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ABSTRACT

Organizations use the formal mentoring program as a human resource intervention in the socialization of newcomers. Mentoring scholars have found that effective mentoring leads to various socialization outcomes of newcomers, partially because mentors, seen as organizational agents, can facilitate the learning process in the socialization. Despite this progress, several limitations can be found in the literature. First, it is largely unknown how mentoring influences socialization outcomes in addition to the learning process (e.g. assimilation process). Second, the assumption that mentors are organizational agents in the socialization has never been tested. Third, previous studies of mentoring mainly focused on the white-collar workers, calling into the question about the generality of the findings in the mentoring literature.

To fill the research gaps, this study applied the belongingness theory as the theoretical basis to explain how mentoring functions influence socialization outcomes through assimilation process. Drawing on the belongingness theory, this study proposed a research model and tested the mediation effects of organization based self-esteem (OBSE) and person-organization fit on the relationship between mentoring functions and three socialization outcomes (i.e. affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior). In addition, this study also tested the moderating effect of mentor’s organizational prototypicality on the relationship between mentoring functions and two mediation variables.
Two-wave dyadic data have been collected from blue-collar workers in a manufacturing company. The results supported most of the hypotheses in the model. Specifically, OBSE and person-organization fit significantly mediated the relationship between mentoring functions and two socialization outcomes (i.e. affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction). Only person-organization fit significantly mediated the relationship between mentoring functions and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). In addition, mentor’s organizational prototypicality significantly moderated the relationship between mentoring functions and two mediation variables.

This study advanced our understanding on how mentoring influences socialization outcomes through assimilation process. It also contributed to the literature by testing the role of mentor’s organizational prototypicality as the boundary condition of mentoring-outcome link. Finally, data from blue-collar workers increased the generality of findings in mentoring literature. Limitations and suggestions for future research have been discussed at the end of the study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background

Organizational socialization refers to a process by which newcomers make the transition from being organizational outsiders to being insiders (Ashforth, 2000; Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007). During the organizational socialization, newcomers adjust to their surroundings and learn the behaviors and skills to fulfill their new roles effectively as an organizational member. Successful socialization adjustments often reduce uncertainty and anxieties about fitting in, and increase job satisfaction, organizational commitment and work performance (Cable & Parsons, 2001). From the perspective of organizations, ineffective socialization adjustments are often the primary reason of low performance and turnover of newcomers, which cost organizations on the investments of recruitment, selection and training (Bauer et al., 2007; Fang, Duffy, & Shaw, 2010).

Due to the benefits of effective socialization, organizations employ various socialization tactics and programs to enhance socialization experience of newcomers (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Formal mentoring program, which refers to an activity that the organization formally assigns an employee to a more experienced or senior organizational member with the purpose of providing support and direction (Chun, Sosik, & Yun, 2012; Day & Allen, 2004), can be one of the tactics that facilitate
socialization. Through the provision of three types of supports, including career support (e.g. sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments), psychosocial support (e.g. acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling and friendship) and role modeling, formal mentors may help newcomers to obtain a better understanding of organizational values, mission, structure and systems leading to positive work attitudes and improved performance (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007; Scandura, 1992).

Both socialization and mentoring literatures suggest the notion that mentors can facilitate the organizational socialization. For example, by introducing a concept of localized socialization, Ashforth (2000) indicated that the socialization experience of newcomers relies largely on the localized work environment, including the interpersonal and group-based interactions with the experienced supervisors and coworkers around them. Therefore, organizational insiders, such as experienced supervisors and coworkers, are seen as organizational agents who play important roles in socialization of newcomers (Ashforth, Sluss, & Harrison, 2007; Slaughter & Zickar, 2006). From the perspective of mentoring literature, mentoring relationship is a major source of information and knowledge acquiring which enhances newcomer’s personal learning during early organizational socialization (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). Enhanced personal learning leads to various outcomes of newcomers, including work attitudes and performance (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). In addition, effective mentoring can also reduce stress and anxiety of newcomers, which may further enhance socialization experience and organizational commitment (Allen, McManus, & Russell,
Despite the impacts of mentoring on socialization, research on the mentoring-socialization link has at least three research gaps. First, literature has not fully captured the underlying mechanisms of how mentoring influences socialization outcomes. Socialization scholars indicate that successful socialization should contain two processes in order to facilitate socialization adjustment of newcomers (Fang et al., 2010; Morrison, 2002). One is the learning process, which includes acquiring job and organizational knowledge, leading to role clarity and self-efficacy (Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). The other is the assimilation process, which includes feeling of social acceptance and value congruence with the organization (Grant & Brush, 1996; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Moreland & Levine, 2001). However, research on mentoring-outcome link has mainly focused on the learning process (Kwan, Mao, & Zhang, 2010; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Liu & Fu, 2011; Pan, Sun, & Chow, 2011). No empirical study has investigated how mentoring helps newcomers feel socially accepted and value congruence with the organization. This omission is significant because newcomers not only acquire knowledge, information and feedback from organizational agents (e.g., supervisors, mentors), but also seek for social acceptance and affiliation to the organization (Ashforth, 2000). The interactions with organizational agents are important conduits for newcomers to feel attached and committed to the organization (Allen & Shanock, 2013; Ashforth, 2000). Empirical studies have supported this statement by finding that the relationship with the
supervisor (i.e. leader-member exchange) influences subordinate’s feelings of social inclusion and person-organization fit (Ferris, Brown, & Heller, 2009; Sluss & Thompson, 2012). The results of meta-analysis showed that social acceptance is a strong predictor of socialization outcomes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to remain (Bauer et al., 2007). Therefore, it is particularly important to examine the assimilation mechanism, although the learning process is surely significant to understand mentoring-socialization link. Due to this importance, this study focuses on the assimilation mechanism suggesting that mentoring supports enhance newcomer’s socialization outcomes through feelings of social acceptance and value congruence.

Second, in addition to the assumption that mentors are organizational agents, who can influence socialization of newcomers, researchers begin to criticize this assumption by indicating that organizational insiders may differ in the extent to which they are seen as prototypical organizational agents (Eisenberger et al., 2010). Prototypicality of organizational insiders, which refers to the degree that the organizational member is perceived to be a typical and exemplary representative of the organization, can affect how newcomers interpret their interactions with organizational insiders (Sluss, Ployhart, Cobb, & Ashforth, 2012). For example, prior study has focused on the supervisor’s role as prototypical organizational agents by finding that supervisor’s prototypicality strengthens the effect of supervisor identification on organizational identification of newcomers, because supervisor’s prototypicality may influence the extent to which newcomers generalize their
relationship from the supervisor to the organization (Sluss et al., 2012). Despite the findings on supervisor’s role, no study has empirically tested this assumption in the context of mentoring. The omission is significant in two ways. On the one hand, similar to the role of supervisor, it is possible that newcomers might see their mentors not only as the representative of the organization, but also as individuals in their own right. When perceived similarity between the mentor and the organization is high, newcomers tend to see their mentors as the prototypical organizational agents. Given that mentors provide various supports including career, psychosocial and role modeling that can affect protégé’s personal adjustments and the understanding of the organization, the effect of mentoring supports on protégés’ socialization outcomes to the organization may be varied if newcomers consider that their mentors are not typical organizational agents. Examining the prototypicality of the mentor in newcomer’s eyes is helpful to fully understand the boundary condition of mentoring-socialization link. On the other hand, newcomer’s socialization outcomes largely rely on the localized work environment through the interactions with the organizational members around them, such as supervisors and mentors (Ashforth, 2000). In addition to the interaction between supervisor and subordinate (i.e. Leader-member exchange), mentoring functions provided by the mentors have been found to explain additional variance on the socialization of newcomers (Thomas & Lankau, 2009). Newcomers who have mentors are more likely to assimilate into the organization because mentors may not only convey the organizational culture and values, but also transmit encouragement, counsel and social support (Chao, Walz, &
Gardner, 1992; Thomas & Lankau, 2009). The lack of considering the role of mentors as prototypical organizational agents makes it difficult to fully understand how newcomers adjust to be organizational members in the process of socialization.

Third, meta-analysis reveals that the effectiveness of mentoring varies across different disciplines and different occupations. For example, in terms of the different disciplines, the effect of workplace mentoring on protégé’s sense of affiliation is significantly stronger than the effect of academic mentoring. Besides, the psychosocial support by workplace mentors is a stronger predictor of protégé’s self-efficacy and situational satisfaction than academic mentors (Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & Dubois, 2008a; Eby et al., 2013). In addition, researchers indicate that the meaning of mentoring may vary across different occupations (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2010). In the early date, organizations use mentoring as part of a personal development program for managers and professionals (Noe, 1988; Wilson & Elman, 1990; Zey & Zey, 1984). Therefore, majority of mentoring studies focus on white-collar workers (Kwan, Liu, & Yim, 2011). However, recent mentoring researchers indicate that organizations also use mentoring program on blue-collar workers (Kwan et al., 2010). One major difference between white-collar workers and blue-collar workers is that the jobs of white-collar workers are more complex than blue-collar workers (Hu, Kaplan, & Dalal, 2010). Owning to this complexity, white-collar workers may have different work motivation from blue-collar workers. In support of this argument, Huang (2011) found that white-collar workers have higher motivation for autonomy and learning than blue-collar workers. In contrast,
blue-collar workers tend to reciprocate more to the organization than white-collar workers when blue-collar workers have higher relational identification with their supervisors (Cem Ersoy, Born, Derous, & van der Molen, 2011). Since work motivation is central to predict individual behaviors and attitudes (Mitchell & Daniels, 2003), lack of the empirical studies on blue-collar workers, who may have different work motivation from white-collar workers, makes it difficult to capture the full picture of how mentoring facilitates socialization of newcomers. In addition, because the dominant workforce in China is the blue-collar workers in manufacturing companies (Editorial Board of the China Commerce, 2009), it is also interesting and significant to conduct more research on blue-collar workers to increase the generality of findings in workplace mentoring (Bozionelos & Wang, 2006).

1.2 Research Objectives

In light of the above research gaps and discussions, the first objective of this study is to examine how mentoring influence socialization outcomes of newcomers through feelings of social acceptance and value congruence. Belongingness theory provides a theoretical foundation to understand this process. According to the belongingness theory, human beings are motivated to form and maintain stable and quality interpersonal relationship with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). When entering a new organization, newcomers often feel anxiety and stress partially because of the uncertainty to fulfill their needs for belonging (Ashforth, 2000; Ashforth et al.,
Previous studies also mentioned that feelings of social acceptance and value congruence are rooted on the basic need for belonging of employees (Ferris et al., 2009; Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995; Van Vianen, Stoelhorst, & De Goede, 2013; Yu & Yang, 2013). Therefore, I argued that mentoring supports can affect socialization outcomes of newcomers through the feeling of social acceptance and value congruence, by integrating the belongingness theory into mentoring-socialization link. Accordingly, this study proposes that organization-based self-esteem (social acceptance) and person-organization fit (value congruence with the organization) as two mediators to explain the effect of mentoring supports on socialization outcomes. On the one hand, self-esteem can be a relational evaluation referring to the extent to which an individual sees his or her relationships with others as “valuable, important or close” (Leary & Baumeister, 2000, p.9). It will be enhanced or reduced in accordance with the feeling of social acceptance and rejection (Williams, 2007). In the organizational context, self-esteem is often assessed with the measure of organization-based self-esteem (OBSE), defined as the extent to which individuals believe they are capable, significant, and worthy at work (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989). On the other hand, person-organization fit reflects employee’s perception of fit into the organization. It is often operationalized as the value congruence between the employee and the organization (Cable & Parsons, 2001). I operationalize these two constructs more broadly, encompassing the feelings of being accepted by the organization and value congruence with the organization, because previous studies suggested that protégé’s perceptions and attitudes to the organization
can be developed through supports from the mentors (Baranik, Roling, & Eby, 2010).

The second objective of this study is to investigate the boundary condition that influences the effect of mentoring in the socialization process. Specifically, this study examines the moderating role of mentor’s organizational prototypicality on the relationship between mentoring and two mediation variables (i.e. OBSE and person-organization it). I argue that mentor’s prototypicality is an important boundary condition of mentoring-socialization link by proposing that when mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high, the relationship between mentoring and newcomer’s OBSE and person-organization fit will be stronger.

The third objective is to investigate mentoring in the context of blue-collar workers. In the past two decades, Chinese young adults have moved out of the agriculture into industry, which contribute to the dominant workforce in manufacturing industries (Banister, Bloom, & Rosenberg, 2010). Since mentoring can help both organization and newcomers by facilitating newcomers’ efficient and effective adjustments to the new positions (Chao, 2007), it is appropriate and significant to investigate the effect of formal mentoring program in the context of blue-collar workers in China.

In summary, this study contains three major objectives: (a) to test the mediation effect of OBSE and person-organization fit on the relationship between mentoring and three protégé’s outcomes (i.e. affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior), (b) to explore the moderating effect of mentor’s organizational prototypicality on the relationship between mentoring
function and two mediation variables, including protégé’s OBSE and person-organization fit, (c) to conduct the research in blue-collar workers in China.

1.3 Intended Theoretical Contributions

This study intends to make four major theoretical contributions. First, drawing on the belongingness theory, it extends the mentoring literature by investigating how mentoring influences newcomer’s feeling of acceptance and fit during the socialization process. Specifically, by proposing OBSE and person-organization fit as mediators, this study advances our knowledge of how mentoring program enhances protégé’s sense of acceptance and value congruence, leading to more distal socialization outcomes. Second, person-organization fit is an important proximal outcome of organizational socialization. Researcher proposes that socialization program such as formal training and formal mentoring may be related to newcomer’s person-organization fit (Ostroff, 2012). However, no previous research has empirically tested this relationship. Therefore, this study contributes to the person-organizational fit literatures by empirically testing the relationship between mentoring and person-organization fit in early socialization stage of newcomers. Third, by testing the moderating role of mentor’s organizational prototypicality, this study advances our understanding of mentor’s characteristic and boundary condition of socialization process of newcomers. Fourth, this study examines formal mentoring program by collecting the data from blue-collar workers in a manufacturing company,
which contributes to the generality of mentoring findings at workplace.

1.4 Organization of the Dissertation

This study is separated into six chapters. Chapter 1 has introduced the research background of the topic, identified the research gap and outlined the purpose of the study as well as the contributions. Chapter 2 reviews the literatures including mentoring, socialization adjustments, belongingness theory, person-organization fit and OBSE. Chapter 3 discusses ten hypotheses that have been tested in the later part of the study. Chapter 4 introduces the methodology of the empirical study including data collection procedure, measurements and analytical method. Chapter 5 shows the results of the empirical study. Chapter 6 contains the discussion, limitation as well as the conclusion.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a literature review of the mentoring research, organizational socialization and the belongingness theory. In the first section, the definition and functions of mentoring, the empirical studies on formal mentoring and socialization tactics and processes will be reviewed. Research gaps will be identified on the basis of the literature review. In the second section, I will review belongingness theory as well as the constructs of organization based self-esteem and person-organization fit. On the basis of the review in this chapter, the theoretical framework and hypotheses arguments will be discussed in the next chapter.

2.1 The Definitional Issues of Mentoring

The original concept of mentoring can be traced back to Homer’s Odyssey and other literary works, including Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein, F. Scott Fitzgerald’s The Great Gatsby, and Shakespeare’s Much Ado about Nothing (Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). Mentoring research starts from the study on the development of adult men by Levinson (1978). In his work, the mentoring relationship, as a learning and development resource, is regarded as one of the most important experiences in young adulthood. In addition to his work, other studies, including Kanter (1977), Dalton,
Thompson, and Price (1977), and Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978), have also investigated the influence of relationships between young and old adults on personal growth and career development. These works identified this specific type of relationship and created the foundations of mentoring theory. Researchers in various areas, including education, sports, arts, and management, have paid increasing attention to the topic of mentoring during recent decades. Since Kram (1985) published her seminal book on workplace mentoring, mentoring in the workplace context has aroused great interest among management scholars. Through an in-depth qualitative study on mentor-protégé dyads, Kram examined the role of mentoring in the development network and identified two types of functions in organization settings. The details of mentoring functions will be discussed later in the thesis.

In spite of the increasing interest, there is still no consistent definition of what a mentoring relationship is in the management literature (Haggard et al., 2010). Kram (1985) mentioned that the word mentor means different things to different people. Eby et al. (2007) discussed various constructs that are related to mentoring, such as supervisor and subordinate, teacher and student, advisor and advisee, coach and client. Even in the context of mentoring, within-construct variance is criticized by various researchers for lacking consistency in terms of the “general concept” of mentoring (Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003). Table 1 shows some examples of mentoring definitions. What’s more, Allen, Eby, O’Brien, and Lentz (2008) indicated in their review of research methodology in the mentoring literature that around 40% of the articles published between 2006 and 2008 did not specify the types of mentoring
being studied. It makes even more difficult to compare different findings in the mentoring literature. Therefore, it is essential to conduct a review on the definitional issues of mentoring, including both within and cross-construct variance, and provide a clear definition of the mentoring being studied. In the following sections, I will first discuss the challenges of the definitions used in the mentoring literature. I will then compare and distinguish similar constructs with the mentoring concept, and discuss the within-construct variance by introducing different types of mentoring.

### Table 1. Examples of Mentoring Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levinson et al., 1978 (p. 98)</td>
<td>“The mentor relationship is one of the most complex, and developmentally important, a person can have in early adulthood...No word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here...Mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationship and the functions it serves.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kram, 1985; Allen, 2003 (p. 134)</td>
<td>“Mentors are typically defined as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing support to and increasing the career advancement of junior organizational members, their protégés.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, 1991 (p. xiv)</td>
<td>“A deliberate pairing of a more skilled or experienced person with a lesser skilled or experienced one, with the agreed-upon goal of having the lesser skilled person grow and develop specific competencies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandura &amp; Ragins, 1993 (p.256)</td>
<td>“Respondents were asked to indicate if they had experienced a working relationship that significantly affected their career mobility in their firm.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godshalk &amp; Sosik, 2000 (p. 299); Godshalk &amp; Sosik, 2003 (p. 424)</td>
<td>“Mentoring is defined as a pairing of a more skilled or experienced person with a lesser skilled or experienced one, with the goal [either implicitly or explicitly stated] of having the lesser skilled person grow and develop specific career-related competencies. Your mentor may or may not be your manager.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandura &amp; Williams, 2001 (p.</td>
<td>“Mentoring is described as a one to one relationship between a more experienced and senior person (Mentor) and a new...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Allinson &amp; Hayes, 2002 (p. 1112)</td>
<td>“A developmental, caring, sharing, helping relationship where one person invests time, know-how and effort in increasing and improving another person’s growth, knowledge and skills”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day &amp; Allen, 2004 (p. 77)</td>
<td>“A mentor is an experienced employee who serves as a role model, provides support, direction and feedback regarding career plans and interpersonal development. A mentor is also someone who is in a position of power, who looks out for you, gives you advice and/or brings your accomplishments to the attention of people who have power in the company.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solansky, 2010 (p. 676)</td>
<td>“Mentoring is defined as the matching of a novice with a more experienced person in the same role.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen et al., 2009 (p. 1119)</td>
<td>“A mentor is generally defined as a higher-ranking, influential individual in your work environment who has advanced experience and knowledge and is committed to providing upward mobility and support in your career.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.1 The Challenges of Mentoring Definitions

Mentoring scholars believe that the word *mentor* means different things to different people (Kram, 1985). Therefore, providing a universal definition that can be applied to every mentoring context is challenging. One of the challenges is the level of specificity. In their review article, Haggard et al. (2010) discussed how specific the definition of mentoring should be. They mentioned that restrictive definitions can ensure that the relationship being studied across the mentoring research is substantially consistent. However, such definitions are less sensitive in terms of detecting the existence of a mentoring relationship. Broad definitions, on the other hand, provide space for different interpretations. However, they might also include relationships that would have strong overlaps with other similar constructs. For example, Scandura and Ragins (1993) described the mentoring relationship as “if the respondents had experienced a working relationship that significantly affected their career mobility in their firm”. This definition is a broad definition which would be more likely to result in self-identified protégés and to become mixed up with other similar constructs such as coaching and feedback seeking.

In addition to the level of specificity, some researchers describe the types of support and commitment provided by the mentor in their definition of mentoring. For example, Scandura and Williams (2001) stated that the role of a mentor is to be someone “who is committed to providing upward mobility and support to your career.” Day and Allen (2004) defined a mentor as the person “who looks out for you,
gives you advice and/or brings your accomplishments to the attention of people who have power in the company.” The advantage of describing types of mentoring support and commitment in the definition is that protégés are more likely to be able to identify who the mentor around them is. However, some protégés may not be able to see the mentor’s commitment to the relationship since they might not have enough sources and information regarding the levels of mentor commitment (Haggard et al., 2010). Besides, mentor commitment and mentoring functions might not be perceived by protégés in a negative mentoring context since the protégés might not consider their mentors to be committed and qualified.

2.1.2 Similar Constructs to Mentoring in the Workplace

In the workplace, several types of relationships may share some similar characteristics with the concept of mentoring. In the following sections, I discuss the overlaps as well as the distinctiveness between mentoring and supervising, coaching, advising, and counselling. Table 2 shows a summary of the comparison among the different constructs.

2.1.2.1 Supervision

The dyadic relationship between supervisor and subordinate is one of the most typical relationships in the workplace. Hundreds of research articles have examined this topic from different perspectives, including leadership styles, trust, and
relationship quality. The supervisor-subordinate relationship is related to the mentoring relationship in several ways. First, both mentoring and supervisory relationship are one-to-one relationships in the workplace. Each supervisor and mentor may have several dyadic relationships with subordinates and protégés respectively. Second, supervisors may provide some mentoring functions. Recent research articles have investigated the role of the supervisor in providing subordinates with various types of mentoring functions, including career support, psychosocial support, and role modeling (Baranik et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2011; Sun, Pan, & Chow, 2014). I will discuss this specific type of mentoring (i.e. supervisory mentoring) later in the thesis. Third, the supervisor-subordinate relationships and supervisors’ leadership styles are often considered and compared with mentoring in research studies. For example, Raabe and Beehr (2003) compared the effects of formal mentoring with the supervisory relationship and the coworker relationship. Scandura and Williams (2004) examined the role of mentoring and transformational leadership in shaping employees’ work attitudes. Thomas and Lankau (2009) studied the effects of mentoring and leader-member exchange (LMX) on employees’ organizational socialization and job burnout. In spite of the common characteristics between the supervisory relationship and the mentoring relationship, mentoring is often treated as a distinct construct beyond the supervisory relationship (Scandura & Williams, 2004) for several reasons. First, the supervisor has legitimate power over the subordinate (Cobb, 1980; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990), while the mentor does not have legitimate power. The relationship between mentor and protégé depends on mutual
trust and commitment (Allen & Eby, 2008; Wang, Tomlinson, & Noe, 2010). Second, the supervisory relationship and mentoring are different in terms of the nature of the relationship. It is the job of the mentor to provide mentoring support for the personal growth and development of the protégé (Kram, 1985). However, the job of the supervisor is to monitor and evaluate the subordinate’s work and to reach work goals, although some supervisors may also provide mentoring function to subordinates (e.g. supervisory mentoring).

2.1.2.2 Coaching

The second related research stream is coaching in the workplace. Coaching is defined as the “process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective” (Peterson & Hicks, 1995). It has been widely used as a management and developmental tool in organizations. Coaching involves facilitating learning, providing feedback, counseling about work related issues, and improving effectiveness (Ellinger & Bostrom, 1999; Evered & Selman, 1989; Feldman & Moore, 2001). Although it shares some similar characteristics with mentoring in terms of the training and support provided by coaches, mentoring and coaching are different in at least three ways including the formation of relationships, duration and the development of personal bonds. First, the initiation of the mentoring relationship can be based on mutual trust in an informal way (e.g. informal mentoring) or on the assignment by the organization in a formal way (e.g. formal mentoring). Unlike mentoring relationships, coaching relationships
are formally contracted rather than informally developed (Feldman & Lankau, 2005). Some may argue that the initiation of a formal mentoring relationship is similar to the coaching relationship. However, although the protégé is assigned to a mentor in a formal mentoring program through a matching process, the formal mentoring relationship still depends on the mutual trust and commitment between the protégé and the mentor. It is normally a voluntary relationship. In contrast, coaching has explicit job duties to guide the behaviors of coaches. The coaches normally charge coaching fee to the clients. Second, researchers have mentioned that the coaching relationship is normally shorter in duration than the mentoring relationship (Feldman & Lankau, 2005). Third, most of the mentors are in the same organization with the protégés, while most of the coaches are outside the organization (Feldman & Lankau, 2005). Fourth, the mentoring relationship involves a high level of psychosocial support including friendship and counselling (Kram, 1985; Wanberg et al., 2003). Therefore, a close relationship and personal bonds are important in a mentoring relationship. In contrast, it is not necessary to have a personal bond and attachment between a coach and a client.

2.1.2.3 Advising

The third related research stream of organizational behavior concerns employee’s advice seeking and taking. Employees may sometimes seek advice from others in the workplace. According to the Oxford Dictionary, the word advice is defined as guidance or recommendations offered with regard to prudent action. In the workplace,
the purpose of advice seeking and taking is to help to make decisions and avoid mistakes (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006). Some researchers have mentioned that advisors may provide different types of advice, including job related, career, and social support advice, which are similar to the functions of mentoring in a mentoring relationship (Heath & Gonzalez, 1995). Other researchers have also indicated that mentoring falls within the nature of advice seeking and resembles advice in which someone provides particular recommendations regarding an action or an alternative (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006). However, mentoring differs from advice seeking and taking in at least two ways. First, mentoring is a relationship-based construct, while advice is decision based. In the mentoring context, mentor and protégé form a stable relationship in a certain period of time. During a mentoring relationship, the mentor provides the protégé with career and psychosocial support which may relate to the different decisions the protégé makes. Therefore, if no relationship between mentor and protégé exists, mentoring does not exist. On the other hand, advice is based on each decision. For each important decision, the employee may seek advice from different people. Employees, for example, may seek advice from former employees on some work-related procedures and policies. Newcomers may seek advice from parents, friends, or colleagues on the proper behaviors to adopt in a new organization. Some may have a short-term advisory relationship with an advisee as an advisor depending on the different decisions the advisee needs to make, but the relationship is not necessary. Second, mentor and protégé typically have a shared common goal regarding the purpose of mentoring. The mentoring functions provided by the mentor
are based on this goal (e.g. helping the career development and socialization of the protégé). On the other hand, the purpose of advice seeking and taking is to help employees make a decision (Bonaccio & Dalal, 2006). Once the decision has been made, the advice seeking is finished before the next decision has to be made.

2.1.2.4 Workplace counselling

Workplace counselling refers to a psychological therapy given by an internal or external counsellor for solving work-related psychological problems of employees (Carroll & Walton, 1997). It is a human resource intervention which is normally paid by the organization where such therapy has an impact on work functioning (McLeod, 2010; McLeod & Henderson, 2003). Although mentor may provide some degree of counselling to help protégé solve work-related psychological problems, workplace counselling and mentoring are different mainly in three ways. First, mentoring is normally voluntary while workplace counselling needs fee for service which is normally paid by the organization. Second, different from the mentors who may also provide other supports for personal development including the provision of training and teaching on work-related skills and knowledge, counsellors may only focus on solving the psychosocial problem (Stokes, 2003). Third, the purpose of mentoring is for the personal adjustment and development of protégés (Kram, 1985), while counselling aims to help employees to solve the psychosocial problems that they have at the workplace (McLeod & Henderson, 2003).
2.1.2.5 Summary of Similar Constructs to Mentoring in the Workplace

It is noted that mentoring has some degree of overlaps with the similar constructs discussed above. For example, organization can assign a direct supervisor to an employee as the mentor. On the other hand, direct supervisors may also provide mentoring functions although they are not assigned as formal mentors to the employees. Besides, mentors may provide supports similar to the above constructs including coaching, feedback and counselling to the protégés as parts of the mentoring functions. Despite these overlaps, mentoring can be mainly distinguished with these similar constructs in five ways. First, mentoring involves both work-related and psychosocial-related supports while other constructs mainly focus on one area. Second, mentoring is normally voluntary while others including counselling and coaching need fee for service. Third, mentoring is a relationship based service while others such as counselling and advising are problem based. It is necessary for mentors to form friend relationships with the protégés because friendship is one of the mentoring functions that mentors should provide. On the other hand, it is not necessary to form a relationship of friendship for other constructs. Fourth, mentoring relationship may not have a clear time bound depending on the mutual agreement between mentors and protégés. Other constructs such as counselling, coaching and supervision normally have a clear time bound at the beginning of the service. Fifth, the relationships in the context of counselling, coaching and supervision are formally initiated by the organization, while mentoring relationship can be informally or formally initiated.
Table 2. Comparison of Mentoring with Other Similar Constructs in the Workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Primary scope of influence</th>
<th>Nature of service</th>
<th>Service fee</th>
<th>Time-bound</th>
<th>Relationship initiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Job related and psychosocial support</td>
<td>Relationship based service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Informal or formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising</td>
<td>Job related</td>
<td>Relationship based service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Job related</td>
<td>Relationship based service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Job related and psychosocial support</td>
<td>Problem based service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Informal or formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>Relationship based service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3 Different types of mentoring

2.1.3.1 Supervisory and non-supervisory mentoring

One of the major variances among different mentoring contexts is whether the immediate supervisors of the employees are also their mentors. Supervisory mentoring occurs when a protégé’s mentor is also his or her immediate supervisor, while non-supervisory mentoring occurs when the mentor is not the immediate supervisor. Researchers have studied various topics in both supervisory (Pan et al., 2011; Scandura & Williams, 2004; Sun et al., 2014) and non-supervisory (Liu & Fu, 2011; Liu, Wang, & Wayne, in press) mentoring contexts. In spite of the separation, many researchers have included both supervisory and non-supervisory mentoring in their mentoring studies (Thomas & Lankau, 2009; Wang et al., 2010). In addition,
most of the mentoring definitions allow a protégé’s immediate supervisor to be the mentor (e.g. Godshalk & Sosik, 2000; Scandura & Williams, 2001). Researchers have also indicated that 85% of mentoring relationships take place between a supervisor and a subordinate dyadic (Burke & McKeen, 1997) and that 97% of self-identified protégés mention that their supervisors have more or less provided mentoring functions during their career (Day & Allen, 2004). Therefore, immediate supervisors can be seen as a valuable mentoring resource in an organization (Kram, 1985).

In terms of the mentoring effectiveness, protégés in a supervisory mentoring relationship tend to receive more mentoring functions than protégés in a non-supervisory mentoring relationship (Burke & McKeen, 1997; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997). However, other researchers have indicated that immediate supervisors are more likely to provide a higher level of job-related skills and support rather than the exposure and visibility functions provided by higher-level executives (Haggard et al., 2010). This may be due to the power and resources immediate supervisors have in providing mentoring functions.

2.1.3.2 Internal and external mentoring

In addition to the hierarchical status within of an organization, mentors can also be persons outside the organization. External mentoring refers to the mentoring relationship where the mentor does not work in the same organization as the protégé. Although most studies have examined the mentoring relationships which take place in the same organization, a few studies have allowed the mentor to be outside the
organization (e.g. Nielson, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). In terms of the mentoring, internal mentors may provide more organizational resources to support protégés and may be more physically accessible than external mentors (Ragins, 1997). Internal mentors can provide more support, such as challenging assignments, job-related skills and feedback, than external mentors. On the other hand, due to their position outside the organization, external mentors are unlikely to provide support such as sponsorship, protection, or challenging assignments. However, they are more likely to provide protégés with career mobility and long-term career advancement (Haggard et al., 2010).

2.1.3.3 Formal and informal mentoring

The differences between formal mentoring and informal mentoring have often been discussed in previous studies (see the summary in Table 3). First, the informal mentoring relationship is initiated spontaneously by the mentor and the protégé. Protégés tend to find more senior and experienced people who are willing to provide career-related support and advice. Meanwhile, mentors tend to select protégés who have potential for career development and are considered to be “rising stars” in the workplace (Singh, Ragins, & Tharenou, 2009). Therefore, the initiation of the relationship is based on perceived competence, mutual identification, and interpersonal comfort (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Kram, 1983; Kram, 1985). On the other hand, formal mentoring is initiated by the organization or the program coordinators with the aim of training, socializing, and developing employees in the
organization. Formal mentors are recruited and assigned to protégés. In some cases, formal mentors do not even meet with the protégés until the formal mentoring program starts. Therefore, in contrast to informal mentoring, the formal mentoring relationship is based on the willingness and commitment of mentors to engage in the formal mentoring program (Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

Second, researchers have indicated that the length of formal mentoring relationships often lasts between six months and one year, while the length of informal mentoring relationships lasts between three and six years (Kram, 1985; Zey, 1985). A formal mentoring relationship begins when the mentor is assigned to the protégé and ends when the mentoring program is over. Researchers have indicated that formal mentors tend to focus more on the short-term goals while informal mentors are more concerned with the long-term needs of the protégés (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Informal mentors may adjust the goals of the mentoring according to the changes of protégé’s career status. Sometimes, informal mentors may suggest and recommend the protégés to change jobs and work for another organization if the current jobs of are not in line with the personal goals of the protégés. In some cases, informal mentors and protégés can still maintain the mentoring relationship even when the protégés have left the company. Therefore, the duration of informal mentoring is normally longer than that of formal mentoring.

Third, researchers have indicated that due to the difference in the initiation of the relationship, the mentor’s motivation to engage in mentoring may be different in the two mentoring contexts (Ragins & Cotton, 1991; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Allen
found that mentors can have different motivations, including self-enhancement motivation, prosocial motivation, and intrinsic motivation. Since formal mentors are recruited and assigned by the organization or program coordinators, they may be motivated to engage in a formal mentoring program by their needs to be good organizational citizens (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). On the other hand, informal mentors have more commitment to their protégés than formal mentors. Therefore, informal mentors are more likely to focus on the career needs of protégés and to provide long-term support (Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

In spite of the differences between formal and informal mentoring, the effectiveness of both types of mentoring has been debated intensely. However, the evidence is mixed (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007). For example, some studies have found that protégés report a higher career function in informal mentoring than in formal mentoring (Allen, Day, & Lentz, 2005; Chao et al., 1992; Ragins & Cotton, 1999), but other studies have found no such difference (Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Sosik, Lee, & Bouquillon, 2005; Tepper, 1995). Some studies have also found less psychosocial function reported by protégés in formal mentoring than in informal mentoring (Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura & Williams, 2001; Sosik et al., 2005), whereas other studies have found no such difference (Allen et al., 2005; Chao et al., 1992; Tepper, 1995). Therefore, rather than assumes that formal mentoring mirrors the informal mentoring, formal mentoring deserves more research in its own right due to their difference in nature (Wanberg et al., 2003).
Table 3. Comparison of Formal Mentoring and Informal Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal mentoring</th>
<th>Informal mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Initiation of the relationship</em></td>
<td>Assigned and matched by the program coordinator</td>
<td>Relationship formed simultaneously on the basis of mutual identification and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Duration</em></td>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>3 to 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Structure of the relationship</em></td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Implementation</em></td>
<td>Focus on short-term goals set by the formal mentoring program</td>
<td>Focus on protégé’s long-term career goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mentor’s commitment</em></td>
<td>Commitment to the mentoring program</td>
<td>Commitment to the protégé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3.4 Electronic mentoring

Due to the development of computer and internet technologies, a new form of mentoring has been introduced in the workplace. Electronic mentoring (e-mentoring) takes place when mentors and protégés communicate and implement mentoring functions through computer-mediated technologies (Ensher, Heun, & Blanchard, 2003). In addition to the face-to-face mentoring, electronic mentoring allows both mentoring parties to employ different communication methods, including phone, instant messages, and emails. Recent research on electronic mentoring has found that mentoring parties have more interactive dialogue through electronic mentoring than through traditional face-to-face mentoring. In addition, the communication method of electronic chatting facilitates the effect of dialogue interactivity on the protégé’s post-mentoring self-efficacy (Smith-Jentsch, Scielzo, Yarbrough, & Rosopa, 2008).
2.1.4 Summary of the Definition Issues

Although the inconsistency of the mentoring definitions has been criticized by mentoring researchers (Allen et al., 2008), none of the existing study provides a universal definition that can be applied to every mentoring context. Due to the various types of mentoring and contexts discussed above, it is also impossible to provide such a universal definition. Therefore, researchers use different definitions in their mentoring studies (see the examples in Table 2). Haggard et al. (2010) indicated that the optimal definition should reflect the purpose of the study and the very specific type of mentoring the researchers would like to study, but the core characteristics and fundamental attributes of the mentoring construct should be consistent across different definitions so that the mentoring construct can be distinct from other similar constructs.

Haggard et al. (2010) concluded that three key attributes should clarify in workplace mentoring. First, mentoring requires a reciprocal notion which involves a social exchange relationship. For example, Ragins (2012) mentioned that high quality mentoring relationship should facilitate mutual learning, growth and development between mentors and protégés. In support of this argument, Chun et al. (2012) found that not only the protégés who can have various mentoring outcomes, mentors can also gain transformational leadership, affective well-being and organizational commitment from the mentoring relationship. A pure one-way relationship may not be defined as a mentoring relationship. Second, a mentor should produce developmental
benefits to protégé’s job. The primary goal of a mentoring relationship is to help the protégé to advance in his or her organization. By receiving both job-related and psychosocial support, protégés not only learn the job skills and knowledge from the mentors, but also establish reciprocal relationship with the organization given that mentors are organizational agents (Baranik et al., 2010; Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Third, a mentoring relationship involves regular interaction between mentor and protégé over some period of time. Haggard et al. (2010) also suggested to include additional information, such as the relationship initiation and the mentor’s hierarchical location, which is helpful to clarify the nature of the mentoring relationship.

Considering the focus of this thesis which is on the formal mentoring context, I adopt the definition of a formal mentor as a more skilled and experienced person who is assigned by the company to a less experienced person in order to form an interpersonal relationship with the purpose of providing ongoing job-related and psychosocial supports for the personal adjustments and development in the organization. The mentor may or may not be the immediate supervisor of the protégé. This definition shares common fundamental attributes with other mentoring definitions (Day & Allen, 2004; Godshalk & Sosik, 2000; Payne & Huffman, 2005) in terms of the reciprocal relationship, developmental benefits, and regular interaction. The hypotheses arguments and the design of the empirical study in this thesis are based on this definition.
2.2 Mentoring Functions

In Kram’s (1985) original work, she concludes two types of mentoring functions provided by a mentor. Career functions include sponsorship (e.g. public support of a protégé; nominating a protégé for desirable lateral moves and promotions), exposure-and-visibility (e.g. introducing a protégé to senior managers in the organization who may judge his/her potential for further advancement), coaching (e.g. providing suggestions for achieving work and career objectives), protection (e.g. intervening in situations where a protégé is unable to achieve a satisfactory result), and challenging assignments (e.g. assigning a challenging task followed by training and feedback). Psychosocial functions include acceptance-and-confirmation (e.g. exhibiting support and encouragement regarding the performance of a protégé), counseling (e.g. listening to a protégé’s personal concerns and giving ongoing feedback), friendship (e.g. social interaction with protégés after work; eating lunch and sharing personal experiences), and role modeling (e.g. working as a model for protégés to emulate the mentor’s attitudes, values, and behaviors). Despite the two types of mentoring functions mentioned by Kram (1985), Scandura (1992) indicated that role modeling is a separate mentoring function in addition to the career function and the psychosocial function. In this study, I adopt Scandura’s (1992) approach. The justification and the details of measurement will be discussed in Chapter 4.
2.3 Mechanisms and Consequences of Mentoring Functions

Previous research has found that mentoring has various outcomes which can benefit not only protégés but also mentors and organizations. For example, scholars have found that mentoring can lead to various outcomes for protégés such as job satisfaction (Baranik et al., 2010), job performance (Pan et al., 2011), work-family enrichment (Kwan et al., 2010), career success (Byrne, Dik, & Chiaburu, 2008), career satisfaction (Pan et al., 2011), personal learning (Lankau & Scandura, 2002), and affective well-being (Chun et al., 2012). Mentors can also benefit from mentoring. Prior research has found that by providing mentoring functions, mentors can have a high level of job effectiveness (Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006) and affective well-being and can exhibit transformational leadership (Chun et al., 2012). In recent research, scholars have been changing the focus to outcomes for the organization. Research has found that mentoring is positively related to organizational commitment (Chun et al., 2012; Payne & Huffman, 2005; Weinberg & Lankau, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Kwan et al., 2011), organizational career satisfaction (Byrne et al., 2008), and organizational socialization (Thomas & Lankau, 2009).

Despite the various outcomes of mentoring for protégés, researchers know little about how mentoring works. Most of the studies focus on the personal learning of protégés. For example, Lankau and Scandura (2002) found that personal learning mediates the relationship between mentoring functions and outcomes. They divided
personal learning into two dimensions: relational job learning and personal skill development. Furthermore, Kwan et al. (2010) used the same dimensions of personal learning and found that two dimensions mediate the relationship between role modeling and work-family enrichment. Pan et al. (2011) used personal learning as a mediator in the context of supervisory mentoring. By using the same measurement developed by Lankau and Scandura (2002), they found that personal learning mediated the relationship between supervisory mentoring and two outcomes, including job performance and career satisfaction. In addition to personal learning, some scholars have tried to provide explanations from other perspectives. For example, drawing from role theory, Lankau, Carlson, and Nielson (2006) found that role stressors, including role ambiguity and role conflict, mediated the relationship between mentoring functions and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Baranik et al. (2010) used social exchange theory and found that perceived organizational support partially explained the effect of various mentoring functions on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Sun et al. (2014) found that psychological empowerment and OBSE mediated the relationship between supervisory mentoring and two outcomes including contextual performance and promotability.

2.4 Formal Mentoring Program

Formal mentoring program has become a popular employee development tool in
the organization (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006a). Organizations use formal mentoring program as a strategy for human resource development (HRD) practices (Hegstad, 1999). HRD is defined as “the integrated use of training and development, career development and organization development to improve individual and organizational effectiveness” (McLagan, 1989, p.7). Formal mentoring program is one type of HRD practices because it can help protégés on their career and organization development (Hezlett & Gibson, 2005).

As mentioned above, a formal mentor is a powerful agent in the organizational socialization process (Chao, 2007). Companies invest in formal mentoring programs with the aim of enhancing the socialization of newcomers. However, if protégés do not believe that the mentoring functions provided by the mentors are supported by the organization, the benefits of a formal mentoring program to the organization, including organizational socialization, will hardly materialize. Therefore, it is important for companies to ensure that mentoring functions provided in formal mentoring programs contribute to protégé’s outcomes to the organization (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007).

2.4.1 The Empirical Studies on Formal Mentoring

Similar to the studies on informal mentoring, researchers have examined the effects of mentoring functions on protégé outcomes, including organizational commitment (Seibert, 1999), job satisfaction (Raabe & Beehr, 2003), work role stress
(Seibert, 1999), mentorship quality (Allen et al., 2006a), and organizational citizenship behavior (Okurame, 2012). In addition, researchers have also investigated the outcomes related to a particular formal mentoring program, including perceived program effectiveness (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006b), satisfaction with the formal mentoring program, and mentor effectiveness (Weinberg & Lankau, 2010). In terms of the predictors of mentoring functions, researchers have examined the role of similarity between formal mentors and protégés, including cognitive similarity and gender composition (Armstrong, 2002). In addition, protégés’ personalities, such as proactivity and openness, have been found to be positively related to the mentoring functions provided (Wanberg et al., 2006). In terms of the boundary conditions, researchers have found some moderators that can influence the effect of formal mentoring on various outcomes. These moderators include protégé’s learning goal orientation (Allen & O’Brien, 2006), power distance orientation (Chen, Liao, & Wen, 2014), emotional intelligence (Chun, Litzky, Sosik, Bechtold, & Godshalk, 2010), perceived mentor responsiveness (Wanberg, Welsh, & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007), and protégé’s need for dominance (Horvath, Wasko, & Bradley, 2008).

In spite of the research on the predictors, outcomes, and boundary conditions in the formal mentoring context, research on the underlying mechanisms between formal mentoring functions and outcomes has received less attention in the literature. To the best of my knowledge, only two studies have investigated the mediators, including perceived psychological safety (Chen et al., 2014) and protégé’s commitment and trust (Son & Kim, 2013), on the relationship between mentoring functions and
outcomes. Appendix A shows the summary of the empirical studies on formal mentoring in the field of organizational behavior and psychology.

2.5 Organizational Socialization

In this section, I focus on the socialization tactics and newcomer’s adjustment in the socialization, because this study focuses on how formal mentoring, which is a program used as a socialization tactic, affects newcomer’s socialization outcomes through socialization adjustments. Specifically, I will first introduce the several types of socialization tactics. Then, I will briefly review the process of how newcomers adjust in the organizational socialization.

2.5.1 Socialization Tactics

Organization may use different types of methods and programs to socialize newcomers. Van Maanen and Schein (1977) have summarized these methods and programs into six bipolar tactics. First, the collective (vs. individual) tactic involves grouping newcomers together and transferring the organization knowledge through common experiences. Second, the formal (vs. informal) tactics includes providing training and orientation classes to socialize newcomers. Third, the sequential (vs. random) tactic involves training the newcomers step by step through sequence. Fourth, the fixed (vs. variable) tactic makes the socialization training by following a fixed
schedule. Fifth, the serial (vs. disjunctive) tactic involves providing a role model, such as a supervisor, mentor or other experienced coworkers in the organization socialization. Finally, investiture (vs. divestiture) affirms newcomer’s identity, capabilities and attributes after entering into the organization. Following this approach, Jones (1986) further grouped these six types of tactics into two categories. Institutionalized socialization, including collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial and investiture tactics, reflects a structured program of socialization that reduces the uncertainty and encourages newcomers to accept organizational values. Individualized socialization, including individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive and divesture tactics, involves leaving the newcomers along without providing clear guidance which may create ambiguity and encourage the newcomers to develop through their own approach. Based on this definition, formal mentoring program can be seen as an institutionalized socialization tactic because it is a formal and structured program by assigning a mentor to provide guidance and training for newcomers.

2.5.2 Newcomer’s Adjustment during Organizational Socialization

In the seminal work of organizational socialization, Saks and Ashforth (1997) concluded that institutionalized (vs. individualized) socialization tactics related to various socialization outcomes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to stay. They also mentioned that these socialization tactics affect the outcomes through various proximal adjustments. The proximal adjustments include
role clarity, person-organization fit, motivation, skill acquisition, social integration, social identification and others. Socialization scholars try to classify these proximal adjustments into different categories. For example, Bauer and Erdogan (2014) used four categories including role ambiguity, self-efficacy, social acceptance and cultural fit for newcomer’s adjustments. Bauer et al. (2007) concluded three categories, including role clarity, self-efficacy and social acceptance. Saks, Uggerslev, and Fassina (2007) used three categories including role conflict, role ambiguity and perceived fit. Although socialization scholars use different approaches to classify newcomer’s adjustments into different categories, these categories mainly reflect two processes: learning and assimilation (Fang et al., 2010). Learning process includes clarifying roles, acquiring organizational knowledge and mastering tasks, while assimilation process includes identifying with organization and becoming socially integration (Fang et al., 2010). This study adopts Fang and co-authors’ approach by identifying newcomer’s adjustments into two processes (i.e. learning and assimilation). The reason is that Fang et al’s approach is mostly consistent with the mentoring literature by identifying learning as one of the important processes, because majority of mentoring articles focus on the learning process between mentoring functions and outcomes (see the review above). Adopting this approach makes it easy to connect two streams of literature and examine how formal mentoring program affects socialization outcomes through newcomer’s adjustments.
2.6 Research Gaps

From the above review of the mentoring and socialization literature, several research gaps can be identified. First, we know little about how mentoring affects socialization outcomes of newcomers in addition to the learning process. The omission is significant because mentors may not only transfer the skills and knowledge to the protégés through learning process, but also form a friend relationship and show the care and concern on protégé’s personal growth. In support of this argument, previous studies have found that mentoring function can also affect protégé’s perceived organizational support and psychological safety (Baranik et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2014). The lack of understanding how mentoring affects newcomer’s socialization outcomes in addition to the learning process creates significant research gap for both mentoring and socialization literature.

Second, we still know little about the role of mentor characteristics in organizational socialization of newcomers. From the perspective of formal mentoring program, the organization needs to recruit the appropriate mentors and assigned them to protégés, because inappropriate mentor is a primary reason of low quality mentoring relationship (Eby & Lockwood, 2005). From the perspective of socialization, mentor is seen as the organizational agent that can facilitate the socialization and influence newcomer’s interpretation of work environment (Ashforth, 2000). Therefore, mentor characteristic is a key factor that can influence the effectiveness of both the formal mentoring program and socialization (Wanberg et al.,
2003). Future studies can contribute to this area of research by focusing on more mentor characteristics that may influence formal mentoring program and socialization.

Third, previous mentoring studies mainly focus on the professional and white-collar workers (Bozionelos & Wang, 2006; Chun et al., 2012; Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins, 2008b; Singh et al., 2009). Research examining the role of mentoring on blue-collar workers is limited. Given that the dominant component of the Chinese workforce is blue-collar workers in manufacturing companies (Editorial Board of the China Commerce Yearbook, 2009), the insufficient mentoring research on blue-collar workers makes it difficult to generalize the findings on mentoring across different occupational settings and contexts. Researchers have been encouraged to investigate the role of mentoring in different occupations since the meaning of mentoring varies across different occupations (Haggard et al., 2010).

In a word, several research gaps can be identified in both mentoring and socialization literature. Specifically, we know little about how (a) mentoring affects newcomer’s outcomes in addition to the learning process (b) how mentor characteristic can affect the effectiveness of formal mentoring program and socialization outcomes, and (c) how mentoring works in the context of blue-collar workers. Therefore, in order to fill the research gaps mentioned above, this thesis investigates both the underlying mechanisms and the boundary conditions of formal mentoring program by the use of the blue-collar sample. Drawing on the belongingness theory, I propose that mentoring functions can affect newcomer’s
socialization outcomes through assimilation process. In the next section, belongingness theory and two mediating variables (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit) are discussed.

2.7 Belongingness Theory

Belongingness theory proposes that people have a fundamental need to form and maintain high quality relationships with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, a lack of need for belonging would cause adverse reactions and a variety of ill effects (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996; Thau, Aquino, & Poortvliet, 2007). Belongingness is a powerful psychological motivation. It can be found in all individuals across different cultures, although it may have different strength and intensity for different people (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Ever since the belongingness theory was introduced into the literature, it has received great attention (being cited over 7000 times in the past two decades via Google Scholar) in different research areas, including organizational behavior, clinical psychology, educational psychology, and child psychology.

The belongingness needs of human beings can be explained by the evolutionary theory. The basic view of evolutionary theory is that human beings, similar to other animal species, have to face external selection pressures. In this view, human behaviors can be understood as ways to adapt these pressures (Laland & Brown, 2011). One of the ways is to form and maintain social bonds and cooperate with
others for the purposes of survival and reproduction (Moreland, 1987; Nowak, 2006). Therefore, human beings are motivated to establish social connections with others (Brewer & Harasty, 1996; Dasgupta, Banaji, & Abelson, 1999; De Cremer, 2004). This represents the basic need of human beings to “maintain high quality relationships with others” (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Perceptions of social exclusion by others lead to psychological pains and ill effects (Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003). Another view in the evolutionary theory is that human beings have to compete for limited resources. According to Baumeister and Leary (1995), forming groups provides favorable conditions for sharing and obtaining resources. Belonging to a group facilitates cooperation with others. This helps human beings to obtain resources and protect them against external pressures.

2.7.1 Need for Belonging and Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization refers to the process by which newcomers adjust themselves psychologically from being organizational outsiders to being organizational insiders (Bauer et al., 2007). It facilitates a newcomer’s adjustments to work. Saks and Ashforth (1997) indicated that the effectiveness of socialization program is related to various adjustment outcomes, including both proximal outcomes (e.g. role clarity, social identification, and learning) and distal outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work performance). One of the underlying motives of newcomers to achieve these personal adjustments is their needs.
for belonging (Ashforth, 2000). According to the belongingness theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), people are motivated to maintain high quality relationships with others. When newcomers enter an organization, they are motivated to form stable interpersonal relationships with other organizational members. The cues perceived by the newcomers for social inclusion or exclusion are seen as acceptance or rejection by the organization. Researchers have found that workplace social inclusion affects employee job performance (Pearce & Randel, 2004). A high quality of leader-follower relationship and organizational supports reduce the likelihood of employee deviant behavior by fulfilling their need for belonging (Ferris et al., 2009). In addition, uncertainty reduction theory also explains newcomers’ need for belonging. Newcomers face a high level of stress and anxiety when they enter a new organization (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). This stress and anxiety mainly comes from uncertainty about the work environment. According to uncertainty reduction theory (Falcione & Wilson, 1988; Lester, 1987), newcomers are motivated to reduce stress and anxiety by establishing social interactions with other organizational members (Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

On the basis of the belonging theory, I propose that mentoring function can satisfy newcomer’s need for belonging through two mediators: OBSE and person-organization fit.
2.7.2 Organization-Based Self-Esteem

2.7.2.1 The Development of the Construct

Self-esteem is defined as a person’s overall self-evaluation of his or her competencies (Rosenberg, 1965). It reflects how the person sees himself or herself “as a competent and need-satisfying person” (Korman, 1970, p. 32). Self-esteem has been studied in various fields such as psychology, management, and education. Researchers have found different consequences related to self-esteem, including work, life, and health outcomes (Orth, Robins, & Widaman, 2012; Sowislo & Orth, 2013; Steiger, Allemand, Robins, & Fend, 2014). Many researchers have argued that self-esteem should be a hierarchical and multifaceted construct. Therefore, in addition to global self-esteem, which refers to the overall evaluation of competence and self-worth, researchers have identified role-specific self-esteem and situation-specific self-esteem in the literature. Role-specific self-esteem is the self-evaluation arising from one of a person’s life roles, and situation-specific self-esteem is the self-evaluation resulting from a specific situation (Simpson & Boyle, 1975).

On the basis of the concept of self-esteem and its hierarchical and multifaceted nature, Pierce et al. (1989) defined OBSE as the degree to which a person sees himself or herself as competent, significant, and self-worthy as an organizational member. People with high OBSE are more likely to satisfy their needs through their organizational roles (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). In this thesis, I focus on OBSE rather than the other types of self-esteem because it is superior to other types of self-esteem.
in terms of predicting organization-related outcomes (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). First, global self-esteem has frequently been found to be insignificantly related to outcomes in the organizational context. Second, little research has validated the construct of global self-esteem in organizational research. Third, the measurement of self-esteem should be aligned with the level of the research (Pierce et al., 1989).

2.7.2.2 Theorizing on Organization Based Self-Esteem

OBSE is a specific type of self-esteem. Pierce et al. (1989) argued that the determinants of OBSE should be similar to the determinants of global self-esteem. Researchers have suggested that global self-esteem can be affected in three ways (Pierce & Gardner, 2004), including (a) the implicit signals sent by the organizational structures, (b) messages sent from significant others, and (c) feelings of competence from one’s past experiences.

In addition to the antecedents, researchers have employed various theories to explain why self-esteem affects people’s attitudes, motivation, and behaviors. For example, self-consistency motivation theory (Korman, 1970) posits that people tend to engage in behaviors that maximize their sense of consistency and cognitive balance. Therefore, people who have a positive image of themselves will engage in behaviors that can enhance this self-image (Korman, 1970). Self-enhancement theory proposes that people have the fundamental need to enhance their self-esteem. People with low self-esteem are more likely to engage in behaviors that can prevent a further reduction in their self-esteem (Campbell, 1990). Behavioral plasticity theory posits that people
with low self-esteem are more sensitive to external cues (Brockner, 1988). It provides an alternative view on self-esteem, namely that individual differences in self-esteem can influence the relationship between work environment conditions and employee outcomes (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Due to the similarity between global self-esteem and OBSE (Pierce et al., 1989), these theories have also been used to explain OBSE in the organizational context (Gardner, Dyne, & Pierce, 2004; Hui & Lee, 2000; Liu, Lee, Hui, Kwan, & Wu, 2013b).

2.7.2.3 Organization-Based Self-Esteem and Belongingness Theory

In spite of the antecedents and consequences of self-esteem, researchers have indicated that the motivation of people to pursue self-esteem is rooted in their fundamental need for belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Leary & Baumeister, 2000). According to the sociometer theory (Leary et al., 1995), an individual seeks self-esteem not only for positive self-evaluation but also for relational evaluation, which refers to the extent to which an individual sees his or her relationships with others as “valuable, important or close” (Leary & Baumeister, 2000, p.9). Leary et al. (1995) indicated that self-esteem is “an internal, subjective index or marker of the degree to which the individual is being included versus excluded by other people” (p. 519). Therefore, individuals are motivated to monitor the environment to gather information about the inclusion or exclusion in important relationships (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). When people perceive that they have been accepted by a group, their self-esteem will rise. On the other hand, low levels of acceptance or simply
being rejected by a group will lead to low levels of self-esteem (Williams, 2007). Belongingness theory proposes that self-esteem is an indicator of the satisfaction of one’s need for belonging (Leary & Downs, 1995). In the organizational setting, OBSE is employed to measure employee self-esteem in the workplace. It has been shown to reflect the satisfaction of the need for belonging of employees (Ferris et al., 2009).

2.7.2.4 Organization-Based Self-Esteem and Organizational Socialization

Researchers have found that organizational efforts on newcomers’ socialization process help newcomers in the initial development of their OBSE. For example, in their longitudinal study, Riordan, Weatherly, Vandenberg, and Self (2001) found that institutionalized socialization tactics are significantly related to new employee OBSE. They mentioned that a newcomer’s OBSE can be affected by the organizational efforts on newcomer’s socialization, such as “providing role models, accepting and respecting newcomers’ values, and providing information regarding career paths within the organization” (p. 164). Researchers have also found that other organizational factors, such as perceived organizational support (Ferris et al., 2009; Lee, 2003), idiosyncratic employment arrangements (Liu et al., 2013b), and job complexity (Lee, 2003), significantly affect employee OBSE. In addition to the organizational factors, newcomers also gather information about the organization from organizational insiders, including supervisors, coworkers, and other newcomers, during the socialization process (Settoon & Adkins, 1997). Therefore, relationships with organizational insiders play an important role in forming employees’ OBSE.
Researchers have found that interpersonal relationships with supervisors and coworkers, such as workplace incivility (Chen et al., 2013), leader-member exchange (Aryee, Budhwar, & Tan, 2003; Ferris et al., 2009), guanxi with a supervisor (Liu, Hui, Lee, & Chen, 2013a), feeling trusted by a supervisor (Lau, Lam, & Wen, 2014), and supervisory mentoring functions (Sun et al., 2014), are significantly related to OBSE.

2.7.3 Person-Organization Fit

2.7.3.1 Definition of Person-Organization Fit

The concept of person-environment fit is defined as the compatibility between an individual and a work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). It is rooted in interactional psychology, which focuses on the interactional effects of individual and environment on human behaviors (Feldman, 1976; Jones, 1986; Lewin, 1951; Terborg, 1981). The foundations of person-environment fit are supported by various theories. For example, the needs-press theory developed by (Murray, 1938) assumes that an individual’s needs can be fulfilled by what Murray referred to as “press” (i.e. environment; p. 151). It also distinguishes between actual and perceived press. Lewin’s (1935, 1951) field theory makes a contribution to the concept of person-environment fit by stating that human behavior is the interactional function of both the person and the environment, not the person or the environment.
Person-environment fit has several dimensions in terms of different targets such as the organization, the job, the vocation, and the group. Person-organization fit is one of these dimensions. It is defined as the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when one or both of the following conditions exist: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs; (b) both entities share similar fundamental characteristics.

2.7.3.2 Person-Organization Fit and Person-Organization Value Congruence

The word fit has two different meanings. Supplementary fit refers to the congruence of characteristics between individual and organization, whereas complementary fit occurs when the characteristics of one party complement the needs or characteristics the other party lacks (Kristof, 1996). Of these two types of fits, congruence between the individual’s and the organizational values is the most frequently used operationalization of person-organization fit (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Chatman, 1989; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Values represent the individual’s conscious desires because values contain preferences, interests, motives, and goals (O'Reilly et al., 1991; Van Vianen et al., 2013). Research has found that people seek the organization that fits with their values. Value congruence influences employees’ feelings of attachment to the organization (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Therefore, values are “fundamental and relatively enduring” to self-identity, and value congruence is a significant form of fit (O'Reilly et al., 1991, p.459). The present study followed previous studies (e.g. Cable & DeRue, 2002;
Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001) to operationalize person-organization fit as value congruence between the person and the organization.

2.7.3.3 Measurements of Person-Organization Fit

Three types of measurements are commonly used to assess person-organization fit. The objective approach measures the actual fit between person and environment. This measurement is used to compare characteristics (e.g. values) between the separately rated individual and environment. Then, the index of actual fit is calculated to assess the person-organization fit. In contrast to the objective approach, the subjective approach measures the fit by asking the same respondents about both individual and organizational values (Cable & Judge, 1996; French, Rodgers, & Cobb, 1974). For example, O'Reilly et al. (1991) used the Q-sort technique to assess person-organization fit by calculating and comparing the individual’s and the organizational value congruence. The individual’s values and the organizational values are rated by the same sources. Similar to the subjective fit, the third type of measurement is to assess the perception of person-organization fit instead of calculating the fit index between individuals and the organization (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009; Vogel & Feldman, 2009). Respondents are invited to make a direct assessment of the compatibility between them and the organization.

In this study, I will use the perceived fit approach to assess person-organization fit for two reasons. First, this approach has been the most widely used in assessing person-organization fit. It tends to have larger effect sizes than other types of
measurement (Resick, Baltes, & Shantz, 2007). Second, perceived fit provides a psychological driven for attitudes and behaviors. Researchers have mentioned that the influence of objective fit on the outcomes still needs to go through individual’s perceptions (Kristof - Brown et al., 2005). Therefore, compared with objective fit and subjective fit, perceived fit is a more proximal determinant of attitudes and behaviors (Cable & DeRue, 2002). This may be due to individuals’ propensity to interpret environmental cues in ways that allow them to maintain a positive self-concept (Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Kristof - Brown et al., 2005).

### 2.7.3.4 Person-Organization Fit and Belongingness Theory

Researchers have indicated that people’s motivation to fit the social environment is rooted in their need to belong (Kammeyer - Mueller, Schilpzand, & Rubenstein, 2013; Van Vianen et al., 2013). Both evolutionary and psychological theories point out that people try to seek out similar others in the workplace in order to fulfill their need for affiliation and belonging (see the review above). For example, the evolutionary perspective emphasizes that human beings choose to cooperate with others in order to face and adapt to external selection pressures (Nowak, 2006). In this process, similar others may reduce the uncertainty through cooperation. Therefore, people are more likely to have a feeling of belonging when they perceive that there are similar others in the social environment (Van Vianen et al., 2013). In addition, various psychological theories, including the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971) and the self-affirmation theory (Steele, 1988), indicate that people like those
who hold similar opinions and views consistent with their belief system. Given their fundamental need for belonging, people are motivated to monitor their social environment for cues to assess their perception of person-organization fit. Researchers have found that the perception of fit correlated to a sense of belonging (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001) and value congruence satisfies people’s need for belonging and affiliation (Edwards & Shipp, 2007).

2.7.3.5 Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Socialization

People tend to search for and choose jobs in organizations that match their personal self-concepts (Tom, 1971). On the other hand, organizations consider the fit between job applicants and the organization as an important criterion in the recruitment and selection process (Chatman, 1989; Ferris & Judge, 1991; Judge & Ferris, 1992). However, researchers have indicated that person-organization fit may change after organizational entry. For example, when tenure increases, employees learn and accept the values and goals of the organization (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970; Hinrichs, 1964). In addition, person-organization fit is also a proximal outcome of organizational socialization (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). For example, Cable and Parsons (2001) discussed the effects of different organizational tactics on person-organization fit. Furthermore, (Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005) found that positive framing, general socializing, and relationship building moderate the relationship between institutionalized socialization and person-organization fit. In addition, person-organization fit may also be linked to more distal socialization outcomes such
as employee attitudes and behaviors. For example, in the meta-analyses of person-organization fit (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003), research has found that person-organization fit has a moderate to strong correlation with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to leave, and organizational satisfaction. Most of the research studying organizational socialization adopts the value congruence approach by operationalizing person-organization fit as the value congruence between individual and organization (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Chatman, 1989; Kim et al., 2005; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Sluss & Thompson, 2012). In this study, I adopt the same approach, because value system of the organization affects what the organization wants to offer to the employees. In a similar way, employee’s value system affects what the employee desires from the organization (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Edwards & Shipp, 2007). Therefore, the degree of the value congruence between the employee and the organization is more influential to affect the satisfaction of psychological needs and adjustment (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009).

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the concept of mentoring as well as the research gaps in the mentoring literature. Then, the belongingness theory, which is the main theory used in the thesis, was reviewed. Two variables (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit) employed to reflect the satisfactions of one’s need for belonging were respectively
reviewed. In the next section, I will discuss the details and arguments of the hypotheses on the basis of the theory reviewed.
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter provides the theoretical model and hypotheses of the study. Specifically, it first introduces the theoretical model. Then, ten hypotheses are discussed regarding (a) the effect of mentoring functions on OBSE, (b) the effect of mentoring functions on person-organization fit, (c) the mediating effect of OBSE and person-organization fit on the relationship between mentoring functions and three socialization outcomes (i.e. affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior), (d) the moderating effect of mentor’s organizational prototypicality on the relationship between mentoring functions and two mediation variables, including OBSE and person-organization fit.

3.1 The Theoretical Model of the Research

This study examines the underlying mechanism between mentoring functions and newcomer’s outcomes in the organizational socialization. Drawing on the belongingness theory, employee’s assimilation process in the socialization was considered to explain why their affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) would be affected by the supports provided by their formal mentors.
Specifically, due to the needs for belonging, newcomers are motivated to monitor their work environment for cues to assess social acceptance and value congruence. Once newcomers feel socially accepted by other organizational members and perceive fit into the organization, the increased OBSE and person-organization fit will lead to more distal socialization outcomes including affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and OCB. Moreover, this study proposes that mentor’s organizational prototypicality as a moderator on the relationship between mentoring functions and two mediation variables. See Figure 1 for the conceptual model.
Figure 1. A Conceptual Model
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3.2 Mentoring Functions and OBSE

Self-esteem is not only a self-evaluation of competence and ability, but also a relational evaluation regarding the focal individual feels social inclusion or exclusion by others (Leary et al., 1995). As an indicator of one’s satisfaction of belongingness needs, it varies according to one’s being accepted and rejected by others (Williams, 2007). In the organizational context, self-esteem is measured by OBSE which is an indicator of social acceptance in the organization (e.g. “I am trusted around here” and “I am valuable around here”; Ferris et al., 2009). Researchers have identified several factors that can influence OBSE. Pierce and Gardner (2004) categorized these factors into three sources: (a) the implicit signals of organizational structures, (b) messages sent by the significant others at the workplace, (c) feelings of self-efficacy in building role conditions. In this study, I argue that mentoring functions affects newcomer’s OBSE because it reflects “messages sent by the significant others at the workplace”.

Support from the organization is an important source for social acceptance and belongingness of employees (Ferries et al., 2009), because it signals that the employees are significant, valued and accepted to be an effective organizational member. Previous studies have supported this argument by finding that perceived organizational support enhance employee’s feeling of social acceptance, and thus, increase employee’s OBSE (Ferries et al., 2009). In contrast, failing to provide support which communicates to the individuals that they are not valued promotes a sense of exclusion and thwarts the need for belonging (Leary, Twenge, & Quinlivan,
In addition to the supports from the organization, the interaction and relationship between the organizational agent and the employee may also signal that the employee is valued and socially accepted, which enhance employee’s OBSE. For example, previous studies have demonstrated that employee’s feelings of being respected and being trusted by the supervisor are positively related to OBSE (Pierce et al., 1989; Lau et al., 2014).

Following this research line, I argue that supports from the formal mentors can increase newcomer’s feeling of social acceptance, and thus, enhance newcomer’s OBSE. For example, in terms of providing career function, publicly supporting the newcomers (sponsorship) and introducing the newcomers to more senior managers for the future advancement (exposure and visibility) signals that newcomers are valuable and significant organizational members. Mentor may also teach and encourage the newcomer to be an effective organizational member (coaching, acceptance and confirmation), which may increase newcomer’s feeling of social acceptance. In terms of providing psychosocial function, stable and quality friend relationship between the mentor and newcomer (friendship) fosters newcomer’s attachment to the mentor. Given that the interaction between mentor and protégé is a conduit for protégé to form attitudes to the organization (Allen & Shanock, 2013; Ashforth, 2000), newcomers may feel attached to the organization through their interaction and friendship with the mentors. Newcomers may also see their mentors as role models and emulate mentor’s behaviors and attitudes (role modeling). Once newcomers internalize mentor’s values and attitudes to be an effective organizational member, they will be more likely to feel
social acceptance in the organization. In support of the above argument, findings from previous study found that mentoring functions provided by the supervisor are positively related to protégé’s OBSE (Sun et al., 2014).

Hypothesis 1: Mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors are positively related to newcomer's OBSE.

3.3 Mentoring Functions and Person-Organization Fit

Person-organization fit is an important indicator of newcomer’s socialization adjustment (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). It is often operationalized as the perception of value congruence between the focal individual and the organization (O’Reilly et al., 1991), because value represents individual’s desirable states, objects, or goals which are normative standards to judge the level of fit and guide the behaviors (Huang, Cheng, & Chou, 2005).

Socialization scholars have mentioned that formal mentoring can increase protégé’s perception of person-organization fit (Ostroff, 2012), although this proposition has not been empirically tested. If mentors can increase newcomer’s perception of person-organization fit, one explanation is that mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors affect newcomer’s interpretation of the work environment. Researchers indicate that individual’s assessment of person-organization fit can be an affective and subjective response to the work environment (Edwards,
During the organization socialization, mentors may provide several types of supports including career function, psychosocial function and role modeling (Kram, 1985). High level of mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors signals that the work environment is caring and supportive, engendering the positive affect to the organization. Therefore, newcomers may assess person-organization fit as the affective response to the organization based on their perceptions of how well the organization satisfies their needs, make effort to meet their expectations and build the high quality exchange relationships (Sluss & Thompson, 2012). Besides, caring and supportive work environment build the mutual and reciprocal relationship between the newcomers and the organization (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). In this case, newcomers will be more likely to accept organizational values rather than “rocking the boat”, when their relational uncertainty has been reduced through the high quality relationship with the organization (Cable & Parsons, 2001).

Another explanation is that mentoring functions foster newcomer’s value congruence with the organization by accepting mentor’s values. When mentors provide high level of mentoring functions, protégés may consider the mentoring relationship to be effective (Weinberg & Lankau, 2010). The high quality mentoring relationship motivates the protégé to take the mentor’s advice (Son & Kim, 2013), which helps to internalize mentor’s values. Findings from leadership studies support this argument by demonstrating that transformational leadership enhances follower’s person-supervisor value congruence (Hoffman, Bynum, Piccolo, & Sutton, 2011). The
reason is that a leader who displays personal concern for the well-being of the subordinate is likely to foster a strong sense of pride and commitment, leading to subordinate’s acceptance of leader’s values (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004; Hoffman et al., 2011). In the organizational context, employee’s values can be congruent to the organizational values when the employee internalizes the values of organizational agents. For example, charismatic leader can “shape” follower’s values to be congruent with the organizational values by encouraging the follower to identify with the leader and internalize leader’s values (Huang et al., 2005). Following the same logic, I argue that newcomers will be more likely to perceive value congruence with the organization once they have identified with the mentor and internalized mentor’s values.

*Hypothesis 2: Mentoring functions provided by the formal mentor are positively related to newcomer’s person-organization fit.*

### 3.4 The Mediating Role of OBSE and Person-Organization Fit

Organizational socialization literatures indicate that newcomer’s assimilation process is an important mediating mechanism that links between socialization and outcomes (Bauer et al., 2007; Fang et al., 2010). In newcomer’s socialization, mentors play an important role as well as other organizational agents such as peers and supervisors (Ashforth et al., 2007; Sluss & Thompson, 2012). Through mentoring
relationship, mentors not only transfer knowledge (Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Viator & Scandura, 1991), but also fulfill newcomer’s needs for belonging. Building on the belongingness theory, this study argues that formal mentoring affect newcomer’s feeling of social acceptance and fit. Specifically, it proposes that mentoring functions link to three employees outcomes including affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and OCB through two mediators: (a) the evaluation of social acceptance (OBSE), and (b) the perception of fit into the organization (person-organization fit).

3.4.1 Affective Organizational Commitment

Affective organizational commitment refers to “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). In a meta-analytic review of protégé’s outcomes, Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, and Lima (2004) mentioned that the most consistent protégé’s outcomes are favorable affective reactions to the workplace. Affective organizational commitment offers a frequently studied outcome of formal mentoring at workplace. Scandura (1997) indicated three reasons to explain the relationship between mentoring functions and affective organizational commitment: (a) mentoring promotes organizational values which enhances the attachment to the organization, (b) mentoring helps protégés cope with the stress and anxiety at the workplace, and thereby, lead to positive attitudes to the organization, (c) protégés see mentors as role models and imitate mentor’s positive attitudes.
In the present study, I argue that mentoring functions affect newcomer’s affective organizational commitment through two assimilation mechanisms: OBSE and person-organization fit. First, sociometer theory posits that self-esteem can be a relational evaluation of being socially accepted by others (Leary et al., 1995). It provides information about one’s status of social inclusion or exclusion (Leary et al., 1995). Individuals with high self-esteem tend to feel good about themselves including feelings of pride, self-satisfaction and confidence (Scheff, Retzinger, & Ryan, 1989). In the organizational context, newcomers with high OBSE evaluate themselves to be capable, significant and self-worth at workplace (Pierce et al., 1989). As noted before, such evaluation reflects newcomer’s feeling of social acceptance and fulfillment of belongingness need. Due to individual’s motivation to fulfill the fundamental needs for belonging, newcomers are to seek social inclusion by maintaining quality and stable relationship with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, I expect that newcomer’s with high OBSE tends to adjust themselves to feel attached and committed to the organization in the socialization process, because failing of such commitment may reduce the perception of an effective organizational member, which engenders the feeling of social exclusion and thwarts sense of belongingness. Empirical findings from previous studies supported this argument by demonstrating that OBSE positively relates to affective organizational commitment (Hui & Lee, 2000; Lee & Peccei, 2007; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). In the present study, I argue that mentoring functions from formal mentors signal that newcomers are valued and socially accepted by the organization, increasing OBSE. OBSE further engenders
positive affective response to the organization leading to affective organizational commitment.

*Hypothesis 3a: Newcomer’s OBSE mediates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by formal mentors and affective organizational commitment.*

Second, as noted in the last chapter, the motivation to seek person-organization fit is rooted on human’s fundamental needs for belonging. A feeling of belonging is most likely to be achieved when individuals perceive fit into the environment (Van Vianen et al., 2013), because individuals who share similar values with other organizational members should find it easier to work and commitment with others (Cable & DeRue, 2002), which fulfill their belongingness needs to the organization. Such fulfillment of psychological needs enhance their emotional bonds to the organization, which leads to affective organizational commitment. Previous studies supported this argument by finding that person-organization fit significantly related to affective organizational commitment through satisfaction of psychological needs (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). In the present study, I argue that mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors bias newcomer’s perception of value congruence with the organization. Such value congruence satisfies newcomer’s psychological needs and further leads to affective organizational commitment.

*Hypothesis 3b: Protégé’s person-organization fit mediates the relationship between*
formal mentoring and affective organizational commitment.

3.4.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to a positive emotional state resulting from one’s job experience (Locke, 1976). It can be derived from both intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Herzberg, 1959). Intrinsic factors include development and opportunities for career growth and job accomplishment, while extrinsic factors include reward satisfaction and company policies (Walker, Churchill, & Ford, 1977). Mentoring can enhance protégé’s job satisfaction in both intrinsic and extrinsic ways. For example, mentoring functions such as career function, psychosocial function and role modeling aiming for the personal development in one’s work increase the intrinsic satisfaction of the job. Job satisfaction can be also achieved when mentor provides psychosocial supports such as counseling, acceptance and confirmation display the supports from the mentor and organization, which enhance the extrinsic satisfaction of the job. Previous research has demonstrated direct relationship between mentoring and job satisfaction (Baranik et al., 2010; Lankau et al., 2006; Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Meta-analysis for mentoring outcomes also found a moderate correlation between mentoring and job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004; Underhill, 2006).

In the present study, I argue that mentoring functions provided by formal mentors can enhance newcomer’s job satisfaction in two ways. First, newcomers with high OBSE tend to hold the positive relational evaluation of being accepted as an effective
organizational member. These newcomers are motivated to maintain such evaluations by focusing on the positive relational features of the work environment, such as coworker and organizational supports. These relational features contribute to higher job satisfaction by promoting positive job affect and preventing stress outcomes (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). The findings of meta-analysis supported this argument by demonstrating a strong correlation between OBSE and job satisfaction (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Following the discussion of Hypothesis 1, I argue that mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors enhance newcomer’s OBSE, which further leads to higher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4a: Newcomer’s OBSE mediates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by formal mentors and job satisfaction.

Previous studies indicated that job satisfaction can be enhanced through the perceptions of favorable job characteristics, coworker relationships and fulfillment of psychological needs (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010; Russell et al., 2004). Employees who perceive fit into the organization tend to have high level of psychological needs fulfillment (Greguars & Diefendorff, 2009). Person-organization fit also promotes communication and trust within the organization (Edwards & Cable, 2009), which facilitates job completion. Needs fulfillment and job completion foster positive job feelings and emotion toward the job, further leading to job satisfaction (Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994). Meta-analysis has
supported the positive relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction by identifying large effect size for this relationship (p=.56). Following the discussion of Hypothesis 2, I argue that newcomers will be more likely to perceive fit into the organization through the lens of mentoring relationship when their formal mentors provide high level of mentoring functions. Then, person-organization fit will further lead to job satisfaction. Therefore, I expect that person-organization fit mediates the relationship between mentoring functions and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b: Newcomer’s person-organization fit mediates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors and job satisfaction.

3.4.3 OCB

OCB refers to “the individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Previous literatures have investigated the role of mentoring on protégé’s OCB and argued that mentoring affects protégé’s OCB because it facilitates socialization process, promotes positive attitudes toward organization and role modeling from the mentors (Donaldson, Ensher, & Grant-Vallone, 2000; Kwan et al., 2011; Tepper & Taylor, 2003).

In addition to the relationship between mentoring and OCB, researchers have found that OBSE and person-organization fit are significantly related to OCB. First,
researchers indicate that when employees perceive valuable and self-worthy in the organization, they try to maintain such positive status through positive attitudes and behaviors (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). In other words, employees are motivated to engage in the behaviors that can reinforce this positive evaluation. Due to the belongingness needs, individuals are willing to maintain high quality of interpersonal relationship (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, high OBSE, which reflects positive relational evaluation of social inclusion in the organization, fosters the motivation to cooperate and comply with social groups (Den Hartog, De Hoogh, & Keegan, 2007). When individuals have a strong sense of belongingness to the collective group, they tend to pay more attention to the collective interests which engender the sense of responsibility to benefit for the group (De Cremer & Van Knippenberg, 2002). In support of this argument, researchers have found that the sense of belongingness directly relates to OCB (Den Hartog et al., 2007). Previous literatures have also demonstrated significant relationship between OBSE and OCB (Chattopadhyay, 1999; Lee, 2003). In the present study, I argue that mentoring functions enhance newcomer’s OCB through the satisfaction of social acceptance.

Hypothesis 5a: Newcomer’s OBSE mediates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by formal mentors and OCB.

Second, person-organization fit affects OCB through both cognitive and affective processes (Resick, Giberson, Dickson, Wynne, & Bajdo, 2013). When people
perceive fit with the organization, they tend to have high organizational identification (Cable & DeRue, 2002), which actives the cognitive process to engage in the citizenship behavior. In addition, person-organization fit also induces positive affective experience, leading to cooperation and helping behavior in the organization (Resick et al., 2013; Spector & Fox, 2002). In support of this argument, previous studies have found significant relationship between person-organization fit and OCB (Kristof, 1996; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Following the discussion of Hypothesis 2, I expect that person-organization fit mediates the relationship between mentoring functions and OCB of newcomers.

Hypothesis 5b: Newcomer’s person-organization fit mediates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by formal mentors and OCB.

3.5 The Moderating Role of Mentor’s Organizational Prototypicality

Leadership researchers defined organizational prototypicality as the extent to which the supervisor is perceived to be a typical and exemplary representative of the organization (Sluss et al., 2012). A prototypical organizational member shares some common characteristics including goals, values, beliefs and norms with the organization (Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2005; Sluss & Ashforth, 2008). The more prototypicality organizational members have, the more organizational members share similar characteristics which align with the collective
organization. Previous research has examined the role of supervisor’s organizational prototypicality on leadership effectiveness. For example, researchers have found that supervisor’s organizational prototypicality links to leadership effectiveness (Pierro et al., 2005). It also moderates the relationship between leadership style and leadership effectiveness (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005), and leader-member exchange and affective organizational commitment (Eisenberger et al., 2010). In the eyes of the subordinate, supervisor differs in the degree of similarity to the organization. Subordinates not only see their supervisors as organizational agents, but also as individuals on behalf of their own right. The perception of similarity between the supervisor and the organization affects subordinate’s exchange relationship and identification from the supervisor to the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2010; Sluss et al., 2012).

Organization employs formal mentoring program for the newcomer’s organizational socialization. There is an assumption that mentoring functions provided by the mentors are believed to be carried out on behalf of the organization. Therefore, newcomers form the attitudes and perception to the organization through the lens of mentoring relationship with the mentors who are seen as organizational agents (Chao, 2007). Mentoring literatures support this view. For example, social exchange theory proposes that mentoring functions provided by the mentors are positively related to protégé’s perception of organizational support (Baranik et al., 2010). In contrast, protégé’s psychological contract breach by the mentor results in the perception of psychological contract breach by the organization (Haggard, 2011).
Despite these findings, it is essential to test this assumption. Consistent to the leadership research on supervisor’s organizational prototypicality, I define mentor’s organizational prototypicality as the extent to which the mentor is perceived to be a typical and exemplary representative of the organization. I argue that formal mentor differs in the degree of similarity with the organization in the eyes of protégés. When organizational prototypicality is high, mentor is seen as organizational agent to transmit organization values to protégés and facilitate protégés’ learning and socialization process. In contrast, when organizational prototypicality is low, mentor’s supports to the protégés are more likely to be regarded as mentor’s own behavior. Prototypicality affects the interpretation of organizational support through the lens of formal mentoring, and the attachment to the organization through the organization agent (Sluss et al., 2012). Therefore, I argue that the effect of mentoring function on newcomer’s adjustments (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit) depends on the prototypicality of the mentor.

OBSE reflects the satisfaction of being valued and included by the organizational members (Williams, 2007). It derives from messages sent by the meaningful and significant others at the workplace (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Prototypical organizational agents can be the meaningful and significant others because they represent the organization in the eyes of the newcomers. Therefore, I argue that the prototypicality of the mentor moderates the relationship between mentoring function and OBSE. When the perception of mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high, newcomers tend to see the mentor as a “meaningful and significant other” due to the
similarity between the mentor and the collective organization. In contrast, when the perception of mentor’s organizational prototypicality is low, protégés are difficult to form the perception of being valued and included by the collective organization, because the messages from a non-prototypical organizational member cannot represent other organizational members.

_Hypothesis 6a: Mentor’s organizational prototypicality moderates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by formal mentors and OBSE, such that the relationship is stronger when mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high._

Although the proposition that newcomer’s person-organization fit derives from prototypical organizational members has not been tested yet, researchers argue that the values and behaviors of prototypical organizational member affect the identification process to the organization and the perception of person-organization fit (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; Sluss & Thompson, 2012; Van Vianen et al., 2013). Due to the need for belonging, newcomers are motivated to monitor the work environment to seek information from other organizational members about whether they fit into the organization. Prototypical organizational members, such as supervisors, formal mentors and coworkers, are important sense making resources in the socialization process (Settoon & Adkins, 1997). When formal mentors are perceived to have high level of organizational prototypicality, they are seen as organizational agent. Protégé is more likely to form the perception of
person-organization fit based on the values and attitudes of the formal mentors in the socialization process. In contrast, when formal mentors are perceived to have low level of organizational prototypicality, newcomers will be less likely to adopt mentor’s values as organizational values. In this case newcomers will be more likely to seek information from other sources (e.g. coworkers, supervisors and other organizational members) about information to assess fit or misfit into the organization. As a result, the relationship between mentoring functions and person-organization fit will be weakened when newcomers believe that their mentors are not prototypical organizational members.

Hypothesis 6b: Mentor’s organizational prototypicality moderates the relationship between mentoring functions provided by formal mentors and person-organization fit, such that the relationship is stronger when mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research methods and the detailed information about the samples. First, it introduces the information of research context. Second, this chapter discusses the data collection procedure. A time-lag data collection procedure was used to collect data from the perspectives of both mentors and protégés in the current study. Third, this chapter provides the details of all the measures used in the analysis including independent variables, mediator variables, moderator variable and dependent variables. Finally, it discusses the data analysis technique and briefly explains its appropriateness in the current study.

4.1 Research context

Research on mentoring has mainly focused on the professions or white-collar workers (Lankau, Riordan, & Thomas, 2005; Weinberg & Lankau, 2010). Based on the reasons mentioned in Chapter 1, it is interesting and significant to investigate the effects of mentoring in other occupational groups such as blue-collar workers (Bozionelos & Wang, 2006; Kwan et al., 2011). In addition, given the predominant role of blue-collar workers in Chinese workforce (Editorial Board of the China Commerce Yearbook, 2009), it is also important to access the generality of mentoring
research in China into blue-collar workers. Therefore, to address the aforementioned contributions in Chapter 1, the current study collected data from blue-collar workers in China.

Data were collected from a manufacturing company producing audio equipment in Guangdong Province of China in late 2013. This company has over 1,200 full time employees in Guangdong manufacturing base. Majority of the employees are production line workers. Haggard et al. (2010) indicated that researches use considerable variety of mentoring definitions in the mentoring literature. The inconsistent definition of mentoring would call into question the conclusions from the findings. Therefore, before the data collection, I had short interviews with the general manager and HR director and four protégés to understand the nature of formal mentoring program in this company. The company has a one-year formal mentoring program designed for all the newcomers. After new employees enter into the company, each of them will be assigned as a protégé by the company to one experienced employee (i.e. mentor). The company launched the formal mentoring program two years ago. The purpose of the formal mentoring program is to socialize newcomers and reduce the turnover rate. The rationale for implementing the program is to transfer the job and organizational knowledge to the newcomers, so that the newcomers can better understand their job. In the meanwhile, mentors can provide help and support in protégé’s life after work because most of the mentors and protégés live in the dormitory of the company. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of mentoring provided in Chapter 2 which is an activity that the organization formally assigns a
newcomer to a more experienced or senior organizational members with the purpose of providing support and direction (Day & Allen, 2004; Chun et al., 2012). Normally, the experienced employees, also called mentor, come from the same production department with the new employees. The company believes that mentors and protégés working in the same production department can share expertise and response to both work and non-work related concerns in the organization. Mentors can be either the direct team leader or other senior employees in the production department. It is common for the direct supervisors to be the mentors in the formal mentoring program in China (Wang et al., 2010). All the employees who have over two-year organizational tenure can join the program as mentors. The participation of mentors is on a voluntary basis. But the process of matching the dyadic of mentors and protégés are made by the program coordinators. One mentor can have several protégés, depending on the number of qualified mentors and new employees in the production department. Before protégés are assigned to mentors, HR department will deliver a short seminar to the mentors about the company value and communication skills.

4.2 Data Collection Procedure

Most prior mentoring research is based on protégé’s self-report of both mentoring functions and outcomes (Allen et al., 2008). In order to avoid the common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), I followed prior studies (Chun et al., 2012; Weinberg & Lankau, 2010) to collect data from both
mentors and protégés in different waves. Specifically, mentoring was accessed by mentor’s rating of mentoring functions provided in Time 1. It was employed to predict protégé’s self-report outcomes measured in both Time 1 and Time 2. Table 4 shows the detailed information of data collection sources and schedule. Time 2 protégé’s self-report measures were accessed three weeks later than Time 1 protégé’s measures. The time lag was enough to create temporal separation (Podsakoff et al., 2003), which was applied by prior organizational behavior studies (Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts, 2008; Tsai, Chen, & Liu, 2007).

Samples were selected from the employees who are currently in the formal mentoring program. In order to encourage the participation of the data collection, small gifts were prepared for each protégé who finished the questionnaires every time. Both mentors and protégés who had answered all the questions in the given questionnaires could have opportunities to win more valuable prizes by the lucky draw at Time 2. All the newcomers who were engaged in the formal mentoring program were selected as the potential sample. At Time 1, department of human resource helped to distribute the questionnaires to both newcomers and their mentors. Newcomers were asked to write down their names and ID. Mentors were asked to write down both their protégés’ names and their own names. The respondents were informed by the statements at the beginning of the questionnaires that all the information collected would be kept confidential. After filling in the questionnaires, the respondents returned the questionnaires in the sealed envelopes which were provided by me along with each questionnaire. 342 sets of questionnaires were
distributed to both mentors and protégés. 246 questionnaires for protégés and 241 questionnaires for mentors were returned back, representing the response rates of 72% and 70%, respectively. At Time 2, similar to the procedure of Time 1, the second sets of questionnaires were sent to the protégés who have returned their questionnaires at Time 1. Finally, 209 questionnaires for protégés were returned back, representing the response rates of 85%. After deleting some questionnaires due to the missing values of key variables, 203 paired samples (including 203 protégés and 114 mentors) were included in the final sample. I tested for nonresponse bias by comparing the demographic information between the final sample and those who did not participate at Time 2, as well as between the final sample and those were excluded due to the missing values of key variables. Specifically, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on protégé’s age (response versus nonresponse: F=0.82 n.s.; completed versus dropped: F=0.01 n.s.), gender (response versus nonresponse: F=0.18 n.s.; completed versus dropped: F=0.02 n.s.), educational level (response versus nonresponse: F=0.02 n.s.; completed versus dropped: F=2.02 n.s.), organizational tenure (response versus nonresponse: F=0.07 n.s.; completed versus dropped: F=0.80 n.s.). The results showed that no significant difference between the response and nonresponse, and the completed questionnaires and the dropped questionnaires.

Of these respondents, 141 protégés were male (69.5%) and 62 protégés were female (30.5%). The average age of protégés was 25.8 years old. 123 protégés (60.6%) had secondary school or lower education level, 56 protégés (27.6%) had high school education level and 24 protégés (11.8%) had college or higher education level. The
average organizational tenure of protégés was 4.63 months. 110 protégés (54.2%) indicated that their mentors were their direct supervisors. Of the 114 mentors, the average age of mentors was 30.0 years old. 76 mentors were male (66.7%) and 38 mentors were female (33.3%). 54 mentors (44.7%) had secondary school or lower education level, 45 mentors (39.5%) had high school education level and 15 mentors (11.4%) had college or higher education level. The average organizational tenure of mentors was 3.5 years.

One may argue that the average tenure of newcomers was 4.63 months, which was too small to see the change of newcomers in the socialization process. However, the job nature of the blue-collar workers in this company were more routine and simple than other white-collar workers. Therefore, the participants in this study may have shorter learning and assimilation curve in the organization socialization, which may support short socialization period. In addition, previous researchers have also indicated that short socialization period (e.g. 4 months) is enough for socialization outcomes (Saks, Gruman, & Cooper-Thomas, 2011).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Scale source</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring functions</td>
<td>Scandura and Ragins (1993)’s 15-item scale</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person–organization</td>
<td>Cable and DeRue (2002)’s 3-item scale</td>
<td>Protégé’s self-report</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit</td>
<td>Pierce and co-authors (1989)’s 10-item scale</td>
<td>Protégé’s self-report</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Hirst, Van Dick and van Knippenberg (2009)’s 5-item</td>
<td>Protégé’s self-report</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based self-esteem</td>
<td>scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OBSE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3-item scale from Michigan Organizational Assessment</td>
<td>Protégé’s self-report</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins &amp; Klesh, 1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Lee and Allen (2002)’s 16-item scale</td>
<td>Protégé’s self-report</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OCB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Time 2 was measured three weeks after Time 1.*
4.3 Measures

All the measures for both mentors and protégés used in the current study were employed from the established scale. Unless otherwise stated, respondents answered all the measures based on five-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. Since data were collected in China and all the measures in the current study were originally developed and validated in English, a back-translation procedure was applied to translate the measures from English to Chinese (Brislin, 1980). First, measures were translated into Chinese, and another bilingual management scholar translated the measures back into English. Second, the back-translated English measures were compared with the original English measure to make sure that no important keywords were missing during the translation. Before I distributed the questionnaires, the human resource manager of the target company was invited to review the measures to make sure that the questions were appropriate for the respondents. Appendix B shows the measures used in the current study.

4.3.1 Independent Variable

Mentoring function was measured by Scandura and Ragins (1993)’s 15-item scale, adapted from Scandura (1992)’s Mentorship Scale. Researchers use different scales to measure mentoring function. The measurements which are often used include the 18-item scale developed by Dreher and Ash (1990), the 17-item scale by...
Noe (1988), the 33-item scale by Ragins and McFarlin (1990), and the 15-item scale used by Scandura and Ragins (1993). In this study, I used Scandura and Ragins (1993)’s scale because recent meta-analysis has found that this scale is more strongly related to protégé outcomes than other mentoring measures (Kirkpatrick-Husk, Weaver & Kendall, 2014). Previous literatures have demonstrated satisfactory levels of reliability and validity for the three-factor structure of this scale (Scandura & Ragins, 1993; Scandura & Williams, 2001). It has been widely used to measure mentoring functions in the context of formal mentoring by various studies (Allen et al., 2006b; Wang et al., 2010; Weinberg & Lankau, 2010). Following previous study (Chun et al., 2012), I worded the questions to ask mentors about their mentoring function provided to the protégés. Six items measured career support, five items measured psychosocial support and four items measured role modeling. Sample items include “I take a personal interest in his/her career/job” (career function); “My protégé shares personal problems with me” (psychosocial function); and “My protégé respects my knowledge of the profession” (role modeling). The scale showed an acceptable reliability in the current study (α=0.90). A second-order confirmative factor analysis (CFA) produced satisfactory fit indices ($\chi^2[87] = 212.45$, $p \leq .001$; RMSEA= 0.08, CFI =0.96, TLI = 0.95), which demonstrated that the distinct three factors would also collectively reflect an overall construct.
4.3.2 Mediators

Protégé’s organization-based self-esteem was measured by Pierce et al (1989)’s 10-item scale. This scale was developed and validated by Pierce et al (1989), and has been previously used in Chinese context (Chen & Aryee, 2007; Liu et al., 2013b). Sample items include “I count around here”, “I am taken seriously around here” and “I am important around here”. Cronbach’s alpha of this measure was 0.84.

Protégé’s person-organization fit was measured by Cable and DeRue (2002)’s 3-item scale. I followed previous research and measured person-organization fit as value congruence between employee and organization (Chatman, 1989; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Sample item includes “The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organization values”. Cronbach’s alpha of this measure was 0.79.

4.3.3 Moderators

Mentor’s organizational prototypicality was measured by Hirst, Van Dick and van Knippenberg (2009)’s 5-item scale, which was adapted from the previous works on leader’s prototypicality (Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Previous research has used this scale to measure leader’s group prototypicality (Cicero, Pierro, & van Knippenberg, 2007; Hirst, 2009) and leader’s organizational prototypicality (Koivisto, Lipponen, & Platow, 2013). In the current study, I worded the questions to ask the protégés about their mentor’s
organizational prototypicality. Cronbach’s alpha of this measure was 0.81.

4.3.4 Dependent Variables

Affective organizational commitment was measured by Allen and Meyer (1990)’s affective commitment scale. This measure has eight items. A sample item includes “This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me”. Cronbach’s alpha of this measure was 0.84.

Job satisfaction was measured by a 3-item scale from Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983). A sample item includes “In general, I don’t like my job”. Cronbach’s alpha of this measure was 0.87.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was measured by Lee and Allen (2002)’s 16-item scale. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they engaged in these behaviors by the use of 5-point scales (1 = never, 5 = always). Sample items include “I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time off” and “I keep up with developments in the organization”. Cronbach’s alpha of this measure was 0.94.

4.3.5 Control Variables

Prior studies on formal mentoring (Chun et al., 2012; Wanberg et al., 2003) have
identified several potential confounders that should be considered in the mentoring study. Following their research, I considered protégé’s age, gender, education level, organizational tenure and supervisory status as potential control variables in the current study. Respondents were asked to write down their actual age. Gender was measured by “1 = male” and “2 = female”. Education level was measured by “1 = primary school or below”, “2 = secondary school”, “3 = high school”, “4 = associate degree or professional diploma” and “5 = university degree or above”. Organizational tenure was measured by asking the respondents to indicate the time they had worked for the current organization. Supervisory status was measured by asking the respondents whether their mentors were direct supervisor. It was indicated by “1 = yes” and “2 = no”. Gender composition between protégés and mentors were coded by “1 = same gender” and “2 = different gender”. It is noted that non-significant control variables will reduce the statistical power of the structural equation modeling (Becker, 2005). Therefore, following previous studies (Sluss et al., 2012; Wu, Tsui, & Kinicki, 2010), I will only control the significant variables on the particular endogenous variables in the research model.

4.3 Data Analysis Technique

I will test the hypotheses mentioned in Chapter 3 by the following steps. First, I will conduct confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to check both the convergent and discriminant validity of the measurement model. Second, a serious of tests will be
conducted to provide additional information of the sample, including means, standard deviations and correlations. Third, I will use structural equation modeling (SEM) the hypotheses in the research model.

Two methodological approaches have been widely used to test mediation effects in the management and organizational behavior research literature (James, Mulaik, & Brett, 2006; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Mayer, 2005). The two approaches are Baron and Kenny (1986)’s four-step mediation test and James and Brett (1984)’s structural equation modeling (SEM). In the following section, I will briefly discuss the reasons of using SEM in the current study.

Structure equation modeling (SEM) examines the structure of interrelationships among different variables (Hair, Tatham, Anderson, & Black, 2006). When researchers test the mediation effects by multiple regressions, the independent variable in one regression equation can be the dependent variable in another regression equation. For example, the role of the mediator variable at the step 2 of Baron and Kenny (1986)’s method is the dependent variable. Meanwhile, the role of the mediator variable at the step 3 is the independent variable. One major advantage of SEM is that SEM allows for all of the relationships among different variables in the model to be estimated simultaneously (Hair et al., 2006). The current research model contains one moderation variable and two mediation variables, which too complicated to use hierarchical linear regression. Therefore, it is more appropriate to use SEM to test the model simultaneously. According to James et al. (2006), mediation effects can be supported when all parameter estimates in the hypothesized model are significant,
and the overall model has an acceptable goodness-of-fit. The full and partial mediation can be determined by the comparison of two mediation models by examining the significance of chi-square change.

Bootstrapping is considered as a more effective way to confirm mediation effect compared with other methods (Hayes, 2009). Although some researchers suggest the Sobel (1982) test to check the indirect effect between the independent variable and the dependent variable via the mediator, the Sobel test is not appropriate in the current study for several reasons based on the review by Preacher and Hayes (2008) and Hayes (2009): (1) it requires the assumption of normal sampling distribution of the indirect effect. Therefore, it is more appropriate in large samples; (2) the current research model contains two mediators. Examining the total indirect effects between the independent variable to the dependent variable via two mediators by the Sobel test is questionable. Bootstrapping is a process that resamples from the original samples to obtain a larger sample size (Hayes, 2009). It makes no assumption that the samples are normally distributed, which is suggested and applied by various researchers for mediation test following SEM approach (e.g. de Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyens, 2011; Dong, Seo, & Bartol, 2013). Therefore, I will first use SEM approach to test the two mediators (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit). Then, I will conduct bootstrapping to investigate the total indirect effect and each individual indirect effect in a single multiple mediation model. This step can help to confirm the total indirect effect as well as the specific indirect effect conditional on the inclusion of the other mediator (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Bias Corrected Confidence Intervals (BC CI) will be used
to determine the significance of the indirect effects, which is superior to the product-of-coefficients strategy in terms of statistical power and Type I error rates (Williams & MacKinnon, 2008).
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis from the empirical study. It is organized into four sections. The first section presents the results of confirmatory factor analysis to show the validation of the measured variables. The second section shows the results of the means, standard deviation and correlations the variables. The third section presents the results of hypothesis testing. As mentioned in the last chapter, there are two steps for the hypothesis testing. SEM will be used to test the ten hypotheses. Then, the six mediation hypotheses will be confirmed by the bootstrapping method.

5.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Since the measurements in the current study were adopted from different studies in the literatures, I conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in structure equation modeling (SEM) to check both the convergent and discriminant validity of the measurement model. Bentler and Chou (1987) indicate that the sample-to-parameters ratio for SEM should be between 5:1 and 10:1. However, the sample-to-parameters ratio of this study is out of this range. Therefore, I followed the previous literature (Landis, Beal, & Tesluk, 2000) to parcel the items of each construct which contains over five items. This partial disaggregation technique (Bagozzi & Edwards, 1998)
reduces the total number of parameters to be estimated in the measurement model, and thus it is more suitable for the study with small sample size. It is superior to other parceling strategies in terms of the better representation of the true factor structure, the likelihood of biased estimates of parameters and the inflation of fit indices (Eisenberger et al., 2010; Hall, Snell, & Foust, 1999). Specifically, I applied the parceling strategy on the constructs containing over five items, including mentoring functions, OBSE, affective organizational commitment and OCB. I created three subsets of items for the mentoring functions and two subsets for organizational citizenship behavior by parceling the items to each dimension (i.e. career function, psychosocial function and role modeling for mentoring functions, and OCBO and OCBI for OCB). The two constructs were represented by three indicators and two indicators respectively. I also created five subsets of items for OBSE and four subsets for affective organizational commitment. The procedure of parceling was followed the recommendation by Little, Cunningham, and Shahar (2002). The item of the highest loading was combined with the item of the lowest loading to create the first parcel. Then, the item of the second highest loading was combined with the item of the second lowest loading to create the second parcel, and so on. The further SEM test was also based on these parcelled constructs.

A series of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were conducted to check the convergent and discriminant validity of the measured variables. Convergent validity examines the extent to which indicators of a specific construct share a high proportion of variance in common, while discriminant validity examines the extent to which a
construct is distinct from others (Hair et al., 2006). The model fit was accessed by the overall model’s chi-square, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) (Browne, Cudeck, & Bollen, 1993), comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973). First, I examined the seven-factor model including the variables of mentoring function, organizational prototypicality, OBSE, person-organization fit, affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and OCB. This model fitted the data well ($\chi^2(254) = 379.99, p < 0.01; \text{CFI} = 0.97; \text{TLI} = 0.96; \text{RMSEA} = 0.050$) and all the factor loadings were significant. Therefore, the convergent validity was supported.

Since all the measured variables were rated by the protégés, except for the mentoring function which was rated by the mentor, I conducted a series of alternative CFA models and compared them with the baseline model. The model comparison results were accessed by the change of chi-square test. The results showed in Table 5 revealed that the baseline model (seven-factor model) was better than any other alternative models. Hence, both convergent and discriminant validity demonstrated the distinctiveness of the seven variables in the current study. Given the results, all the variables were used in the subsequent analysis.
Table 5. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven-factor model</td>
<td>379.99</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six-factor models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit and OBSE combined</td>
<td>648.57</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>268.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality and PO fit combined</td>
<td>545.60</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>165.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality and OBSE combined</td>
<td>771.18</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>391.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction and Affective organizational commitment combined</td>
<td>559.14</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction and OCB combined</td>
<td>519.39</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>139.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective organizational commitment and Job satisfaction combined</td>
<td>507.76</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor Model</td>
<td>2030.09</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1650.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *$p<0.05$; **$p<0.01$.  
TLI is Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI is the comparative fit index; and RMSEA is the root-mean-square error of approximation.
5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 6 shows the means, standard deviation and zero-order Pearson correlations of the variables used in the analysis. As expected, mentoring function was positively correlated to OBSE ($r = .15$, $p \leq .05$) and person-organization fit ($r = .32$, $p \leq .01$). OBSE was positively correlated to affective organizational commitment ($r = .25$, $p \leq .01$), job satisfaction ($r = .26$, $p \leq .01$) and OCB ($r = .17$, $p \leq .05$). Person-organization fit was also positively correlated to affective organizational commitment ($r = .27$, $p \leq .01$), job satisfaction ($r = .28$, $p \leq .01$) and OCB ($r = .32$, $p \leq .01$). In addition, some control variables were found to be significantly correlated to the measured variables. For example, protégé’ age was positively correlated to person-organization fit ($r = .23$, $p \leq .01$), affective organizational commitment ($r = .18$, $p \leq .05$), job satisfaction ($r = .21$, $p \leq .01$) and OCB ($r = .14$, $p \leq .05$). Protégé’s gender was negatively correlated affective organizational commitment ($r = -.17$, $p \leq .05$) and OCB ($r = -.19$, $p \leq .01$). Protégé’s education was positively correlated to OBSE ($r = .15$, $p \leq .05$). Supervisory status was negatively correlated to OCB ($r = -.14$, $p \leq .05$) and gender composition was negatively correlated to OBSE ($r = -.16$, $p \leq .05$). The results of Pearson correlations were in line with the predictions. In the next section, I used SEM approach and bootstrapping to further test the hypothesized relationships.
### Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tenure</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisory status</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender composition</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mentoring</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prototypicality</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OBSE</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PO fit</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Org commitment</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. OCB</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N=203. Values in parentheses along the diagonal represent the reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for the scale.
5.3 Hypothesis Testing

5.3.1 Design Effect

In the current study, mentoring function provided was rated by 114 mentors. It was possible that one mentor rated the variable of mentoring function for more than one protégé, which would cause a nested effect. That is, one mentor’s rating of mentoring function to one protégé may influence his or her rating to another protégé. Therefore, following the previous studies (Wei, Chiang, & Wu, 2012; Xu, Huang, Lam, & Miao, 2012), I calculated the design effect to see whether the data needed to aggregate into group level. The design effect is superior to ICC(1) in terms of checking the nested effect because ICC(1) is very sensitive to the average group size (Kaiser, Woodruff, Bilukha, Spiegel, & Salama, 2006).

The results indicated that the design effect was 1.49 for mentoring function, which was below the conventional cutoff value of 2 (Kaiser et al., 2006). In other words, mentor’s rating was relatively independent and not significantly influenced the results of the study. Therefore, the results of design effects supported to use SEM to analyze data at the individual level.

5.3.2 Structural Equation Modeling

Since the model of this study included both mediation and moderation effects, I followed the approach came from Mathieu, Tannenbaum, and Salas (1992) to create
the interaction term. The variables of mentoring function and organizational prototypicality were centered to create the interaction term because this could help to prevent multicollinearity. Following the suggestions by Mathieu et al. (1992) and Cortina, Chen, and Dunlap (2001), I set the error and measurement path of the interaction term by the following formula:

\[ \lambda = \sqrt{\alpha} \]

\[ \sigma^2 = 1 \times (1 - \alpha) \]

\[ \alpha = (\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 + r^2)/(1 + r^2) \]

Notes: \( \lambda \) is the value for the path from the latent construct to its indicator; \( \sqrt{\alpha} \) means the square roots of the reliabilities of the variables; \( r \) means the correlation between the components of the interaction term.

5.3.3 The Main Effects and the Mediation Effects

The results (see Table 7) indicated that the hypothesized mediation model fitted the data well \( (\chi^2(257) = 461.67, p < 0.01; CFI = 0.93; TLI = 0.92; RMSEA = 0.063) \). The results (see Figure 2) also showed that mentoring function was significantly related to OBSE (\( \beta = .19, p \leq .05 \)) and person-organization fit (\( \beta = .38, p \leq .01 \)), which supported Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2. In addition, OBSE was positively related to affective organizational commitment (\( \beta = .26, p \leq .01 \)) and job satisfaction (\( \beta = .27, p \leq .01 \)), but was not significantly related to OCB (\( \beta = .10, n.s. \)). Person-organization fit was significantly related to affective organizational commitment (\( \beta = .33, p \leq .01 \), job
satisfaction ($\beta = .29, p \leq .01$) and OCB ($\beta = .40, p \leq .01$). In order to test the partial and full mediation effects, three alternative models were conducted by linking mentoring function and three protégé’s outcomes. The results of the change of chi-square test indicated that three alternative models were not significantly improved and all the three additional paths were not significant, which supported the full mediation models. In addition, I conducted another two alternative models by linking OBSE and person-organization fit as a process model instead of the two-mediator structure. The results revealed that the hypothesized mediation model (two-mediator structure) was better than any of these two alternative models. Therefore, the above results supported Hypothesis 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b and 5b, but not supported Hypothesis 5a due to the insignificant relationship between OBSE and OCB.

To further support for the hypotheses, I bootstrapped with 1000 samples to construct bias-corrected confidence intervals for the significant tests of the indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Results in Table 8 showed that the indirect effect of OBSE, person-organization fit and the total indirect effect for affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction were significant at 95% confidence intervals (confidence intervals exclude zero). The indirect effect of person-organization fit and the total effect for OCB were also significant at 95% confidence intervals (confidence intervals exclude zero). But the indirect effect of OBSE for OCB was insignificant at 95% confidence intervals (confidence intervals include zero). The above bootstrapping results provided further support to Hypothesis 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b and 5b.
Notes: N = 203; This is a simplified version of the actual model. It does not show indicators, error terms, exogenous factor variances, and correlations between exogenous factors. Control variables and their paths are not shown for the sake of clarity; *p<0.05; **p<0.01.
Table 7. Results of Model Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized mediation model</td>
<td>461.67</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial mediation models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adding Mentoring to organizational commitment</em></td>
<td>459.51</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.16 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adding Mentoring to job satisfaction</em></td>
<td>459.27</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.40 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adding Mentoring to OCB</em></td>
<td>461.28</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.39 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mentoring $\rightarrow$ OBSE $\rightarrow$ PO fit</em></td>
<td>487.01</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mentoring $\rightarrow$ PO fit $\rightarrow$ OBSE</em></td>
<td>471.91</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized moderation model</td>
<td>391.76</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-69.91**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 203; *p<0.05; **p<0.01.

TLI is Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI is the comparative fit index; and RMSEA is the root-mean-square error of approximation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Percentile 95% CI</th>
<th>BC 95% CI</th>
<th>BCa 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.006, 0.071</td>
<td>0.003, 0.077</td>
<td>0.003, 0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.017, 0.148</td>
<td>0.022, 0.161</td>
<td>0.022, 0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.037, 0.187</td>
<td>0.040, 0.191</td>
<td>0.040, 0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.003, 0.095</td>
<td>0.005, 0.099</td>
<td>0.006, 0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.004, 0.166</td>
<td>0.009, 0.173</td>
<td>0.009, 0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.031, 0.207</td>
<td>0.031, 0.209</td>
<td>0.032, 0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.119, 0.066</td>
<td>-0.008, 0.080</td>
<td>-0.008, 0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.064, 0.264</td>
<td>0.072, 0.278</td>
<td>0.076, 0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.077, 0.282</td>
<td>0.087, 0.292</td>
<td>0.090, 0.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: BC=bias corrected; BCa=bias corrected and accelerated; 1,000 bootstrap samples.
5.3.4 The Moderation Effects

Results on Table 7 showed that the hypothesized moderation model fitted the data well ($\chi^2(253) = 391.76, p < 0.01; \text{CFI} = 0.96; \text{TLI} = 0.94; \text{RMSEA} = 0.052$). In addition, the relationship between the interaction term on OBSE ($\beta = .19, p \leq .05$) and person-organization fit ($\beta = .19, p \leq .05$) were significant, supporting Hypothesis 6a and 6b. Then I plotted the interactions on Figure 4 and Figure 5 with the values of the moderator plus and minus one standard deviation from the means (Aiken & West, 1991). Figure 4 showed that the relationship between mentoring function and OBSE was significant ($\beta = .28, p \leq .01$) when mentor’s organizational prototypicality was high, but was not significant ($\beta = -.10, \text{n.s.}$) when mentor’s organizational prototypicality was low. Similarly, Figure 5 showed that the relationship between mentoring function and person-organization fit was significant ($\beta = .63, p \leq .01$) when mentor’s organizational prototypicality was high, but was not significant when mentor’s organizational prototypicality was low ($\beta = .09, \text{n.s.}$). The above results further supported Hypothesis 6a and 6b. The summary of the findings were shown on Table 9.
Figure 3. SEM Results of Moderation Test

Notes: N = 203; This is a simplified version of the actual model. It does not show indicators, error terms, exogenous factor variances, and correlations between exogenous factors. Control variables and their paths are not shown for the sake of clarity; *p<0.05; **p<0.01.
Figure 4. The Moderation Effect of Mentor’s Organizational Prototypicality on the Relationship between Mentoring Function and OBSE

Figure 5. The Moderation Effect of Mentor’s Organizational Prototypicality on the Relationship between Mentoring Function and Person-Organization Fit
Table 9. Summary of the Data Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Mentoring → OBSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Mentoring → PO fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a</td>
<td>Mentoring → OBSE → Org commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b</td>
<td>Mentoring → PO fit → Org commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4a</td>
<td>Mentoring → OBSE → Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4b</td>
<td>Mentoring → PO fit → Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5a</td>
<td>Mentoring → OBSE → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5b</td>
<td>Mentoring → PO fit → OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6a</td>
<td>Prototypicality moderates Mentoring → OBSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6b</td>
<td>Prototypicality moderates Mentoring → PO fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter offers the discussion and conclusion of the study. Specifically, it will first discuss the results from the empirical study. Second, both theoretical and practical implications will be discussed to point out the contributions of this study. Third, this chapter will present both strengths and limitations of this study. Suggestions for future research will be discussed based on the limitations. Finally, a conclusion will be made to summarize the findings of this study.

6.1 Review of the Research Findings

6.1.1 The Main Effects of Formal Mentoring on Psychological Adjustment

The results supported the first two hypotheses linking formal mentoring to protégé’s psychological adjustment. Specifically, first, mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors positively affected protégé’s OBSE. This finding is consistent with previous studies linking supervisory mentoring and OBSE (Sun et al., 2014). Second, the results indicated that mentoring functions positively affected protégé’s perception of person-organization fit in the in newcomer’s organizational socialization. Although no previous study has empirically tested this relationship, the finding is consistent with the research findings of socialization tactics from socialization
literature. For example, researchers found that institutionalized tactics were positively related to newcomer’s perception of person-organization fit (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Kim et al., 2005). Institutionalized tactics refer to a structured and systematic program of socialization that reduces newcomer’s stress and ambiguity and encourages them to accept the organizational values and norms (Cable & Parsons, 2001). Formal mentoring program is seen as a form of institutionalized socialization tactics because it is intervened by the organization to provide newcomers systematic guidance to be the organizational members in the socialization process. The significant relationship between mentoring functions provided by the formal mentors and newcomer’s perception of person-organization fit supports the proposition that newcomers tend to accept and conform to the organizational values when an organization provides planned and systematic socialization tactics (Cable & Parsons, 2001).

6.1.2 The Mediating Effects of OBSE and Person-Organization Fit

Hypothesis 3, 4 and 5 proposed that protégé’s OBSE and person-organization fit mediated the relationship between mentoring function and three socialization outcomes. The two-mediator structure was tested and confirmed by the SEM and Preacher and Hayes (2008)’s bootstrapping method. First, the results supported Hypothesis 3a and 3b that OBSE and person-organization fit mediated the relationship between mentoring function and affective organizational commitment. The results of the SEM suggested the full mediation model that mentoring function
indirectly affected protégé’s affective organizational commitment through OBSE and person-organization fit. Significant results of bootstrapping indicated that both mediators (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit) explained unique variance between mentoring function and affective organizational commitment. Second, similar to the results of Hypothesis 3, Hypothesis 4a and 4b were supported. Specifically, OBSE and person-organization fit fully mediated the relationship between mentoring function and job satisfaction, suggesting that mentoring function indirectly affected job satisfaction through these two mediators. These findings are in line with the previous studies which indicate that fulfilling sense of belongingness is an important source of organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Mathieu, 1991; Winter-Collins & McDaniel, 2000).

The results also indicated that person-organization fit fully mediated the relationship between mentoring function and OCB, supporting Hypothesis 5a. This finding is consistent with previous studies on the relationship between person-organization fit and OCB (Chen & Chiu, 2008; Shin & Choi, 2010). It also supports the findings from previous studies suggesting that fulfilling need for belonging is a motivation to engage in helping and citizenship behaviors (Den Hartog et al., 2007; Kidwell, Mossholder, & Bennett, 1997). However, Hypothesis 5b was not supported due to the insignificant relationship between OBSE and OCB, which was not in line with my prediction. At first glance, this result was in contradiction with the findings in the previous studies that have found the significant relationship between OBSE and OCB (Chattopadhyay, 1999; Lee, 2003; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).
Specifically, the results indicated that when OBSE and person-organization fit were tested simultaneously, person-organization fit mediated the relationship between mentoring function and OCB, but OBSE did not. One possible explanation is that previous studies only focused on one factor (OBSE or person-organization fit), giving less attention to compare the impacts of the two. This study tested the mediating effects of OBSE and person-organization fit simultaneously. When both OBSE and person-organization fit were included in the research model, the relationship between OBSE and OCB became non-significant. However, when I re-analyzed the model again by removing the variable of person-organization fit, OBSE became significantly related to OCB. Bootstrapping results showed that OBSE significantly mediated the relationship between mentoring function and OCB (BC CI ranged from 0.002 to 0.096 excluding zero) when person-organization fit was omitted. This result suggested that person-organization fit is more influential to explain the effect of mentoring function on newcomer’s OCB. Another explanation is that newcomers with low OBSE, indicating they currently have low level of social acceptance, will still work harder to help others because they want to seek for social acceptance by other organizational members in the future. The findings by DeWall, Baumeister, and Vohs (2008) have supported this argument. Through a series of experiments, they found that people with thwarted belongingness were motivated to work harder and perform better on the next task when the next task is helpful to recover the feeling of social acceptance. If this is the case, OBSE is less important to predict OCB of newcomers. The results of this study suggested that newcomers with low OBSE may still report high OCB when
person-organization fit of newcomers are high. However, this idea is speculation because it is based on the pattern of the findings. Future research is needed test this idea.

6.1.3 The Moderating Effects of Mentor’s Organizational Prototypicality

The results supported Hypothesis 6a and 6b, suggesting that mentor’s organizational prototypicality moderated the relationship between mentoring function and the two mediator variables. Specifically, when mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high, which represents that mentors share similar characteristics with the organization in the eyes of the protégés, the effect of mentoring function on OBSE and person-organization fit will be stronger than the effect when mentor’s organizational prototypicality is low. Although no previous study has investigated the role of mentor’s organizational prototypicality in literature, studies in the leadership literature provide some evidences. For example, Eisenberger et al. (2010) found that when leader shared characteristics with the organization in the eyes of the followers, the relationship between leader-member exchange and affective organizational commitment was stronger. Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, and Zagenczyk (2013) also found that when followers perceived to be abused by such leader, they would attribute this mistreatment to the negative evaluation by the organization. Sluss et al. (2012) demonstrated that leader’s organizational prototypicality moderated the relationship between relational identification and organizational identification. Therefore, the
findings of these two hypotheses are consistent with the previous studies examining the role of organizational prototypicality on how the relationship with the organizational agents influences the attitudes to the organization.

6.2 Theoretical Implications

This study makes three distinctive contributions to the literature. First, it extends the belongingness theory to explain how mentoring function affects socialization outcomes of newcomers through assimilation process. Specifically, this study investigated the underlying mechanism of mentoring function by proposing two mediators (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit). According to the belongingness theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), newcomers are motivated to monitor the work environment for cues about their social acceptance by other organizational members and value congruence with the organization. The results indicated that fulfilling the sense of belongingness from the supports of formal mentors enhanced protégé’s OBSE and person-organization fit leading to positive socialization outcomes. Previous studies on the mediation effects of mentoring mainly focused on the learning process (Liu & Fu, 2011; Pan, Sun & Chow, 2011; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Kwan et al., 2010). This study contributes to the mentoring literature by proposing an alternative insight on how mentoring function affect socialization outcomes of newcomers through assimilation process. It also responded to the call for more research on the mechanism which can reveal the “black box” of mentoring (Chandler,
Second, this study provides empirical evidence on the relationship between mentoring function and person-organization fit. Previous researcher proposed that socialization program such as formal training and formal mentoring might be related to newcomer’s person-organization fit (Ostroff, 2012). However, no previous research has empirically tested this relationship. Therefore, this study contributes to the socialization and person-organizational fit literature by empirically testing this relationship during early socialization stage of newcomers.

Third, leadership studies have mentioned the importance of leader’s organizational prototypicality in the process when subordinates transfer the positive attitudes from the leader to the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2010; Shoss et al., 2013; Sluss et al., 2012). This is the first study to examine the role of mentor’s organizational prototypicality in the mentoring-socialization link, which extends our knowledge about the role of mentor’s characteristic in the organizational socialization of newcomers. This study shows similar findings that when mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high, support from formal mentors is more likely to lead protégés to form positive attitude and judgment to the organization, such as feeling of social acceptance and value congruence with the organization. The findings of this study also responses to the call for considering “mentor’s shared identity with the organization” in the mentoring process (Hu, Wang, Yang, & Wu, 2014).

Fourth, this study extends our understanding on how blue-collar workers react to the formal mentoring program in the organizational socialization. The jobs of
blue-collar workers have traditionally seen as “largely routine and repetitive” (Halle, 1984, p. 105). Both academic scholars and practitioners have paid increasing attention on this type of work force from different perspectives (e.g. Iverson & Roy, 1994; Huang, 2011; Lucas, 2011). One of these perspectives is how blue-collar workers are assimilated into the organization in the socialization process, because one of the key work motivations for blue-collar workers is the acceptance of organizational norms, values and practices (Burawoy, 1979; Gibson & Papa, 2000). Therefore, the findings of this study contribute to the socialization literature by demonstrating how blue-collar workers react to the formal socialization program (i.e. formal mentoring). This study also responses to the call for investigating the effect of mentoring in different occupations (Bozionelos & Wang, 2006).

6.3 Practical Implications

The findings of this study provide several practical implications for human resources managers to design and implement the formal mentoring program. First, this study provides evidence that formal mentoring program works on the blue-collar workers in a manufacturing company in China. It is also noted that the mean value and the median value of protégé’s age in the sample are 25.8 and 23.0 respectively. Therefore, almost half of the respondents were post-90s young workers. Given that manufacturing industry in China suffers large turnover rate, especially for the post-90s young workers (Li & Lu, 2014), managers may implement the effective
formal mentoring program because formal mentors can help protégé increase OBSE and person-organization fit, leading to both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Employee’s turnover intention can be reduced when the employee perceives high organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Second, the results indicate that formal mentoring can affect protégé’s OBSE and person-organization fit, leading to both attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Therefore, managers may carefully monitor the quality of mentoring relationship to ensure that formal mentors provide effective and appropriate support to the protégés. If formal mentors do not provide high quality support to the protégés, protégé’s may not only have negative self-evaluation as an effective organizational member and perceive person-organization misfit, but also may suffer from the negative experience. Recent mentoring scholars have shifted the research interest from positive mentoring experience to negative mentoring experience (Eby, Butts, Lockwood, & Simon, 2004; Eby et al., 2008b). Formal mentoring relationship, which is formed and intervened by the organization, is more likely to involve negative mentoring experience than informal mentoring due to the mismatch of the dyadic and lack of mentor’s expertise (Eby et al., 2004). Since negative mentoring experience can lead to protégé’s depressed mood and psychological job withdrawal (Eby et al., 2004), it is essential for managers to ensure the supports from the formal mentors are effective.

Third, the significant effects of OBSE and person-organization fit on both attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, except for the insignificant effect of OBSE on OCB, suggest that fulfilling employee’s belongingness needs is an important source of
positive attitudes and behaviors. Managers may consider ways to enhance employee’s perception of social acceptance and value congruence with the organization. On the other hand, managers may promote organizational values and encourage the employees to accept the values. Recruiting people who have similar value to the organization may also help because employee’s value congruence with the organization directly affects the attitudes and behaviors.

Fourth, the moderating effect of mentor’s organizational prototypicality provides the implication for managers to select the appropriate mentor. Since the mentor and the protégé from a formal mentoring relationship are often matched by the organization, mentor’s and protégé’s common characteristics such as similarity and congruence on motivational orientations have been examined in the previous studies (Hirschfeld, Thomas, & Lankau, 2006; Lankau et al., 2005). This study provides an additional boundary condition that mentor’s organizational prototypicality can influence the effectiveness of mentoring process. Managers are suggested to not only consider the common characteristics in the matching process, but also to consider the prototypicality of the mentor. The findings of the study help managers select appropriate mentors for the formal mentoring program. In addition, managers may suggest the formal mentors to show their prototypicality to the protégés which may also enhance the effectiveness of the formal mentoring. One possible way is to encourage the formal mentors to express their favorable attitudes toward the organization in the mentoring process (Eisenberger et al., 2010).

Finally, the results of this study demonstrated the significant effect of mentoring
function on the socialization outcomes of newcomers. Researchers have indicated that
formal mentoring is one of the human resource development (HRD) practice in the
organization (Marchington & Wilkinson, 2008). HR professionals play an important
role to provide information and develop a successful mentoring program (Hirschfeld
et al., 2006). Therefore, the findings of this study provide implication for HR
professions to include formal mentoring program in the HR and socialization system
of the organization.

6.4 Strengths of the Research

This study has several strengths. First, it is theory driven. Drawing on the
belongingness theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), this study examines both the
mediation and moderation effects in the mentoring process and responses to the calls
by various mentoring scholars to advance the explanatory theory of mentoring
(Bozeman & Feeney, 2007; Chandler et al., 2011).

Second, this study collected data from both mentors and protégés perspectives.
The lack of dyadic data from both sources in the mentoring literature has been
criticized by various mentoring scholars (Allen et al., 2008; Eby, Lockwood, & Butts,
2006). The data collection method used in the current study can help to reduce the
common method bias and strengthen the causal relationships in the model (Cook,
Campbell, & Day, 1979; Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Third, in addition to collecting the data from dyadic sources, this study also
collected data from protégé’s perspectives in two waves. The design of the data collection procedure can further reduce the possibility of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Fourth, the sample size in the study is large (N=203) comparing to other empirical studies on formal mentoring (see the summary in Appendix A). The large sample size obtains higher statistical power for testing the interaction effects in SEM, since interaction effect is often hard to detect in small sample size (Champoux & Peters, 1987; McClelland & Judd, 1993).

Fifth, this study used SEM to test the model of two mediators, and then used the bootstrapping method suggested by Preacher and Hayes (2008) to confirm the structural model of the two mediators. To be specific, Preacher and Hayes’s (2008) model can help to confirm the indirect effects of one mediator after controlling the effect of the other mediator. This approach has been widely accepted to test mediation effects with multiple mediators, which is superior to the method only using regression or SEM (Christian & Ellis, 2011; Dong et al., 2013).

6.5 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

In spite of the strengths mentioned above, this study still has several limitations deserving to specifically mention. First, although I collected data to measure the two mediator variables (i.e. OBSE and person-organization fit) and the three outcome variables in two waves, all these five variables were assessed by protégé’s self-report
which might still suffer the threat for common method bias (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). However, I followed the common practice by using Harman’s one factor test to check the variance explained by each factor and conducting confirmatory factor analyses to show the distinctiveness of the constructs (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; Richard, Ismail, Bhuian, & Taylor, 2009). Therefore, I believe this is not a major concern in the current study. However, future research may still consider to collect information from different sources. For example, collecting the information about OCB from mentors or coworkers perspective may see whether the results of the study can be repeated.

Second, this study collected data in two waves which is superior to the majority of mentoring studies collecting data in one time. However, mentoring functions and two mediator variables were collected in the same wave which is still in the nature of cross sectional data. Therefore, it is still hard to determine the causality of the variables (Cook et al., 1979). For example, researchers indicated that person-environment fit can be a response to job satisfaction (Yu & Yang, 2013). It is possible that mentoring functionss affect person-organization fit through job satisfaction. Although the effect of person-organization fit on job satisfaction has been studied by previous research (Kristof - Brown et al., 2005), the causality of how formal mentoring influences person-organization fit and job satisfaction may be still not clear. Future research should employ longitudinal method to explore how person-organization fit and job satisfaction changes over time after newcomers enter the organization.
Third, this study did not consider other types of supports in newcomer’s socialization process. For example, in the context of this study, supports from the supervisors and coworkers who are not protégé’s formal mentors may still influence newcomer’s socialization outcomes (Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Settoon & Adkins, 1997). Consider other sources (e.g. supervisors and coworkers) may also provide supports similar to the formal mentors, future research should include these factors and show that whether formal mentoring can explain additional variance.

Fourth, data were collected from one formal mentoring program, the generality of the findings from the study is open to the question. Given that different companies may have different designs, including matching process and mentor training, for the formal mentoring program which influences the effectiveness of the mentoring (Allen et al., 2006a, b), future research should replicate this study by collecting data from multiple formal mentoring programs. In addition, because the meaning of mentoring varies across different occupations (Haggard et al., 2010), future research should examine the effect of formal mentoring in other industries. One particular industry that has received insufficient research on mentoring program is the hospitality industry. Hospitality industry has high turnover rate of employees (Shen & Huang, 2012), partially because the hospitality employees suffer from high level of job burnout (Kang, Twigg & Herzman, 2010) and low level of job satisfaction (Shen & Huang, 2012), organizational support (Cho, Johanson, & Guchait, 2009) and socialization (Yang, 2010). Mentoring program may be important for hospitality employees because mentors may provide not only the job-related supports, but also
the psychosocial supports, which may reduce the job burnout and enhance the socialization, career advancement and job satisfaction of hospitality employees. For example, mentors may teach the protégés how to communicate with the emotional customers and handle their complaints. In the meanwhile, mentors may provide counselling by talking about the stress and troubles with the protégés. Therefore, more research should focus on whether and how mentoring can help the hospitality employees.

In spite of the limitations, future research may consider several other areas. First, drawing on the belongingness theory, this study explored the mediation process on the relationship between formal mentoring and employee outcomes. It also identified the moderating role of mentor’s organizational prototypicality in the mentoring process. Future research may consider other boundary conditions that may influence the effect of formal mentoring. For example, newcomer’s proactive personality has been found to be positively related to socialization adjustments (Fang et al., 2010; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). It has also been found to moderate the relationship between socialization tactics and person-organization fit. Proactive person is more likely to receive high quality mentoring functions (Liang & Gong, 2013). Therefore, future research may consider the role of protégé’s proactive personality in the formal mentoring relationship. Another possible boundary condition is mentor’s motivation. Allen (2003) mentioned three motives for mentoring others, including self-enhancement, benefiting others and intrinsic motivation. According to self-determination theory, human motivations are different in the level of
self-motivated and self-determined which may affect human behaviors and performance (Grant, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is possible that formal mentors participate in the formal mentoring program because they have one or several motivations. Future research may consider mentor’s motivations in the formal mentoring relationship and how the motivations influence the mentor’s providing of mentoring functions and protégé’s perception of mentor’s and organizational support.

Second, future research should investigate more protégé’s outcomes in the formal mentoring context. For example, this study has demonstrated the effect of formal mentoring on protégé’s OCB through person-organization fit. Allen (2003) mentioned that mentoring is a specific form of OCB. Therefore, future research may consider protégé’s intention to be the mentor as an additional formal mentoring outcome. This outcome can be significant for formal mentoring program because protégés, who have already understood the nature and purpose of the mentoring, are able to transmit organizational knowledge and values to the future protégés based on their own mentoring experience.

Third, in addition to the protégé’s outcomes, mentoring scholars have recently shifted the research interest from protégé’s outcomes to mentor's outcomes. Researchers have demonstrated that formal mentors can have various positive outcomes such as mentor's program satisfaction, transformational leadership, affective well-being and organizational commitment (Chun et al., 2012; Weinberg & Lankau, 2010). Future research may consider the underlying mechanisms of why providing mentoring functions in the formal mentoring program can affect mentor’s outcomes.
One potential explanation is that being selected as a formal mentor increases mentor’s OBSE, because mentors may consider them to be valuable, significant and worthy persons in the organization.

Fourth, most of the studies use narrow lens to assess the quality of mentoring relationship. They only focus on the instrumental measure instead of relational measure. Just as the previous studies, this study used mentoring functions to assess the quality of the formal mentoring. However, Ragins (2012) mentioned that mentoring is not a one-side relationship. She defined a new latent construct, called “relational mentoring”, to reflect the relational state of high quality mentoring. Relational mentoring refers to an "interdependent and generative developmental relationship that promotes mutual growth, learning and development within the career context" (Ragins, 2012, p. 519). It includes several dimensions such as mutual learning, self-affirmation, commitment and trust. Current measures of mentoring functions do not consider the relationship quality, mutual trust and learning in the mentoring relationship. It is possible that formal mentors provide a high quality mentoring functions as a citizenship behavior, but have low level of trust and commitment to the protégés. Researchers have found that relationship quality, commitment and trust can affect mentoring functions and employee outcomes (Chun et al., 2010; Kwan et al., 2011; Son & Kim, 2013). Therefore, future research may build on this latent construct to examine the quality of mentoring and provide a more comprehensive picture of how and why mentoring works.

Fifth, this study investigated the moderating role of formal mentor’s
organizational prototypicality in the organization socialization of newcomers. It is possible that informal mentors may also differ in the extent to which they are seen as the prototypical organizational members. Hu et al. (2014) indicated that mentors, including both formal and informal mentors, are “important agents who represent their organizations” (p. 33). Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that organizational prototypicality of informal mentors may be a potential moderator in the socialization of newcomers.

6.6 Conclusion

Building on the belongingness theory, this study tested a research model about the mediation process between mentoring function provided by the formal mentors and socialization outcomes of newcomers in the organizational socialization. The results indicated that mentoring supports positively affected newcomer’s OBSE and perception of person-organization fit. Further, person-organization fit mediated the relationship between mentoring function and three socialization outcomes including affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction and OCB. OBSE mediated the relationship between mentoring function and two socialization outcomes including affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Moreover, mentor’s organizational prototypicality moderated the relationship between mentoring function and two mediator variables including OBSE and person-organization fit, suggesting that when protégé’s perception of mentor’s organizational prototypicality is high, the
effect of formal mentoring on OBSE and person-organization fit will be stronger.

This study extends our understanding about the assimilation process of mentoring-socialization link. It also provides evidence for the boundary condition of how mentoring influences newcomer’s adjustment in the organizational socialization. In addition, this study collected data from blue-collar workers in China, which contributes to the generality of mentoring findings in the literature. With the theoretical and practical implication discussed above, the findings of this study provide evidence and implications for future research on the mechanisms of formal mentoring.
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APPENDIX A

EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON FORMAL MENTORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ragins &amp; Cotton, 1999</td>
<td>352 female and 257 male protégés</td>
<td>Gender composition</td>
<td>Type of mentoring relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring functions, compensation and promotions.</td>
<td>Protégés from informal mentoring receive higher effective and receive greater compensation than protégés from formal mentoring. The gender composition affects mentoring functions and outcomes. Type of relationship moderates the relationship between protégé’s gender and mentoring functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seibert, 1999</td>
<td>72 newly hired mechanical and electrical engineers</td>
<td>Mentoring functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, work role stress, and self-esteem at work</td>
<td>Employees who have formal mentors report a higher level of organizational commitment and job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Research Variables</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ragins et al., 2000             | 1162 employees | Satisfaction of mentoring relationship, type of relationship, design of a formal mentoring program | Job and career attitudes  
Satisfaction with mentoring relationship explains more variance on protégé’s attitudes than the type of relationship and design of a formal mentoring program. |
| Armstrong, 2002                  | 53 pairs of mentors and protégés | Cognitive similarity, gender composition  
Mentoring functions | Similarity of cognitive styles and gender composition enhance the quality of mentoring relationships. |
| Waters, McCabe, Kiellerup & Kiellerup, 2002 | 77 pairs of mentors and protégés | Mentoring functions, frequency of mentor contact  
Protégé’s perception of business success and self-esteem | Protégé’s perceptions of business success were predicted by the frequency of mentor contact and career mentoring support. |
| Raabe & Beehr,                   | 61 pairs of | Mentoring, LMX, LMX,  
Job satisfaction,  
Mentors and mentees had | |

There is no significant difference between mentored and non-mentored employees in terms of work role stress and self-esteem at work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal or Book Title</th>
<th>Mentors and Protégés</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>Different Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Journal of Organizational Behavior</em></td>
<td>Mentors and protégés from two companies and relationship with coworkers</td>
<td>Organizational commitment, turnover intent.</td>
<td>Different perceptions in terms of the nature of the mentoring relationship. Supervisory and coworker relationships were more significantly related to mentee outcomes than to mentoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006a</td>
<td><em>Journal of Applied Psychology</em></td>
<td>175 protégés and 110 mentors from 12 different formal mentoring programs</td>
<td>Voluntary, involved in matching process, geographic proximity, differences in rank, training</td>
<td>Interaction frequency</td>
<td>Mentorship quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006b</td>
<td><em>Personnel Psychology</em></td>
<td>175 protégés and 110 mentors from 12 different formal mentoring programs</td>
<td>Voluntary participation, math input, training</td>
<td>Mentor commitment, program understanding</td>
<td>Perceived program effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><em>Journal of Vocational</em></td>
<td>96 pairs of mentors and protégés from 12 companies</td>
<td>Proactivity, openness, perception of similarity and support</td>
<td>Mentoring functions, protégé’s satisfaction with mentor, perceived positive influence</td>
<td>Mentor’s proactivity and protégé’s perceptions of similarity were significantly related to mentoring functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Allen &amp; O’Brien, 2006 <em>Human Resource Development Quarterly</em></td>
<td>190 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Formal mentoring</td>
<td>Learning goal orientation, self-efficacy, and proactive personality</td>
<td>Organizational attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanberg, Welsh &amp; Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007 <em>Journal of Vocational Behavior</em></td>
<td>75 pairs of mentors and protégés from a large multinational organization</td>
<td>Protégé’s and mentor’s self-disclosure</td>
<td>Perceived mentor responsiveness</td>
<td>Mentoring functions, protégé-reported relationship satisfaction, and the positive influence of the mentoring.</td>
<td>Protégé’s self-disclosure was related to mentoring functions received, relationship satisfaction, and the positive influence of mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horvath, Wasko &amp; Bradley, 2008 <em>Human Resource Development Quarterly</em></td>
<td>254 undergraduate students</td>
<td>Voluntary, protégé input into the choice of mentor, mentor’s rank, and mentoring functions</td>
<td>Need for dominance</td>
<td>Organizational attraction</td>
<td>Some characteristics of the formal mentoring program can influence potential job applicants’ pre-hire perceptions of organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Eby, 2008 <em>Journal of</em></td>
<td>91 pairs of mentors and</td>
<td>Mentor commitment</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Relationship quality</td>
<td>The relationship between mentor commitment and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Behavior</td>
<td>protégés from 4 organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protégé’s reported mentorship quality was significant. The relationship was stronger for male protégés than for female protégés.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parise &amp; Forret, 2008 Journal of Vocational Behavior</td>
<td>97 mentors from a financial institution</td>
<td>Voluntary participation, input into matching process, perception of training effectiveness, and managerial support</td>
<td>Mentor’s perception of costs and benefits</td>
<td>Voluntary participation was significantly related to rewarding experiences. Input into the matching process was related to nepotism. Training was related to generativity. Management support was related to rewarding experience, recognition, generativity, and reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Tomlinson &amp; Noe, 2010 Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>140 pairs of mentors and protégés from a company in China</td>
<td>Affective trust, cognition-based trust, and protégé’s internal locus of control</td>
<td>The interaction of trust and internal locus of control</td>
<td>Mentoring functions</td>
<td>Protégé’s internal locus of control moderated the relationship between cognition-based trust and mentoring functions but could not moderate the relationship between affect-based trust and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Number of Pairs</td>
<td>Mentors and Protégés</td>
<td>Mentoring Variables</td>
<td>Mentoring Functions</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg &amp; Lankau, 2010</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pairs of mentors and protégés from a large insurance company</td>
<td>Mentor gender, gender composition, hours spent together, protégé perceived mentoring support</td>
<td>Mentoring function provided, mentor satisfaction with the formal mentoring program, and protégé-rated mentor effectiveness</td>
<td>Gender composition and total hours spent together were related to the mentoring function provided. Psychosocial support and role modeling were positively related to mentor satisfaction with the formal mentoring program. Only psychosocial support was significantly related to protégé-rated mentor effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun et al., 2010</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Pairs of mentors and protégés from several professional industries</td>
<td>Mentor emotional intelligence and protégé emotional intelligence</td>
<td>Trust in mentor</td>
<td>Mentoring functions and protégé’s willingness to mentor others were related to mentoring provided through protégé’s trust in mentors. The interaction effect of mentor and protégé emotional intelligence on protégé’s trust in mentor was also significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun et al., 2012</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Protégé’s</td>
<td>Career support affected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal of Organizational Behavior</strong></td>
<td>study of 111 mentor-protégé dyadic among white-collar employees from nine Korean companies.</td>
<td>functions</td>
<td>organizational commitment and affective well-being; Mentor’s transformational leadership, affective well-being and organizational commitment</td>
<td>mentor’s transformational leadership and organizational commitment. It also affected protege's organizational commitment and affective well-being. Psychosocial support affected mentor's organizational commitment. Role modeling affected mentor’s transformational leadership and affective well-being.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son &amp; Kim, 2013 <em>Journal of Career Development</em></td>
<td>184 protégés from 2 different organizations</td>
<td>Protégé perceived relationship quality</td>
<td>Protégé commitment and trust</td>
<td>Protégé’s trust was found to partially mediate the relationship between relationship quality and taking advice, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This review starts with Ragins and Cotton’s (1999) seminal work on formal and informal mentoring.
APPENDIX B

MEASUREMENT SCALES USED IN THE SURVEY

Mentoring Function


I take a personal interest in my protégé’s career.
I have placed my protégé in important assignments.
I give my protégé special coaching on the job.
I advise my protégé of promotional opportunities.
I help my protégé coordinate professional goals.
I have devoted special time and consideration to my protégé’s career.
I share personal problems with my protégé.
I socialize with my protégé after work.
I exchange confidences with my mentor.
I consider my protégé to be a friend.
I often go to lunch with my protégé.
My protégé tries to model his/her behavior after me.
My protégé admires my ability to motivate others.
My protégé respects my knowledge of the profession.
My protégé respects my ability to teach others.

Person-organization fit


The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organization values.
My personal values match my organization’s values and culture.
My organization’s values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life.

OBSE

I count around here;
I am taken seriously around here;
I am important around here;
I am trusted around here;
There is faith in me around here;
I can make a difference around here;
I am valuable around here;
I am helpful around here;
I am efficient around here
I am cooperative around here.

**Mentor’s organizational prototypicality**


My mentor is a good example of the kind of people that are members of my organization.
My mentor has very much in common with the members of my organization.
My mentor represents what is characteristic of the organization.
My mentor is very similar to the members of my organization.
My mentor resembles the members of my organization.

**Job satisfaction**


In general, I like working here.
All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
In general, I don’t like my job.

**Affective Organizational Commitment**

This company has a great deal of personal meaning for me. 
I do feel emotionally attached to this company.
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career working for this company.
I feel like part of the family at this company.
I really feel as if this company’s problems are my own.
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this company.
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.

OCB


Help others who have been absent.
Willingly give my time to help others who have work-related problems.
Adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time off.
Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
Give up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems.
Assist others with their duties.
Share personal property with others to help their work.
Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.
Keep up with developments in the organization.
Defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
Show pride when representing the organization in public.
Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.
Express loyalty toward the organization.
Take action to protect the organization from potential problems.
Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THE SURVEY

Questionnaire 1: The Formal Mentoring Program and Socialization Outcomes
(For Protégés in Time 1)

企业师徒制度调查问卷（学徒版）

尊敬的先生、女士:

您好!

我们正在开展一项以“企业师徒制度调查”为题的研究。我们拟在全国进行大规模调研，并基于此调研数据的科学分析作出研究结论及给出政策性建议。您的支持与及时客观的反馈将对此项研究的顺利进行意义重大。本次调查研究将分两次进行。因此希望阁下在问卷（即第一部分）留下您的姓名和员工编号等信息。目的是为了将两次调查的数据相互联系。请您放心，我们仅是为了纯粹的科研目的，关心的是普适的理论规律，并无意刺探贵单位与您个人的情报。您所提供的信息将与其它人士的信息一并做分析而得出客观而普适的科研结论。我们郑重承诺：我们所搜集的信息将仅用作学术研究使用，绝对不会向第三方（包括您的公司）泄露。

香港浸会大学
研究项目

第一部分（请务必填写）:

您的姓名：__________ 员工编号：__________
第二部分：
以下语句描述的是您和企业的适合度，请按照您认同的程度进行评价，在符合的数字上打勾“√”或划圈“○”。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 我个人的价值观和这个企业的价值观很相似。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 我个人的价值观和这个企业的价值观和文化很匹配。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 这个企业的价值观和文化很符合我人生的价值观。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 我在这里是有价值的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 我在这里是被重视的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 我在这里是重要的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 我在这里是被信任的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 这里的人都相信我。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 我在这里是有影响力的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 我在这里是有宝贵的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 我在这里是有用的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 我在这里是有效率的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 我在这里是能和人合作的。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 我的导师是这个企业员工很好的一个例子。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 我的导师和这个企业的成员有很多相同点。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我的导师代表了这个企业的特征。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 我的导师和这个企业的员工很相似。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 我的导师很像这个企业的员工。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

第三部分：请按照您的实际情况填写或勾选，在符合的字母上打勾“√”或划圈“○”。

1. 您的年龄：____岁
2. 您的性别： A. 男性   B. 女性
3. 您的教育程度：
   A. 小学   B. 初中   C. 高中   D. 大专或职业院校   E. 大学本科及以上
4. 您在这个企业工作了多久？____个月
5. 您的导师是否是您的直属领导（顶头上司）？
   A. 是   B. 不是

问卷结束，谢谢！
尊敬的先生、女士:

您好!

我们正在开展一项以“企业师徒制度调查”为题的研究。我们拟在全国进行大规模调研，并基于此调研数据的科学分析作出研究结论及给出政策性建议。您的支持与及时客观的反馈将对此项研究的顺利进行意义重大。本次调查研究将分两次进行。因此希望阁下在问卷（即第一部分）留下您的姓名和员工编号等信息。目的是为了将两次调查的数据相互联系。请您放心，我们仅是为了纯粹的科研目的，关心的是普适的理论规律，并无意刺探贵单位与您个人的情报。您所提供的信息将与其它人士的信息一并做分析而得出客观而普适的科研结论。我们郑重承诺：我们所搜集的信息将仅用作学术研究使用，绝对不会向第三方（包括您的公司）泄露。

香港浸会大学
研究项目

第一部分（请务必填写）：

您的姓名：___________ 员工编号：___________

以下语句描述的是您对工作的态度，请按照认同的程度进行评价，在符合的数字上打勾“√”或划圈“○”。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 总的来说，我喜欢在这里工作。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 总而言之，我很满意这份工作。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 总的来说，我不喜欢我的工作。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 我帮助那些自我感觉茫然的员工。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 我愿意利用我的时间帮助那些有工作问题的人。</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. 我调节我的工作计划来适应其它员工休假的请求。 1 2 3 4 5
7. 我特意让新员工感受到团队对他们的欢迎。 1 2 3 4 5
8. 即使在最艰难的工作或个人境中，我依然对同事表现礼貌以及真诚的关心。 1 2 3 4 5
9. 我利用我的时间去帮助那些有工作或非工作问题的人。 1 2 3 4 5
10. 我愿意帮助别人完成任务。 1 2 3 4 5
11. 我与其他人分享个人物品来帮助他们工作。 1 2 3 4 5
12. 我会出席一些非必须但能够帮助提升团队形象的活动。 1 2 3 4 5
13. 我能紧跟团队的发展。 1 2 3 4 5
14. 当其他同事批评我的团队时，我为自己团队辩护。 1 2 3 4 5
15. 在公共场合代表团队时我会表现出自豪。 1 2 3 4 5
16. 我为提升团队运作提供想法。 1 2 3 4 5
17. 我对团队展现忠诚。 1 2 3 4 5
18. 我用实际行动保护团队免于潜在的问题。 1 2 3 4 5
19. 我会表现出对团队形象的关心。 1 2 3 4 5
20. 这个企业对我来说有很大的个人意义。 1 2 3 4 5
21. 我对这个企业有一种情感上的依赖。 1 2 3 4 5
22. 我很乐意在我的职业生涯中一直为这个企业工作。 1 2 3 4 5
23. 我在这个企业中感到自己像这个大家庭的一部分。 1 2 3 4 5
24. 这个企业的问题就好像是我的问题一样。 1 2 3 4 5
25. 我对这个企业感到很强烈的归属感。 1 2 3 4 5
26. 我喜欢和外人讨论我工作的这个企业。 1 2 3 4 5
27. 我觉得我不能很轻易地对另一个企业产生依赖感，就像现在对这个企业这样。 1 2 3 4 5

第三部分：请按照您的实际情况填写或勾选，在符合的字母上打勾“✓”或划圈“○”。

1. 您的年龄：_______岁
2. 您的性别：A. 男性  B. 女性
3. 您的教育程度：
   A. 小学  B. 初中  C. 高中  D. 大专或职业院校  E. 大学本科及以上
4. 您在这个企业工作了多久？_______个月
5. 您的导师是否是您的直属领导（顶头上司）？
   A. 是  B. 不是

问卷结束，谢谢！
企业师徒制度调查问卷（导师版）

尊敬的先生、女士:

您好!

我们正在开展一项以“企业师徒制度调查”为题的研究。我们拟在全国进行大规模调研，并基于此调研数据的科学分析作出研究结论及给出政策性建议。您的支持与及时客观的反馈将对此项研究的顺利进行意义重大。请您放心，我们仅是为了纯粹的科研目的，关心的是普适的理论规律，并无意刺探贵单位与您个人的情报。您所提供的信息将与其它人士的信息一并做分析而得出客观而普适的科研结论。我们郑重承诺：我们所搜集的信息将仅用作学术研究使用，绝对不会向第三方（包括您的公司）泄露。

香港浸会大学
研究项目

第一部分（请务必填写）:

您的姓名：______________
您的学徒的姓名：______________
您的员工编号：______________

第二部分：

以下语句描述的是您对学徒的行为，请按照您认同的程度进行评价，在符合的数字上打勾“√”或划圈“○”。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>序号</th>
<th>语句内容</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>我会关注他/她的职业发展。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>我会让他/她完成重要的任务。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>我在工作上给他/她提供专门的指导。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>在升迁机会上，我会给他/她建议。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>我会协助他/她调整职业目标。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>我会花时间去思考他/她的职业发展。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>我和他/她互相分享个人问题。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. 我和他/她在下班后交际一下。 1 2 3 4 5
36. 我会同他/她互相说说心里话。 1 2 3 4 5
37. 我把他/她看作是朋友。 1 2 3 4 5
38. 我经常和他/她共进午餐。 1 2 3 4 5
39. 他/她把我看作是榜样。 1 2 3 4 5
40. 他/她钦佩我激励他人的能力。 1 2 3 4 5
41. 他/她尊重我的专业知识。 1 2 3 4 5
42. 他/她尊重我教导他人的能力。 1 2 3 4 5

第三部分：请按照您的实际情况填写或勾选，在符合的字母上打勾“√”或划圈“○”。

1. 您的年龄：______岁
2. 您的性别： A. 男性  B. 女性
3. 您的教育程度：
   A. 小学  B. 初中  C. 高中  D. 大专或职业院校  E. 大学本科及以上
4. 您在这个企业工作了多久？ ______年

问卷结束，谢谢！
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