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ABSTRACT

This study examined the current practice of a formal mentoring programme at the Hong Kong Baptist University with special emphasis on (a) the mentor and mentees' perspectives on mentoring, (b) the desirable characteristics of mentors, (c) preferences of gender in mentoring and (d) problems in mentoring.

Surveys of mentors and mentees were undertaken to provide the basic sources of data. 447 and 79 valid responses were received from mentees and mentors respectively. Ten of the mentors were also interviewed.

From the quantitative data collected through the survey, the findings revealed that a large proportion of mentors were male so there was a high incidence of male mentor-female mentee relationships. Apparent discrepancies between mentors and mentees' views were observed in the desirable characteristics of mentors. The analysis of quantitative data yielded a slight significance between gender expectations on the desirable characteristics of mentors, yet the differences among faculties were significant. There was no gender preference in choosing mentors or mentees but, when given an option, faculty and students would choose a mentor or mentee of the same sex.

From the qualitative analysis of mentors' interviews, the problems such as lack of time for both mentors and mentees, the lack of training for mentors and the lack of support from senior management for mentoring were identified.

Recommendations include suggestions on how to improve the current mentoring programme, development of a model for mentoring and the need for further research in matching mentors and mentees.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the reasons for conducting this study. Included in this chapter are a brief history of mentoring, the definition of mentoring, current practice of mentoring at Hong Kong Baptist University, statement of problem, purposes of the study phrased as questions and the significance of the study in different contexts.

Brief History of Mentoring

Mentoring is not a new phenomenon. It has its roots 2000 years ago in Homer's epic poem - The Odyssey. It originated in classic Greek mythology when Odysseus, the King of Ithaca and a great warrior, who had been away from home fighting the Trojan War, entrusted his son Telemachus to his friend and adviser, Mentor. Mentor was given the responsibility of being the guardian and adviser of Telemachus from boyhood to manhood. Now the term 'mentor' is used to describe: “The gesture of providing advice and counselling to guide someone through the transitional phases of adulthood and in doing so, influence one's personal and professional growth and development” (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995, p. 1). However, mentoring can also apply to the workplace. The mentor-mentee concept applies to the workplace in the form of induction programmes for new staff joining the company, or in an on-the-job training programme where senior members can help junior members in acquiring essential knowledge, skills and professional behaviours required. Shea (1997) stated that:

Mentors were also seen as senior people in an organisation who took talented young people under their wing and protected, taught
and even sponsored these proteges. However, in recent years this sponsoring role has been criticised for leading to favouritism, career climbing, and internal politics. In today’s globally competitive organisation, many people dislike the word protégé and prefer the more neutral term mentee (p. 7).

Mentoring actually has a long history in many cultures, and the Chinese culture is no exception. Lifelong mentoring, which is imbedded in the Chinese culture and heritage, is the passing of the ancestors’ knowledge, values, attitudes and ethics to the successive generation. In Taoism, traditionally:

Mentoring incorporates the Taoist teaching of self-reflection, simplicity, openness to others and sharing of ourselves. Tao mentoring, a process of learning in which the reward is not only in teaching one’s goals but also in the very process of guiding and growing together. Both mentor and proteges mutually benefit from this dynamic interaction as ideas, support and the joy of success are exchanged and shared (Huang & Lynch, 1995, p.1).

Therefore, in Tao’s eyes, a good mentor is a superb mentee, the excellent mentee is a fine mentor. According to Tao, the best relationship between a mentor and a mentee is like water, a natural element that ultimately changes the shape of whatever it touches. Tao mentoring, therefore, changes the life of people it comes into contact with in a satisfying and positive way. Think for a moment about the Tai Chi symbol, with Ying and the Yang, black and white which blends into a circular movement, becomes grey, and has no distinction between giving and receiving. The
art of Tai Chi, which has its origin in Taoist thought, is characterised by gentle and harmonious movements even in its combative form. Finally, the Tai Chi master whom his students address as “Sifu” is the perfect teacher and mentor for life (Chuckrow, 1998).

Mentoring in Education

While most of the mentoring research and related books have been published in relation to a business setting, studies have not been restricted to this area alone. In education it has become increasingly important as a mode of professional development as well. Bush, Coleman, Wall and West-Burnham (1996) suggest that mentoring is a multi-faceted concept incorporating personal support and a more vigorous notion of professional development leading to enhanced competence. Mentoring in education settings has thus become increasingly important as a mode of professional development, but mentoring is also regarded as an important element in the process of job induction (Kirkham, 1992). Nowadays, mentoring is being used in United Kingdom and also in Hong Kong as a motivation to improve the work of school pupils and university students. This sort of mentoring is a different manifestation to that which is more closely related to professional development in a work setting.

So far, there are two universities in Hong Kong that have a mentoring programme. The University of Hong Kong’s mentoring programme is designed to facilitate education and social and personal growth of university students who are matched with mentors of a different background from their own on a one-to-one mentoring relationship. It is called ‘classical mentoring’ because the mentor and
mentee come together voluntarily for the professional and personal growth of both.

Then there is the mentoring programme at the Hong Kong Baptist University which is a part of the University Life Programme conducted for all freshmen. It is a formal set up where the mentor and mentee are forced to take up their roles on a group basis.

Definition

Fagan and Walter (1983) define the mentor as: "an experienced adult who befriends and guides a less experienced adult" (p. 113). Similarly, Phillip-Jones (1982) defines mentors as: "influential people who significantly help proteges reach their life goals" (p. 21). The five types of mentors mentioned by Phillip-Jones (1982) include:

1. traditional mentors who are long-term, authority figures who protect, advise and nurture their proteges. They permit their proteges to move up the organisational ladder on their coat tails.

2. supportive bosses who, like the traditional mentors, serve as coaches more than protectors.

3. organisational sponsors or top-level managers, who see that their proteges are promoted within the organisation.

4. professional mentors who are paid for their services as career counsellors and advisers.

5. patrons or persons who use their financial resources and status to help proteges as 'invisible godparents' who help proteges reach career goals without their knowing it. They
make 'behind the scenes' arrangements and recommendations (pp. 22-24, 79-89).

The kind of mentoring programme conducted by the Hong Kong Baptist University is not related to any of the above definitions but is similar to the definition described by Moses (1989). He says: “mentoring in higher education is when a professor takes an undergraduate or graduate under his or her wings, helps the student set goals, develop skills and facilitates the student's successful entry into academic and professional roles” (p.9)

Traditionally, in Western society, mentoring is thought of as:

A formal process whereby an older, more experienced person helps and guides a younger person in learning the ropes in an organisation or on the job. The term mentoring has also been used to describe the activities of a senior person in preparing a junior for a particular office or job, providing career guidance, and encouraging high standards of performance. When successful, mentoring was seen to have an important and beneficial effect on a person’s career and life (Shea, 1997, p. 7).

In fact, the word 'mentor' nowadays carries a lot of implications. First, mentoring is an intentional process. Second, mentoring is a nurturing process, which fosters the growth and development of the protégé toward full maturity. Third, mentoring is an insightful process in which the wisdom of the mentor is acquired and
applied by the proteges. Fourth, mentoring is a supportive, protective process.
Finally, mentoring is a role-modelling process. By setting examples, mentees can see
their adult selves in other adults and thus stimulate their growth and development.

From the above process, ‘mentoring’ can mean one thing to a developmental
psychologist, another in the business sector and a third in an academic institution.
However, there are certain commonalities such as the involvement of a relationship
between a more knowledgeable individual with a less experienced individual, who
provides professional networking, counselling, guiding, instruction, modelling (Zey,
1993).

What has been described in previous paragraphs represents informal
mentoring partnerships on a one-to-one basis, which is recognised as one of the most
effective types of mentoring. Galbraith (1991) has asserted that the goal of this one-
to-one model of learning is to prepare the mentee for change and to energise him/her
into more positive and competent participation as decision-makers in a life-long
learning society.

Contrary to this, individual mentoring, the focus of our present study is a
more formalised programme adopted at Hong Kong Baptist University, or what we
may call ‘arranged’ mentoring relationships with deliberate matches between mentors
and mentees. Thus they are not: “naturally-evolved mentorships where people with
common interests or needs happen to come into contact with each other” (Daresh,
Current Practice of Mentoring at Hong Kong Baptist University

Hong Kong Baptist University, the former Hong Kong Baptist College, was founded in 1956 with a mission to provide quality higher education in a Christian environment for the young people of Hong Kong. The University, as a community of scholars, is committed to a distinctive mission of higher education that incorporates teaching, research and service, and which inculcates in all who participate, a sense of value that extends beyond the mere acquisition of knowledge. The University seeks to achieve and to foster excellence, intellectual freedom and the highest of ethical standards. These commitments are greatly influenced by the University’s heritage of Christian higher education within a Chinese cultural setting. Furthermore, as a result of this tradition, the Institution is committed to creating and maintaining an environment which develops and sustains the whole person in all these educational endeavours (Hong Kong Baptist University, 1999, p. 5)

In the May 1996 Senate Meeting, the subject “University Life” was introduced to all first-year students as a required subject for graduation, starting September, 1997. The University Life Programme (U.L. 1111-1112) is a one-unit subject for all freshmen, and has three components. It consists of a series of academic skill workshops, a number of university forums and departmental based mentoring sessions. The mentoring sessions of the University Life Programme were introduced
in 1997 and were quite new to both teaching staff and students. Although some departments have had some experience in the academic advisory system (AAS), the mentoring sessions are more than mere academic advising, as a mentor is not only an academic adviser but he or she also acts as a resource person to students in areas of university life outside of academic matters.

Mentoring programmes vary in nature and in the way they are designed according to their functional objectives. Academic objectives are the goal of most mentoring programmes for students in universities and schools, followed by objectives related to attitude, self-esteem and personal development. The objectives of the mentoring sessions at the Hong Kong Baptist University are (1) to help students to adjust to the changes during their transition from the secondary school setting to the university setting, (2) to help students to understand the field of study, (3) to share experiences and views on different issues and (4) to assist students to achieve their own goals by providing information, opportunities, guidance and suggestions in problem solving and learning techniques (Young, 1996). The University proposed that there should be seven to ten one-hour sessions per year with no fixed format. They could be conducted on a group or individual basis. The nature of mentoring is to allow free communication between staff and students in an informal atmosphere on any topic. Although there is a simple record form which the mentor has to fill and pass to the department head for filing, written reports on the meetings or discussions are not required. To show its support for the programme and to encourage staff's involvement, the University allocated a designated fund, based
on $100 per student, to help each mentor to cover expenses incurred by treating the students to tea, coffee, snack or simple lunches at their own discretion.

**Statement of Main Problem**

It has been three years since the inception of this programme and there has been no evaluation of the effectiveness or appropriateness of the programme, thus the main aim of this study is to conduct a review of the attitudes of both staff and students towards the existing practice in the mentoring programme. This will not take the form of an evaluation of the aims of the programme but will include an assessment of the qualities and skills which are considered to be essential for good mentoring, and explore whether there is any preference by mentees for choosing male or female mentors. From the investigator's experience as a mentor in the programme to be evaluated, it was found that the moral and financial support received is minimal, thus there is a lack of commitment and recognition from senior management. As a result, limited resources are made available for orientation and training programmes which would be beneficial in preparing the mentors for their duties. Under such circumstances, mentors (1) cannot fully realise the objectives of the mentoring programme, (2) cannot fulfil their responsibilities as mentors, or (3) derive the benefits possible from the programme itself.

**Purpose**

There are six purposes to be investigated as follows:-

1. What are the current mentoring practices carried out at the Hong Kong Baptist University? This will provide some background information on mentoring at the Hong Kong Baptist University.
2. What are the attitudes of staff and students toward the existing arrangements for mentoring at the university? This will provide the investigator with relevant information to recommend changes that will suit the needs of the students.

3. What qualities (i.e. desirable characteristics) are deemed as essential for good mentoring at this university? The answers to this question should provide assistance in any future plans for in-service training to equip staff members with the necessary knowledge and skills.

4. Has any preference been shown in regard to the selection of male and female mentors? (The gender issue is important because female professors are in the minority even though female students outnumber males two to one at the University) The result will assist the programme coordinator to make compatible matches as gender is one of the criteria for matching mentor and mentee and one of the features that is likely to affect the relationship.

5. What implications do these findings have for the development of the mentoring programme? This may help the University in setting up guidelines and policies for future mentoring programme.

6. Can a more useful model for guiding mentors at the University be derived from the data collected? If the findings of the research is meaningful, then a useful model can be developed for mentors to follow.

**Significance of the study**

The study is significant since there is no other work that focuses on the mentoring of an entire cohort of freshmen in a Hong Kong university.
This study is significant in the general context because it is the only piece of research that is focused on all freshmen in the university. It is also important in the educational context as mentoring has been seen as a means to reduce the attrition rate in the university. It is important in the cultural context as it is one of the few studies that study mentoring in the Chinese culture as well as on gender preferences of mentors. Last but not least, it is important because it measures some of the qualitative as well as quantitative outcomes which we do not find in other studies on mentoring.

1. General context

A number of universities in Hong Kong now recognise the importance of mentoring in university education as it provides a supportive system to students who need academic counselling as well as personal advice. Following in the footsteps of Hong Kong Baptist University, a number of other universities in Hong Kong have adopted a mentoring programme either on a formal or informal basis. This study is also considered to be significant because most of the studies on mentoring for students are concerned with school-based mentoring programmes for potential dropouts and high-risk students in high schools (Blum & Jones, 1993; Slicker & Palmer, 1993), whereas the present study focuses on all freshmen in a university thus it is breaking new grounds in mentoring research.

2. Educational context

Mentoring is a new concept in the university setting in Hong Kong. The student drop-out rate in institutions of higher education has always been a concern to faculty and university administrators, because the FTE (full time equivalent)
quota partly determines the funding that the UGC (University Grants Committee) allocates to the universities. Reasons given for student attrition include lack of preparation to enter university both academically and psychologically, poor time management, and 'no one cares' (Kerr, Schulze & Woodward, 1995). Different kinds of interventions are taken to counteract such problems and mentoring programmes are one such intervention. It is hoped that, with the setting up of a mentoring system, student retention can be increased and academic achievement can be promoted. Professors who act as mentors can offer support and encouragement to students who are also their mentees, especially those students with academic deficiencies and adaptation problems during their freshmen year. As Jacobi stated in the case of education: “Mentoring … is increasingly … looked to today as a retention and enhancement strategy for undergraduate education” (Jacobi, 1991, p. 505).

3. Cultural context

This study is culturally significant in that very few such studies have been conducted using members of the Chinese population as subjects. As there are certain differences between Western and Chinese societies, understanding the practice of mentoring in Chinese culture (i.e. the attitudes of mentors and mentees towards mentoring) will help university officials understand whether mentoring is being accepted in the Chinese culture. Another significance is the status of women in the Chinese culture. The under-representation of women in higher education lead to lack of women role models and women mentors. This
may affect the expectations of mentees towards female mentors. The section on desirable characteristics of mentors will shed some light on this topic.

4. Institutional context

Sophisticated programme evaluation is an expensive undertaking. Most programmes do not have extra funds to support such endeavours. Even though evaluation is being carried out at HKBU, only the quantitative data is presented in formal evaluation because it is easier to analyse. Most of the research on mentoring focuses on the quantity, such as the number of students mentored, length of relationships and number of mentees trained, rather than the subsequent performance of mentees. In this study, the author also measures some of the qualitative outcomes by interviewing the mentors. Although the results only reflect the opinion as revealed by the subjects, their words reveal some of the actual experiences and feelings of the respondents, enriching the quantitative outcomes.

Summary

In this introductory chapter, a very brief history of mentoring was presented followed by several definitions of the term “mentoring” offered by various scholars. Then a statement of the problem was identified, including a series of sub-problems phrased as questions. This chapter concluded with a discussion on the significance of the study in different contexts. Chapter 2 that follows will be a review of literature related to the focus of the thesis.
Chapter II  

LITERATURE REVIEW

Mentoring Concepts and Its Practice.

Mentoring, although it has its roots in Greek mythology, is universal. Different cultures have placed different emphases on mentoring and the concepts and definition of mentoring vary across sectors but one consistent theme is that it has been described as experienced and esteemed members of an organisation playing a leading role by giving advice, support and guidance to less experienced members to achieve a level of personal and professional attainment (Anderson & Shannon, 1995; Alleman, 1986; Fagan & Walter, 1983; Phillip-Jones, 1982). In higher education: “a mentor is one who shares information and strategies which enable the mentees to succeed within the specific environment” (Jacobi, 1991, p. 513). The mentor role, as defined by Stalker (1994), is: “to ensure mentees’ integration into the language, norms, values, attitudes and beliefs of academe” (p. 364).

Informal Versus Formal Mentoring

Formal mentoring programmes have become very popular in recent years within higher education. Such programmes have been developed for a range of issues including career development, leadership development and retention or academic success among students at risk of failure or attrition (Jacobi, 1991).

Matters (1998) suggested that mentoring was the most complex activity because it could be manifested through informal or formal mentoring relationships. The meeting can be held over lunch or in an office and there are no rules dictating
how long such sessions should last. In any case, the relationship should be intimate and communicating, contrasting with leader and follower relationships because there should be an interpersonal relationship between the mentor and the mentee. Shea (1992) stated that mentoring relationship is not duty bound because it is more than doing a job; it goes beyond an obligatory relationship. Today, mentoring is perceived as ‘partnership’ with both the mentor and the mentee contributing to the discussion on an equal basis and based upon mutual respect. It is assumed that not only the mentee gains from this partnership but the mentor also gains from this relationship.

In the 1980s, there was a dichotomy between formal and informal mentoring. Formal mentoring partnerships are those which are part of the organisational plan to facilitate the teaching of occupational skills and enhance the professional formation and development of participants (Goodlad, 1995). In formal mentoring programmes, mentees are assigned to a mentor. Klauss (1981) and Kram (1985) alluded that such relationships may not be as beneficial as mentoring relationships that develop informally, due to personality conflicts between parties, or a lack of personal commitment of either the mentor or the mentee because the relationship was not formed on their initiative. On the other hand, informal mentoring is a natural process which has been fostered when mentees happen to be chosen by or find people of greater experience or expertise who take a special interest in them and in helping to promote their personal and/or professional development. Its major characteristics are spontaneity and a shared intellectual bonding (Matters, 1998).
Mentoring relationship have ups and downs; intense periods and times of withdrawal and distraction, but with patience from the mentor and perseverance from the mentee then there can be a fruitful outcome which may be unnoticeable in the first instance (Johnson & Sullivan, 1993, p. 51).

**Voluntary Versus Compulsory Programmes**

Mentoring can be on a totally voluntary basis when a more experienced person devotes extra time to help a younger person at one’s freewill. A compulsory programme is organised on an institutional basis and everyone is compelled to participate. Stott and Walker’s (1992) programme for potential candidates for the principalship is an illustration of an institutionalised programme, as it is a compulsory part of a diploma course through which all candidates must pass. “The major advantages of an institutionalised programme is that it ensures that mentorship is extended to individuals who previously would not be considered for mentorship” (Ehrich, 1994, p. 15). Byrne (1993) summarised the main problems of institutionalised mentorship as lack of selectivity; unwilling participation and a risk of functioning at a low level of productivity.

**Mentoring in the Educational Sector**

The concept and definition of mentoring varies across sectors. It is still incompletely and ambiguously described. It is generally selective and self-chosen although increasingly it is becoming formalised. However, mentoring in academic institutions is often informal and rarely visible.
In the educational setting, McIntyre and Haggar (1996) view mentoring as a mechanism of counselling, educating and socialising the student into the school environment. When we look at institutions of higher education, Levinson (1978) concludes that, though officially committed to fostering the intellectual and personal development of students, we provide mentoring that is generally limited in quantity and poor in quality. The system is common in graduate schools and seen to work in relation to such aspects as

- recommended for post-graduate scholarship
- recommended for awards
- award them part-time tutorship to enable concurrent postgraduate research to be taken
- advice and encouragement to students to help them to progress over barriers
- giving students more practical experience in real life situation
- enhancing a student’s exposure (seminar, joint papers, conference attendance)
- brainstorming, discussing the latest scientific or technological work with students.

Mentoring and Undergraduate Academic Success

While mentoring has long been associated with graduate education, it is becoming popular today as a retention strategy for undergraduate education (Jacobi, 1991). There is agreement that mentoring is a critical component of effective undergraduate education and facilitates academic success. Moses (1989) says that: "Ideally, a professor takes an undergraduate or graduate student under his wing, helps the student set goals and develop skills, and facilitates the student’s successful entry
into academic and professional circles” (p. 9). In 1978, Pascarella, Terenzini and Hibel examined the effects of six different types of faculty contact on academic achievement of approximately 500 students (sampling similar to this study). Results showed a curvilinear relationship between faculty and achievement, such that: “the first few informal interactions with faculty….appear to be the most important” (Pascarella et al., 1978, p. 457).

There has been disagreement about the period of mentoring in academe. Some suggest mentoring relationships can be as brief as a single encounter (Phillip-Jones, 1982) or can last as long as 10 years (Levinson, 1978). Jowett and Steed (1994) describe mentoring programmes for college students similar to the situation at Hong Kong Baptist University.

Mentoring, in institutes of higher education, is very often resented by mentors as it seems to add extra work to their already very busy schedules; by recipients because of jealousy from others; and by non-recipients who feel they are excluded. Henderson (1985) concludes that the roles of mentors and mentees are best formed under an organisational umbrella that actually promotes mentoring but does not impose it.

However, mentoring is not restricted to students in institutions of higher education. In respect of schools, Bush et al. (1996) suggest that mentoring is a multifaceted concept incorporating personal support and the more rigorous notion of professional development leading to enhanced competence. In Smith and Wall’s
(1993) document, the benefits of mentoring are identified in the teaching profession under the following headings:-

For the mentee

- having a medium through which to address ideas to senior management
- provide support, consolation, sympathy
- the opportunity to share achievements and failures
- time to observe other teachers at work
- opportunity which can reflect their performance
- non-threatening guidance
- feeling less isolated within an established staff
- meeting other NQTs

For the Mentor

- makes one evaluate the quality of one's teaching
- develop appraisal skills
- keep in touch with the problem of NQT
- an opportunity to be reflective on own performance
- good experience for career development
- increase status and responsibilities
- increasing your enthusiasm
- providing new ideas

Despite all the benefits stated by various scholars, Bush et al. (1996) also identified two factors, which may limit the potential of mentoring. They were
disparities in personal outlook or professional principles between mentor and mentee. Firstly, effective mentoring depended on a good match between mentor and mentee as there was a need to establish a common view on mentoring and its purpose and their outlook on life as well as professional beliefs. Where there was compatibility between mentor and mentee, there was potential for substantial, often rapid, professional growth. Where there were disparities in personal outlook or professional principles, then the benefits might be limited.

Hudson and Latham (1995) expressed the view that lack of support and professional criticism was not always wholly attributed to the attitude of the mentors but instead to the fact that mentors were allocated insufficient time and training to fulfil their role. The second factor was the lack of time, mostly on the part of the mentors, as most people in senior positions are too busy with their commitments and not giving enough time to their mentees. The mentees, when given the impression that their mentors were too busy to give time, would avoid approaching them and thus ideas would not be raised for discussion. The lack of time for mentoring was due to several factors, the most frequently cited being that no timetabled space had been allocated for meetings of mentor and mentees. The reason is that the staff: students contact hours in the formal curriculum have already taken up most of the time in the timetable.

With all the difficulties involved, mentoring in the educational setting has become increasingly important as a mode of professional development in education. A more experienced colleague may facilitate the professional development of a newly
qualified teacher (NQT). NQTs are usually considered to be competent to teach but their skills are unrefined and need to be nurtured. Thus, mentoring is regarded as an important element in the process of induction. According to Kirkham (1992), the mentor must have subject or phase-specific skills in order to pass on the classroom craft in an entirely subject-specific way. The mentor should be knowledgeable about the curriculum and the subject content and the methods of successfully teaching these contents. In addition to the curriculum and subject expertise, the mentor needs to have the following generic skills in mentoring:-

a. Needs analysis; knowing the mentee’s previous educational experience enables the mentor to locate gaps in knowledge which need to be bridged and what is the role of the mentee. This will help the mentor in planning individual developmental programmes for mentees with different abilities and offer appropriate guidance.

b. Counselling; counselling skills are imperative to successful mentoring. Giving advice and playing the role of a counsellor is inevitable in mentoring.

c. Negotiation and conflict solving; the mentor needs to negotiate with the mentee and other colleagues like senior management and teachers in other departments.

d. Giving and receiving positive and negative feedback; the quality of feedback is the single most important factor in this aspect of staff development. Most mentors give negative feedback despite the fact giving positive feedback and praise is easier. However, it is found that mentoring is more effective when negative feedback is balanced with some positive feedback. Immediate feedback
is more effective than delayed feedback. In providing feedback, it is recommended that observable things, rather than opinions, should be taken into account. The setting and environment for giving feedback is also crucial. The interview session between mentors and mentees should take place in a private and comfortable setting. A positive tone of voice, right body language and eye contact is also important.

e. Observation skills; observation skills are essential to the mentee either from the point of view of observing others or being observed by others. The focus of such observation will differ according to the stage of training and the mentee’s progress. After the induction period, topics of discussion will be more specific including use of resources, management issues and record keeping.

f. Report writing; professional reports should refer to facts and not subjective opinions. Professional reports from mentors or mentees will help both mentors and mentees to identify weaknesses and set targets for future development (Kirham, 1992).

Leadership and Mentoring Relationship

If we examine the traits associated with a mentor, we find some similarities with those expected from a leader. Both leaders and mentors have a passion for compassion and unyielding integrity that engenders trust (Restine, 1993). They are good listeners, and give ideas and feeling to their subordinates and their mentees. They inspire and empower others through influence and responsibility. Their efforts may not result in immediate transformation but changes over a long period of time
(Shea, 1992). Appelbaum, Ritchie and Shapiro (1994) examined the duality of mentoring and leadership and argued that: “the two definitions are almost interchangeable. The only difference might be leaders adopted a more direct approach while mentors took a more indirect guiding/assisting approach. Possibly, leadership is more formal and overt and mentorship is more subtle” (Appelbaum, Ritchie & Shapiro, 1994).

**Gender Issues**

Historically, leadership has been a masculine concept and sex-role stereotyping is still prevalent in leadership studies. In general, the traits ascribed to the group reflect the group’s work roles and the kind of activities in which we see them engaged in (Eagly, 1987). Eagly proclaimed that gender role stereotypes are a reflection of the specialization of the sexes in different types of productivity - men have greater economic responsibility (as well as status and power), women have greater domestic responsibility, with qualities usually identified with women such as sensitive, softhearted, emotional and family-oriented. Women leaders have been described as being too ‘soft’ on decisional matters and lack decisiveness yet when a woman succeeds aggressively, she is criticised for failing to live up to the feminine image.

In the new millennium, with Hong Kong’s resumption of sovereignty by China, Hong Kong is facing new demands and adapting to new developments. One of the issues is women’s place and their role in this new era. Women constitute at least half of the population in Hong Kong and the impact of changes on women’s life
certainly develop a new area for investigation. The number of researchers interested in gender issues has increased since women are playing a leadership role in socio-economic and political environments. By looking at the following case we can understand why gender plays an important part in leadership and in mentoring. On 19 November, 1997, when Leung Oi Sie (Secretary of Justice of Hong Kong) was interviewed, she recorded her experience when she first became one of the few women lawyers. No woman at that time would consider studying law and becoming a lawyer. Even if there were a few who would eventually enter the law profession, they were in minority and regarded as ‘exceptional’ (Pearson & Leung, 1995).

To understand gender differences in leadership, it is important to distinguish two terms ‘sex’ and ‘gender’. ‘Sex’ is a biological description which divides people into male and female while gender is a cultural term which is socially constructed and describes the characteristics that we ascribe to people because of their sex, the ways we believe they behave or the characteristics we believe they have, based upon our cultural expectations of what is male and what is female (Ouston, 1993). In examining the research on gender studies, it was found that one’s biological identifications as male or female have very little influence on how people behave. However, one’s gender identification has a tremendous influence on behaviour, perceptions and effectiveness. In fact, Reich (1985) found that female mentees in her samples valued more highly than male mentees the affective or emotional quality of the mentors: that female mentors were more likely than male mentors to stress the caring and nurturing aspects of the relationship.
Under-representation of Women in Leadership

The lack of women role models and women mentors in our society is a stumbling block for women to progress as leaders in their respective professions. In the United Kingdom education sector, women are under-represented. According to Coleman (1994), the majority of senior managers in education are male. In primary schools, where over 80 percent of teachers are women, men hold over 50 percent of primary headships. In secondary schools, where approximately 50 percent of teachers are men, around 20 percent of head teachers are women. In 1990, there were only 13 female principals of further education colleges compared with 394 men and just 4.6% of university professors were females in the academic year 1991-1992.

The situation is worse in Hong Kong. In the Chinese culture, the ‘Ying’ and the ‘Yang’ stand for ‘women’ and ‘men’ and imply that women are more fragile and submissive whereas men are more aggressive and stronger. With 90 percent of the population in Hong Kong being Chinese, the cultural belief in a Chinese society that ‘women’s place should be in the home’ has confined women to attend to household chores and childbearing activities. Although attitudes towards education for women changed slightly after the 1970s, preference would still be given to males when admitting students to universities. So even with the expansion of the financial and service sectors and the revival of the entrepôt trade consequent upon China’s open-door policy, the job opportunities for women are still limited because the amount of education one received would determine the kind of jobs that a person would enter (Pearson & Leung, 1995).
The education level of women has increased significantly in the past 30 years and especially in university education which has made an impact in terms of the occupational status of women. The change is particularly obvious in the decade between 1981 and 1991 and is characterised by a shift from occupational roles in factory and related workers to clerical and related workers, professional, technical and related workers and managers and administrators (Table 2.1). The percentage dropped from 49.3 percent to 17.1 percent in the first category, accompanied by a corresponding increase in the managerial/administrative from 1.0 percent to 4.9 percent, professional from 6.3 percent to 14.3 percent and clerical from 18.0 percent to 28.8 percent.

The pattern of change suggests that there has been a significant improvement in the occupational status of women, and of men, in at least the past 15 years of Hong Kong’s economic development. But it should be noted that the disparity between the sexes remains in the highest-ranking managers and administrators’ category, though over the years the gap has been proportionally narrowed in women’s favour.
Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Managers &amp; Professional Administrators</th>
<th>Professional technical &amp; related workers</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; related workers</th>
<th>Production &amp; related workers (in factory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


At the lower end, women’s drop in the production category is replaced to some extent by an increase in the clerical category, suggesting that the improvement in women’s occupational status has been limited and restricted mainly within the lower-ranking jobs. Finally, the strong representation of women in the ‘professional’ category must be interpreted in light of the fact that this category includes occupations such as teaching and nursing in which women predominate numerically. The overall picture
suggests that over the past three decades the inequality gap in occupational
distribution between men and women has narrowed, but the difference remain
significant (Pearson & Leung, 1995). In Hong Kong's report to the Fourth UN World
Conference on women, it was stated that Hong Kong has adopted a policy of equality
for students of both sexes in school education, vocational training and even higher
education (Table 2.2).

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Female Students at Various Education Levels, 1961-1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Education Department Annual Summary, 1961, 1971; Census & Statistics
Department, Hong Kong Annual Digest of Statistics, 1982, 1987, 1991; Vice-
Chancellor's Report, 1990/91, The University of Hong Kong; Student enrolment
figures for the Chinese University of Hong Kong for the year 1990-1991, by courtesy
of the Registration Section of the University.

Despite the fact that education opportunities increased for women and that
there are more female teachers in schools than male teachers, there are more male
school principals (69%) in both primary and secondary schools. This is similar to a study done by Coleman (1994) showing the pattern of women holding lower rank positions in United Kingdom schools.

Table 2.3

Percentage of Women Teachers in Secondary Schools by Rank in 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% of women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal I and II</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master/Mistress (PGM) &amp; Senior Education Officer (SEO)</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master-Mistress (PAM)</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master/Mistress (SAM)</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Master/Mistress (AM)</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Master/Mistress (CM)</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Head</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Teacher</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rank</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hong Kong Education Department.
Table 2.3 demonstrates that women are concentrated in the lower ranks in schools. This is true for both graduate and non-graduate teachers. Gender discrepancy is greatest at the school principal level.

At the College and University level, male leadership is obvious. Table 2.4 shows the gender distribution of full-time teaching staff at the two prominent universities in Hong Kong and the two Polytechnics and demonstrates the dominance of male faculty in the university academic structure.

Table 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities/ Polytechnics</th>
<th>Reader/ Professor/ M/F</th>
<th>Principal Lecturer/ Senior Lecturer M/F</th>
<th>Lecturer M/F</th>
<th>Total M/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Universities</td>
<td>243/18</td>
<td>262/39</td>
<td>1019/204</td>
<td>1514/261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.1%/6.9%</td>
<td>87%/13%</td>
<td>83.3%/16.7%</td>
<td>85.3%/14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Polytechnics</td>
<td>36/1</td>
<td>499/116</td>
<td>474/214</td>
<td>1010/331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.3%/2.7%</td>
<td>81.1%/18.9%</td>
<td>68.9%/31.1%</td>
<td>75.3%/24.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Internal telephone directories of the University of Hong Kong, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Polytechnic and City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
Table 2.4 shows that male leadership predominates which in turn reduces the possibility of nurturing female leaders in academic settings and the prospect of female mentors in the university.

Gender Differences in Leadership Styles

Differences in leadership styles between women and men are usually portrayed in stereotypes such as those listed by Eagly and Johnson (1990) and Schein (1989). There have been two different schools of thought on leadership styles of the two genders. The first school of thought, where data were drawn from interviewing managers, suggests that men’s style are seen to be more competitive, controlling, unemotional, analytical and hierarchical whereas women are more collaborative and cooperative. The second school of thought is based on limited research conducted by social scientists who state that there are no consistent sex differences in leadership styles. Faced with two conflicting views, Eagly and Johnson (1990) undertook a review of the literature in which they analysed studies of men and women’s leadership styles. They found that there were 380 comparisons made in a group of managers whose average age is late thirties and occupying positions ranging from first-line supervisors to manager. They found that the strongest evidence for a sex difference in leadership style occurred in the tendency for women to adopt a more democratic or participative style and for men to adopt a more autocratic, directive style. Male managers tended to be more task oriented than female managers and female managers tended to be more interpersonally oriented than male managers, and were better at tending to the morale and welfare of other people in the work setting.
Edlund (1993) proposed a humanistic model of leadership, based on the assumption that all people possess both feminine and masculine traits, and highlight the difference between feminine and masculine styles of leadership as in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating style</td>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational structure</td>
<td>team</td>
<td>hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic objective</td>
<td>quality output</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving style</td>
<td>Intuitive/rational</td>
<td>rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key characteristics</td>
<td>low control</td>
<td>high control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>empathetic</td>
<td>analytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaborative</td>
<td>strategic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings are consistent with Drake's work reconfirming that, for women, the world is a network of connections in which support and consensus are sought. The female is described as "interpersonal and expressive" which should facilitate rapport in mentoring. This contrasts with the traditional picture that is projected by a male mentor which is 'controlling, hard, competitive, demanding and aggressive' (1985, p. 125). For men, the world is made up of individuals in a hierarchical social order in which life is a competitive struggle for success and gaining advantages over
others and avoiding loss of power. Today’s leaders are characterised as being more open to consensus-building, participation in decision making and empowerment of followers and this applies to all whether they be men or women. Thus, it is not important which types of characteristics are better in defining leadership but rather how do stereotypes operate in the context that we describe and what is the strength and weakness of such qualities attributed to our work. Scandura and Ragins (1993) found that biological sex was not related to mentoring in male dominated occupations but gender orientation was. Those with androgynous sex role orientation reported more mentoring functions than those with either masculine or feminine orientations. Wolf (1993) shows that, although traditional mentoring models are from males, women’s model of mentoring may have elements unique to female experience. He suggested more studies on how women mentor women in education can develop better understanding on women mentoring. Woood (1997) claimed that the softer, traditional female qualities might be perceived as closer to the mentoring role. Bem (1974) has identified that the most effective leaders are those who possess both female and male attributes which he called the ‘androgynous’ style. After we have reviewed different management styles of men and women, we recognise that despite some claims that men are better leaders than women, there are gender attributes identified with the feminine qualities of human nature which also have their value in leadership. This, however does not imply women are better mentors because feminine qualities are not necessarily identified with women.
Gender Differences in Mentoring

Although there is limited evidence recorded on gender differences in mentoring relationships, there is research reported that women are not well integrated into mentoring systems. Studies by Byrne (1993) and Torrance (1984) indicated that fewer male mentees had female mentors while over half of the female mentees had male mentors. First, fewer women than men are holding senior positions thus more males will serve as mentors as mentors are those holding senior positions in an organisation. Secondly, male mentors tend to accept male mentees because they see similarities between their mentees and themselves. These mentors also assume that many women lack the commitment and drive required for a long-term professional career. Ragins and Cotton (1991) reported on gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor and concluded that women face more barriers than men. One of the reasons which prohibit women from initiating a mentoring relationship with male mentors was the fear that the mentor or others in the organisation will misconstrue such an approach as a sexual advance whereas same-sex mentoring relationship will not have detrimental sexual connotations. Men, on the other hand, may prefer men to women as mentees in order to avoid destructive office gossip and discrediting innuendoes (Gaskill, 1991; Noe, 1988). Since there are fewer women holding senior positions, there is less opportunity to get a mentor of the same sex.

By the same token, women tend to hold lower positions where there are fewer formal opportunities for a mentorship relationship to be established (Gaskill, 1991; Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1989). Kram (1985) also found that women have more
difficulties establishing mentoring relationships, both when mentoring other women and when mentoring men, because of the lack of female role models in leadership positions, as most mentors were men. This was attributed to the fact that women’s access to informal networks, socialisation process and the lack of visibility as decision-makers, may reduce their chances of becoming mentors. Given this is so:

Most academic staff who are potential mentors will continue to be male. Most female students, if they have a mentor, will therefore have a cross-sex mentor and a male-female relationship whereas most male students, if they have a mentor, will have a same-sex mentor, and a male-male relationship (Byrne, 1993, p. 147)

The situation may have improved in the 1990s, when many women are holding better posts in their workplace, but the distribution of sex in mentors is still unbalanced. In cross-gender mentorships, both the female mentor and the male mentors may ‘avoid the intense and often personal interaction’ since such interactions may invite criticisms and may be perceived as risky as well as creating a potential threat to the careers of both the mentor and the mentee:

Until recent decades, cross-gender mentoring in organisations has been rare. Several studies of mentoring reveal a number of problems related to cross-gender mentoring based on gossip, envy, suspicion, speculation, false assumptions, sexual stereotypes and charges of sexual harassment. Unfortunately, such attitudes and behaviour have lessened the effectiveness of cross-gender
mentoring in some environments. Yet each sex has much to offer and teach the other. Cross-gender mentoring can improve morale, enrich the lives of mentees, and provide valuable insights and experiences to each sex. A gender balanced and fairly treated workforce is likely to remain a challenge rather than a reality for some time. Effective cross-gender mentoring is one of the tools we can use to achieve this balance and fairness (Shea, 1992, p. 73).

Shakeshaft (1987) asserted that same-sex role models appear to be more important for women. Gilbert (1985) echoed this view that same-sex role models and personal attributes are more important to female students. However, same gender as well as cross-gender mentoring is a source of personal growth in both the teacher mentor and the student mentee regardless of the gender of mentor or mentee. If we look at mentoring from this perspective, there should not be any predetermined gender differences in mentoring.

Preference for Male and Female Mentors

Erkut and Mokros (1984) found that female students were more likely than males to select female role models. They choose female faculty as models if such models are available on campus. Women students’ selection of women professors as role models was directly proportional to the number of women professors on the faculty. At coed schools, where women constituted roughly 20% of the faculty, about 20% of women students selected same sex professors. Similarly, in a women’s college where women constituted half of the faculty, 51% of the students selected
women models. Men, on the other hand, showed a significant trend to avoid women professorial models.

Burke (1984) found that male mentees prefer high status, powerful male models who can promote their educational or career goals while women, when choosing female models, will choose those who have a rewarding professional and family life. Jacobi (1991) confirmed that gender difference did emerge in students’ preferences for mentoring functions. Male students appeared to look for a mentor with status and power who could provide direct assistance with career development while female students wanted a mentor who could serve as a role model for combining rewarding professional and personal/social activities. A significant difference is in the style of mentoring. Arnold and Davidson (1990) showed that women found personal development in the forms of self-confidence and emotional support to be of high importance whereas those psychosocial aids were barely recognised by men. Regardless of the reason for their choices, they found that women do not receive as much mentoring as do men. The most frequently cited reason for this is the scarcity of women who are in positions to serve as models/mentors.

In two of the three experiments conducted by Olian, Carroll, Giannantonio, and Feren (1988), there was no evidence of respondent preferences for same-sex over cross-sex mentoring relationships. In contrast to Olian’s study, Darling (1986) studied the relationship between mentors and mentees and discovered that there were gender preferences when mentees choose their mentors. Ugbah and Williams (1989)
found that students generally selected mentors of their own gender and cross-gender pairs have difficulties in establishing a mentoring relationship. In studies where women mentored other women, women mentees reported better experiences and positive effects from mentoring. In studies where there were few same gender mentors for women, women reported difficulties in identifying and establishing mentoring relationships. However, male researchers have found no difference while female researchers concluded that there was a difference.

The gender of the researcher, as suggested by Jacobi (1991), may have been a factor in the conclusions drawn from the analysis of each case. A related concern is that cross-ethnicity mentoring relationships may be less effective than same ethnicity mentoring relationships. Meznek, McGrath and Garcia (1989) explained that “mentors of same ethnic background as their proteges can assist students in resolving apparent conflicts between the values of one’s culture or community and the values of the institution” (p. 9).

Desirable Characteristics of Mentors and Mentees

There are certain skills for encouraging a positive mentor-mentee relationship. Collins (1983) describes that the mentor must be high up the organisational ladder, an authority in the field, influential and interested in the proteges’ growth and potential. According to Haensley and Edlind (1986) the mentor must display enthusiasm, the ability to communicate clearly shows flexibility and a sense of humour. Cunningham and Eberle (1993) list the desirable characteristics of mentors and mentees as follows:

1. Mentor’s skills and characteristics
- personal security and confidence
- willingness to trust
- ability to communicate effectively
- introspective and open
- innovative
- patience and tolerance
- accessibility

2. Mentee’s skills and characteristics
- desire to learn
- people oriented
- goal oriented
- introspective
- initiative
- assertiveness

The six most important characteristics and skills that successful mentors should possess are ranked in the following order by Bolam, McMahon, Pocklington, and Weindling (1995).
- listening skills
- open, warm and enthusiastic behaviour
- experience
- providing feedback
- non-judgmental
counselling skills.

Although characteristics most valued may be similar for male and female mentees, Torrance (1984) emphasised that there are still some differences. The characteristics most valued by males and females are summarised in Table 2.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics valued by females</th>
<th>Characteristics valued by males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging/raising</td>
<td>Skill-expert/friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/expert</td>
<td>Encouraging/prodding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Respectful/guiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring/energising</td>
<td>Caring/interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive/acknowledged talent</td>
<td>Motivating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Committed/dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving/caring</td>
<td>Hardworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested/persistent</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The males more frequently prize their mentor’s skill and expertise while females more frequently prize encouragement and praise. It is also interesting to note that males tend to use the terms ‘encourage and prod’ while females usually use the terms ‘encourage and praise’. Friendship seems to be valued almost equally by both sexes, with males mentioning it somewhat more frequently, usually in connection
with continuing aspects of the mentor relationship. Whether mentors can play an effective role as a mentor or not depends on the personal attributes rather than one’s subject’s expertise (Torrance, 1984).

Shaw (1992) describes the ideal mentor as a good listener, who is encouraging, empathetic, organised, analytical and approachable. This is confirmed by Williams (1994) who sees the interpersonal skills of supportive listening and critical evaluation of performance as two of the most important attributes. The success of mentor/mentee relationships depends on whether the student is willing to play his/her role as a mentee, which in turn depends on his/her willingness to seek help. The mentee feels comfortable if the mentor is approachable and is able to communicate with his/her mentor if the mentor is a good listener (Tellez, 1992). Effective communication, according to Haensley and Edlind (1986), involves active listening and the ability to engage in the mutual exchange of feedback with the student. Consequently, a reciprocal student/mentor relationship is likely to develop. It involves the active participation of both the student and mentor, a mutual exchange of information and willingness to accept individuality. Hardy (1994) describes this as one of the most important characteristics in the relationship between a mentor and his mentees. Therefore ‘mentoring’ and ‘mentor’ can only be understood in relation to the context of individual mentoring relationships and the individuals who share them. In addition to the attributes named by Regan and Brooks (1995), Coleman (1994) states that the “nurturing qualities identified with women are being recognised as a strength in management” (p. 190). She quotes from Shakeshaft (1987) that women
managers tend to be more democratic than males, their speech tends to be more polite, less aggressive and more tentative, suggesting that women are more suitable for mentoring roles. Specifically, the essence of mentoring, involving helping mentees and nurturing their development, is certainly aligned more with female than male gender-role expectations (Eagly, 1987).

Mentor Mentee Relationship

The mentor who is usually an older and always more experienced person, guides and assists a usually younger but less experienced person, the mentee, to a level of personal and professional excellence not acquired and demonstrated previously.

One of the criteria for successful mentoring is that mentor and mentee should have a good relationship. Mentors should be sincerely interested in working with students, understand the spirit of co-operation and partnership, be able to motivate, be competent and have good interpersonal skills (LaBonty & Stull, 1993). There is disagreement whether mentoring should be voluntary or mandatory. Some researchers suggest formally arranged mandatory (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newman, 1984; Gray & Gray, 1985) while others support voluntary mentoring (Kram, 1985; Phillip Jones, 1983). There is no single method and the choice always depends on the organisational culture and the decision of top management of the organisation in which mentoring is to take place.

Mentoring, which should be perceived as a ‘partnership’ is often practised in a top-down manner, similar to a parent-child relationship, a situation reinforced when
the mentor is a faculty member in an academic institution. Today, mentoring may be viewed as a partnership, with both the mentor and the mentee contributing to the discussion on an equal basis and based upon mutual respect (Shea, 1992). Both the mentor and the mentee gain from this relationship.

Matching of Mentor and Mentee

"Matching can be a problem especially when the process is compulsory and based on proteges', albeit criteria-based, choice" (Chong, Low & Walker, 1989). Generally speaking, we see a good mentor as a parental figure that serves as a guide, teacher and sponsor. He/she encumbers skills, knowledge, virtue, accomplishment, the superior qualities a young mentee hopes someday to acquire. With this superiority, a mentor conveys the promise that, in time, they will be peers. The mentee, who is the recipient of such a process, hopes that soon he/she will be able to join or even surpass his/her mentor in the work they both value. He/she reaps the various benefits to be gained from a serious, mutual, non-sexual, loving relationship with a somewhat older man or woman (Levinson, 1978).

A belief in psychological theories of identification, and that people try to match role models who have similar background, sex, race and personality as their own and to have identified a role model of the same sex, will encourage female students to seek similar achievements (Erkut & Mokros, 1984). However, little research has been undertaken about whether male and female professors have a differential modelling impact on their mentees. Again this is due to the lack of female professors as the majority of the university's faculties are predominantly male.
Earlier studies (Tidball, 1973, Tidball & Kistia asked, 1976) found a positive relationship between the number of women on a college's faculty and the subsequent achievement of women students from that institution and that students who attended women colleges, where more female faculty are employed, are more likely than women enrolled in coeducational colleges to major in 'masculine' fields such as science and mathematics due to lack of male role models in a women's college.

**Mentor Training**

Training is important if the program is to be successful. After conducting his research into mentoring practices in over 100 American Fortune 500 companies, Zey (1993) concludes the need to include training if expectations are to be realistic.

Programme success is very much dependent on the training given to mentors and proteges. The training given to mentors must attempt to familiarise them with both the techniques of mentoring and the overall goals of the mentoring programme. Training can help the protégé understand both the capabilities of formal mentoring and its limits (Zey, 1989).

Stott and Walker (1992) argue that some type of training is vital for mentors in a formal mentorship programme as the mentoring role does not usually come naturally.

Johnson and Sullivan (1995) find that instincts of compassion, concern and goodwill alone do not prepare prospective mentors, thus orientation sessions that provide information and context about the programme goals in local context and strategies for successful mentoring must be provided if the programme is to be
successful. In conducting a mentor training programme, the programme objectives and expected outcomes must be fully explained. Conditions such as performance appraisal, feedback systems, rewards systems and management support must be clear; characteristics of the mentor, interpersonal skills of the mentor and the nature of supervision should be explored through case studies, role play and group meetings. O’Neill, Middlewood and Glover (1994) express the view that linked to the issue of training for mentoring, is the identification of the attitudes and skills involved in the mentoring role. On the one hand, the right attitude is adopted by effective mentoring which assumes acceptance of the idea of partnership entered into voluntarily, based on a relationship between equals and rooted in a common task or shared concern. Thus the agreement should be negotiated, not imposed and can be reviewed as the parties progress and revised if necessary. On the other hand, skills if developed correctly through training will include the ability to share ideas, perceptions and understand values as well as focusing on the message delivered during active listening, and clarifying ideas in the questioning.

In today’s economic situation, when cost cutting and downsizing is common in most organisations, management’s view in cutting training expenses is unavoidable. Mentoring training, which has no immediate tangible benefit, may be left to chance on an informal/voluntary basis. However, as described by Kram and Bragar (1992), formal planned programmes have intended positive consequences provided that the core components are present. These core components include specific objectives of the programme that define the target population as well as the intended benefits of
participation, a selection process that maximises voluntary participation and the likelihood that matched pairs will find value in their relationship; orientation and training that provide knowledge, skills and support for participants to benefit from their involvement, a monitoring and evaluation process that determines whether objectives are achieved and how the programme might be strengthened. Any action that minimise the above components is likely to undermine the programme’s effectiveness.

Good Mentors

Results from previous successful programmes (Slicker & Palmer, 1993; Stanwyck & Anson, 1992) have shown that the most successful mentors are those who are willing to reflect on their roles and on their own expectations, biases and limitations. They must go one step further to extend themselves beyond the confines of their own experience to understand a young person. They may have to wait for students to share information about themselves when they feel ready. Mentors must approach their students with openness and a willingness to listen and follow the student’s lead. When meeting students, skilled mentors will acquaint themselves with student mentees, make the experience fun and discover shared or new interests. Jointly-planned meetings will offer opportunities for mentor and mentee to decide activities together to reach the stated goals (Johnson & Sullivan, 1995). To mentees, mentors may appear to be successful role models without having undergone hardship but mentors should share their experience and problems encountered during their early years and discuss their outlook on life, including values, beliefs, determination
and self discipline which have led them to their present status and show that success is not a matter of luck. In universities, mentors must help students to see the links between doing well in their academic work, becoming mature in their personal development and their future careers. To teach students how to exercise power and discretion, accepting responsibility and fulfilling their potential, is the most valuable lesson a mentor can give.

Encouraging students to identify opportunities for themselves and to develop problem-solving and coping skills so that they are able to take full advantage of those opportunities is the focus of this instruction. It is accomplished by talking through situations with students, asking questions without providing answers, challenging assumptions and fears, suggesting alternatives that may never have been considered and providing information and support. A skilled mentor utilises those tools to help students learn to take responsibilities for themselves and to feel hopeful about their futures (Johnson & Sullivan, 1995, p. 52)

Role Theory and Mentoring

‘Role’, in general terms, means a designated position, within a structure of positions. To an organisational theorist, a role is more than just a position in a structure, it is a set of expectations applied to an occupant of a particular position (Garland, 1982). ‘Role theory’ is the study of the individual and his roles in a
particular setting. This definition is based on four terms: behaviour, person, context and characteristics.

a) Roles are behavioural-overt action or performances that may be observed and that characterise the person observed. It does not include non-behavioural characteristics such as sex, race or national origin.

b) Roles are performed by persons.

c) Roles are sometimes vague.

d) Roles consists of those behaviours that are characteristic of one set of persons.

Role theory provides a framework for defining and analysing roles, roles expectations and role consensus. It conceptualised patterns of human conduct and it is used to describe activities of participants in interpersonal relationships. West-Burnham, Bush, O’Neill, and Glover (1995) describe the ‘art’ of role management in educational organisations as to promote consistent interpretation and performance of roles through the organisation yet, at the same time, to encourage individual initiative and creativity. The essential point is that the roles interpreted by the incumbent, members of the ‘role set’ and other holders of similar roles may vary, which may lead to misunderstanding, conflict and duplication of roles. For example, in university mentoring, the mentors who are also professors will see themselves in different roles in different settings. The role of a professor who is also a mentor may be in conflict and the perception may differ when he/she places himself/herself in the position of a professor rather than a mentor. Likewise, he/she may act differently when playing
different roles as a professor and as a mentor. As described by Handy (1993), a
professor's performance in these roles will depend on his personality and the situation.

Nolder, Smith and Melrose (1994) focus upon the personal factors and upon
the importance of working together. They describe the mentor's role in terms of
supportive fellow professional, listening friend, supportive critic, gatekeeper and link
agent. In no way is this list exhaustive, but these are the personal attributes without
which mentoring cannot be addressed successfully. The role of the mentor is very
distinct and active in the mentoring process. Firstly, as a role model and as an
exemplar to the students. Then as a good communicator to explain the policy of the
university, a counsellor who shares the problem with his students and finally a
facilitator in many contexts such as seeking employment and gaining access to
resources. Providing feedback and information on a regular basis during meetings is
the major responsibility as seen by the mentor and often seem very dictatorial. In the
case of a professor, it is understood that eventually he may have to assess the
student's performance, a role that is not always easy to reconcile with that of a
mentor. In contrast, the role of the mentee is mostly passive as he/she feels
subordinated as a student. In mentoring, students value a mentor's behaviour that is
supportive, accessible, sympathetic and positive but the ideal situation is for students
to adopt an active role rather than a passive one. Students, as suggested by Hudson
and Latham (1995), should be educated into their role so as to enable them to be the
autonomous, active and analytical learners which successful mentoring requires. The
time required for the exchange of information and sharing is lengthy and students often complain that mentors have allocated insufficient time to fulfil their roles.

Outcomes of Mentoring Partnerships

It is important that the mentors and the mentees believe that mentoring has certain benefits for them. It seems that benefits for the mentees are more easily recognised than benefits for the mentors. If mentors perceive that they do not stand to benefit substantially from such relationships, this may inhibit their ability to internalise the value of such relationships and, ultimately, their motivation and desire to participate in such relationships. For this reason, the design of a mentoring programme might need to respond to this by a range of options such as incentives, recognising formally that mentoring is part of the job (Cunningham & Eberle, 1993).

Literature reveals that ideal mentoring relationships are reciprocal and that the mentor as well as the mentees derive specific outcomes from the relationship (Daloz, 1991). For the mentees, it can be personal development in heightened self-esteem, confidence and self-assurance. Professionally, mentees can enhance understanding of their professional identity within academe and adapt to the environment. From the mentor’s point of view, mentoring may produce similar outcomes and mentoring ideally provides insights into personal issues and helps mentors to define their own strengths and weaknesses more clearly. The personal satisfaction and excitement of involvement with mentees as they grow and develop is a form of development for the mentors as well (Daloz, 1991). Mentoring may affirm their commitment to academe, or be a way in which they repay their debt to the field (Phillips-Jones, 1982).
The success of a mentoring relationship depends on the respect that the mentor and the mentee has for each other. Along with respect, there is a need for trust and honesty, which will facilitate a two-way communication channel. Effective communication is more than just imparting information to students and the student acting as a passive recipient. Instead, it involves the mutual sharing of information and of listening to, interpreting and acting upon this information.

The benefit that a mentor gains from a two-way process development is illustrated by Chong, Low and Walker (1989) when one of the Singapore mentors claim that: “every encounter with the protégé is a learning experience” (p. 20). Hudson and Latham (1995) claim that the benefits of mentoring are reciprocal although there may be an imbalance due to the relative positions and qualifications for entering into the relationship. The mentor possesses a range of relevant skills and experiences, which they can contribute to the mentoring process, such as counselling and advising skills. In return they gain recognition, respect, confirmation of self-worth and acceptance as a result of the interaction and visibility that can open doors to promotion. The mentee also brings fresh ideas and fresh views that can be exciting and innovative thus helping the mentor to grow professionally from their mentoring experience.

Mullen and Kealy (1999) claim that:

The potential for mentors to learn from mentees rises as mentors step back from endorsing traditional roles as knowledge-producers and seekers. Mentoring becomes paradoxically
empowered as mentors’ and mentees’ roles become
indistinguishable. Co-mentoring is a process wherein learning
becomes greater than the capacity for individuals to produce on
their own, without guidance or feedback. Attribution of who has
done or created what part of a larger whole becomes difficult
when co-mentors peak in their learning, shared understanding, and
synergistic efforts (p. 196)

However, mentoring demands a high degree of personal and often emotional
investment which some mentors may not be able to afford due to heavy teaching and
research commitments. Kanter (1977) suggests that women incur greater cost from
being mentors than men and Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) explain that this is
due to commitments that a woman has in carrying out her family and domestic
responsibilities. In addition to this: “both mentor and protégé run the risk of being
accused of either showing or garnering favouritism, thereby fostering jealousy and
resentment” (Chong, Low & Walker, 1989, p. 21). Mixed gender mentoring invites
gossip and criticism (George & Kummerow, 1981).

**Summary**

In this chapter, the author has described different forms of mentoring,
mentoring in the education sector and the relationship between leadership and
mentoring. Stemming from leadership, the author discusses under-representation of
women leaders. Within the context of mentoring, leadership styles are examined and
the desirable characteristics of mentors are also explored. Previous research has
found that there is a gender preference by mentees and this is one of the issues that the present author is seeking to explore.
Chapter III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study has been designed to investigate (1) the current practice of mentoring, (2) the beliefs and motives held by the mentors and mentees, (3) the gender preferences of those involved and (4) the desirable characteristics of mentors as perceived by both mentors and mentees.

The research questions in this study are as follows:

1. What are the current mentoring practices carried out at the Hong Kong Baptist University?

2. What are the attitudes of staff and students toward the existing arrangements for mentoring at the University?

3. What qualities are deemed essential for good mentoring at this University?

4. Has any preference been shown up to date with regard to the selection of male or female mentors by the prospective mentees?

After examining several research models, the researcher adopted the critical path model (See Fig. 3.1) developed by Birley and Moreland (1998). This model allows the researcher to put the task in a logical sequence specifically indicating which need to be carried out first and including a schedule and deadline for each. The researcher can review from time to time whether he/she has deviated from the plan, and then make modifications. This model therefore provides an excellent yardstick against which to measure the progress of the study.
Figure 3.1. Critical path in which the research has followed and the time frame for developing the project.

(Adapted from Birley & Moreland, 1998, p. 8)
Research Approaches

In social science, there are two major research paradigms: "positivism" and "interpretivism". Positivism is: "aimed at objectivity, standard procedures and replicability" (Johnson, 1994, p.4). Techniques used in this mode will be objective and include eliciting responses to predetermined questions, recording measurements, describing phenomena and performing experiments. Such a method contrasts with the interpretive paradigm which is more subjective, as the term implies. Interpretive techniques allow the researcher to observe, role-play and interview (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p38). The researcher in this study mainly used the former approach which included a large-scale survey. Interviews were, however, conducted in the second stage because the researcher planned to use the survey data and the interview data to triangulate the findings; to enrich the findings; and to explore any differences between mentors of two faculties (as a significant difference appeared in the responses of two faculties in the quantitative data in the first stage).

Bryman (1992) recommended combining quantitative and qualitative methods, stating that:

Quantitative and qualitative research represents distinctive approaches to social research. Each approach in quantitative research is strongly associated with social survey techniques like structured interviewing and self-administered questionnaires, experiments, structured observation, content analysis, the analysis of official statistics and the like. Qualitative research is typically
associated with participant observation, semi and unstructured interviewing, focus groups, the qualitative examination of texts, and various language-based techniques like conversation and discourse analysis (p. 58).

The following distinctions made by Bryman (1992) can apply to this piece of research. Quantitative research uses a pre-determined instrument that is often restricting. In this case the questionnaire is used. The questions are set in such a way that it restricts the responses of the subjects. Qualitative research allows the researcher to be the instrument. In this way, the researcher uses the information gathered from the interviews and interprets the data based on her cultural background and experiences.

Bryman (1988) also identified some approaches to combining quantitative and qualitative research which are applicable to this study:

1. Findings from one method that is quantitative can be checked against findings from another that is qualitative to prove whether the findings are valid and consistent.

2. Qualitative research facilitates quantitative research. Qualitative research may help to provide background information on context and subject.

3. Quantitative and qualitative methods of research are combined to give depth and substance.

4. Quantitative research explores the "structural features of social life" while qualitative studies deals with the "process".
5. Quantitative research can often tap large-scale, structural features of social life, while qualitative research tends to address small-scale, behavioural aspects.

In this study, the findings in the interviews were used to compare with the quantitative data collected from the questionnaire to see if the results were consistent. When the researcher found that there were differences between the responses from two faculties, obtained from a large-scale survey, she used a qualitative method by interviewing a small group in order to gather background information. By combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, she sought to explain the behavioural aspects in the local context.

Triangulation

Triangulation was also used in this study. Triangulation may be defined as: “the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behaviour” (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 223). The multi-method approach has certain advantages over the singular method when data, collected from different methods yield substantially the same results. In this study, the researcher used multiple methods (methodological triangulation) to examine a single problem. She used survey and semi-structured interviews to gauge the perceptions of mentors and the students. In empirical research, independent measures never converge fully as observations do not confirm or coincide with data completely with interview data gleaned from interviews or with written records. The researcher did not anticipate that the results from student questionnaire would agree fully with findings from the semi-structured interviews with the mentors or with the findings from the
questionnaire to the mentors (Baker, 1994; Cohen & Manion, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1994).

Further, Cohen and Manion (1994) suggest two occasions in which triangulation is particularly appropriate. First, triangulation is useful where the researcher is engaged in case studies as in the present study. Second, when a more holistic view of some educational outcomes is sought, triangulation will be able to provide a better view that is not limited or distorted. The researcher, following on the cue from Cohen and Manion, used triangulation for the present case study because it is more substantive, holistic and better represents the real situation. She incorporated a pilot study, a larger scale demographic survey, and small-scale, in-depth interviews to gather information concerning mentors' attitudes, characteristics, functions and feelings.

Research instruments

The main instruments used for data collection were the questionnaire and the interview. Both the survey questionnaire and the semi-structured interview have distinct advantages. The questionnaire tends to be more reliable because it is anonymous and thus encourages greater honesty from the subjects, not to mention being more economical in time and money. However, the response rate may be low. Interviews, in contrast, have the advantage of a high return rate and the interviewer can always explain to the subjects the purpose of the interview and clarify any misunderstanding. The researcher adopted a large scale demographic survey and a
small-scale in-depth interview in order to gather enough information for the study and to obtain a more holistic view of the issue on mentoring.

Following are some guidelines in conducting a survey and interview:

1. The survey questionnaire, as an instrument, has to be visually appealing to facilitate interest or at least to prompt some response. Not only must the layout be pleasing, instructions must be simple to relax the respondents, earn their trust and encourage candour. As suggested by Manion and Cohen (1994), a questionnaire should start with the easier questions first. Specific questions are better than general ones. Following the above suggestion, the questionnaire used in this survey is divided into four parts. Part I relates to personal information about the mentor or the mentee. Part II asks about respondents' experiences of mentoring and their motives for taking part in the process. Part III consists of opinion questions on the desirable characteristics of mentors. The questions are the same for both mentors and mentees so that direct comparisons can be made about the two. Part IV consists of preference questions with regard to gender, frequency and length of mentoring sessions, and the format of mentoring (i.e. whether it be individual or group).

Respondents were also asked whether they thought mentoring is helpful. Mentors also had to answer one extra question about what difficulties they had encountered while doing their jobs. In constructing questions about the desirable characteristics of mentors and their motivation for participation in the mentoring programme, this researcher reviewed literature from previous
researchers’ work on presumed desirable characteristics of mentors (Arnold & Davidson, 1990; Bolam et al., 1995; Cunningham & Eberle, 1993; Haensley & Elind, 1986; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985 and Shea, 1992). The researcher also interviewed three students who served as mentees and three faculty members who served as mentors to “pre-test” the questions to be used. As Brannen (1992) suggested: “Qualitative work may take place at an early stage in the development of the instruments for data collection” (p. 25).

The researcher, after drafting her questionnaire, conducted a pilot test with 30 major students in physical education in September 1998, and deleted inappropriate wording and ambiguities. She then checked to ensure most pertinent areas were covered by asking the subjects whether she had missed any areas and whether the subjects felt comfortable in answering the questions in the sequences they were asked. The pilot test is a process that Yin (1994a) found important as long as it did not constitute a dress rehearsal (Cunningham, 1993).

The following amendments were made after the pilot study:
The scale was changed to minimise “false opinion” skills and a central tendency error rating as most people would choose three once they were given a 5-point Likert Scale. The researcher then amended the 5-point Likert Scale to a 4-point one (Dane, 1990) eliminating the category of “undecided”.
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One more attribute was added to the list of desirable characteristics of mentors (a "has a doctorate" category because some of the professors requested it out of curiosity).

2. Interview. Interviews were conducted as the second stage in this study as significant differences were found between the two faculties in the data collected from the survey. For the interview, the researcher planned a set of questions (Appendix 5) to let the subjects answer in the same sequence. She also included eight open-ended questions so that she could compare the answers and also probe into more in-depth information. She interviewed each mentor for about one hour with questions focusing on:

(a) Experiences in mentoring  
(b) Perceptions of mentoring roles  
(c) Preferences regarding the gender of their mentees  
(d) Difficulties in mentoring.

The mentors were asked the following questions about their mentoring roles:

(a) How long have you been a mentor?  
(b) Do you enjoy mentoring?  
(c) What aspects of mentoring do you like?  
(d) What aspects of mentoring do you dislike?  
(e) How do you perceive your role as a mentor?  
(f) Do you have any gender preferences in your mentees?  
(g) What difficulties have you encountered?
(h) Do you have any recommendations on how to improve mentoring at the Hong Kong Baptist University?

The researcher transcribed and analysed by examining similarities and differences across the range of mentors’ responses to the above questions. The interviewer, in conducting the research, first phoned the subjects so that they would be prepared and not be embarrassed by an abrupt approach. She told them the nature and purpose of the research and identified herself. She also informed them how long the interview would take as well as how they could contribute. She assured them that they would remain anonymous and their responses would be kept confidential. She also arranged interviews with them where they would feel most comfortable and secure.

**Sampling**

Sampling decisions at the beginning are always important. Too few would discredit the research and too many would be unmanageable. The researcher decided to include half of those in the mentoring programme in 1998-99 and drawn from all five faculties: namely arts, business, communication, science and social sciences as half of the total population would seem to be a reasonable number.

The investigator surveyed 50% of all 1350 freshmen, the sampling size was therefore about 675 subjects (50% of 1350). The multi-stage sampling method was used: “Stage sampling is an extension of cluster sampling. It involves selecting the sample in stages, that is, taking samples from samples” (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 88). In Stage One, four out of eight instructors who taught most classes were
purposely chosen to participate in the survey in order to achieve a high response rate. Although this is "non-probability sampling", it was not likely to create a bias sample and the sample can still represent the wider population since at Hong Kong Baptist University, all freshmen have to enroll in one activity class as an elective, therefore all freshmen in all five faculties will be covered by choosing the classes of half of all instructors. However, one of the instructors did not administer the questionnaires to her class; thus, only 500 questionnaires were distributed. As a result, the survey did not achieve the target of having 50% of freshmen participating in the survey but the researcher felt that it could still represent the parent population as all 500 questionnaires were returned. The survey was undertaken during the last week of April and the beginning of May 1999. Students received the questionnaire during the teaching evaluation exercise but they did not have to respond in compliance with the practice of the University’s Human Ethics Committee. Even though it was a voluntary exercise, all subjects returned the questionnaire so the guidelines produced by the Human Ethics Committee did not have any impact on the response rate.

The survey for the mentors started in mid-May 1999, immediately after the examination period, with questionnaires for 250 mentors. The researcher set her target at a 25% response rate since some professors would rather conduct their own research and write paper to secure tenure or gain promotion. Questionnaires were sent with a self-addressed stamped envelope to help the response rate. The covering letter and the questionnaire to mentors and mentees are in Appendices 1 - 5.
The researcher then followed up on this by interviewing 10 mentors, five from each of the following faculties: science and communication. The rationale for choosing these two faculties for further qualitative investigation was due to the significance found in the quantitative results relating to the desirable characteristics of mentors as perceived by the mentees between these two faculties. The sample was further stratified by interviewing two associate professors and three assistant professors, three locals and two expatriates from each of the above faculties. Hopefully the results could cover mentors of different academic ranks and different cultural diversities.

Preparation for Data Collection

1. Primary contacts with coordinators (physical education instructors teaching PE 1111 classes) were made in April 1999. Cover letters and questionnaires to mentees were sent to coordinators seeking comments (Appendix 1 & 2). Data collection was conducted in May 1999. Questionnaires were distributed during the last week of classes and the students were told that participation was voluntary.

2. Collate results.

3. Names of faculty who served as mentors were acquired from the Centre of Educational Development. In June 1999, a total of 250 covering letters and questionnaires for mentors were sent through internal mail to all Associate and
Assistant Professors who served as mentors (Appendix 3 & 4). The letter reaffirmed that participation in the project was voluntary.

4. Results were collated at the end of August.

5. In October, initial contacts were made with mentors to request interviews and book appointments for December.


7. Results were collated at the end of January.

Data Collection from the Mentees

The researcher invited coordinators to be “gatekeepers”. They were (1) to distribute the questionnaire to all the subjects and (2) to ensure that subjects understand the nature and purpose of the voluntary survey. Gatekeepers were to answer any questions during the course of filling out the questionnaire and collect the completed questionnaire at the end of the class. The researcher briefed all coordinators so that they would know what to do. As all coordinators participated on a voluntary basis, their attitudes were enthusiastic and serious resulting in a high return rate of 500. One of the coordinator forgot to distribute the questionnaires to her classes and some responses were faulty because not all questions were answered. Only 456 returns were usable.

Data Collection from the Mentors

The researcher began surveying the mentors after she had collected data from the students in May. Covering letters and questionnaires were sent out in June, and 90 returns were received from 250 mentors, (of which only 79 were usable). The
mentors seemed less inclined to participate perhaps because the survey was not compulsory and most academics are occupied and preoccupied with their own work.

Five mentors from each of the two faculties were contacted for interviews, a total of 10 mentors from the two faculties, a manageable number for the multiple methods approach. Fortunately, the participants were the right mix of ranks and nationalities as mentioned earlier.

The researcher conducted the pilot interview with semi-structured questions (Appendix 5) in November 1999 and substantive ones in January 2000. The researcher first contacted the interviewees in late December to book appointments for early January during the semester break. Interviews were carried out in the mentors' respective offices so that they would feel more relaxed in a familiar environment. To start the interview, the researcher explained its purpose and the time involved which was between 40 to 50 minutes. She assured the subjects of confidentiality and the interviews would not be taped. All interviews proceeded smoothly. The questions were asked and answered in the same order for every interview, and the responses were consistent (which facilitated the organisation and analysis of the data).

Data Analysis

The investigator in this study adopted a method in the positivist tradition. Although some data were collected by interviews, it was analysed to produce quantitative outcomes. These methods addressed different but associated research questions so that the two types of data derived could complement one another. When
responses were inconsistent, qualitative data tended to explain the discrepancies. The analysis of the data is divided into three parts:

   Part 1 analysed the demographic information, which includes details on gender, age and faculty.

   In Part 2, data was analysed by mean, standard deviation, t-test, and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An independent t-test was used to gauge any significant difference in the attitudes between male and female students at the 5% level of confidence. The researcher using one-way ANOVA could assess whether mentors from the faculties differed in their responses. She used frequency counts to determine whether students preferred male or female mentors. All data were also analysed by the computer software of Statistical Package for Social Science 9.0 (SPSS).

   In Part 3, for question no. 14 and for information collected through personal interview, the researcher analysed the content from the interviews with Text-Smart 1.1 by SPSS. This is a new statistical package that can use statistics to analyse qualitative data, such as responses to open-ended questions by identifying key words or phrases in the text of the interview. Even though this technique is rarely used by researchers committed to a qualitative paradigm, it is a way of statistical triangulation to keep up with the broadly positivist approach.

   The following delimitations and limitations would be considered in reviewing the results of this study:-
Delimitations

1. Only faculty members who took part in the mentor's programme participated in the study.

2. Only freshmen students also enrolled in the physical education programme in the second semester of the 1998-1999 academic year participated in the study.

3. The attitudes of students as mentees were assessed by a self-designed attitude inventory.

4. The attitudes of staff as mentors were assessed by a self-designed questionnaire and an interview.

Limitations

1. The number of male subjects was disproportionally smaller than that of female subjects as male to female students at Hong Kong Baptist University is 1:2.

2. The researcher assumed all subjects would be honest.

3. The survey was conducted only once between May and June of 1999.

4. The skill of the researcher.

5. The limited number of mentors interviewed for the study.

Potential Problems

There is always a danger of achieving validity and reliability in any research. The extent to which an instrument can accurately measure what it is supposed to measure and in a consistent manner also exist in this study. As Manion and Cohen (1994) identify some issues and problems confronting researcher using triangulation:

Where a researcher seeks information from which her inferences
can be generalised to wider populations, methods yielding statistical
data will be most efficient. Where she looks for information
representing a personal or phenomenological perspective, or process
rather than product, accounts or interviews will meet her need more
successfully. If she wants to integrate objective and subjective
perspectives, she will use contrasting methods. (p. 242)
The question here is that the researcher might have conducted too few
interviews and that the questions might not have been comprehensive enough. By
"pre-testing" the questionnaire and using a pilot survey, the researcher hoped to
resolve those problems.

Summary

This chapter explains why the researcher has set out the benefits of combining
quantitative and qualitative techniques in what is called a "triangulated approach".
The sampling procedures and the use of pre-pilot and pilot study are documented.
The preparation for data collection and the data collection process are explained and
the method of data analysis is also discussed. A separate section on the possible
delimitations and limitations of the study is presented. These factors may influence
some of the findings in the following chapter.
Chapter IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The data concerning the attitudes towards mentoring, preferences on mentor’s gender and the desirable characteristics of mentors were presented and analysed by gender and faculty in the following manner:

1) Mentees’ survey
2) Mentors’ survey
3) Comparison of ten desirable characteristics of mentors
   i. between mentors and mentees
   ii. between male and female mentees
   iii. between mentees from different faculties
4) Mentors’ interviews

Mentees’ Survey

Demographic data on mentees.

500 questionnaires were distributed during PE 1112 classes during the last two weeks of May 1999. All 500 questionnaires were returned with 100% response rate. However, only 456 (91.2%) were usable.

The age range of the mentees was from 19 to 24 with a mean age of 20.02 and standard deviation of 0.96. There were 139 (31%) male and 310 (69%) female respondents. Seven respondents omitted this question.

The distribution of students in the five faculties were Arts: 671 (16.9%), Business: 1012 (25.4%), Communication: 455 (11.4%), Science: 854 (21.5%),
Social Sciences: 989 (24.8%). The percentage of mentees from each faculty was similar to that of the student population in each of the five faculties thus it truly represented the student population of the Hong Kong Baptist University (See Table 4.1).

Table 4.1
Distribution of Mentees among Different Faculties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of mentees</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in the University</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of M:F in the faculty</td>
<td>9.2/90.8</td>
<td>30.1/69.9</td>
<td>28.1/71.9</td>
<td>55.3/44.7</td>
<td>25.4/74.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing data : 7

Percentage of mentees with male/female mentors.

As one of the purposes of this study is to establish the gender preference of mentors, it is essential to find out the percentage of mentees of both genders who have males or females as mentors. Since only 449 respondents indicated their gender while one male and one female respondent did not reveal the gender of their mentor, analyses were based on 447 responses. Out of 137 male mentees, 116 male mentees have male mentors leaving 21 male mentees with female mentors. Out of 310 female mentees, only 95 female mentees were mentored by a
female mentor while 215 female mentees have cross-sex mentoring. Therefore the number of mentees with male mentors is definitely more than mentees with female mentors. As illustrated in Table 4.2, the number of students with female mentors was 116 which constituted only 25.9% of those receiving mentoring despite the fact that 835 out of 1305 (63.9%) of first year students in 1998-1999 at the Hong Kong Baptist University were females.

Table 4.2

Percentage of Mentees with Male and Female Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of mentor</th>
<th>Male mentor</th>
<th>Female mentor</th>
<th>Male mentor</th>
<th>Female mentor</th>
<th>Male mentor</th>
<th>Female mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*missing data : 2

The percentage of female faculty in the University.

The percentage of male and female faculties at Hong Kong Baptist University is shown in Table 4.3. A breakdown of the percentage in each category shows that the percentage of females is lower than their male counterparts at all levels and particularly in more senior posts.
Table 4.3

Sex Profile of Faculty at Hong Kong Baptist University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof. B</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof. A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of mentoring sessions received by mentees.

The average number of mentoring sessions received by mentees was 3.42 sessions per year with only slight differences among individual faculty. It is interesting that the number of mentoring sessions mentioned by mentees do not match the number of mentoring sessions reported by mentors, as we shall see later in this chapter (See Table 4.4).

Table 4.4

Number of Mentoring Sessions Received by Mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
<th>Mean of all faculties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per year</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentees' attitude towards the frequency of mentoring sessions.

Mentees were asked about their attitudes towards the frequency of mentoring. 58 students (13.3%) felt that mentoring sessions held were too frequent. 96 students (22.2%) felt that too few mentoring sessions were held. 282 students (64.7%) indicated that the number of sessions held was just right. Most students were satisfied regarding the number of sessions held. There were 20 missing cases.

Length of mentoring sessions.

As reported by the mentees, the maximum length of mentoring sessions conducted was 12 hours and the minimum length of mentoring sessions held was one minute. 82 (19.1%) indicated that the suggested length of one hour was too long while 22 (5.1%) indicated that it was too short. 325 (75.8%) indicated that a one hour session was just the right length. Most of the students were satisfied with the length of mentoring sessions recommended by the University. There were 27 missing cases.

Group size of mentoring sessions.

The largest group of students mentored in a single session conducted by mentors, as reported by mentees, was 60, and the smallest group was one. This discrepancy in group size between groups can affect the quality of the mentoring sessions provided by the mentor as it is more difficult to provide effective mentoring in large groups.
Motivational factors for participation in the mentoring programme.

The primary motivation for participating in the mentoring programme for most mentees was to fulfil the university requirement. This had the highest percentage of 48%. The second highest rank was to develop better relationship between professor and students with 20.4% (See Table 4.5).

Table 4.5

Mentees' Ranking of Motivational Factors for Participation in the Mentoring Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Fulfil Univ. requirement</th>
<th>Seek acad. advice</th>
<th>Personal counselling</th>
<th>Make friends</th>
<th>Better relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>216 (48%)</td>
<td>81 (18%)</td>
<td>32 (7.1%)</td>
<td>29 (6.4%)</td>
<td>92 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55 (12.2%)</td>
<td>144 (32%)</td>
<td>71 (15.8%)</td>
<td>69 (15.3%)</td>
<td>109 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52 (11.6%)</td>
<td>109 (24.2%)</td>
<td>125 (27.8%)</td>
<td>67 (14.9%)</td>
<td>98 (21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40 (8.9%)</td>
<td>80 (17.8%)</td>
<td>116 (25.8%)</td>
<td>121 (26.9%)</td>
<td>94 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>87 (19.3%)</td>
<td>36 (8%)</td>
<td>108 (23.6%)</td>
<td>164 (36.4%)</td>
<td>57 (12.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preference on gender.

396 (88.79%) of those responding claimed that there was no necessity to have same-sex mentoring. The percentage of male to female in this group was 117: 279 (29.5%: 70.5%) while 50 indicated that students should be mentored by mentors of the same-sex. The percentage of male to female in the second group was 21:29 (42%:58%) with 10 missing data. However, when they were given an opportunity to choose between a male or female mentor, out of 419 mentees
responding to this question, 228 mentees (96 males and 132 females) chose male mentors while only 191 students, 32 males and 159 females, chose female mentors. This constituted 54.4% of all mentees choosing male mentors versus 45.5% choosing female mentors. This question reveals that there is some inconsistency in students' responses. Despite the fact that students claimed that there was no necessity to have a mentor of the same sex, results showed that they would choose a mentor of their own sex when given a choice. This is particularly true of male mentees where 75% chose a male mentor.

Preference on group or individual mentoring.

Out of 444 responses to this question, 397 (89.41%) would choose group mentoring while only 47 (10.59%) students chose individual mentoring. This could be attributed to the fact that Chinese students are more shy and thus prefer group interaction. There were 12 missing data.

Whether mentoring is helpful.

Out of 447 responses to this question, 274 (61.3%) indicated that mentoring was helpful to them while 173 (38.7%) indicated that mentoring was not helpful. There were 9 missing data.

Mentors' Survey

Demographic data on mentors.

The population of mentors is 250. A total of 250 questionnaires were sent out on 1 June 1999 with 90 (31.6%) returned by the end of July of which 79 (87.7%) were usable. The percentages of male to female were 57 (72.2%) and 22 (27.8%) respectively. This suggests that there is an unequal balance of female and
male mentors in the university and this also correlates with the percentage of male to female academic faculty employed by the University which is 75.75 % male and 24.25 % female respectively.

Since the number of mentors responding was small, the distribution of mentors in different faculties by gender is also small (See Table 4.6).

Table 4.6
The Distribution of Mentors among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of mentors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in University</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of M:F</td>
<td>11:7</td>
<td>12:4</td>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>20:2</td>
<td>7:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of M: F in faculty</td>
<td>61.1/38.9</td>
<td>75/25</td>
<td>63.6/36.4</td>
<td>90.9/9.1</td>
<td>58.3/41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of mentees per mentor in each faculty is 5.7 and slight differences were noted among departments (See Table 4.7).

Table 4.7
Average Number of Mentees Allocated to Mentors among Faculties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of mentees</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average numbers of mentoring sessions held by mentors.

The average number of mentoring sessions reported by mentors were 5.15 sessions per year with slight differences among individual faculties (See Table 4.8). However, this does not correlate with the number of mentoring sessions received by mentees as reported by the mentees in the mentees' survey (See Table 4.4).

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentors’ attitude towards the frequency of mentoring sessions.

Mentors were asked about their attitude towards the frequency of mentoring. 21 (26.6%) felt that the mentoring sessions held were too frequent, six (7.6%) felt that there were too few mentoring sessions while the majority 52 (65%) indicated that the number of sessions held was just right.

Length of mentoring sessions.

As reported by the mentors, the maximum length of mentoring sessions conducted was eight hours and the minimum length of mentoring sessions conducted was only 10 minutes. 11 (14.3%) indicated that the suggested length of one hour was too long and the same percentage (14.3%) indicated that it was too short. 55 (71%) indicated that a one-hour session was just right. There were two missing data.
Group size of mentoring sessions.

The largest group of mentees mentioned in a single session was 60 while the smallest group consisted of one mentee. This is one of the questions in which the answers from the mentors and the mentees correlate match perfectly.

Motivational factors for participation in the mentoring programme.

In table 4.9, we note that the greatest motivational factor ranked by mentors for their participation in mentoring was to 'help students in adjusting to university life' with 43.4% followed by 'develop better relationship between professors and students' with 23.7% while the least important motivational factor ranked by mentors was to 'fulfil one’s job assigned by the university' with 15.8%.

Table 4.9

Ranking of Motivational Factors by Mentors for Participation in Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Help students to adjust to Univ. life</th>
<th>Stimulate thinking &amp; improve learning skills</th>
<th>Develop better relationship between profs. &amp; students</th>
<th>Fulfil the job as assigned by the Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 (43.4%)</td>
<td>15 (19.7%)</td>
<td>18 (23.7%)</td>
<td>12 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26 (34.2%)</td>
<td>28 (36.8%)</td>
<td>17 (22.4%)</td>
<td>4 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (14.5%)</td>
<td>26 (34.2%)</td>
<td>30 (39.5%)</td>
<td>8 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 (7.9%)</td>
<td>7 (9.2%)</td>
<td>11 (14.5%)</td>
<td>52 (68.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preference on gender.

74 (96.1%) indicated that there was no necessity to have same-sex mentoring but when they were given a choice to choose male or female mentees,
20 (37.5%) out of 56 male mentors would choose male mentees while only nine (16.07%) would choose female mentees. The majority 27 (48.21%) remained neutral. In the case of female mentors, two (9.52%) out of 21 would choose male mentees while nine (42.9%) would choose female mentees. 10 (47.62%) remained neutral.

Preference on group or individual mentoring.

70 mentors (88.6%) preferred group mentoring leaving nine (11.39%) preferring individual mentoring.

Is mentoring helpful?

Out of 77 valid responses, 37 (46.8%) indicated that mentoring was helpful while 40 (50.6%) indicated that it was not helpful. This was different from the mentees’ response in which 61.3% of the mentees claimed that mentoring was helpful.

Comparison of Ten Desirable Characteristics of Mentors

When interpreting tables 4.10–4.13, the number under ‘ranking’ signifies the order of importance of that characteristic in mentors which attracts mentees as indicated by the mean score of the subjects being surveyed. The number under ‘mean’ means the average score of all subjects being surveyed regarding the importance of characteristics of mentors which attracts mentees with 1 = most important and 4 = least important. Thus the smaller the score, the more important that characteristic is as rated by mentees and vice-versa.
Table 4.10 shows the ranking of the 10 desirable characteristics of mentors as perceived by mentors and mentees. ‘Understanding & sympathetic’ was ranked by mentors as the most desirable characteristics followed by ‘accessible to students’; ‘communicate well’ was ranked third and ‘enthusiastic’ ranked fourth.

Table 4.10

Comparison on the Importance of Ten Desirable Characteristics of Mentors as Perceived by Mentors and Mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mentors (n=79)</th>
<th>Mentees (449)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; sympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject well</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive life style</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local &amp; international Reputation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.11 shows whether there were any significant differences between the mentor and the mentee group in the 10 desirable characteristics. It was found that a significant difference was found in all characteristics except ‘a good teacher’.

Table 4.11

Independent T-Test for 10 Items on Desirable Characteristics of Mentors between Mentors and Mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.752**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local &amp; international reputation</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.703**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has attractive life style</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>5.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-5.245**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.762*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject well</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.542*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-1.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-3.212**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and sympathetic</td>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-4.799**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentee</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 4.12 compares the perceived importance of desirable characteristics between male and female. The rankings for female students followed a similar pattern as for the mentor/mentee group while a 'good teacher' and 'know my subject well' seemed to occupy a higher ranking for male mentees. The last four items remained the same for both the male and female group.

Table 4.12
Comparison of 10 Items on Desirable Characteristics of Mentors between Male and Female Mentees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Female (n=310)</th>
<th>Male (n=138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; sympathetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject matter well</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive life style</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local &amp; international reputation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13 shows whether there was any significant difference between male and female mentees on the 10 items on desirable characteristics and it was found that only two items out of 10 had a significant difference and they were ‘has local and international reputation’ and ‘can influence decisions.’

Table 4.13

Independent T-Test for 10 Items on Desirable Characteristics of Mentors between Male and Female Mentees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-1.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local &amp; international reputation</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.156**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has attractive life style</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-2.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject well</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; sympathetic</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 4.14 shows that two groups of students (communication and science) appeared most frequently in the table and on many occasions seemed to be at the polar ends. There were certain desirable characteristics in a mentor that students in the Faculty of Communication viewed as most important such as ‘a good teacher’, ‘accessible to student’, ‘know my subject well’, ‘enthusiastic’, ‘communicate well’ and ‘sympathetic’. Interestingly, all these characteristics were viewed as least important by students in the Science Faculty. This is probably attributable to the nature of their studies as communication studies is heavily related to the human aspect whereas studies in the science faculty are more formula driven and sometimes neglect the human side of academic learning. The researcher then chose mentors of these two faculties to be interviewed with the intention of finding out how mentors perceived their role and whether there was any correlation between the attitude of the mentor and the reaction of the students towards these characteristics.
Table 4.14

A Summary Table Showing the 10 Characteristics of Mentors as Perceived as Most Important or Least Important by Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty view as most imp.</th>
<th>Faculty view as least imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and int’ reputation</td>
<td>Social science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has attractive life style</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to student</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject well</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one-way ANOVA was used to determine any significant mean differences among different faculties in terms of desirable characteristic for mentors. A 0.05 level of significance was used for all data analysis. It was found that there was significant difference among faculties in eight desirable characteristics for mentors.
Table 4.15
Results of ANOVA for Mentees from Different Faculties on Desirable Characteristics of Mentors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>6.568</td>
<td>3.983**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>5.876</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>2.732*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local &amp; international reputation</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>7.938</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>2.741*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an attractive life style</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>7.827</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td>4.089**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>8.994</td>
<td>2.248</td>
<td>3.588**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject matter well</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>4.601</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>8.199</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>3.508**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>11.394</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>5.474**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and sympathetic</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>6.733</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td>3.266*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = Degree of Freedom, SS = Sum of Square, MS = Mean Square, F = F ratio, * p < .05., ** p < .01.

A detailed description in mean scores among different faculties in all dimensions is presented separately in the following 10 tables (tables 4.16 to 4.25).

The faculties which rated the characteristics as most important (MI) and least important (LI) are also shown and analysis of differences by faculties is presented in each table. Those faculties which have statistically mean significant
differences between them are marked with an * and those which have no statistically significant differences are marked with a \.

In table 4.16, the characteristic ‘has a doctorate’ was found to be most important for the science students and least important for the arts students.

Table 4.16

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Has a Doctorate’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12 LI</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.41 MI</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristics of ‘has a doctorate’, significant difference was found (F ratio = 3.983, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p<.05).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Arts and Science faculty
b. Arts and Social Science faculty
c. Business and Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important
     LI = Least important
For table 4.17, the characteristic ‘a good teacher’ was found to be most important for the communication students while it is least important for the science students.

Table 4.17
Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘a Good Teacher’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>MI Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>LI Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristic of ‘a good teacher’, significant difference was found (F ratio $= 2.732$, df = 4,445 : 2.96, $p < .05$).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Arts and Business faculty

b. Arts and Science faculty

c. Arts and Social Science faculty

d. Business and Communication faculty

e. Communication and Science faculty

f. Science and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important

LI = Least important
In table 4.18 the characteristic ‘has local and international reputation’ was found to be the most important for the Social Science students and least important for the Arts students.

Table 4.18

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Has Local and International Reputation’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>LI Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>MI Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristics of ‘has local and international reputation’, a significant difference was found (F ratio = 2.741, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Arts and Science faculty

b. Arts and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important

LI = Least important

In table 4.19, the characteristic ‘has an attractive life style’ was found to be most important for the science students and least important for the business students.
Table 4.19

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristics ‘Has Attractive Life Style’

among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.46 LI</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29 MI</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference in the mean score was found between any faculties with

(F ratio = .698, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p <.05).

**Key:**

MI = Most important

LI = Least important

In table 4.20, the characteristic ‘accessible to students’ was found to be most

important for the communication students and least important for the science

students.
Table 4.20

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Accessible to Students’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>MI Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>LI Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristic of ‘accessible to students’, significant difference was found (F ratio = 4.089, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in mean score was found between

a. Arts and Science faculty
b. Business and Communication faculty
c. Business and Science faculty
d. Communication and Science faculty
e. Communication and Social Science faculty
f. Science and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important  
     LI = Least important

In table 4.21 the characteristic ‘can influence decision’ was found to be most important for the science students and least important for the arts students.
Table 4.21

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Can Influence Decision’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.69 LI Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43 Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24 MI Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35 Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristic of ‘can influence decision’, significant difference was found (F ratio = 3.588, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Arts and Business faculty

b. Arts and Communication faculty

c. Arts and Science faculty

d. Arts and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important

LI = Least important

In table 4.22, the characteristic ‘knows my subject well’ was found to be most important for the communication students and least important for the science students.
Table 4.22

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Knows My Subject Well’

among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>MI Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>LI Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristic of ‘knows my subject matter well’, significant difference was found (F = ratio = 1.932, df = 4.445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Communication and Science faculty

b. Communication and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important

LI = Least important

In table 4.23, the characteristic ‘enthusiastic’ was found to be most important for the communication students and least important for the science students.
Table 4.23

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Enthusiastic’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristic of ‘enthusiastic’ significant difference was found (F ratio = 3.508, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in mean score was found between

a. Arts and Science faculty
b. Business and Communication faculty
c. Community and Science faculty
d. Community and Social Science faculty
e. Science and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important
     LI = Least important

In table 4.24, the characteristic ‘communicate well’ was found to be most important for the communication students and least important for the science students.
Table 4.24

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristic ‘Communicate Well’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 MI</td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.86 LI</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristic of ‘communicate well’, significant difference was found (F ratio = 5.474, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Arts and Business faculty
b. Arts and Science faculty
c. Arts and Social Science faculty
d. Business and Communication faculty
e. Communication and Science faculty
f. Communication and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important
LI = Least important

In table 4.25, the characteristic ‘understanding and sympathetic’ was found to be most important for communication students and least important for the science students.
Table 4.25

Differences in Mean Score for the Characteristics ‘Understanding and Sympathetic’ among Different Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Soc. Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41 MI</td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.84 LI</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>Soc. Sc.</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences

For the characteristics of ‘understanding and sympathetic’, significant difference was found (F ratio = 3.266, df = 4,445 : 2.96, p < .05).

A significant difference in the mean score was found between

a. Arts and Science faculty

b. Business and Communication faculty

c. Communication and Science faculty

d. Communication and Social Science faculty

Key: MI = Most important

LI = Least important

Gender preference on mentors.

Out of 450 returns, 446 (99.1%) responded to the question “students should be mentored by mentors of the same sex”. Table 4.26 showed that, out of 446 mentees, 396 (88.8%) mentees answered “no” against 50 (11.2%) mentees
who answered "yes". Out of 138 male mentees, only 21 (15.2%) answered "yes" while 117 (84.8%) answered "no". As for 308 female mentees, only 29 (9.4%) answered "yes" while 279 (90.6%) answered "no". The number of mentees answering "yes" was significantly lower than those answering "no".

Table 4.26
Responses from Students Towards the Question Whether Students Should be Mentored by Mentors of the Same Sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21 (15.2%)</td>
<td>117 (84.8%)</td>
<td>138 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29 (9.4%)</td>
<td>279 (90.6%)</td>
<td>308 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50 (11.2%)</td>
<td>396 (88.8%)</td>
<td>446 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.27, it was shown that 419 (93.1%) responded to the question "If you have a choice, would you choose a mentor that is male/female?" Out of 128 male mentees who answered this question, 96 (75%) would choose male mentors while 32 (25%) would choose female mentors. Out of 291 female mentees who answered this question, 132 would choose male mentors while 159 would choose female mentors.
Table 4.27

Responses from Students Towards the Question Whether They Would Choose Male or Female Mentors if They Have a Choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male mentor</th>
<th>Female mentor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male mentee</td>
<td>96 (75%)</td>
<td>32 (25%)</td>
<td>128 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female mentee</td>
<td>132 (45.4%)</td>
<td>159 (54.6%)</td>
<td>291 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228 (54.4%)</td>
<td>191 (45.6%)</td>
<td>419 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This reflects some inconsistency in that students expressed a preference despite appearing to regard the sex of mentors as an insignificant variable.

**Mentors’ Interviews**

Quantitative analysis on answers from mentors’ interviews using frequency counts.

The statistical package Text Smart 1.1 picks up key words or phrases in the text and sorts by frequencies the words or phrases appearing in the text of the response for each question asked of the mentors. As such, all irrelevant words such as the, a, an, and, or, are deleted from the text before conducting the analysis. Words and phrases with qualitative meaning provide the researcher with deeper understanding of the issues rather than looking at the quantitative analysis alone.

The following is a description of the responses from the mentors’ interviews.

For question 1 - How long have you been a mentor?
All subjects responded and the answer was three years, as the mentoring programme only started three years ago.
For question 2 - Do you enjoy mentoring?

All subjects responded. Seven answered 'yes', two answered 'no' and one answered 'yes' if the student was responding well and no if the response rate from the students was 'poor'.

For question 3 - Which aspect of mentoring do you like?

There were only eight responses as two chose to answer question 4 only. The word appearing most frequently was 'communicate' (five counts) and 'understand' (five counts) thus communication and understanding were probably the aspects which mentors liked the most.

For question 4 - Which aspect of mentoring do you dislike?

Only eight responded to this question. The word 'absences' (three counts) and the phrases 'no reward' and 'no motivation' (three counts) suggested that students' absences from mentoring sessions, lack of motivation and the process being not rewarding were the aspects that mentors disliked the most.

For question 5 - How do you perceive your role as a mentor?

All subjects responded to this question. The phrase appearing most frequently was 'adviser' (eight counts) followed by the word 'academic' (seven counts). So it is clear that eight mentors viewed themselves as advisers and seven connected this to academic matters. The word 'friend' (four counts) 'consultant' (three counts) and 'facilitator' (three counts) also seemed to be significant. Other words such as 'counsellor, guide, information provider, resource agent and lunch coordinator' each had two counts.

Question 6 - Do you have any gender preference for your mentees?
All 10 subjects responded with the same answer 'no' except that one mentor mentioned 'female better because better language skills from female mentees'.

Question 7 - what difficulties have you encountered in carrying out mentoring?

All 10 subjects responded to this question. The phrases ‘language barrier’ and ‘mentor training’ appeared four times. The word ‘absences’ appeared three times. The greatest difficulty encountered by most mentors was the lack of training to carry out their mentoring while most expatriates said that language barrier was one of the problems they encountered in mentoring.

Question 8 - Give your views and suggestions concerning the improvement of mentoring practice at Hong Kong Baptist University.

All subjects responded with the words ‘management’ and ‘reward’ appearing most frequently (four counts), the words ‘involvement’ and ‘proper training’ having three counts followed by such words as ‘recognition, workload and release time’ having two counts. The suggestions by mentors included involvement from the senior management, given due recognition, proper training and release time to mentors for the already heavy workload because good mentoring is essential for a successful mentoring programme.

Qualitative analysis of the content in the mentors’ interviews.

Case 1

In this case, the mentor seemed to be dissatisfied with the formal mentoring arrangement. As an expatriate, he had already encountered cultural barriers and language barriers which were the basis for good communication. When he was being asked the question whether he enjoyed mentoring, without hesitation, he
said “No, I do it simply because the students are required to fulfil their graduation requirement.” In response to the question that followed “Which part of mentoring do you dislike?” He paused “May be we did not communicate because of language barrier or cultural differences. Students were to shy to express and the meeting end up in silence.” In addition, he also mentioned ‘role ambiguity’. As West-Burnham et al. (1995) suggest, the roles interpreted by the incumbent, members of the ‘role set’ and other holders of similar roles may vary, which may lead to misunderstanding, conflict and duplication of roles. Unless these roles are clearly defined, mentors might feel confused. This mentor did not see himself performing the mentor’s role in terms of a supportive fellow professional, listening friend, gatekeeper and link agent but rather as a traditional academic adviser, referral agent, clerk and social lunch host.

Case 2

This was a similar case to case 1, as both mentors were expatriates in the science faculty. He encountered similar problems to the previous case and saw himself playing similar roles as academic adviser and lunch coordinator. It was confirmed when he answered the question “How do you perceive your role as a mentor?” He replied “No more than an academic adviser and lunch co-ordinator.” One distinct difference between this mentor and the previous mentor was that he blamed the students for their absence, their low responses and their lack of motivation. He sighed and added “What can you do if students do not appear for their appointment?” One common point between the two cases was the attitude of senior management who was perceived not to take mentoring seriously. Failure to
give recognition and rewards for good mentoring, and the failure to provide training, were the key problems in mentoring. Compassion and goodwill alone did not prepare prospective mentors, thus orientation sessions that provide information and context about the programme goals in the local context and strategies for successful mentoring must be provided. Strategies should include feedback systems, reward systems and management support from senior management. In addition, training courses should be conducted to improve the ability of the mentors to share ideas, perceptions and understand values as well as focusing on the message delivered during active listening, and clarifying ideas in the questioning process.

Case 3

This case was similar, and, yet different from previous cases. The similarities were the mentor was also an assistant professor in the science faculty and also an expatriate. The differences were the mentor was a female and that she enjoyed the mentoring process. "I enjoyed mentoring." She said "It gives me an opportunity to communicate with students....especially when they are first-year students, I get to know their aspiration and it helps me in my teaching." She also described the difficulties she encountered in terms of shortage of time and tight schedules that affect her mentoring role. She mentioned that the present system was dominated by her male counterparts and commented that the percentage of female faculty is under-represented in this university.
Case 4 and Case 5

Case 4 (Professor A) and case 5 (Professor B) had distinct differences from the first three cases. Since both mentors were locals, thus, there was no mentioning of a language barrier or cultural differences in the responses. Similar responses to case 3 words like 'understand' and 'communicate' appeared. In case 4, Professor A expressed “Mentoring improves communication and create understanding between professors and students.” The answers were positive in the sense that this mentor was looking at mentoring from a student perspective using terms such as 'understand students' feeling', 'instil confidence in student' and 'prepare students for challenge'. This positive approach was important in mentoring as the success of mentoring depended on whether the mentor was willing to provide help to the mentees. In case 5, although 'academic adviser' was still one of the roles mentioned by Professor B, this mentor viewed himself more than just an academic adviser. “Whether the programme works or not depends on whether the mentor can make himself available and accessible to his students.” was his remark.

Case 6

In this case, the professor was an expatriate who also mentioned the language barrier. Contrary to previous cases when language was one of the problems, he looked at mentoring more positively by trying to get to know the culture, and to understand and communicate with students. When he was asked whether language was a problem, he paused and uttered “although I don’t speak Cantonese, I think we communicate, understand and accept each other. However, management could have done a better job by providing proper orientation,
training and giving rewards for good mentoring.” Compared to other expatriates, he seemed to enjoy mentoring much more.

Case 7

Similar to case 6, this professor viewed mentoring from a positive angle. Although he mentioned that mentoring did not accomplish what it was intended for in the university, which was ‘whole man education’, he still found improved student work leading to a lower dropout rate. As Jacobi (1991) stated in the case of education “Mentoring... is increasing looked to today as a retention and enhancement strategy for undergraduate education” (p. 505). Like most other professors, this professor expressed that, because of his heavy commitments, he could not afford the time or the energy to conduct a good mentoring programme. “I am not going to spend time in something which is not taken seriously by senior management. Besides, I cannot afford the time and energy because it is not rewarded. Although I must say it does work in lowering the attrition rate.” Some of the recommendations he made were to provide a conducive environment for learning and include mentoring as part of the curriculum.

Case 8

Although this professor voiced the opinion that it was difficult to fit in the schedule, she felt it was a meaningful task where mutual understanding could be achieved through communication. She was the only respondent who mentioned that mentoring should continue after the first year because, like the “Sifu” in Tai Chi, the relationship is long term. “It should not stop after the freshman year. I
still have my mentees from two years ago dropping in to seek advice. Although I can hardly fit them in my schedule, I do it because I thought it was meaningful.”

Case 9

This respondent was the only respondent who did not give a direct answer to the question about whether she enjoyed mentoring or not. Instead, her answer depended on the response rate of her mentees. “Mmmm..... depends, depends on the attitude of the mentees.” However, she still enjoyed her encounter with her mentees and the two-way communication as well as recognising the importance of mentoring which encouraged student retention. Her difficulties were: problem students, student absence and the programme not being cost effective. Her suggestion was to change the system to include mentoring as part of the university curriculum.

Case 10

With this particular case, the male mentor cited that the close relationship between mentor and mentees was the thing that he liked in mentoring. “I like the close relationship with my mentees, this is the best part.” he said. This matches the study by Baack (1983) who found that the ‘close relationship between the mentor and the student’ was the greatest strength of the mentoring programme.

Salient points from the qualitative analysis.

From the interview responses, we can make comparisons using three criteria:-

1. Faculty base - professors from the science faculty versus professors from the faculty of communication. All professors from the communication faculty
seemed to enjoy mentoring whereas only half of those from the science faculty confirmed that they enjoyed mentoring. This may be explained by the cultural differences between the two faculties with the work in the science faculty more task oriented and formula-driven and the work in the communication faculty more people-oriented and depending on human interaction.

2. Gender base - all responses from the female professors were positive and they see their role in a more positive way by describing their relationship with students as that of ‘friend, guide, sister, counsellor’. They also seemed to enjoy communicating with students, which led to mutual understanding and friendship but it did not seem to be the case with the male professors. The role of ‘academic adviser’ did not appear in the interviews with women. Both Eagly (1987) and Woodd (1997) claimed that the softer, traditional female qualities may be perceived as closer to the mentoring role and that mentoring, which essentially involved helping mentees and nurturing their development, is certainly aligned more with female than male gender-role expectations.

3. Language base - expatriates versus locals. All expatriates referred to language barrier difficulties encountered in mentoring. Language is essential for good communication, and mentoring is based on two-way communication between mentors and mentees. The researcher can understand why the expatriates did not derive any benefits themselves and did not feel that they were helping the students. According to Kirham (1992), the generic skills required for a mentor such as counselling, negotiation, giving feedbacks, all
depends on one’s communication skills. The failure to carry out a two-way communication with the mentees would inhibit the mentoring process.

Summary

Quantitatively, data collected were analysed in terms of frequency and percentages were calculated on distribution of gender, age, faculties, attitudes towards mentoring and preferences on format in the mentors’ and mentees’ survey. In comparing the score of ten desirable characteristics of mentors between mentors and mentees, male and female mentees, means and ranking for each characteristic were calculated and t-tests were used to compare mean differences between each group to find out if there were significant differences. In comparing the score on ten desirable characteristics of mentors among faculties, analysis of variance was used to identify statistical differences in mean score on desirable characteristics of mentors as perceived by mentees. Qualitatively, the researcher analysed by frequencies of words or phrases appearing in the text of the response from the mentor’s interview. Additionally, the researcher used her experience in mentoring to conduct a genuinely qualitative analysis of the interview data to identify the differences between faculties, gender and languages used in mentoring.
Chapter V

ANALYSIS

Current Mentoring Practice at Hong Kong Baptist University

At Hong Kong Baptist University, mentoring is a formalised programme for all freshmen who enter the university. It is conducted on a group or individual basis whereby staff and students can communicate freely in an informal setting. As Kirkham (1992) suggests, mentoring has become increasingly important not only as a mode of professional development in education, but also as an important element in the process of induction. Mentors from the faculty of communication believe that mentoring can improve retention rates, one of the university’s objectives in introducing the mentoring scheme. Jacobi (1991) states that mentoring is increasingly regarded as a retention and enhancement strategy for undergraduate education and it should decrease the drop-out rate. Studies done by Blum and Jones (1993) and Slicker and Palmer (1993) have similar results.

Gender Preference on Mentoring

The lack of women role models in higher education has been well documented. There are barriers to women’s leadership due to male-oriented organisational expectations as Lipman-Blumen (1984) stated: “Even without formal rules and regulations barring women from the highest ranks … the informal practices of the (old boy) network manage to reserve the lion’s share of the roles for their own and their colleagues’ proteges” (p. 148)
Results from the mentors' survey show that 27.8% of the mentors were female while the responses of mentees indicated that 26.17% of the mentees were mentored by women. These two figures correlate closely with the percentage of women serving above assistant professor’s rank in the university, which is 24.25%. This phenomenon is in line with similar studies by Coleman (1994) who found that the majority of senior managers in education are male. As mentors are those holding senior positions, more males will serve as mentors (Coleman, 1994). This principle applies equally to university settings where male leadership predominates which in turn reduces the possibility of nurturing female leaders in academic settings to provide role models. This also reduces the chances of having female faculty to become mentors. The fact that only 22 out of 138 (15.9%) of the male mentees have female mentors and 214 out of 309 female mentees (69.3%) have male mentors matched the studies by Byrne (1993) and Torrance (1984). This finding is supported by Erkut & Mokros (1984) who found that women students’ selection of women professors as role models was directly proportional to the number of women professors in the faculty.

Darling (1986) examined the relationship between mentors and mentees and discovered that there were gender preferences when mentees could choose their mentors. This leads to the issue of same-sex mentoring versus cross-sex mentoring. Although both the mentors and mentees in the present study claimed that there was no necessity to have same-sex mentoring, when given a choice, the majority of the mentees chose mentors of the same sex. Several studies of mentoring revealed
problems regarding cross-sex mentoring. Mentors and mentees tend to choose mentees and mentors of the same sex in order to avoid intense and personal interaction since such interaction may invite gossip and criticism which may create a threat to both the mentor and the mentees (Gaskill, 1991; Noe, 1988; Shea, 1992). It is clear that same-gender mentoring is preferred to cross-gender arrangements. However, it has not been established that same-gender relationships are more effective than cross-gender mentoring.

Motives for Participation in Mentoring

The primary motives for student participation in the mentoring programme according to the mentee survey, is to fulfil their university requirement as mentoring is a required component of the University Life Programme which is worth one hour of credit and essential for graduation. The primary motive for the mentors was to help students to adapt to the university environment. This concurred with Young (1996) who stated that: “the mentoring sessions in Hong Kong Baptist University are to help students to adjust to changes during their transition from the secondary school setting to the university setting, to share experiences and views on different issues and to assist students to achieve their own goals by providing information, opportunities, guidance and suggestions in problem solving and learning techniques” (p. 2).

“Mentoring activities are intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated” (Gladstone, 1988, p. 7). If mentoring is self-motivated, then the benefit is more than performance and productivity. Jacobi (1991) found that a formal mentoring
programme at the undergraduate level provides psychosocial but not career or vocational benefits to mentees, suggesting that formal mentoring programmes may have limited effectiveness. Even so, other studies recognise that mentoring benefits mentees more than mentors, and for this reason, it may be difficult to motivate mentors if they do not find self-worth and satisfaction from the mentoring process (Cunningham & Eberle, 1993). From this study of a formal mentoring programme in a university setting, 61.3% of the mentees indicated that mentoring is helpful while only 46.8% of the mentors found mentoring helpful. In the interviews, some mentors expressed their dissatisfaction with the formal mentoring arrangements and others did not think mentoring accomplished what it was intended for in the university.

Desirable Characteristics of Mentors

Part III of the questionnaire shows the rankings of desirable characteristics as perceived by mentors and mentees. There were significant differences yet the most important desirable characteristics such as 'understanding & sympathetic, accessible to students, enthusiastic and good communication skills' were very similar to what Shea (1992) describes as the ideal mentor; encouraging, empathetic, organised and approachable. Williams (1994), Tellez (1992), Haensley and Edlind (1986) concluded that supportive listening and effective communication are the essential qualities of a good mentor.

The desirable characteristics of mentors were perceived differently by male and female mentees. The two characteristics in which there were significant differences were 'has local and international reputation' and 'can influence decision'
with the male mentees perceiving them as more important than their female counterparts. This was confirmed by Jacobi (1991) who claim that gender difference did emerge in students' preferences for mentoring functions. Male students appeared to look for a mentor with status and power who could provide direct assistance with career development while female students wanted a mentor who could serve as a role model combining rewarding professional and personal/social activities (p. 519).

Table 5.1 gives an overall picture of the desirable characteristics of mentors from the literature, the mentors' survey and mentees' survey. The interview findings are omitted from the table as they are not appropriate for this mode of presentation (See Table 5.2).
## Table 5.1

**Integrative Analysis of Literature Review and the Two Surveys on Desirable Characteristics of Mentors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirable characteristics</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
<th>Mentors' survey Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mentees' survey Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; sympathetic</td>
<td>Shea (1992)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td>Cunningham &amp; Eberle (1993), Shea (1992)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td>Haensley &amp; Edlind (1986), Shea (1992), Tellez (1992), Williams (1994)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Bolam et al. (1995), Shea (1992)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions</td>
<td>Haensley &amp; Edlind (1986), Jacobi (1991)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive life style</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Davidson (1990), Burke (1984), Stalker (1994)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local &amp; international reputation</td>
<td>Collins (1983), Kram (1985)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td>(this characteristic was suggested by the faculty because of curiosity)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits of Mentoring

The last question in the questionnaire was the only question regarding output and benefits derived from the programme. Although over 60% of the mentees thought mentoring was helpful, this did not seem to apply to the mentors as less than 50% felt it was beneficial to them. Chong, Low & Walker (1989) did not share this view as they conclude in their Singapore study that mentors also benefit from the mentoring partnership. Previous studies on benefits of mentoring also confirmed that mentoring was beneficial to the mentors in terms of personal development (Cutterback, 1993; Kerr, Schluz & Woodward, 1995; Zey, 1993). Mullen and Kealy (1999) claimed that:

> The potential for mentors to learn from mentees rises as mentors step back from endorsing traditional roles as knowledge-producers and seekers. Mentoring becomes paradoxically empowered as mentors' and mentees' roles become indistinguishable. Co-mentoring is a process wherein learning becomes greater than the capacity for individuals to produce on their own without guidance or feedback. Attribution of who has done or created what part of a larger whole becomes “difficulty” when co-mentors peak in their learning, shared understanding, and synergistic efforts (p. 196).

As the mentoring programme at the Hong Kong Baptist University was a required programme, the mentors might feel that they were under pressure to perform
and did not enjoy the process of mentoring nor could they realise that they could also learn from their encounter with their mentees. As Henderson (1985) suggests: “roles of mentors and mentees are best formed under an organisational umbrella that actually promotes mentoring but does not impose it” (p. 862).

Qualitative Analysis of Mentors’ Interviews

When comparing the responses on the desirable characteristics of mentors as perceived by mentees from different faculties, there were six characteristics which were perceived as most important by mentees from the faculty of communication, and yet the mentees from the science faculty viewed them as least important. These characteristics were ‘a good teacher, accessible to students, know my subject well, enthusiastic, communicate well and sympathetic’. Based on the above findings, the researcher decided to interview five subjects from each of the two faculties.

By analysing the interviews from mentors, it was found that seven out of ten mentors enjoyed mentoring. The aspects which mentors enjoyed were the understanding achieved through communication with students. To see less student drop out and student retention as a by-product of mentoring is an encouragement to some faculty. The aspects which mentors disliked were the absence of reward for good mentoring and the lack of motivation from the mentees. It was found that mentors perceived their role as mostly academic advisers. Some would view themselves as friends, consultants and facilitators while a small number would see themselves as counsellors, guides, information providers and lunch co-ordinators. All mentors except one indicated that they did not have any gender preference
regarding their mentees. The reason given by the one who stated that he/she preferred female was because female mentees have better language skills. The greatest difficulty encountered in mentoring as revealed by the mentors were the lack of training provided to mentors to carry out their mentoring role and for the expatriates, it was the language barrier that prohibited them from establishing good communication with their mentees.

From the interview responses with mentors, a number of observations were made. Mentors described their role as academic advisers, friends, counsellors, problem solvers, consultants and facilitators. Nolder, Smith and Melrose (1994) also described the mentor's role as counsellor, fellow professional listening friend, role model, good communicator and facilitator who advised students on academic studies, explained the policy of the university, shared the problem and assisted students in seeking employment and gaining access to resources. Although 'effective communicator' was not mentioned in the interview, 'communication and understanding' was the part that most mentors enjoyed. Tellez (1992) described 'effective communication' which involves active listening, exchanging information and providing feedback as one of the most important characteristics in the relationship between a mentor and a mentee.
Table 5.2 is an integrative analysis of the literature review and the findings from the mentors’ interview:

Table 5.2

Integrative Analysis of Literature Review and Findings from Mentors’ Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings from mentor’s interview</th>
<th>Literature and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction derived from understanding achieved through communication with students</td>
<td>Tellez (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention as by-product of mentoring</td>
<td>Jacobi (1991), Pascarella et al. (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s self-perception as academic advisers</td>
<td>Stalker (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No gender preferences</td>
<td>Dreher &amp; Ash (1990), Olian et al. (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties due to language/cultural barriers</td>
<td>Erkut &amp; Mokros (1984), Meznik et al. (1989), Ugbah &amp; Williams (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties due to lack of support from senior management in terms of recognition and reward system</td>
<td>Garvey (1999), Jacobi (1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems Identified with Mentoring

As one of the purposes of the present study is to recommend changes to the current programme, problem identification is deemed necessary. From the mentors' interview, the following problems were identified.

The expression 'lack of time' was mentioned repeatedly. As Henderson (1985) noted in relation to higher education, mentoring is often resented by mentors as it seems to add a lot of extra work to their already very busy schedule. The results of this study are supportive and consistent with the study by Hudson and Latham (1995) who found that most people in senior positions are too busy with their commitments and do not give enough time to their mentees. Reasons given by the mentors were that student contact hours in the formal curriculum have already taken up most of the time in their time table and no time table space had been allocated for meetings of mentors and mentees. When mentees are given the impression that their mentors are too busy, they will avoid approaching them and this will affect the success of the mentoring programme. At Hong Kong Baptist University, mentoring is not considered as part of the workload assignment thus mentoring was conducted whenever there was 'spare time'. Moreover, faculty devoted most of their time to teaching and research commitments which again took priority over mentoring which is not recognised by the university as a criteria for substantiation or promotion.

'Lack of training' was one of the main hindrances for good mentoring. As the nature of mentoring at the Hong Kong Baptist University is to allow free communication between staff and students in an informal atmosphere with no fixed
format, many of the mentors would conduct mentoring sessions at lunch hours and tea breaks without specific objectives and the results would be left to chance. This approach contradicts what researchers had suggested in earlier studies. Kram and Bragar (1992) suggested formal programmes must have specific objectives and intended benefits of participation. Johnson and Sullivan (1995) echoed this view and found that compassion, concern and goodwill alone do not prepare prospective mentors. If a mentoring programme is to be successful, orientation sessions that provide specific objectives in the local context and expected outcomes must be fully explained. Training including workshops, seminars on skills and qualities of mentor and debriefing sessions should be conducted regularly to ensure mentors are well equipped for the work they perform. Forret, Turban and Doughterty (1996) suggest the following methods of training as part of the formal training programme:

- using role plays to train mentors in coaching and providing constructive feedback and to train mentees how to receive feedback
- show videos which describe and illustrate effective mentoring relationships
- using lectures to describe what mentoring is, as well as the functions, benefits and pitfalls of mentoring.

‘Lack of support from senior management’ was an inherited problem as identified by the mentors. There was no reporting nor appraisal system to reward good mentoring and this was a cause of failure for the existing programme. Mentors felt that recognition, release time and tangible rewards should be given to good mentoring. This supports the view of Johnson and Sullivan (1995) that performance
appraisal, rewards given to good mentors and feedback from mentees should be taken into consideration before a programme can become successful.

The problem 'language barrier' that was identified by the expatriates was not discussed in any of the literature. However, without common language, the communication link is broken and there is limited two-way communication between mentors and mentees. In addition, with the differences in culture, most of the mentors would not have understood problems encountered by students from a Chinese society and this would be a 'double jeopardy'. Bush et al. (1996) mentioned that one of the factors essential for good mentoring is the matching between mentor and mentees. Matching is definitely an important issue in the present formal mentoring system. Although mentees and mentors come from the same department and have similar professional interest, the language barrier is a hindrance in establishing a good mentor and mentee relationship.

As a conclusion, the following suggestions in order of priority, were given by mentors to improve mentoring practice at Hong Kong Baptist University:

1. Reward good mentoring and involvement from senior management
2. Provide training for mentors.
3. Due recognition by giving release time and reduced workload for good mentoring.
4. Assign mentees who can communicate fluently in English to mentors who are expatriates.
5. Involve senior management.
Summary

This chapter links the findings from the survey and the interviews to insights from the literature. There was overall consistency in that most findings from the surveys agreed largely with what had been done in previous research on gender preferences, motives for participation, desirable characteristics of mentors and benefits of mentoring.

Results from the mentors' interviews were also similar to other findings, especially on the problems encountered in mentoring. One exception was the language barrier that came out in the interviews with the expatriates serving as mentors at the Hong Kong Baptist University but does not appear as a problem in the literature. A number of ways were suggested to solve this problem generally and specifically at the Hong Kong Baptist University.
Chapter VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Much recent research at the Hong Kong Baptist University has focused on teaching and learning since 3.3 million dollars (Hong Kong) were made available to staff members who wished to apply for such funding to conduct research in these areas. This study drew on this support and was the first to focus on the topic of mentoring at this institution, even though mentoring has been in operation since 1997. With the recent trend of “Life-time Education” promoted by the Government of the Special Administrative Region, mentoring which is a life-time learning process best represent the relationship between the two processes. The mentoring programme which is part of the University Life Programme and the mentor who is teacher for life is the focus of this study.

The present study has been designed to investigate (1) the current practice of mentoring, (2) the beliefs and motives held by the mentors and mentees, (3) the gender preferences of those involved, and (4) the desirable characteristics of mentors as perceived by both mentors and mentees.

The main objective of this study, therefore, was to discover after three years of operation—what the attitudes and opinions of both staff and students were toward the established plan for mentoring at the Hong Kong Baptist University. This study also included also an assessment of the qualities and skills that were considered to be essential for good mentoring, as well as whether there was any preference by mentees in choosing male or female mentors.
There were four sub-problems (phrased as questions) to be investigated as follows:

1. Exactly what are the current mentoring practices carried out at the Hong Kong Baptist University?

2. What are the attitudes of staff and students toward the existing arrangements for mentoring at the University?

3. What qualities are deemed essential for good mentoring at this University? (The answers to this question should provide assistance in any future plans for in-service training to equip staff members with the necessary knowledge and skills.)

4. Has any preference been shown up to date with regard to the selection of male or female mentors by the prospective mentees? (The gender issue is important because female professors are in the minority even though female students outnumber males two to one at the University.)

The main problem and sub-problems were analysed from the standpoint of descriptive research method employing several of the many techniques available under this rubric (e.g. literature analysis, survey questionnaires). In the process of carrying out the study, the investigator applied methodological triangulation that incorporated a large-scale demographic survey and in-depth interviews to collect qualitative data as well. Through response triangulation, the researcher studied mentors' attitudes, functions and feelings by word-content analyses. When analysing the data quantitatively, cross comparison between gender and faculties
were made on the presumed desirable characteristics of mentors. Additionally, data from semi-structured interviews were collected and analysed qualitatively. This was a follow-up to the first and main stage of the research which had revealed substantial differences in particular areas on the part of two faculties. This also helped to provide the basis for a possible new model of the mentoring process at the University.

Findings

The findings or results from the application of these selected research techniques described briefly above to the sub-problem (phrased as questions were as follows:

1. **How is mentoring being practised at Hong Kong Baptist University?**

Most of the mentees and mentors felt that the length of the mentoring sessions and the number of mentoring sessions received was just right. The size of the mentoring groups indicated by both mentors and mentees varied significantly. As to the format of mentoring, most students preferred group to individual mentoring. This response may have occurred because the Chinese culture in Hong Kong is more conservative and less expressive, so that students do not wish to discuss their personal matters with a mentor who does not have a close relationship with them. Lew in his study on morality and interpersonal relationships had found that more Hong Kong men (38%) during adolescence do not seek social support from other people when faced with personal problems. Chinese adolescents also choose to talk to peers whom they know well rather than
to other people (Lew, 1998). This study shows that the primary motivations for the participation of the mentees were to “fulfil university requirement” followed by “develop better relationship between professor and students” whereas the primary motivations for the participation of the mentors were to “help students to adjust to university life” followed by “develop better relationship between professors and students”. Thus, one of the motivations which was common to both groups was to develop a better relationship. This tends to show that the primary intention of both the mentors and mentees participating in mentoring is to develop a better intrinsic relationship. It was also found that one of the primary motivation of the mentees was to “fulfil university requirement”, a motivation that is extrinsic. Studies by Gladstone (1988) and Jacobi (1991) have found that self-motivated mentoring is more beneficial and more effective, while formal mentoring programmes are less effective.

The results revealed that women faculty are under represented at HKBU as they are, generally, in universities (Lipman-Blumen, 1984). This serves to reduce the number of female mentors available (Byrne, 1993; Erkut & Mokros, 1984).

2. **What constitute desirable characteristics of mentors?**

The top four rankings of the ten most desirable characteristics were (1) “understanding & sympathetic”, (2) “accessible to students”, (3) “communicate well” and (4) “enthusiastic”. However, the order of preference was not exactly the same for mentors and mentees. “Being a
good teacher” and “knows my subject well” were ranked fifth and sixth by both groups. The last ranked items were similar for mentors and mentees, although they were in a different order from seven to ten. The rankings of importance by male and female students were similar except on two items where significant differences were found. These were “has local and international reputation” and “can influence decisions.”

3. Are there any gender preferences in mentoring?

Both mentors and mentees claimed that there was no necessity to have same sex-mentoring. This coincides with the findings that students focus on the characteristics of a good mentor who can help them, rather than on the gender of the mentor. However, when they were given a choice, a majority would choose mentors or mentees of the same sex. This indicates that their actions do not match their words, and that same-gender mentoring is usually preferred to cross-sex mentoring (Darling, 1986; Gaskill, 1991; Shea, 1992).

4. Is mentoring helpful?

Most students felt that mentoring was helpful, but fewer than half of the mentors thought that mentoring was helpful.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the investigator has drawn what she believes to be four reasonable conclusions as follows:-
1. Student mentees are not so much concerned about the gender of the mentor as they are with the personal characteristics and the professional knowledge of the mentors.

2. Despite conclusion #1, immediately above, based on further responses from the mentees, the investigator concludes that the University may be wise to match the gender of the mentor and mentees (i.e., male with male, female with female). Very often, whether mentoring is successful depends on the relationship of the mentor and the mentees. For cross gender mentoring between professors and students, the intimate relationship may invite gossip whereas same-sex mentoring will not have detrimental sexual connotations (George & Kummerow, 1981).

3. The University should consider organising in-service-training seminar sessions so that mentors may come to appreciate that mentoring can also be beneficial to them as professors as well. As suggested by Johnson & Sullivan (1995), training of mentors should include regular mentoring and debriefing sessions, workshops and seminars by experts in mentoring.

Discussion

1. Cultural concerns - Analysis of the data revealed that there were two problems that were specific to the local context and the institutional context, respectively. The first problem is the 'language barrier' that was encountered by some of the expatriates but was not identified anywhere in the literature as a problem elsewhere. However, this could have a significant impact on the success of the mentoring programme since it
prevents the mentors from establishing a good communication relationship with their mentees. This reinforces the notion that "matching" is necessary for good mentoring.

The second problem is institution specific and relates to the "gender" issue. If mentees prefer "same-gender" mentoring, the university should assign female mentees to female mentors. This may be possible in other institutions where the proportion of women students is small. However, at the Hong Kong Baptist University, where females constitute 69.3% of the student body, and women only constitute 24.25% of the university teaching faculty, it would be impossible to allow each female student to have a mentor of her own sex. Since careful "matching" is ideal for good mentoring, the findings show that this can be a problem especially when the process is compulsory and mentees' choice is limited by the composition of the faculty (Chong, Low & Walker, 1989).

2. Limitations - There were certain strengths and limitations in conducting this study. The strength was that it assessed the current situation and identified problems in the current practice of mentoring in a Hong Kong university. This problem can be addressed. The limitation was that the more abstract issues concerning interaction and outcomes and personal and professional development have not been investigated. An alternative research design might have involved using an experimental and control group to test whether mentoring has any effect on students' academic performance. This approach was adopted by Slicker and Palmer (1993)
and Stanwyck and Anson (1992) when they showed that mentoring has some effect on student academic performance. However, such an approach was not feasible in this study, because all students participate in the University mentoring programme without exception. Thus, the researcher could not find a control group for comparison.

Another consideration is that the results of the present study are drawn from one institution. Thus, they cannot be generalised to other educational settings. At the University of Hong Kong, a voluntary mentoring programme is available to students but only a small number of students participate in this programme rather than the total freshmen population at this University.

3. Policy Implications - A number of key policy implications arise from the findings of this study:

a. A successful mentoring programme must have the commitment and support from top management, including recognition for this aspect of work. Top management commitment through both word and deed may help to address three related concerns: lack of time for mentoring, inadequate systems and mechanics, and low motivation on the part of staff.

b. Mentoring is a worthwhile process to be continued since faculty who serve as mentors can perform a link between university management and students and facilitate the flow of communication throughout the organisation. Because mentoring requires active listening and
feedback, the organisational environment should foster openness and encourage exchange of ideas through discussions between mentors and training seminars. Mentoring is a complex activity and the rewards may not be immediately apparent to both mentor and mentee. "The process offers the potential for discovery, joy, humour and growth for student and mentors, the potential to 'hand' another along until the moment that allows both of them together to envision possibilities hitherto out of sight" (Coles, 1993, p. 114).

c. The attitudes and assumptions that (1) men are better qualified than women, (2) are generally seen as better mentors have given most people a wrong impression. The fact is that (1) men occupy more senior positions, (2) dominate and administer higher education create the problem of stereotyping. To break this problem of stereotyping, the only way is through long-term training and education strategies for mentors regardless of gender so that there is equal number of male and female mentors. Education and long term training for mentoring should be provided to professors who are also mentors so that there will be no role conflict when they perform their dual roles. Professors acting as mentors should take mentoring seriously, since they may also be the role models in the same professions that their mentees will choose.

d. The findings in this thesis provide important data relating to gender
differences in mentoring and the desirable characteristics of mentoring. They also provide a framework for generating new directions in mentoring, as well as some inspiration for future research agenda. The present study also shows how university researchers can utilise the by-products of research and its findings to ensure participants in a particular programme can benefit from any improvements in the programme.

Finally, the present study helps to underline the importance of mentoring within the education process and contributes to new knowledge in this field. It may also act as a catalyst by stimulating other mentors to review, rethink and redevelop new theory.

Recommendations

1. First, for the mentoring programme to be successful and acknowledged as a part of the university ecology, the parties involved, including the university management, the mentors and the mentees should believe in mentoring and work towards a common goal. Mentors should give ample time to carry out their mentoring sessions, and due credit must be given to good mentors for their work in a similar way to those who perform good teaching and research duties. Cunningham (1993) claimed that formal mentoring programmes are increasingly popular. Also, successful formal mentoring programmes are characterised by (1) top management support, (2) careful matching of mentors and mentees, (3) an extensive orientation programme emphasising the development of realistic expectations
covering the relationship, (4) clearly stated responsibilities for both the mentor and the mentee and (5) established criteria for the duration and frequency of contact between mentor and mentee. Mentors need skills for communication and should be open, patient and accessible. Desirable characteristics for mentees include being people-oriented, having a focus or goal and having a desire to learn. The mentor-mentee relationship is enhanced in an atmosphere of shared responsibility, mutual respect and clear focus (Shea, 1992).

A number of principles should be considered for adoption at the Hong Kong Baptist University as a result of this study.

1) Mentoring should be included as part of the curriculum.

2) Mentoring should not only be a formal process; the encouragement of informal mentoring relationships also has merit.

3) Mentoring should not be treated only as a compulsory process fulfilling the university requirement and terminating at the end of the freshman year. Forret, Turban and Doughterty (1996) show that the mentor-mentee arrangement in a formal mentoring programme is for a specific time period such as six months, one year or two years. After this time period has elapsed, whether the mentor or mentee choose to continue meeting is commonly left up to them.

4) “Mentoring” is not a “one-off” exercise, but an ongoing process of professional development. Like the ‘sifu’ in Tai Chi, the relationship is long term, a mentor for life (Chuckrow, 1998). “Mentoring” should not be
conceived as a one-way process, but rather as a dual process in which both
the mentor and the mentee have much to learn. "Mentoring" should
operate within agreed educational principles. It was mentioned by the
mentors in their interviews that lack of training and lack of a reporting
system were two hindrances for mentoring at the Hong Kong Baptist
University. The author recommends formal training sessions organised by
the university and a reporting system which will include notes recorded
from the mentoring sessions and feedback from students and mentors to
senior management at the end of the year. This would help the mentors to
gain recognition, as well as promoting review and improvement of the
programme itself. Research shows that improvement of the mentoring
partnership will be achieved through
a. Formal training sessions.
b. Notes on the mentoring sessions conducted.
c. Feedback from student.
d. Periodic evaluation of mentoring function.
(adapted from Williams, 1994)

5) The university should adopt the proposed model, since it is believed to be
superior to the one in existence at present.

2. A Proposed Model for an Ideal Mentoring Programme. Mentoring in an
educational setting should be designed to (a) improve student performance,
(b) assist students to adapt to university life, and (c) develop the concept of
"whole-person" education. Since this present study was problem- or issue-
based in nature, an attempt will be made here, based on the findings of and conclusion from the present investigation, to construct a proposed model which would be practical and would address some of the pressing issues that concerning the existing process of mentoring.

In the present system at the Hong Kong Baptist University, although the university proposed that there should be seven to ten one-hour sessions per year in the programme, the mentors have been given full autonomy as to how they wish to conduct the mentoring sessions. Thus, they have developed their own interpretations of the mentoring process. The university has recognised the need for free communication and interpersonal relationships between faculty and students, so, the university adopted a laissez faire approach and allowed both parties to participate in the programme unsupervised. However, this freedom was not fully appreciated by students, since it takes a lot of discipline to make the programme survive successfully without monitoring. In order to ensure the programme is successful, this investigator is proposing a model that has six steps presented in the format of a “programme life cycle” as shown in Figure 6.1.
The six steps in the author’s proposed model have their own unique functions. Each should contribute to the success of the programme. Each step will also have its own specific detail activities as follows:

1. **Top management support**

The interviews with mentors suggested senior management at the University has not taken mentoring seriously and do not see this programme as important. Mentors have expressed the fact that there was no appraisal system to reward good mentoring and that this is the cause of failure of the existing programme. The expression “lack of time” as repeated by mentors reflected their view that they would rather spend their time in teaching and research that would help them to achieve recognition and promotion. There were suggestions about including mentoring as part of the university curriculum. To do this, support from top management...
must be sought. This is perceived as the first step towards the success of a formal mentoring programme.

2. Careful matching of mentors and mentees

Research has shown that: “matching can be a problem when the process, as in Singapore, is compulsory and based on proteges’, albeit criteria-based, choice” (Chong, Low & Walker, 1989, p. 17). Erkut and Mokros (1984) also believed that people try to relate to role models who have similar backgrounds, sex, race, and personalities as their own in order to achieve a successful relationship.

From the mentees’ survey, students have indicated their preferences for same-gender mentoring and they have also expressed “knows my subject well” as two of the desirable characteristics in choosing a mentor. It appears to be important that, in pairing mentors and mentees, management is sensitive to students’ needs. It may be desirable for female mentees to be assigned to female mentors. Also matching mentees to mentors who have similar professional interests can create opportunities for mentors to develop successfully the mentees’ knowledge and skills in their own areas of expertise.

From the mentors’ interviews, it was revealed that “language” was another barrier which inhibits communication between the expatriate staff members and their mentees. Since two-way communication is essential for good mentoring, it is logical to assign only mentees who can speak fluent English to mentors who are expatriates.
3. Orientation

As expressed by most mentors, “lack of training” was the main hindrance for good mentoring. Thus, orientation as the initial phase in training plays a very important role in this proposed model. Johnson and Sullivan (1995) argue that orientation sessions will provide information and context about the programme goals in the local context. As a start-up phase, mentors will be briefed on the organisational culture, heritage and mission of the university. It will also help existing staff to recapture organisational objectives and recent developments in the university. An extensive orientation programme to define objectives, expectations and responsibilities will help mentors to perform their mentoring work well.

4. Education/training

Based on the mentors’ interviews, the phrase “mentor training” appeared four times, the greatest difficulty encountered by most mentors was the lack of training to carry out their mentoring role. In this proposed model, it was suggested that training should be used as a strategy to improve the quality of mentors. Training should include (1) feedback and reward systems, (2) active listening and interpersonal skills, (3) common problems encountered, and (4) identified referral units such as the student services unit and the health services unit (Johnson & Sullivan, 1995; O’Neill, Middlewood & Glover, 1994). This was echoed by mentors’ interview responses. For example, “Training courses should be conducted to improve the ability of the mentors, to show ideas, perceptions and
understand values as well as focusing on messages delivered during active listening, clarifying ideas in the questioning process”.

Education is not only for the mentors, but also for the senior management since they are the key policy makers of the university.

5. Reporting

Mentors on the whole, expressed the view that there is no reporting system nor appraisal system. Thus, their work was not recognised and rewarded. When the mentors were asked to give suggestions during their interview to improve the mentoring practice at the Hong Kong Baptist University, words like “recognition” and “rewards” were mentioned. It is clear that management needs to find ways of measuring involvement and the success of the programme by adopting some sort of reporting system. Measuring will reveal the quantity and quality of the programme from which management can take appropriate action and revise plans for future development.

6. Review

While collecting information on the present practice of mentoring, the investigator found that there was no mention of periodic review of the current practice of mentoring by anyone. The present programme is not subject to any change in terms of its objectives or its format of delivery. The evidence suggests that the lack of improvement resulting from the absence of a critical review has affected the success of the programme.
Periodic reviews provide the prospect of a programme being modified to enable staff and students to gain greater benefits.

Recommendations for Further Study

This present investigation has focused on the current mentoring practice at the Hong Kong Baptist University. In it, particular attention was given to the problems encountered in mentoring, the desirable characteristics needed for fine mentoring and gender preferences.

This investigator suggests that future research might well explore the following:

1. To what extent students' (mentees) maturity, intelligence and enthusiasm for learning contribute to the overall success of the mentoring programme.

2. To discover through a longitudinal study covering the entire undergraduate period at a university the factors that would improve students' willingness to engage in the mentoring process.

3. To find out the motivational factors that encourage mentors to participate in the mentoring programme.

Summary

This chapter started by restating the research questions and defining the problems followed by reporting of findings to answer the research questions. It concludes with a section on discussion, limitation and policy implications. Based on this study, a number of recommendations were made with a proposed model suggested by the investigator followed by recommendations for further study.
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Appendix 1

HONG KONG BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
Department of Physical Education

To: Tang Sir, Warman, Bill, Sze Sze and Elain
From: Mee-lee
Date: 26 April 1999

Survey on Mentoring

I am conducting a survey on 'mentoring' which aims at seeking feedback from mentors and mentees on the following issues:-

1. The present practice on mentoring.
2. The attitude of mentees on the current practice.
3. The expectation from mentees on the qualities of their mentor.
4. Whether mentees have preference on the gender of their mentor.

In this respect, I would like to seek your assistance in distributing the enclosed questionnaire to your students in PE 1112 classes during this week and next week.

Although their participation is entirely voluntary, their response is important that it will add validity to the findings. Please explain to them that their participation is anonymous and no reference will be made which could link them to the study. The results are used purely for academic purposes.

Thank you for your assistance in advance.
Appendix 2

A SURVEY ON ATTITUDE TOWARDS MENTORING AMONG STUDENTS IN THE HONG KONG BAPTIST UNIVERSITY (student’s version)

Part I: Personal Information

Part II: Information on mentoring experience
4. Sex of your mentor: Male/ female.
5. Number of mentoring sessions in 1998-99: ___.
   The frequency of mentoring sessions are: too frequent/ too few/ just right.
6. Maximum length of mentoring session: ___ hours.
   Minimum length of mentoring sessions: ___ minutes.
   The length of mentoring sessions are: too long/ too short/ just right.
7. Largest size of mentoring session: ___ persons.
   Smallest size of mentoring sessions: ___ person/ persons.
8. Format of mentoring sessions: Free discussion/discussion on selected topics/other activities (outings, lunches etc.)
9. Please rank the following motives for your participation in the mentoring program in order of importance from 1-5 with 1 = most important, 2 = important, 3 = less important and 5 = not important.

Motives
To fulfil university requirements ___
To seek academic advising ___
To seek personal counseling ___
To make friends ___
To develop better relationship and understanding between students and professors. ___
Part III: Opinion questions on characteristics of mentor.

10. Please rank in order of importance from 1 to 4 on the following characteristics of which you think is important for a mentor. 1 = very important 2 = important 3 = less important 4 = not important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local and international reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an attractive life style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions in department &amp; college level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject matter well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IV: Preference question

11. Students should be mentored by mentors of the same sex: Yes/ no
12. If you have a choice, you would choose mentor that is Male/ female

13. What is your expectation on frequency of mentoring sessions per semester? ____

14. What is your expectation on length of each mentoring session? ____ minutes/ hours

15. Do you prefer group or individual mentoring? Group/Individual.
16. Do you think mentoring is helpful to you? Yes/No.

- End -
To: Mentors
From: Leung Mee-lee, Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education
Date: 24 May 1999

Survey on Mentoring

As mentors, we have common ground that we share while performing our duties as a mentor. I am conducting a survey on 'mentoring' which aims at seeking feedback from mentors and mentees on the following issues:

1. The present practice on mentoring.
2. The attitude of mentees on the current practice.
3. The expectation from mentees on the qualities of a good mentor.
4. Whether mentees have preference on the gender of their mentor.
5. To identify some of the difficulties involved in performing out duties as a mentor.

I would like to seek your assistance in this survey by completing the enclosed Questionnaire and return them to me in the Department of Physical Education. Although your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, your response is important that it will add validity to the findings. Other than the fact that your participation is anonymous, data will be kept securely with confidentiality. No reference will be made which could link you to the study.

Thank you for your assistance and hope to get your immediate response.
Appendix 4

A SURVEY ON ATTITUDE TOWARDS MENTORING AMONG MENTORS IN THE HONG KONG BAPTIST UNIVERSITY (staff's version)

Part I: Personal Information
1. Sex: Male/Female
2. Faculty: Arts/Business/Communication/Science/Social Sciences

Part II: Information on mentoring experience
3. Numbers of mentees in charge: 
4. Number of mentoring sessions conducted in 1998-1999: 
   The frequency of mentoring sessions are: too frequent/too few/just right
   What is your expectation on frequency of mentoring sessions per semester?

5. Maximum length of mentoring sessions conducted: _______ hours
   Minimum length of mentoring sessions conducted: _______ minutes
   The length of mentoring sessions of 1 hour suggested are: too long/too short/just right
   What is your expectation on length of each mentoring session? _______ hr. _______ min

6. Largest size of mentoring session conducted: _______ persons
   Smallest size of mentoring session conducted: _______ person/persons

7. Format of mentoring sessions: Free discussions/free discussions on selected topics/other activities (outings, lunches etc.)

8. Please rank the following motives for your participation in the mentoring program in order of importance from 1-4 with 1 = most important, 2 = important, 3 = less important and 4 = not important.
   To help students to adjust to university life and understand their profession
   To stimulate their thinking process and improve their learning skills
   To develop a better relationship and understanding between professors and students
   To fulfil my job as a mentor as assigned by the university
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Part III: Opinion questions on characteristics of mentor

9. Please rank in order of importance from 1 to 4 on the following characteristics of which you think is important for a mentor. 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important and 4 = not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has local and international reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an attractive life style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can influence decisions in department and college level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows my subject matter well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IV: Preference question

10. Students should be mentored by mentors of their same sex: Yes/No

11. If you have a choice, you would choose mentee that is Male/Female

12. Do you prefer group or individual mentoring? Yes/No

13. Do you think mentoring is helpful to you as a teacher? Yes/No

14. Please list out some of the difficulties in carrying out your role as a mentor.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

- End -
Appendix 5

Questions for the interview

1. How long have you been a mentor?

2. Do you enjoy mentoring?

3. What aspects of mentoring do you like?

4. What aspects of mentoring do you dislike?

5. How do you perceive your role as a mentor?

6. Do you have any gender preferences on your mentees?

7. What difficulties have you encountered in carrying out mentoring in this university?

8. Give your views and suggestions concerning the improvement of the mentoring practice in the Hong Kong Baptist University.
Appendix 6

Actual Response of mentors towards interviewed questions

Case 1  (Male Associate Professor from Science Faculty. Expat.)

1. 3 years
2. No, I do it simply because students need it for graduation.
3. Nil
4. No rewards, lack of understanding between mentor and mentees, ambiguity about mentoring role, no interests, no skill, cultural and language barriers, bureaucratic exercises, no incentive, form ride over substances, compulsory.
5. Academic adviser, referral agent, clerk, social lunch host.
6. No gender preference, however, female better because of language skills.
7. Lack of training in mentoring, cultural barriers, language barriers.
8. Get serious, identify those who has interest, provide training, give recognition, reduce teaching workload, reward by promotion. Senior management should take it seriously.

Case 2 (Male Assistant Professor from Science Faculty. Expat.)

1. 3 years
2. No
3. Nil
4. Students have no motivation, absences, requirement too rigid, no reward. What can you do if students do not turn up for their appointment/
5. Academic adviser, lunch coordinator.
6. No
7. Language, barriers, no response from students, no encouragement and involvement from management, lack of training, lack of incentive.
8. Give time release, involve top management, give rewards, give proper training.

Case 3 (Female Assistant Professor from the Science Faculty. Expat.)

1. 3 years
2. Yes
3. Communication with students, friendship with mentees, I get to know their aspirations and it helps me in my teaching.
4. Too few meetings, no time, busy with teaching and research.
5. Adviser, consultant, facilitator.
6. No. However, it seems that men have dominated the present system.
7. Too many mentees at one time, too formal, lack of personal understanding, language barriers, low response.
8. Senior management should be involved, encouragement from management, reward mentors.

Case 4  (Male Associate Professor from Science Faculty. Local)

1. 3 years
2. Yes
3. Communicate with students informally, understand students' feeling, prepare students for challenge.
4. Absence without notice.
5. Parent, information provider, academic adviser.
6. No

Case 5  (Male Associate Professor from Science Faculty. Local)

1. 3 years
2. Yes and No
3. Meaningful, instill confident in student, prepare students for challenge, positive approach, personal contact.
4. Too formal, lack of initiative.
5. Academic adviser, consultant, personal friend.
6. No
7. Absences of students, lack of training.
8. Involve senior management, conduct courses for mentoring, give students personal touch. Whether the programme works or not depends on whether I can make myself available and accessible to my students.

Case 6  (Male Associate Professor from Faculty of Communication. Expat.)

1. 3 years
2. Yes
3. Get to know students more, get to know the culture, understanding and communication with students.
4. Nil
5. Counselor academic adviser, friend, facilitator.
6. No
7. Language barriers, time consuming, too busy, low motivation, lack of mentor training to perform the role of a mentor.
8. Make it official, give credit to mentors, reflect performance in appraisal and add value to promotion, give proper training and give reward for good mentoring.
Case 7  (Male Associate Professor from Faculty of Communication. Expat.)

1. 3 years
2. Yes
4. University requirement does no accomplish what is intended for. Too busy with teaching and research commitment.
5. Friend, resource person, academic advisor, facilitator.
6. No
7. Make students comfortable and provide a conducive environment for learning, make student to come frequently enough, not part of the curriculum, too busy with teaching and research commitment, not enough time and energy to conduct good mentoring.
8. CED does a good job.

Case 8  (Female Assistant Professor from the Faculty of Communication. Local)

1. 3 years
2. Yes
3. Mutual understanding, meaningful task, channel of communication.
4. Difficult to fit schedule, more important for mentors.
5. Guide, resource person
6. No
7. Absences, disappointment, gain trust from mentee, difficulty to establish the relationship.
8. Should continue after first year, activity should be voluntary.

Case 9  (Female Assistant Professor from the Faculty of Communication. Local)

1. 3 years
2. Depending on response rate.
3. Mutual understanding, sharing, two-way communication, it is meaningful.
4. Nil
5. Friend, sister, guide, counselor.
6. No
7. Problem students, not compulsory, absence without notice, unwilling to commit, not cost effective, no reward.
8. Change system, too many contact hour, put into time table.
Case 10  (Male Assistant Professor from the Faculty of Communication. Local)

1. 3 years
2. Yes
3. Closed relationship, understanding needs.
4. Absences, lack of motivation, no rewards.
5. Academic advisor, consultant, problem solver, information provider, referee.
6. No
7. Not in academic curriculum, no time off give, lack of involvement from management, not in official timetable.
8. Make it official, reward for good mentors, create environment, give recognition.