspects: career development and psychosocial support. Career development is broken down into five activities; sponsorship, challenging assignments, exposure, coaching, and protecting. Psychosocial support has four activities; role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The authors align their theory of transformational mentoring with Burn’s (1978) theory. The transformational leader encourages the results of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. Transformational leadership functions align
follower self-interest in development with the larger interest of the group, organization, or society (Clair and Deluga, 2001).

They continue by emphasizing the connections between the “Four I’s” of transformational leadership and mentoring.

The mentor and transformational leader provide new learning opportunities and a supportive climate. Individualized consideration emphasizes the individual’s needs achievements, growth, and career development. Transformational mentoring is not a controlling style but provides feedback and guidance and communication runs both directions. According to Clair and Deluga (2001) the transformational leader concept focuses around the concept “individualized consideration can be directly linked to mentoring activities”. Idealized influence is appropriate behavior; where the leader/mentor demonstrates respect, trust, esteem and confidence. These are attributes that the protégé is likely to adopt. Inspirational motivation is where the leader motivates and inspires, while providing challenging assignments and encouragement to the protégé. Inspirational motivation works through enthusiasm and optimism. The leader provides intellectual stimulation to protect the protégé and to help hone his or her innovative and creative skills. The transformational mentor questions assumptions and reframes problems to encourage the protégé to develop new ideas. This is accomplished through coaching and the avoidance of public criticism (Clair and Deluga, 2001).

The traditional model of mentoring emphasizes career success. “Two of the five career development behaviors identified [sponsorship and visibility] . . . are directly consistent with . . . transformational mentoring model” (Clair and Deluga, 2001). The other three development behaviors, indirectly connected to the mentoring model, are:
coaching; encourage discovery, protection; transform from blame to praise, and the challenge to develop skills.

**Limitations of Mentoring**

As in other leader relationships, transformational mentoring has obstacles, barriers, and limitations that may or may not be apparent. According to authors, Clair and Deluga (2001), these obstacles include: negative relationships, sabotage, submissiveness, and harassment. Other barriers identified are: goals or lack of goals, organizational culture, individual assumptions, and attitudes. Limitations were broken down as protégé based or leader based. The two protégé based limitations discussed were a lack of commitment and a lack of vision. These are huge limitations and may lead to enormous personal cost in terms of time and relationships.

The Clair and Deluga (2001) article discusses several limitations that are leader based. These limitations are; willingness, stereotypes, and tactical knowledge. The willingness to groom one’s predecessor often involves the feeling that one’s authority and prominence is in jeopardy. Sharing the power and limelight may be far too threatening, and a lack of willingness may stem from the symptoms of a narcissistic leader including insecurities, reluctance, or jealousy.

Stereotype limitations are concerned with the individual’s attitude which may impact mentoring choices. “Mentoring is also affected by some demographic factors such as age, gender and race” (Yukl, 2006). Yukl, also includes other forms of stereotypes that create limitations: “appropriate behavior, concern about intimacy with men, awkwardness about discussing some subjects, lack of appropriate role models, resentment by peers, and exclusion from male networks” (p. 407). Tactical knowledge may be described as the
difficulty for the mentor to communicate or articulate clearly in order for the protégé to understand.

Methodology

Quantitative Population and Sample

The population for this study was composed of ARL members. It is a non-probability population of convenience. There are 113 academic libraries that are members of ARL. From this population of libraries the researcher would like to collect survey responses from three to four librarians from each library. The total possible sample size would range from 384 to 512.

Instrument Design

The survey tool is a compilation of three previously tested instruments that measured participant’s thoughts regarding mentoring programs, transformational leadership characteristics, and faculty satisfaction with the tenure process. The first instrument consulted was designed by the Medical Library Association (MLA) (Kwasik, Fulda, and Ische, 2006). The MLA questions measure mentoring relationship characteristics, types of relationship (i.e. formal or informal) and mentoring programs. Forty questions were derived from a questionnaire by Sosik and Godshalk (2000) in which leadership, mentoring, and stress were measured. The questions are divided into five sections. The first four sections include the “Four I’s” inspirational (4 questions), idealized influence (6 questions), intellectual stimulation (3 questions), individualized consideration (5 questions) and psychosocial support. The Sosik and Godshalk survey instrument provides a basis for questions regarding the transformational leadership construct as it relates to mentoring behavior functions and is the focus of this article.
The final instrument, from which questions are taken, is the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey on tenure track faculty job satisfaction. The survey was “designed, tested, and validated in focus groups and a rigorous pilot study” (COACHE, 2005). COACHE is a consortium of 130 universities. This survey is organized in five sections to measure: tenure; nature of work; policies and practices; climate, culture, and collegiality; and global satisfaction. Twenty-six questions were selected from the COACHE survey. Nine of the questions ask participants about general tenure issues, six solicit responses regarding policies and practices and eleven ask about climate, culture, and collegiality.

The combined survey instrument is comprised of 107 questions that will primarily collect numeric data via closed-ended questions. The combined questionnaire (see Appendix A) is divided into 6 sections. The first section asks participants for basic demographic information. The second section asks for information about a mentoring program. The third section asks the participant about their attitudes regarding mentoring relationships. The fourth section asks participants about the importance of a mentoring relationship and the fifth section asks participants about aspects of the tenure process. Table 1 outlines how the questions are operationalized.

Questions 33-71 and 73-95 use the Likert scale “to determine the relative intensity of the different items” (Babbie, 2004) through numeric responses. This five-point scale produces a simple index with a five-response category that corresponds to assigned points. The point assignment for each question ranges from (1) “not important” to (5) “very important”. The final section of the questionnaire will collect participant demographics and tenure status. The survey will be administered via a web-based instrument that solicits and collects participant responses.
As previously stated, this article is based on a study performed to examine the relationship between mentoring and the tenure process within an academic library and to identify characteristics of mentoring that are similar to characteristics of a transformational leader. As stated the study was twofold; however, this analysis only takes into consideration the responses to questions regarding mentoring as it relates to transformational leadership.

Examining the constructs of transformational leadership as it relates to mentoring provides a basis for identifying effective mentors. This is particularly important in today’s economic climate, where the cost of recruitment is high and retention is challenging. This is an environment where the library profession is facing a large number of retirements. The profession is also faced with the “googlization” of information and the need to stay relevant. Mentoring the future librarian, replacing ourselves, and maintaining relevancy are challenges the profession faces. As argued by Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) it is important that transformational leadership characteristics be found in the mentors’ characteristics, because these characteristics are “consistent with requirements for effective mentoring.”

Related Study

Sosik and Godshalk (2000) reported results of their study in an article “Leadership style, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: a conceptual model and preliminary study.” The scope of their study takes into consideration theories regarding transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles as they relate to mentoring functions received and job related stress. The author’s instrument measured four hypotheses. Of these hypotheses only Hypothesis 1a, “Mentor transformational
leadership behavior will be positively related to protégé receipt of mentoring functions,”
will be under consideration for this current article.

Sosik and Godshalk’s study took place at a public university. The 230 participants were full-time corporate employees enrolled in a master’s program. Most of the respondents (99%) were in informal mentoring relationships, while only 18 participants were in formal mentoring relationships. Their data was analyzed using Partial Least Squares (PLS) a structural equation modeling technique.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) with latent variables has become a quasi-standard in investigating complex causal relationships in many social sciences disciplines. . . . A key advantage of the PLS method is it is the relatively unrestricted applications especially in SEM situations where it is difficult or impossible to meet the hard assumptions of more traditional multivariate statistics (University of Technology Sydney, 2010).

Survey Results

A letter to 113 ARL academic libraries was sent out in June, 2010. The letter asked the Dean of each library to forward 3-7 email addresses of possible participants who met the criteria. Twenty-eight library administrators responded to the introductory letter, via email. Nine of the responses indicated non-participation. Reasons cited for non-participation were; librarians do not have faculty status, librarians are not on tenure track, and library does not have a formal mentoring program. Eighteen library administrators contributed email addresses for 101 possible participants. On March 23, 2010 emails containing the online survey URL were sent to participants.
Respondents Demographics

The survey was available from March 23rd to June 18th, during this time period 49 (48.5%) of the 101 librarians responded to the survey. One librarian responded to the demographic questions and provided these general comments:

“Sorry that we did not participate in the survey due to librarians not appointed on the tenure track at [the library]. We do have informal mentoring relationships for new librarians and for librarians who move into leadership responsibilities.”

Participants responded from 16 (89%) of the 18 libraries. Louisiana State University had the highest response rate with 7 librarians participating. The University of Washington had 6 respondents, and there were 5 responses from Southern Illinois University-Carbondale. Other library participation ranged between 1 and 3 respondents.

Of the responding librarians 34 (69%) are involved in a formal mentoring program, 11 (23%) are involved in an informal mentoring program, and 3 reported that the library did not currently having a mentoring program. Forty-six (94%) of the reporting librarians have tenure status. Seventeen responding librarians are currently on tenure track. When asked if they are tenured 27 (55%) responded yes and 21 (43%) responded no. The sample included 37 (76%) female respondents and 12 (24%) male.

SmartPLS Results

Analysis was performed using Smart PLS 2.0 (MS) Beta. Table 1 is an overview of the mean, standard deviation, and T-Statistics. Transformational leadership should be a combined report of the totals from the “Four I’s.” The negative mean, (-0.39) however, seemed to be out of line with the reported mean for each of the “Four I’s.”
Table 14 presents SmartPLS statistics that test reliability and validity. PLS generates statistics to test the reliability and validity of latent constructs with two or more reflective indicators. Reliability is assessed by examining the factor loading of indicators: a common rule of thumb is that the factor loadings should exceed 0.7 as the criterion cut-off.

Table 14
Means, standard deviations, and T-statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Idealized influence (II)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational motivation (IM)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual stimulations (IS)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualized consideration (IC)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This implies that less than half of the indicator’s variance is due to error. Next, each construct’s composite is computed for scale reliability, which measures internal consistency similar to Cronbach’s alpha (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

Table 15
Factor loadings, weights of measures, composite scale reliability, and average variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>Weights of measures</th>
<th>Composite scale reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Idealized influence (II)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational motivation (IM)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual stimulations (IS)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualized consideration (IC)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15, presents factor loadings, weights of measures, composite scale reliability, and the average variance extracted. With the exception of Inspirational motivation (0.62), which is slightly below recommended criterion, the other three indicators met the
reliability criteria (II 0.84, IS 0.75, & IC 0.83). SmartPLS results are reported in Table 16. According to the standardized path coefficient, results (-0.35) there was a negative relationship between transformational leadership and mentoring functions received.

These finding are contrary to the stated hypothesis.

Table 16
Results of Partial Least Squares analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis and proposed relation</th>
<th>Standardized path coefficient</th>
<th>Z-statistic</th>
<th>Cronbachs Alpha</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership to Mentoring functions received</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

It was expected that the PLS analysis would reveal a significant relationship between transformational leadership and mentoring functions as seen in Table 17. The results, however, showed a strong negative relationship. This negative relationship is contrary to the hypothesis and the following comparison of responses by frequency.

Table 17
Transformational leadership frequency results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Idealized Influence Summary</th>
<th>Individualized Consideration Summary</th>
<th>Inspirational Motivation</th>
<th>Intellectual stimulation</th>
<th>Possible responses</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Category %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>58 0.20</td>
<td>77 0.33</td>
<td>56 0.29</td>
<td>61 0.44</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>108 0.38</td>
<td>100 0.43</td>
<td>88 0.46</td>
<td>70 0.50</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>55 0.19</td>
<td>32 0.14</td>
<td>28 0.15</td>
<td>7 0.05</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less important</td>
<td>50 0.17</td>
<td>23 0.10</td>
<td>15 0.08</td>
<td>2 0.01</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>15 0.05</td>
<td>3 0.01</td>
<td>4 0.02</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8 0.01</td>
<td>10 0.01</td>
<td>5 0.01</td>
<td>7 0.01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>294 1.00</td>
<td>245 1.00</td>
<td>196 1.00</td>
<td>147 1.00</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of Table 30 indicates there were 882 possible responses to the “Four I s” that make up the transformational leadership construct questions. Thirty questions (3.40%) of the participants chose not to respond. Twenty-two (3%) of the participants
indicated that transformational leadership characteristics were not important. Intellectual stimulation was the only construct characteristics in which “not important” was not selected as a response. “Less important” had 90 (11%) of the responses. One hundred twenty-two (14%) respondents selected undecided. “Important” was selected the majority of time with 366 (43%) of the participants choosing it. This was followed by “very important” with 252 (30%) of the participants selecting it.

If the results are combined the positive support for transformational leadership characteristics, as a mentoring function, outweigh the negative. It is clear to see that (73%) of the participants selected the characteristics of the “Four I’s” to be either “very important” or “important.” That leaves only (27%) who were undecided or choose ‘less important” or “not important.”

Although the Smart PLS 2.0 (MS) Beta results projected a negative value (-0.35), I believe that frequency analysis disproves the results and puts the validity of the PLS results in question.

Research Limitations

As acknowledged earlier in the article, the sample size was very small. The letter sent to the library administrators, announcing the study, was very specific in outlining who should participate.

The second and most problematic limitation was the researcher’s lack of statistical background. My intention was to perform basic SPSS analysis using frequency and descriptive summaries. It became apparent to me that in order to perform the analysis similar to the Sosik and Godshalk research, I needed to analyze the data using a system of which I knew nothing about [i.e., Partial Least Squares (PLS)]. At that point I had to rely
on resources available from the Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

The NEAR Center is available to assist with quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method research. The services range from instrument development to assistance with data analysis. My contact with the center was after my survey was developed, administered, and data had been collected. The graduate student, who worked with me, was not familiar with using PLS for analysis, hence, the problems started to mount:

1. PLS software was found and downloaded from an internet site
2. The software was not tested for reliability
3. The graduate student taught himself how to use the software
4. Missing values were not eliminated or treated, so they would not skew the analysis

Knowing your own limitation and where and when to seek help were crucial points that almost ruined this study. In conclusion and with a great deal of hindsight, one should not go into the dark without a flashlight.
**Article References**


Article Appendix A
Survey Questions

Mentoring Characteristics (Socik & Godshalk, 2000)

Inspirational motivation
Q.033. Talk optimistically about the future
Q.034. Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
Q.035. Articulate a compelling vision of the future
Q.036. Express confidence that goals will be achieved

Idealized influence
Q.037. Talk about the most important values
Q.038. Talk about the most important beliefs
Q.039 Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
Q.040 Consider the moral consequences of decisions
Q.041 Consider the ethical consequences of decisions
Q.042 Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission

Intellectual stimulation
Q.043 Seek differing perspectives when solving problems
Q.044 Looking at problems from many different angles
Q.045 Suggest new ways to complete assignments

Individualized consideration
Q.046 Spend time teaching
Q.047 Spend time coaching
Q.048 Treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group
Q.049 Consider the individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others
Q.050 Help others develop their strengths
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IRB Pilot Approval November 2009

November 24, 2009

Judith Wolfe
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
200 S 52nd St Lincoln, NE 68510

Leverne Barrett
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
300 AGH UNL 88583-0709

IRB Number: 20091110399 EX
Project ID: 10399
Project Title: Mentoring the Early Career Librarian in the Tenure Process: pilot

Dear Judith:

This letter is to officially notify you of the approval of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is the Board’s opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study based on the information provided. Your proposal is in compliance with this institution’s Federal Wide Assurance 00002296 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) and has been classified as exempt.

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Final Approval: 11/24/2009. This approval is Valid Until: 01/27/2014.

1. Please include the IRB approval number (IRB#20091110399 EX) in the email message to participants. Please send a copy of the email to irb@unl.edu, with the number included, for IRB records. If you need to make changes to the message please submit the revised page to the IRB for review and approval prior to using it.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:

- Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;
- Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential to recur;
- Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
- Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
- Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants or others to the Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,

Mario Scalora, Ph.D.
Chair for the IRB
March 17, 2010

Judith Wolfe
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
200 S 52nd St Lincoln, NE 68510

Leverne Barrett
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
300 AGH UNL 68583-0709

IRB Number: 20100310684 EX
Project ID: 10654
Project Title: Mentoring the Early Career Librarian in the Tenure Process

Dear Judith:

This letter is to officially notify you of the approval of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is the Board’s opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study based on the information provided. Your proposal is in compliance with this institution’s Federal Wide Assurance 00002256 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) and has been classified as Exempt Category 2.

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Final Approval: 03/17/2010. This approval is Valid Until: 12/30/2011.

1. The approved informed consent form has been uploaded to NUgrant (file with -Approved.doc in the file name). Please use this form to distribute to participants. If you need to make changes to the informed consent form, please submit the revised form to the IRB for review and approval prior to using it.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:
* Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;
* Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential to recur;
* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
* Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants or others to the Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,

Becky R. Freeman
Becky R. Freeman, CIP
for the IRB
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IRB Project Amendment Approval May 2010

May 20, 2010

Judith Wolfe
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
200 S 52nd St Lincoln, NE 68510

Leverne Barrett
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
300 AGH, UNL, 68583-0709

IRB Number:
Project ID: 10684
Project Title: Mentoring the Early Career Librarian in the Tenure Process

Dear Judith:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has completed its review of the Request for
Change in Protocol submitted to the IRB.

1. It has been approved to conduct a follow up phone contact with people on the list of participants.

2. It has also been approved to include Mississippi State University and Kansas State University in your study.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following
events within 48 hours of the event:
* Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems)
  which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly
  related to the research procedures;
* Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential
  to recur;
* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an
  unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
* Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This letter constitutes official notification of the approval of the protocol change. You are therefore authorized to
implement this change accordingly.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,

Becky R. Freeman
Becky R. Freeman, CIP
for the IRB
Appendix A
IRB Project Amendment June 2010 Approval

June 29, 2010

Judith Wolfe
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
200 S 52nd St Lincoln, NE 68510

Leverne Barrett
Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
300 AGH, UNL, 68583-0709

IRB Number:
Project ID: 10684
Project Title: Mentoring the Early Career Librarian in the Tenure Process

Dear Judith:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has completed its review of the Request for
Change in Protocol submitted to the IRB.

1. It has been approved to implement Phase 2 or the study. The thank you email, contact letter, interview protocol,
and questions have all been approved.

2. The stamped contact letter has been uploaded to NUgrant (file with -Approved at the end of the file name).
Please use this document to copy and distribute to participants.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following
events within 48 hours of the event:
* Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems)
which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly
related to the research procedures;
* Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential
to recur;
* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an
unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
* Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This letter constitutes official notification of the approval of the protocol change. You are therefore authorized to
implement this change accordingly.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6929.

Sincerely,

Becky R. Freeman, CIP
for the IRB
Appendix B
Survey Questions

Demographics (Questions 1 to 8 and all red were created by me)
R001.T What is the name of the university that you represent?
R002.T What is the name of the library?
R003.V Have you ever been in a mentoring relationship? (i.e., as mentor or mentee, formal or informal) Yes Currently No
R004.V Do librarians have tenure status at the library in which you work? Yes No
R005.V Have you ever been on tenure-track? Yes Currently No
R006.V Please indicate your status
   Faculty status not tenure-track
   Faculty pre-tenured, tenure-track
   Tenured faculty
   Administrator with tenure/faculty status
   Administrator without tenure/faculty status

Mentoring Program
R007.V Does the library in which you work have a structured mentoring program? Yes No
R008.V If you responded NO to the above question, does the library have an informal program? Yes No

PROGRAM STRUCTURES. (R009.T-R026.Other) (Questions 9 to 22 and all green were from Kwasik & Fulda 1a – 1b)
R009.T How many years has the program been in existence?
R010.T How many mentors are currently in a mentoring relationship?
R011.T How many mentees are currently in a mentoring relationship?
R012.V How frequently do the mentor and mentee meet?
   Weekly
   Daily
   Monthly
R013.Other: (please specify)
R014.T How many library faculty have participated in the mentoring program?
R015.V Have faculty that were mentored become tenured? Yes No
R016.T How many tenured faculty members that went through the mentoring program are currently at the University library?
R017.V Are any of the previously mentored tenured faculties acting as mentors? Yes No

R018.T How are mentoring activities coordinated?
R019.V Are there workshops to assist in building mentoring relationships for participants? Yes No
R020.V Are there periodic evaluations of the program? Yes No
R021.V Are there periodic revisions of the program? Yes No
R022.V Is there financial support for the program? Yes No
Phase 2: of the study will take place at a library with an existing mentoring program. Are you interested in participating in the second phase of the study?
R023.V Yes

R024.V No
R025.V If you responded YES, please provide email address and phone number.
R026.Other (email address)
Mentoring Relationships (R027.V-R056.Other) *(Kwasik & Fulda 3a-5b)*
R027.V Have you had a formal mentor in your career? Yes  No
R028.V If you responded YES, indicate your level of satisfaction with the process.
Very dissatisfied  Dissatisfied  Undecided  Satisfied  Very satisfied
R029.V Have you been a mentor (formal or informal)? Yes  No
R030.V If you responded YES, indicate your level of satisfaction with the process.
Very dissatisfied  Dissatisfied  Undecided  Satisfied  Very satisfied
Is having a mentor/s critical to professional experience?
R031.V Undecided
R032.V Not at all
R033.V Somewhat
R034.V Very
R035.V If you chose Very, could you explain?
R036.O Text Explained

Mentoring Trust
Is trust important in a mentoring relationship?
R037.V Undecided
R038.V Not at all
R039.V Somewhat
R040.V Very
R041.V If you chose Very, could you explain?
R042.O Text Explained
Did the length of the mentoring relationship have an effect on trust?
R043.V Undecided
R044.V Not at all
R045.V Somewhat
R046.V Very
R047.V If you chose Very, could you explain?
R048.O Text Explained
What type of mentoring do you consider important to development? *(Mark all that apply)* *(Kwasik & Fulda 1)*
R049.V Career development
R050.V Skill development
R051.V Research development
R052.V Scholarship development
R053.V Social support
R054.V Political support
R055.V Other: (please specify)
R056.O Text Explained
Mentoring Characteristics (R057.V-R074.V) (Socik & Godshalk Transformational Leadership)

Inspirational motivation 57-60
R057.V Talk optimistically about the future
R058.V Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
R059.V Articulate a compelling vision of the future
R060.V Express confidence that goals will be achieved

Idealized influence 61-66
R061.V Talk about the most important values
R062.V Talk about the most important beliefs
R063.V Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
R064.V Consider the moral consequences of decisions
R065.V Consider the ethical consequences of decisions
R066.V Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission

Intellectual stimulation 67-69
R067.V Seek differing perspectives when solving problems
R068.V Looking at problems from many different angles
R069.V Suggest new ways to complete assignments

Individualized consideration 70-74
R070.V Spend time teaching
R071.V Spend time coaching
R072.V Treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group
R073.V Consider the individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others
R074.V Help others develop their strengths

Social Support (R075.V-R096.T) (Sosik & Godshalk Psychosocial support)
R075.V Is it important to be in agreement with a mentor's attitudes regarding career development
R076.V Is it important to be in agreement with a mentor's values regarding career development
R077.V Is it important to respect a mentor
R078.V Is it important to admire a mentor
R079.V Is it important to trust a mentor
R080.V Is it important for a mentor to demonstrate good listening skills
R081.V Is it important for a mentor to understand me
R082.V Is it important for a mentor to be interested in my career
R083.V Is it important for a mentor to challenge me
R084.V Is it important for a mentor to coach me
R085.V Is it important for a mentor to discuss questions or concerns regarding feeling of competence
R086.V Is it important for a mentor to discuss questions or concerns regarding commitment
R087.V Is it important for a mentor to discuss questions or concerns regarding relationships with peers
R088.V Is it important for a mentor to discuss questions or concerns regarding supervisors
Is it important for a mentor to discuss questions or concerns regarding conflict with work/family?

Is it important for a mentor to encourage me to prepare for advancement?

Is it important for a mentor to talk openly about my anxiety?

Is it important for a mentor to talk openly about my fears?

Is it important for a mentor to convey empathy for my concerns?

Is it important for a mentor to convey empathy for my feelings?

Is it important for a mentor to convey a feeling of respect?

Please include other characteristics that are important to a mentoring relationship?

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TENURE (R097.V-R120.T) (COACHE Tenure track faculty job satisfaction)

Clarity of expectation for performance

Clarity of the tenure process

Clarity of the criteria for tenure

Clarity of my prospects for earning tenure

Perception that tenure decisions are based primarily on performance

Clarity of the expectations for performance as a department colleague

Clarity of the standards for tenure

Receiving consistent messages from senior colleagues about the requirements of tenure

Clarity of the expectations for performance as a member within the library community

Effectiveness of written summary of periodic performance reviews

Colleagues are respectful

Effectiveness of informal mentoring

Effectiveness of formal mentoring program

Sense that fair treatment is received from colleagues

Sense of collegiality at the library

Is satisfaction with the fairness of immediate supervisor’s evaluation of work important

Is satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with junior colleagues in the department important

Is satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with senior colleagues in the department important

Is satisfaction with the opportunities for collaboration important

Is satisfaction with department (library) as place to work important

Is satisfaction with the institution as a place to work important

Is satisfaction with how well you "fit" in the department

Is satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of the senior colleagues in their department

Please include other characteristics of the tenure process that are important.
Personal Demographics (R121.V – R124.T)
R121.V What is your gender?
   Female  Male
R122.V Number of years in current position?
R123.V Number of years as a librarian?
R124.V What year were you born?

Tenure Demographics (R125.V-R134.T)
Are you tenured?
   R125.V Yes
   R126.V No
   R127.V If yes, how long have you been tenured?
R128.Other: Years
R129.V What is your rank?
   Assistant Professor
   Associate Professor
   Full Professor
R130.Other: (please specify)
R131.T What is your current position?
R132.V Did mentoring facilitate your advancement within the library? Yes  No
R133.T General comments about survey
R134.T General comments about mentoring
Appendix C
Interview Questions

Questions

1) How does the mentoring program help in the pursuit of research, scholarship, service, and professional development?
2a) How does the mentoring program help with interpersonal, political, collegial, or cultural dynamics?
2b) How does the mentoring program assist in trust for fellow workers?
3) How does the mentoring program assist in one’s ability to achieve tenure?
4a) What insights are gained through the mentoring program that raises awareness regarding tenure?
4b) How is the tenure process explained?
4c) How is a clear understanding of the tenure process gained? (i.e., timeline, expectations, etc.)
5a) How was the mentoring relationship established?
5b) Was the mentee/mentor a suitable match? Would you explain your response?
5c) As a mentee/mentor, do you feel comfortable with the relationship?
5d) Is trust important in a mentoring relationship?
6a) Have you ever been frustrated with the mentor/mentee relationship? Could you expand on your response?
6b) Has the mentoring program met your expectations? Would you explain your response?
7a) What terms have been used at (library name) to describe tenure track librarian?
There are many terms used to describe the junior faculty member in the tenure process. Tenure track, non-tenured, untenured, pre-tenured and junior faculty are examples of these terms, which serve to evoke the lower level ranking of the person and represent the attitude of the senior faculty.
7b) What term or terms would you use to describe the tenure process at (library name)? Some commonly used terms, which are found in the literature, are even more descriptive and emotionally charged. These terms include: tenure gate, ultimate challenge, tenure barrier, elite club, ultimate gate keepers, “good-ole-boy” network, exclusive club, passing initiation, hazing, unstable ground, trial by innuendo, tribal membership and tenurized. All of these pejorative terms enforce the fear factor and add to the anxiety and discomfort of the junior faculty member.
Appendix D
Confidentiality Statement and Agreement

I understand that I may be granted access to in-depth data collected from observation and interviews of an existing mentoring program. The data collection process will include as many as 14 one-on-one interviews comprised of mentors, mentees, and coordinators, and observation of the mentoring experience from two libraries. Execution of this agreement and continued compliance with all of the promises made and obligations imposed in this Confidentiality Statement and Agreement are conditions of receiving authorization for access to above mentioned data.

As a condition of my employment, I agree that all information that I obtain during the course of my employment is strictly confidential. I understand that such confidential information includes, but is not limited to, all interview session recorded and any other proprietary information concerning any aspect of the interviews. I agree to maintain the integrity and confidentiality of interviewee.

I also agree that any disclosure of, unauthorized use of and/or unauthorized access to the confidential information may result in my immediate termination from employment. I agree to undertake the following obligations with respect to such confidential information:

1. To use confidential information for the sole purpose of performing the duties for which I have been hired;
2. To not copy or reproduce, or permit any other person to copy or reproduce, in whole or in part, any confidential information other than in the regular course of the services I am authorized and requested to perform; 
3. To not allow others to use, view or otherwise have access to information available to me to perform my job in my home;
4. Upon termination of my employment, I agree to return immediately in good condition any documents, equipment, software or other media or property containing any confidential information and/or any other property, and I will certify in writing that all such documents, equipment, software or other media and/or any other property has been provided to me during the course of my employment have been returned; and
5. I agree that all my obligations under this Confidentiality Statement and Agreement shall survive and continue following the termination of my employment regardless of the reason for such termination.

Accepted and Agreed to by:

__________________________________  ________________________  _____________________
Transcriptions (Print)                  Signature                  Date
__________________________________  ________________________  _____________________
Witness (Print)                         Signature                  Date
Appendix E

Interview Protocol Form

Wolfe

Mentoring Early Career Librarians Study

Volunteer # ____________________

Interview Protocol

Name______________________________ Date ________________________________

University _________________________ Library ______________________________

Basic Demographic Questions

Program Role_________________________ Years in program_____________________

Faculty Status __________________________

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. I will be recording and transcribing our conversation verbatim. During our conversation, I will take notes. A verbatim transcription includes the “uhhs” and “ahhs” in order to get exactly what was said onto paper. Though I may quote you when writing the results of the study, your anonymity is assured and I will make every effort to disguise your identity while maintaining your views and opinions.

In this study, I am interested in learning about your lived experience in the role indicated above. This interview is semi-structured so the dialogue may trigger additional questions which were not listed. Additional questions often help identify exactly what you mean. I will give you a few minutes to review these questions and give some thought to the responses.

Are you ready to begin?
Appendix F
Introduction Letter

Dear Colleague,

Mentoring the Early Career Librarian in the Tenure Process: A mixed method study
As part of my research for my Ph.D in Human Science, Leadership, I am conducting a survey. The purpose of
the study is to investigate mentoring as it facilitates the early career librarian in the tenure process. I am asking
for your participation and assistance in distributing the survey. The survey takes approximately 20 minutes to
share opinions regarding mentoring and tenure. My target participant for the survey includes the academic
libraries that have tenure status and are part of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).

Dr. Giesecke, a member of my dissertation committee, has agreed to act as my sponsor in this data gathering
effort. Successful data gathering will depend upon appropriate distribution of the survey to the target
participants. It is my goal to receive responses from at least one participant in each category, from each library
as described below. In order to reach these participants I am asking that you forward 3 to 7 email addresses to
me of possible participants who fit into the criteria below. (wolf1@uninotes.unl.edu : Subject line: Mentoring
Survey email address)

The survey is designed to collect responses from a sample that includes:

- Tenure-track librarians: who may or may not be in a mentor relationship;
- Librarians in a mentoring relationship: who may not be tenure-track
- Tenured librarians: who may or may not have been mentored;
- Mentors: currently in a mentoring relationship;
- Coordinators: who oversee a mentoring program; who may or may not have been in a mentoring
  relationship.

The survey includes questions regarding: formal mentoring program structure, mentoring relationships and
characteristics, and characteristics of the tenure process.

The data gathered will be reported in an article and in my dissertation. Every effort will be made to keep
participants identity anonymous; however, the name of the library and university will be used in the analysis. It
may be possible that participants could be identified through years of service and location. Names, e-mail
addresses, and phone numbers of the individuals who respond to this survey will not be disclosed and all
records will be confidential.

Your assistance in completing the survey will greatly strengthen my data collection efforts. Thank you in
advance for your willingness to provide email address. The survey will be available online and I will supply the
URL via an email. Participation is voluntary and there are no known risks associated with this research. You are
free to decide not to participate in this study. You can also withdraw at anytime without harming your
relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. However, if you have any questions as
to your rights in filling out this survey, you may contact the University Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review
Board at 402-472-6965. Please feel free to contact me at 402-472-3543 if you have questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Principal Investigator: Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Speciality, E-Mail: jwolf1@uninotes.unl.edu
Secondary Investigator: Dr. Leanne Barrett, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
Ph: 402-472-2807 E-Mail: barrett@uninotes.unl.edu
Academic Sponsor: Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Ph: 402-472-2526 E-Mail: jgiesecke1@unl.edu
Appendix F
Email to participant

IRB Number: 20100310684 EX
March 15, 2010

Informed Consent for Participation in Research
University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Project Title: Mentoring the Early Career Library in the Tenure Process
Principal Investigator: Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Specialty, E-Mail: jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu
Secondary Investigator: Dr. Leverne Barrett, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
Phone Number: 402-472-2807  E-Mail: lbarrett@unlnotes.unl.edu
Academic Sponsor: Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Phone Number: 402-472-2526  E-Mail: jgiesecke1@unl.edu

Dear Colleague,

As part of my research for my Ph.D in Human Science, Leadership, I am conducting a survey. The purpose of the study is to investigate mentoring as it facilitates the early career librarian in the tenure process. I am asking for your participation and assistance in distributing the survey. The survey takes approximately 20 minutes to share opinions regarding mentoring and tenure. My target participant for the survey includes the academic libraries that have tenure status and are part of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).

Dr. Giesecke, a member of my dissertation committee, has agreed to act as my sponsor in this data gathering effort. Successful data gathering will depend upon appropriate distribution of the survey to the target participants. It is my goal to receive responses from at least one participant in each category, from each library as described below.

The survey is designed to collect responses from a sample that includes:
- **Tenure-track librarians:** who may or may not be in a mentor relationship;
- **Librarians in a mentoring relationship:** who may not be tenure-track
- **Tenured librarians:** who may or may not have been mentored;
- **Mentors:** currently in a mentoring relationship;
- **Coordinators:** who oversee a mentoring program; who may or may not have been in a mentoring relationship.

The survey includes questions regarding: formal mentoring program structure, mentoring relationships and characteristics, and characteristics of the tenure process.

The data gathered will be reported in an article and in my dissertation. Every effort will be made to keep participants identity anonymous; however, the name of the library and university will be used in the analysis. It may be possible that participants could be identified through years of service and location. Names, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers of the individuals who respond to this survey will not be disclosed and all records will be confidential.

The survey is available and may be completed at: [http://skylight.wsu.edu/s/824f7c8b-7c57-436b-9371-eb2fe5a5c324.srv](http://skylight.wsu.edu/s/824f7c8b-7c57-436b-9371-eb2fe5a5c324.srv).

Thank you for participating in the questionnaire; I would appreciate your response by April 30, 2010.

Your assistance in completing the survey will greatly strengthen my data collection efforts. Thank you in advance for your willingness to provide email address. The survey will be available online and I will supply the URL via an email. Participation is voluntary and there are no known risks associated with this research. You are free to decide not to participate in this study. You can also withdraw at anytime without harming your relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. However, if you have any questions as to your rights in filling out this survey, you may contact the University Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at 402-472-6965. Please feel free to contact me at 402-472-3545 if you have questions or concerns. Please feel free to contact me via email or phone if you have additional questions or concerns.

Thanks in advance,

Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University Libraries, Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Specialty, 322 Love Library, Campus Box 4100, Lincoln, NE 68588-4100
Phone Number: 402-472-3545  E-Mail: jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu
Appendix F
Follow-up Email

Dear Colleague,

In the last few weeks, I distributed a survey titled “Mentoring the Early Career Librarian”. The study will be used to inform my dissertation on mentoring as it facilitates the early career librarian.

The survey may take up to 20 minutes to complete and I would appreciate a response by May 31st. Individuals will not be identified in any way with the information obtained from the survey. You are under no obligation to participate in this study. Completion of this survey will be taken as evidence that you have read the information provided, have voluntarily decided to participate, and have consented to have your responses included in the results. There is no obligation to answer all of the questions. You may choose to submit a partially completed survey. If you have any questions please feel free to contact Judith Wolfe at (402) 472-3545 or email at jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu.

The survey is available and may be completed at:
http://skylight.wsu.edu/s/824f7c8b-7c57-436b-9371-eb2fe5a5c324.srv.

Thank you for participating in the questionnaire. The survey is not complete until the last page (p. 17) at which point you may select the finish button. If you have not already responded, please take this opportunity to do so. I look forward to hearing from you and hope to include your responses in the data collected.

Principal Investigator: Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Specialty, E-Mail: jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu
Secondary Investigator: Dr. Leverne Barrett, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication Phone Number: 402-472-2807 E-Mail: lbarrett@unlnotes.unl.edu
Academic Sponsor: Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Phone Number: 402-472-2526 E-Mail: jgiesecke1@unl.edu
Appendix F
Thank You Email

Dear Colleague,

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for participating in my survey. The data collected during the quantitative process will be used to identify participants and questions for the second qualitative phase of the study. It will also be reported in an article and in my dissertation.

Your information will be combined with information from other libraries taking part in this phase of the study. Again, I want to thank you for participating.

Principal Investigator: Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Specialty, E-Mail: jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu
Secondary Investigator: Dr. Leverne Barrett, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication
Phone Number: 402-472-2807  E-Mail: lbarrett@unlnotes.unl.edu
Academic Sponsor: Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Phone Number: 402-472- 2526  E-Mail: jgiesecke1@unl.edu
Appendix F
Dean’s Invitation Letter

July 16, 2010

XXXXXXX
Dean of Libraries
XXXXXXX Libraries
XXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Thank you for participating in the first phase of my Ph.D. research Mentoring the Early Career Librarian in the Tenure Process: A mixed method study. I invite you to take part in the second phase of my research because your library meets the criteria: existing mentoring program, faculty status, and pre-tenured librarians.

In the second phase of the study, I will be conducting qualitative case studies of one or more libraries. The data collected from participants in an existing mentoring program will be used to elaborate on the results gathered in the quantitative survey phase. It is my hope that the case studies will take place during the months of August or September, 2010 but my timeline is somewhat flexible depending upon the libraries’ and librarian’s schedules.

In this phase I will conduct one-on-one formal interviews with mentors, mentees, recently tenured librarians, and coordinators of the library mentoring program.

Formal interview sessions will be scheduled at the participant’s convenience. Sessions will be scheduled for 45 minutes with at least one follow-up member checking interview. Interview sessions will be taped and later transcribed. The study time frame should be up to one week; however, it is important to include enough time to schedule at least one follow-up interview with participants.

The data gathered will be reported in an article and in my dissertation. Your information will be combined with information from other libraries taking part in this phase of the study. Every effort will be made to keep participants identity anonymous; however, the name of the library and university may be used in the analysis. It may be possible that participants could be identified through years of service and location. Names, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers of the individuals who respond to this survey will not be disclosed and all records will be confidential.

Participation is voluntary and there are no known risks associated with this research. You are free to decide not to participate or withdraw at anytime without harming your relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. However, if you have any questions as to your rights in participation, you may contact the University Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 402-472-6965. Please feel free to contact me at 402-472-3545 if you have questions or concerns.

A brief letter or email indicating that you are voluntarily making a decision to participate in this research study is required by IRB and funding sources. The participation correspondence should also include directions for making visitation arrangements.

Thank you,

Principal Investigator: Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Specialty, E-Mail: jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu Secondary Investigator: Dr. Leverne Barrett, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication Phone Number: 402-472-2807 E-Mail: lbarrett@unlnotes.unl.edu Academic Sponsor: Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries Phone Number: 402-472-2526 E-Mail: jgiesecke1@unl.edu
Appendix F
Phone Dialog

Hello, I am Judith Wolfe, from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I am pursuing my degree in Human Science with a specialization in Leadership studies. In March, you may have received a letter from me asking for email addresses of potential participants. The purpose of my call today is to follow up on that letter. Would you be able to share several names/email addresses with me?

Librarians in a mentoring relationship
Mentors & Coordinators

The survey includes questions regarding: formal mentoring program structure, mentoring relationships and characteristics, and characteristics of the tenure process and takes about 30 minutes to complete.

The data gathered will be reported in an article and in my dissertation. Every effort will be made to keep participants identity anonymous; however, the name of the library and university will be used in the analysis. It may be possible that participants could be identified through years of service and location. Names, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers of the individuals who respond to this survey will not be disclosed and all records will be confidential.

Your assistance in completing the survey will greatly strengthen my data collection efforts. The survey will be available online and I will supply the URL via an email. Participation is voluntary and there are no known risks associated with this research. You are free to decide not to participate in this study. You can also withdraw at anytime without harming your relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. However, if you have any questions as to your rights in filling out this survey, you may contact the University Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at 402-472-6965. Please feel free to contact me at 402-472-3545 if you have questions or concerns.

Principal Investigator: Judith A. Wolfe, Assistant Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries Graduate Student, Ph.D Human Science, Leadership Specialty, E-Mail: jwolf1@unlnotes.unl.edu
Secondary Investigator: Dr. Leverne Barrett, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication Phone Number: 402-472-2807 E-Mail: lbarrett@unlnotes.unl.edu
Academic Sponsor: Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries Phone Number: 402-472-2526 E-Mail: jgiesecke1@unl.edu
Appendix G
Descriptive Analysis Statistics

**Inspirational Motivation**

The inspirational motivation construct, as shown in Table 1 and 2, has four questions. The questions ask about optimism, enthusiasm, vision, and confidence. The construct includes question (57) talk optimistically about the future, (58) talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished, (59) articulate a compelling vision of the future and (60) express confidence that goals will be achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53.15%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.83%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

The majority of both the mentors and mentees supported this construct. On the average over 75%, (144 of the total 191 responses) support this construct. The mentors support the inspirational motivation construct. Fifty-nine (53.15%) mentors selected important and 32 (28.83%) very important for a total of 81.98% of the responses. Fewer mentees (66.25%) support this construct. Only 29 (36.25%) of the mentees selected it to be important, while 24 (30%) selected it to be very important.
Idealized Influence

The idealized influence construct, as shown in Table 3 and 4, is the only construct that shows a significant difference between mentor and mentee responses. There are six questions in this construct. The questions ask about values, beliefs, sense of purpose, moral and ethical consequences, and a collective sense of mission. The construct includes question (61) talk about the most important value, (62) talk about the most important beliefs, (63) specify the importance of a strong sense of purpose, (64) consider the moral consequences of decisions, (65) consider the ethical consequences of decisions, and (66) emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

Table 3
Mentor Idealized Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI %</th>
<th>LI %</th>
<th>U %</th>
<th>I %</th>
<th>VI %</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Consequences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Consequences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.17%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Table 4
Mentee Idealized Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI %</th>
<th>LI %</th>
<th>U %</th>
<th>I %</th>
<th>VI %</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Consequences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Consequences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Out of 286 total responses regarding idealized influence, the mentors chose important 76 (45.51%) and very important 42 (25.15%) for a total of 118 (70.65%) of the participants supporting this construct. Less important 28 (23.53%) and important 32
(26.89%) were selected by the mentees. When added to the mentees undecided selection 34 (28.57%) there are 94 (78.99%) of the 119 responses that indicate a lack of support for this construct.

**Intellectual Stimulation**

There are three questions, in intellectual stimulation Table 5 and 6, which revolve around problem solving. This construct includes questions (67) seek differing perspectives when solving problems, (68) looking at problems from many different angles, and (69) suggest new ways to complete assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.85%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Angles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Assignments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.55%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.01%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Angles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Assignments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.82%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Both the mentors and mentees 131 (93.57%) overwhelmingly supported this construct. Seventy-six (91.56%) of the mentors support the intellectual stimulation construct. Thirty-two (38.55%) mentors chose important and 44 (52.01%) chose very important. The mentees are in agreement with the mentor’s responses. Fifty-five (96.49%) of the total mentee responses are in support of this construct. Thirty-eight (66.66%) of the mentees chose it to be important and 17 (29.82%) chose it as very important.
Individualized Consideration

The individualized consideration construct, Table 7 and 8, as shown, has five questions regarding the different types of the attention and consideration paid to the mentee. It included teaching, coaching, individual treatment, consideration for abilities, aspirations and strengths. The questions include (70) spend time teaching, (71) spend time coaching, (72) treat others as individuals rather than as a member of a group, (73) consider the individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others, and (74) help others develop strengths.

Table 7
Mentor Individualized Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat as Individuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs, abilities &amp; aspirations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Strengths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Table 8
Mentee Individualized Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat as Individuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs, abilities &amp; aspirations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Strengths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.84%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.63%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.11%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Both mentors and mentees support the individualize considerate construct.

Fifty-five mentors chose this construct as important (39.29%) and 56 chose very important (40%) for a total of 111 (79.29%) out of 140 responses. Forty-five of the mentees chose this construct to be important (47.37%) and 21 chose very important (22.11%) for a total of 66 (69.47%).
**Psychosocial Support**

Psychosocial support is another construct that is measured using SPSS descriptive statistics. For this analysis the four psychosocial activities: role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship are broken down into three constructs of relationship characteristics. The first construct has five questions that deal with the mentee being in agreement with the mentor’s attitudes and values, along with the mentee having respect, admiration and trust for the mentor. The next relationship construct has ten questions. It deals with the mentor having good listening skills, understanding the mentee, showing interest in the mentee, as well as challenging and coaching the mentee. The remaining questions in this construct, deal with the mentor’s ability to communicate regarding concerns, relationships, supervisors, and conflict.

The last mentoring relationships within psychosocial support construct, has six questions that involve encouragement, anxiety and fears, along with the mentor’s ability to convey empathy and show respect for the mentees feelings (see Appendix B for survey question 75-95). Twenty-eight mentors responded to 18 of the 21 questions and 27 responded to three of the questions for a total of 585 mentor responses. Nineteen mentees responded to the 21 questions regarding psychosocial support for a total of 399 mentee responses.

Seventy-two percent of the total 984 responses indicated that psychosocial support is important with 431 (43.80%) choosing important and 283 (28.76%) choosing very important. One hundred-twenty-five (12.7%) are undecided, 129 (13.11%) chose less important, and only 16 (1.63%) selected not important. Together these three choices (undecided, less important, and not important) are selected fewer times, (270) than very
important 283 (28.76%). The respondents did not select not important for 13 (61.91%) of
the 21 questions.

Table 9
Mentor’s responses to importance of mentee relationship with mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI %</th>
<th>LI %</th>
<th>U %</th>
<th>I %</th>
<th>VI %</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect mentor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admire mentor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust mentor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.29%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Table 10
Mentee’s Responses to the importance of mentee relationship with mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NI %</th>
<th>LI %</th>
<th>U %</th>
<th>I %</th>
<th>VI %</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with attitudes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect mentor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admire mentor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust mentor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.84%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Tables 9 and 10, show the responses from both mentor and mentee. It is important
to note that respect for the mentor (93.62%) and trusting the mentor (95.66%) are
selected by the majority of the participants. Eighty nine percent (89.29%), 25 out of 28 of
the mentors, selected respect as important (11) and very important (14). One hundred
percent of the mentees consider respect to be important (8) or very important (11). The
majority of mentors (27) and mentees (18) overwhelmingly support trust as important or
very important. Both groups also support the importance of agreeing with the mentor’s
values. The two groups, however, differed in their support for the importance of needing
to agree with mentor’s attitudes or the need to have admiration for the mentor.
Table 1
Mentor's responses to importance of mentor's abilities to relate to mentee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good listening skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85.19%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor understands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in my career</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of competence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory concerns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict work/ family</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.73%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35.13%</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

The results of ten questions are shown in Table 11 and 12. These questions solicit responses about the mentor’s abilities, skills, and concerns for the mentee. There are three areas that are important to highlight regarding the participant’s responses. First, good listening skills was selected as important or very important by both mentor 27 and mentee 18. Thirty-two (69.56%) of participants support this skill as being very important.

Secondly, neither group considered discussing concerns and conflicts, regarding work and family, to be important as only 18 (38.3%) of the total participants selected this option. Almost thirty percent (27.66%, 8 mentors and 5 mentees) of the participants are undecided regarding this question. Concerns about relationships with peers (25) and
supervisors (20) are more important to the mentors than mentees peers (9) and supervisors (11).

Table 13
Mentor’s responses to importance of encouragement, empathy and respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages advancement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks openly about anxiety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks openly about fears</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for my concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for feelings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys a feeling of respect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>46.99</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Table 14
Mentee’s responses to importance of encouragement, empathy and respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages advancement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks openly about anxiety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks openly about fears</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys feeling of respect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI = Not important, LI = Less important, U = Undecided, I = Important, and VI = Very important

Tables 13 and 14, present the response for encouragement, empathy, and the mentors respect for the mentee. Encouragement and respect for mentees is highly supported by both groups. Encouragement for advancement is selected as important and very important by 24 (89%) of the mentors and 17 (94.44%) of the mentees. Respect is selected as important and very important by mentors 100% of the time and by mentees 94.44% of the time.
Appendix H
Interview Expense Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Cost Library 1</th>
<th>Cost Library 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1 week at each</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3 meals daily per 5 days</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1165.82</td>
<td>$1420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptionist</td>
<td>56 hours</td>
<td>$1500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital tape record</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigation timeline phase one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Proposal Submission and Quantitative Study Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Prepare Draft Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete &amp; submit IRB Permission for Survey Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Pilot Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit Proposal to Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Revise Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed January</td>
<td>Submit Proposal to Committee for Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual March/June</td>
<td>Complete &amp; submit IRB Permission for Quantitative Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact ARL Libraries &amp; administer survey: collect Quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed March Actual May</td>
<td>Identify Case to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual July</td>
<td>Contact case library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop qualitative questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investigation timeline phase two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Qualitative Study Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Resubmit IRB addendum for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Conduct interviews with two libraries 10 participants (1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. – Oct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Analyze data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May – June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. – Mar. 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Compare and discuss results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – Sept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – May 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Report findings in dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/Dec. 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Defend dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>