Catherine Buria, STOP THE HOVERING: HELICOPTER MENTOR, A NEW VIEW ON THE DYSFUNCTIONAL MENTOR (Under the direction of Dr. Lisa E. Baranik) Department of Psychology, April 2011.

The concept of a helicopter mentor was introduced in the current study. A scale was developed to measure helicopter mentoring. To provide validity evidence for the helicopter mentoring measure, assessments of typical mentoring, dysfunctional mentoring, anxiety and self-esteem were used. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the 20-item four factor helicopter mentoring measure, looking at the following four subscales: Results suggested dropping problematic items, resulting in a 14-item four factor model, where six of the original 20 items were removed. All subscales had acceptable levels of internal reliability. As hypothesized, the helicopter mentoring measure was negatively correlated with the typical mentoring measure, and distinct from but related to dysfunctional mentoring. Helicopter mentoring was also not significantly correlated to anxiety, but was significantly correlated to self-esteem. These results suggest that helicopter mentoring is an important construct to examine in the workplace, and future research should continue to investigate helicopter mentoring.

Keywords: typical mentoring, dysfunctional mentoring, helicopter mentoring, anxiety, self-esteem, overprotective parenting

STOP THE HOVERING: THE HELICOPTER MENTOR, A NEW VIEW ON THE DYSFUNCTIONAL MENTOR

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Catherine Buria

April 2011

STOP THE HOVERING: THE HELICOPTER MENTOR, A NEW VIEW ON THE DYSFUNCTIONAL MENTOR

by:

Catherine Buria

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS	_____
	Lisa E. Baranik, Ph.D.
COMMITTEE MEMBER	_____
	Shahnaz Aziz, Ph.D.
COMMITTEE MEMBER	_____
	Karl L. Wuensch, Ph.D.
CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY	_____ Kathleen A. Row, Ph.D
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL	_____ Paul J. Gemperline, Ph.D

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank my thesis chair, Dr. Lisa Baranik for her direction, enthusiasm, and continued patience. Her ability to give constructive feedback with a smile helped me to complete my thesis with much satisfaction and inspiration. Thank you to Dr. Shahnaz Aziz and Dr. Karl Wuensch for their support and guidance through this endeavor. Special thanks to my classmates Martha Baker, Ashley Miller, and Ryan Weber for their encouragement and motivation. Finally I would like to thank my family, especially Luis Buria, Norma Buria and Christopher Sullivan. They have all given me the care, support, and love that pushed me to succeed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

When individuals think about the term *mentor*, they typically imagine a person with experience helping to guide another who is less experienced. In many individuals' minds, a mentor is a positive person with good intentions to help another individual. In much of the mentoring research, has this focus on helping as well. Kram (1985) described a mentor as a senior person who helps to develop a junior person in the workplace. Research has shown mentoring relationships positively relate to protégés' career satisfaction, salary and promotion rates (Kram, 1985; Scandura, 1992).

Mentors provide a number of supportive behaviors to protégés, including acceptance, role modeling and guidance. These all support the protégé's competence and sense of self-worth (Kram, 1985). Although there has been much research on the "bright side" of mentoring, there has not been much on the "dark side" or the negative aspects of these relationships. The purpose of the current study was to examine a different type of dysfunctional mentoring relationship involving a helicopter mentor. A helicopter mentor can be described as a mentor who is 1) highly supervising, 2) shows difficulties allowing the protégés to have relationships with others, 3) discourages independent work, and 4) is highly controlling. The goal of the current study was to examine the psychometric properties of a measure of helicopter mentoring appropriate for the workplace.

Early Mentoring Research

Levinson, Darow, Klein, Levinson and McKee (1978) believed that mentoring is one of the most significant relationships that individuals have at the beginning stages of their new career. Mentoring, they state, builds and strengthens both the personal and professional skills that employees will develop in their careers. After Levinson et al., major research in mentoring was

pushed forward by Kram's work in 1985. Her research described mentoring relationships in detail.

Mentoring relationships provide two major functions from mentors to protégés: career and psychosocial (Kram, 1983). Kram interviewed 18 pairs of managers from the same organization about relationships currently affecting their development. Due to her extensive qualitative work she identified these two major groups of functions, which have been supported by subsequent empirical research (Noe, 1988). First, career functions involve forms of support related to learning one's way around the organization. Career functions provide a way to learn about the organizational culture and establish oneself within that culture. Career functions include sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection and providing challenging work assignments (Kram, 1983). Second, psychosocial functions allow the protégé to feel supported and cared about, which should relate to increased self-esteem. The subcategories of the psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1983).

Along with the functions of mentoring, Kram (1983, 1985) also provided a step-by-step outline of the phases of a typical mentoring relationship and what each phase entails. "Examination of the phases of a mentor relationship highlights the psychological and organizational factors that influence which career and psychosocial functions are provided, and it shows how each manager experiences the relationship at any given point in time" (Kram, 1983 p. 614). Through her research, Kram found that there are four distinct phases that most mentoring relationships go through despite their short life span of approximately five years. The four stages are initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition.

The initiation stage begins the relationship (Kram, 1985). This is the stage that can be thought of as the fantasy stage. This stage typically happens within the first 6 to 12 months of the relationship. Here, the protégés have good thoughts about their mentor figures. The mentor is looked at with respect and the protégé believes in the mentor's competence and ability to provide support. This stage is filled with positive emotions leading to the protégé beginning to feel supported, cared for, and respected. Strong interactions occur during this phase, including informal interactions during common work tasks, direct hire interviews, discussion of performance and feedback, and other positive actions that pilot a transition of the fantasy to concrete positive expectations from both parties.

The second phase is the cultivation phase (Kram, 1985). Here the ranges of the functions that are used and fulfilled are the greatest. This phase lasts from three to five years. The mentor continues to provide more challenging work for the protégé; this strengthens and demonstrates the career functions of the mentoring relationship. The mentor helps the protégé become orientated in the organization, one of the key career functions. The protégés depend on whether or not the mentors have enough experience within that organization, their rank and how much they give their protégé to work on. On the other hand the psychosocial functions developed are due to more emotion-based ideas, such as intimacy within the relationship, trust and respect. The most common psychosocial functions developed are counseling and friendship. The importance of this phase is not only that the protégé learns the ropes of an organization and gains confidence in what they do, but that they gain this confidence through feedback from another person who is in a higher position than they are and can give them meaningful feedback on their progress.

The separation phase is the third phase in the mentoring relationship (Kram, 1985). During this phase there is a major structural change in the relationship which can come from

either individual changing in a psychological way, or by a change within the organization. Kram notes that there are times of anxiety while the two parties find balance with the change. In the separation phase protégés have to use what they have learned from their mentors, and adapt to being without them. Both parties have to refocus their energies and try to understand the new relationship which they now have. The protégés learn to work independently from their mentors and acquire the job skills that will allow them to grow within the organization. This phase is where both the mentor and protégé can show what they have accomplished during the early stages of the relationship. With the success of the protégés, the mentors show that they too have been successful in teaching their protégés and passing on their values and skills. The end of this phase brings a decision that must be made by both parties regarding whether or not they will continue to have a relationship.

The last phase in the mentoring relationship is known as the redefinition phase (Kram, 1985). During this phase of the relationship, the mentors and protégés must decide their long term goal for the relationship. They must decide whether they would like to continue the relationship as a friendship or if they would like to end it entirely. The relationship is mostly friendship based, and therefore rarely caters to the needs of the career and psychosocial functions. The mentors do continue to have a mentoring role in the relationship, but the protégés share more equal roles with their mentors. The mentors are now treated in a peer-like manner and there is no longer a need for structure or as much direction from the mentors. Here a protégés must work individually and will no longer have the guidance of their mentors. The change in roles may be just as difficult for the mentors, but they do feel some satisfaction from the success of their protégés.

Contemporary Research

Many positive outcomes for a protégé in an organization have been attributed to mentoring. These career outcomes can be seen in salary, promotion and overall career satisfaction (Kram, 1985; Scandura, 1992). Fagenson (1989) ties together mentoring relationships and protégés' power and influence in their organizations. Mentoring relationships are not only positive for the individuals, but also for the organizations. Scandura and Viator (1994) researched the relationship between mentoring and its effects on the organization. They found a negative relationship between intentions to quit and being part of a mentoring relationship, meaning employees in such relationships were less likely to leave the company.

Formal relationships are mentoring relationships where the mentor and protégé are matched by a third party, and are built on the goals and values of the organization. Due to this design, the mentoring process is decided by the organization and will differ from company to company (Wanberg et al., 2003). One the other hand, informal mentoring relationships happen naturally, without organizational input. This relationship happens exclusively between two individuals in the company who have found a common bond. Informal mentoring relationships are developed on the idea of capability and interpersonal comfort of each person (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Olian, Carroll, & Giannantonio, 1993; Olian, Carroll, Giannontonio, & Feren, 1988).

Companies value the potential of a strong mentor – protégé relationship and encourage these types of relationships within their companies. The importance of this relationship, as illustrated by Bragg (1989) and Murray (1991), has lead to many United States companies implementing formal mentoring programs. These formal mentoring programs have been successful, with protégés experiencing better organizational socialization, job satisfaction and reduced turnover intentions than non-participants (Koberg, Boss, Chappell, & Ringer, 1994).

What is Missing From the Research?

Although most research is on the positive outcomes of mentoring, there have been some recent studies conducted on what could go wrong in these relationships. Examination of both the positive and negative sides of mentoring is important because good and bad mentoring relationships are conceptually and empirically unique (Eby, Butts, Lockwood & Simon, 2004). Being able to compare both the positive and negative outcomes of mentoring can provide a broader view on the mentoring experience and possibly make it better for all parties. Kram (1985) proposed "destructive" (p.10) relationships in her early work. Her work shows that there is potential for some relationships to become dissatisfying or destructive for the individual mentor or protégé.

A study conducted by Ragins and Scandura (1999) focused on positive and negative mentoring relationships after the relationship had already ended. They found that in the dysfunctional relationships, three main reasons for the termination could be identified. First, some relationships were highly destructive due to mentor jealousy and attempt to block the protégés' achievements. The second was a dependence on the relationship. Last was the lack of support from the mentor or that the mentor's expectations were unreasonable.

Figure 1. *Four Potential Dysfunctions in Mentoring Relationships*

	Psycho-Social	**Career**
Bad Intent toward other	**Negative relations** (Bullies, Enemies)	**Sabotage** (Revenge, Silent Treatment, Career Damage)
Good Intent toward other	**Difficulty** (Conflict, Binds)	**Spoiling** (Betrayal, Regret, Mentor off Fast Track)

Along with the reasons for termination, one must understand the typology of dysfunctional relationships. Duck (1994) describes this 2 x 2 typology in four different categories; negative relations, sabotage, difficulty, and spoiling (see Figure 1). Scandura (1998) adapted Duck's model to mentoring relationships. The two subcategories of the model are the intentions in relationships, whether a person has good or bad intentions towards the other, and also whether they fall under psychosocial or career functions. *Negative relations* are defined as psychosocial behaviors that result when a person has bad intentions towards another and are exemplified by bullies or enemies. Negative relations lead to consequences on the protégés' end, such as fear or uncomfortable feelings toward their mentor, absenteeism or not having a strong relationship with their mentor and possibly having to end the relationship. These could have a negative impact of the emotional attitudes of the protégé.

Sabotage refers to career behaviors that result when a person has bad intentions. Sabotage can be exemplified by the silent treatment, revenge or career damage. For the silent treatment, mentors would simply disregard the protégés and take charge of their own projects instead of sharing with the protégés. The silent treatment can affect the career of a protégé by losing out on opportunities to be promoted in the organization. Revenge can be seen with either direct revenge or indirect. An example of direct revenge would be to talk down to the protégé one on one, while indirect sabotage would be to ruin the way the protégé is looked at politically within the organization. This could hurt the protégé from achieving job promotion or from gaining new projects within the company.

Difficulty occurs when the person has good intentions for the protégé, but there are some psychosocial issues blocking the intentions from turning into helpful behaviors. This can be seen if there are disagreements between the two parties or if one person puts the other in a "bind." The

idea of a bind is when there is a demand placed on the decision making process for one person. The example given by Scandura (1998) in her description of Duck's model is when mentors tell their female protégés that it may be in their best interest not to have children in the near future so that they can focus and raise within their career. Although the mentor has good intentions, the idea of not having children can be a harsh one for the protégé to absorb; this can cause conflict within the relationship and can harm both parties in a psychosocial manner.

Lastly, *spoiling* falls under the categories of career functions with good intentions. The first part of spoiling comes from betrayal. This betrayal can be perceived, meaning the mentor or protégé believe it happened; however it did not, or actual betrayal during a good mentoring relationship. The betrayal often happens due to some type of career issue from the protégé's perspective. This brings on psychosocial emotions of disappointment or regret. A good example of this would be if protégés feel as if their mentors have been taking and using their ideas on projects. This thought could be given to the mentor through a third party and ultimately ends the relationship in a bad way, harming the protégé's career. The other type of spoiling happens if protégés have mentors who are not at the top in their organization. The mentors may have great intentions to give the protégés direction and support, but the mentors themselves are not on the "fast track" to success within the company. This could harm the protégés because the rest of the organization could compare the mentors and protégés even if they have no connection.

Helicopter Mentor Defined and Scale Development

Although there has been some work done focusing on the four categories of dysfunctional mentoring (Duck, 1994), there are still gaps in the literature. Mentoring relationships can have a range of dysfunctionality, and researchers are just beginning to uncover

these. Although Scandura (1998) provides a straightforward typology of dysfunctional mentoring relationships, she neglects a critical aspect of dysfunctional mentoring: dependence. This is important, as Ragins and Scandura (1999) identified dependence as one of the three reasons mentoring relationships end. To examine this gap in the literature, I introduce the idea of the helicopter mentor.

The helicopter mentor can be seen within Duck's four dysfunctional mentoring relationships criteria as a form of psychosocial and career behavior with good intentions, and is similar to the difficulty and spoiling categories. Although the helicopter mentor can be somewhat connected to these categories, the concept of a helicopter mentor is theoretically distinct from difficulty and spoiling. Helicopter mentors have good intentions; however they differ from those described by Duck and Scandura. The concept of helicopter mentor describes mentors who try to control their protégés and, similar to helicopter parents, see themselves as the guardian of their subordinate. In other words, the helicopter mentor provides "too many" psychosocial and career functions by being controlling. This is in contrast to the dysfunctional relationships described by Scandura, who focuses on mentor-protégé misfit or inappropriate behaviors, as described by difficult and spoiling. Research on the helicopter mentor is needed because dysfunctional mentoring relationships can take many forms. The dysfunctional mentoring relationship in the form of the mentor providing too many psychosocial and career functions because of the mentors overbearing nature is important to study, as there may be many employees experiencing these types of relationships, and the impact on the mentor and protégé is unknown. An important gap in the literature is that there is currently no measure to assess helicopter mentoring.

The concept of a helicopter mentor is grounded in the parenting literature. Helicopter parents are overprotective of their children; their behaviors can be seen as going beyond what

typical parents would do to protect their child (Thomasgard & Metz, 1993). There are four distinct characteristics of overprotective parents: 1) highly supervising and vigilant, 2) difficulties with separation from the child, 3) discourages independent behavior and 4) highly controlling (Thomasgard & Metz, 1993, p. 68). Similarly, helicopter mentors control their protégés. Following the characteristics given by Thomasgard and Mertz (1993), I propose that helicopter mentors are 1) highly supervising, 2) show difficulties allowing the protégés to have relationships with others, 3) discourage independent work, and 4) are highly controlling.

First, helicopter mentors are overly-supervising with their protégés, and discourage independent work. The characteristic of discouraging independent work can lead to protégés becoming dependent on the mentors. This increased dependency can lead to protégés having a lack of experience within the company and also being anxious about working on their own.

Helicopter mentors have difficulties allowing their protégés to have relationships with others. The behaviors that the helicopter mentor may demonstrate are limiting the protégé's access to others. A helicopter mentor will discourage the protégé from socializing with co-workers or other potential mentors. Also, the helicopter mentor seems to hover over the protégé's personal life. This behavior can be seen through asking many questions about the protégé's life or even snooping through the protégés personal property to find out information.

Third, the mentor does not allow protégés to complete his or her own work, tries to prevent them from making any type of mistake, and most importantly, holds them back from establishing their own organizational identity. This identity is the key role of a mentoring relationship, "learning the ropes" of the organization. With this type of mentoring style, there is a possibility that the mentor's overzealous style of mentoring may prevent the protégé from learning critical personal and professional skills that healthy mentoring relationships foster.

The fourth aspect of helicopter mentoring is being controlling. The mentor expects the protégé to do what the mentor wants, and may be upset if the protégé does not do what the mentor wants. Mentors may also use their power to threaten the protégé with poor evaluations. The protégé is fearful of doing anything against what the mentor believes is correct for fear or repercussions.

Currently, there is no measure for assessing the four components of helicopter mentoring: 1) highly supervising (Supervising), 2) shows difficulties allowing the protégés to have relationships with others (Relationships), 3) discourages independent work (Independent), and 4) is highly controlling (Controlling). As such, one of the purposes of the current study was to develop a scale to measure the four dimensions of helicopter mentoring. To do this, after researching these constructs extensively, items were written to assess each one of the four constructs (see Appendix A). A team of psychologists generated an extensive list of behaviors associated with each of the constructs. The following are sample items for each subsection of the definition of a helicopter mentor: 1) highly supervising, "my mentor constantly double checks my work"; 2) shows difficulties allowing the protégés to have relationships with others, "my mentor does not encourage me to work with others"; 3) discourages independent work, "my mentor does not allow me to work on my own"; and 4) is highly controlling, "my mentor threatens me with poor evaluations if I do not want to do things his / her way."

The first goal of the current study is to examine coefficient alpha for each of the four helicopter mentoring components. A coefficient alpha of .70 or above would indicate that the scales exhibit acceptable internal reliability (Nunnally, 1978). However, establishing internal reliability does not necessarily mean that the factor structure of the scales is appropriate. To ensure that the items are measuring four distinct components of helicopter mentoring, a

confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to determine if a four-factor solution fits the data well.

The first goal of the current study was to answer a specific research question: Does the new measure of helicopter mentoring show adequate internal reliability and a four-factor structure?

Building the Nomological Net of Helicopter Mentoring

It is important to ensure that the measure of helicopter mentoring demonstrates good validity evidence. Convergent validity is demonstrated when a new measure correlates with a validated measure of a theoretically-related construct. Questions were pulled from Allen and Eby's (2003) article on effective mentoring relationships, which focuses on the protégé's perception of mentorship effectiveness. This study was used as a baseline for typical mentoring relationships, to establish a difference between helicopter mentors and typical mentors. The authors completed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on their measure. The results indicated that the model was a two factor model with good fit to their data, $\chi^2(34) = 193.82$, $p < .05$; RMSR = .04; GFI = .91; NFI = .91; CFI = .92. The two factors are the relationship quality and the relationship learning, two indicators of mentoring effectiveness. The model also shows significant factor loadings of items on their respective factors. As such, this measure demonstrates adequate validity evidence.

I propose that helicopter mentoring is a form of dysfunctional mentoring that will be negatively related to two forms of successful mentoring relationships, mentoring effectiveness and learning. As such:

Hypothesis 1: The four dimensions of helicopter mentoring will be negatively related to

mentoring effectiveness and learning.

In order to determine if the construct of a helicopter mentor differs from the current conceptualization of a dysfunctional mentor, the current study includes a measure of the previously researched dysfunctional mentor. The use of the dysfunctional mentor measure is a basis for establishing discriminat validity. Discriminant validity is demonstrating that there is a difference between two measures, showing that two similar measures are not redundant with one another. The items for this particular section of the survey were taken from the Eby, Butts, and Lockwood (2004) study on dysfunctional mentoring relationships. In their study, they developed five subscales of dysfunctionality: mismatch within the dyad, distancing behavior, manipulative behavior, lack of mentor expertise, and general dysfunctionality. For this particular study, only the general dysfunctionality subsection will be used. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the measure, the analysis lead to χ^2 (80) = 205.59, $p < .01$; NNFI = .98, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .08. This scale was included to test the discriminant validity of the helicopter mentoring construct. Cohen (1988) lists the following criteria for effect sizes for correlation coefficients: .1 is small, .3 is medium, and .5 is large. In order to establish evidence for discriminant validity, we would expect to see a medium to large relationship, but not so large that the two variables are redundant, which would be above .8.

Hypothesis 2: Following Cohen's effect size standards, the four dimensions of helicopter mentoring will demonstrate a medium to large effect size with dysfunctional mentoring.

Outcomes of Helicopter Parenting and Their Links to Potential Outcomes of the Helicopter Mentor

Childhood anxiety is one of the major outcomes connected with over-parenting. In studies of adults diagnosed with anxiety and social phobias, the participants reported their parents to have been less caring, more overprotective, and more rejecting than those of the control group (Parker & Tupling, 1979). Parker's (1983) studies have linked the overprotective controlling behaviors of a parent to anxiety disorders in their overprotected child. Both researchers show that trait anxiety was connected to parental overprotection and a child social development was distressed by the overprotection of their parent. Rappe (1997) found that both parental rejection and control were connected to child anxiety; however there was a stronger connection between control and anxiety.

Similar to children with helicopter parents, protégés with helicopter mentors can develop anxiety. A helicopter mentor tends to try to control the behaviors and environment of the protégé. This controlling behavior is demonstrated by not allowing the protégé to engage in independent work, controlling those who the protégé has access to, and also controlling the information which the protégé receives. As with Parker's (1979) findings; the frequent commands that the protégé may cause the protégé to second guess his or her work, resulting in high levels of anxiety. The constant questioning can also occur when the helicopter mentor is overly concerned with the protégé's personal life. As Parker (1979) found, this type of behavior can cause the protégé to avoid social situations such as major projects, meetings, or team activities, leading to another source of anxiety for the protégé. To expand the convergent validity of the helicopter mentoring measure, an anxiety measure is utilized.

Hypothesis 3: The four dimensions of helicopter mentoring will be positively correlated with anxiety.

Negative effects on self-esteem are one of the consequences of over-parenting. Parker (1992) found that overprotective parental styles are related to the lowered self-esteem of the adult during their childhood with an overprotective parent. Self-esteem is considered a basis for confidence. Helicopter mentoring behaviors inhibit a protégé's ability to develop confidence. For example, helicopter mentors supervise the tasks that the protégés complete so closely that the protégé is not able to make mistakes. Another good example is that helicopter mentors do not allow their protégés to explore tasks with other employees. Protégés grow as employees and as individuals when they experience new tasks with different people. Parental research shows that the behaviors such as being controlling and not allowing for new opportunities damage the development of self-esteem in a child (Parker, 1992). Confidence and self-esteem are typically built through typical positive mentoring in the workplace, as with parenting research, a correlation should be found between a helicopter mentor and self-esteem. To expand the convergent validity of the helicopter mentoring measure, a measure of self-esteem is utilized.

Hypothesis 4: The four dimensions of helicopter mentoring will be negatively correlated with self-esteem.

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

Participants of the current study were found using the snowball method. A total of 550 individuals participated in the current study. Of the 550 participants 70.7% (389) were female, 77.8% (428) were 25 years of age or under, 75.5% (415) were Caucasian, 69.8% (384) were high school graduates, and 57.6% (317) were not currently employed. Table 1 indicates the frequencies of each demographic question.

Table 1. *Demographics*

Question	**Response**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Gender	Male	161	29.3%
	Female	389	70.7%
Age	25 years and under	428	77.8%
	26-30	47	8.5%
	31-35	12	2.2%
	36-40	14	2.5%
	Over 40	49	8.9%
Race	American Indian or Alaska Native	16	2.9%
	Asian	20	3.6%
	Black or African American	108	19.6
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	.2%
	White or Caucasian	415	75.5%
Ethnicity	Hispanic or Latino	48	8.7%
	Non Hispanic or Latino	474	86.2%
Highest level of education	High School	384	69.8%
	Associates Degree	29	5.3%
	College (BA/ BS)	100	18.2%
	Professional Degree	7	1.3%
	Masters Degree	22	4.0%
	Doctorate	6	1.1%
Currently Employed	Yes	232	42.2%
	No	317	57.6%
Employment Type	Government/State	63	11.5%
	Factory/Production	10	1.8%
	Organizational Management	23	4.2%
	Food/Beverage	36	6.5%
	Academic	43	7.8%

Table 1: *Continued*

	N/A	58	10.5%
Time at current Organization	Less than 1 year	77	14.0%
	1-2 years	58	10.5%
	3-4 years	39	7.1%
	5-9 years	30	5.5%
	10-14 years	10	1.8%
	15 years or more	17	3.1%
	N/A	2	.4%
Time spent with mentor	Less than 3 months	181	32.9%
	3-6 months	97	17.6%
	6-9 months	44	8.0%
	9- 1 year	24	4.4%
	1-2 years	62	11.3%
	Over 2 years	136	24.7%

Procedure

This study was conducted through the Qualtrics, an online survey instrument. The survey was approved through IRB and contained an informed consent form at the beginning (see Appendix B). This form informed participants that they were not obligated to complete the survey and may stop at any point. Participants were recruited in two ways, first using a participant survey program provided by East Carolina University, and second through individual contacts made by the investigators. These contacts were asked to pass on the survey to any of their contacts. This method was used to ensure that the study would include employed participants. This method of recruiting grants quality data that is parallel to the traditional forms of recruiting, it should not be considered as data that is convenient nor deliberate (Smith, Tisak, Hahn, & Schmieder, 1997).

Measures

Typical mentor scale. The 10-item typical mentor scale from Allen and Eby (2003) article discussing the effectiveness of mentors was used to measure affective attitudes toward the mentoring relationship. The original measure was written in the mentor's perspective; in order to use the measure for the current study, the measure was adapted into the protégé's perspective. A sample item (see Appendix C) from this scale is "My protégé and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship." A Likert response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree)* to 5 *(Strongly Agree)* will be used and the coefficient alpha reported in past studies was .80. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .94 for effectiveness and .88 for learning.

Dysfunctional mentor scale. The 8- item dysfunctional mentor scale from Eby, Butts, Lockwood, and Simon (2004) article discussing the negative mentoring experience was used to determine a difference between the helicopter mentor scale and other dysfunctional mentoring scales. A sample item (see Appendix C) from this scale is "My mentor approaches tasks with a negative attitude." A Likert response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree)* to 5 *(Strongly Agree)* will be used and the coefficient alpha was .90 in past studies. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .94.

Helicopter mentor scale. The 20-item dysfunctional mentor scale was produced in the current study using the definition of the helicopter mentor. The current scale has 5 items under each subsection of the definition (see Appendix C). A sample from each subsection are 1) highly supervising, "my mentor constantly double checks my work"; 2) shows difficulties allowing the protégés to have relationships with others, "my mentor does not encourage me to work with others"; 3) discourages independent work, "my mentor does not allow me to work on my own"; and 4) is highly controlling, "my mentor threatens me with poor evaluations if I do not want to do things his / her way." A Likert response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*) will be used. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .82 for factor one, .92 for factor two, .72 for factor three, .87 for factor four.

Anxiety scale. The 8-item anxiety scale was taken from *"N1: Anxiety" on the NEO-PI-R Form S.*. A sample item from this scale is "I am easily frightened." A Likert response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree)* to 5 *(Strongly Agree)* will be used with four of the items being

reverse scored (see Appendix C). The coefficient alpha of this scale is .75. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .72.

Self esteem scale. The 10-item self-esteem scale was taken from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965). A sample item from this scale is "I take a positive attitude toward myself." A Likert response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Agree)* to 4 *(Strongly Disagree)* will be used with three items being reverse scored (see Appendix C) and the coefficient alpha in past samples is .80. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .88.

Analyses

In order to evaluate the internal reliability and factor structure of the measure of helicopter mentoring, SPSS was used to generate coefficient alpha for each of the four scales. To follow best practices, coefficient alphas above .70 were considered as a strong alpha score (Nunnally, 1978). All four alphas were considered strong by the .70 standards. Factor one, Supervising, produced a coefficient alpha of .82; factor two, Relationships, .92, factor three, Independent, .72, and factor four Controlling, .87. Correlations were run using SPSS to confirm the hypotheses.

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the 20-item four factor helicopter mentoring measure. A CFA was run rather than an Exploratory Factor Analysis due to the theory taken from the parenting literature that there were four subsections to the helicopter parent. This description of a helicopter parent was used to define the helicopter mentor. Modification indices, standardized residuals and goodness of fit statistics were evaluated to determine the fit of the model.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Data Screening

The collected data files were merged together to produce one file which included all data. The data were screened for missing responses. All participants who did not complete any part of the survey were removed from the data. The original sample consisted of 602 participants. After screening, 52 participants were removed, leaving a total of 550 participants. Descriptive statistics were run for each item. The means, standard deviations, frequencies, skewness and kurtosis were observed to ensure a normal distribution for all items. There were no items that showed evidence of a non-normal distribution.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using LISREL 8.8. A covariance matrix was generated using SPSS and compared to the covariance matrix produced by LISREL's CFA to confirm that the data were being read correctly. Adequate model fit standards from Yu and Muthen (2002) were used: the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) values below .07, the corrected comparative fit index (CFI) values .95 or above, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) values .05 or below. Individual item functioning was examined using modification indices, and standardized residuals.

Results of fit and understanding misfit. A CFA was conducted on a four factor model using the 20 items of the helicopter mentoring measure. Items were specified to load on each of their respective factors: Supervising, Relationships, Independent, and Controlling. The results of the four-factor model showed that the model did not fit the data adequately (see Table 2). Each

table should appear as soon as possible after first mention. Generally this is done by putting it all by itself on the next page. Modification indices (see Table 3) and standardized residuals (see Table 4) were evaluated to indentify the problem items. Modification indices are the specific value that the model-fit chi-square can be expected to drop if the item is allowed to load on another factor (Byrne, 1998). Standardized residuals stand for the estimates of the number of standard deviations the observed residuals are from the zero residual that would be if the model fit the data perfectly (Byrne, 1998). Items 4 and 5 were identified as having problems fitting with the data. These items both fell under factor one, Supervising. Items 4 and 5 had high modification indices, each above 65 indicating that these items can load highly on the other factors. High completely standardized residuals, well above the |3| benchmark, indicated that the model was not reproducing the relationships between items (Byrne, 1998). After reviewing the items to ensure that the construct of Supervising was still accurately being represented by the remaining items, these items were deemed to be poor items and removed from the model. Items 6 and 7 from the second factor, Relationships, demonstrated similar problems to items 4 and 5 and were removed from the model. Lastly items 11 and 13 of factor three, Independent, were reviewed and removed also due to high modification indices and standardized residuals.

Table 2. *Goodness of Fit*

Model	Chi-Square	*df*	CFI	NFI	RFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Four Factor Model	1783.33						
20 Item	$p < .01$**	164	.89	.88	.86	.15	.13
Four Factor Model	395.26						
14 Item	$p < .01$**	71	.96	.95	.94	.098	.057

Note: *df* = Degrees of Freedom, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, NFI = Normed Fit Index, RFI = Relative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual

** Chi-Square is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 3. *Modification Indices*

	Supervising	Relationships	Independent	Controlling
Item 1	- -	36.23	25.12	36.40
Item 2	- -	23.53	26.27	20.51
Item 3	- -	15.11	4.60	13.91
Item 4	- -	164.14	122.89	143.95
Item 5	- -	98.02	67.82	90.59
Item 6	36.72	- -	0.66	21.82
Item 7	32.03	- -	4.20	19.80
Item 8	22.57	- -	16.20	28.27
Item 9	18.93	- -	5.57	14.53
Item 10	0.00	- -	25.46	5.12
Item 11	24.57	22.87	- -	6.40
Item 12	10.28	16.14	- -	2.01
Item 13	33.18	8.81	- -	0.00
Item 14	4.76	1.11	- -	31.25
Item 15	11.30	1.78	- -	60.37
Item 16	0.01	0.02	6.00	- -
Item 17	2.12	1.75	8.82	- -
Item 18	34.28	10.29	0.01	- -
Item 19	7.73	0.77	8.78	- -
Item 20	0.70	9.37	1.07	- -

Note: The table is describing the modifications indices from the CFA for four factor 20-item model.

Table 4. *Standardized residuals*

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6
Item 1	- -					
Item 2	8.70	- -				
Item 3	5.57	2.42	- -			
Item 4	-6.97	-3.45	-4.36	- -		
Item 5	-4.69	-4.56	-4.80	10.84	- -	
Item 6	0.14	2.47	-0.40	12.58	11.09	- -
Item 7	-0.52	2.06	-1.61	13.40	11.30	15.58
Item 8	-6.64	-5.73	-4.19	7.72	6.37	-5.45
Item 9	-6.60	-5.34	-4.34	8.80	6.46	-7.21
Item 10	-3.01	-1.67	-2.36	7.57	5.08	-3.13
Item 11	6.08	3.80	7.41	-0.76	0.04	-4.12
Item 12	-4.12	-4.78	-2.00	6.33	3.59	-0.54
Item 13	4.64	5.21	6.14	0.80	2.14	-0.82
Item 14	-3.08	-3.28	-0.95	4.05	3.41	-1.45
Item 15	-0.32	1.21	0.02	7.38	5.88	0.54
Item 16	-1.58	-0.79	0.98	3.53	1.47	1.68
Item 17	-3.68	-2.28	-1.07	4.26	3.47	1.21
Item 18	0.65	3.88	1.52	7.89	7.63	1.24
Item 19	-6.02	-4.18	-5.50	9.45	8.16	4.34
Item 20	-3.99	-2.72	-4.73	9.57	7.74	3.63

	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Item 12
Item 7	- -					
Item 8	-5.13	- -				
Item 9	-6.82	12.84	- -			
Item 10	-3.92	-0.07	2.89	- -		
Item 11	-4.40	-2.82	-2.76	-3.94	- -	
Item 12	2.07	-0.28	1.43	8.47	-2.28	- -
Item 13	-1.73	-1.46	-2.94	-3.74	13.08	-4.60
Item 14	-0.75	-1.71	0.02	1.97	1.92	6.26
Item 15	0.10	-2.06	-2.60	-0.44	2.08	-4.89
Item 16	0.41	-2.15	-0.27	0.46	0.97	0.99
Item 17	-0.10	-2.90	-2.10	0.67	0.31	1.18
Item 18	-0.28	-3.70	-3.91	-1.65	2.83	-2.35
Item 19	4.70	-2.93	-1.67	0.49	-3.67	-2.01
Item 20	4.75	-0.97	-0.01	4.28	-4.86	-0.06

Table 4: *Continued*

	Item 13	Item 14	Item 15	Item 16	Item 17	Item 18
Item 13	- -					
Item 14	1.42	- -				
Item 15	2.31	-1.99	- -			
Item 16	0.90	0.59	3.54	- -		
Item 17	0.36	0.73	5.22	10.22	- -	
Item 18	4.00	-0.59	3.30	1.00	2.29	- -
Item 19	-1.21	-5.55	4.20	-4.14	-3.93	-0.21
Item 20	-2.84	-4.50	3.14	-5.89	-5.30	-2.86

	Item 19	Item 20
Item 19	- -	
Item 20	9.41	- -

Note: The table is describing the standardized residuals from the CFA of the four factor 20-item model.

New model results. A CFA was re-run on the four factor model using 14 of the original 20 item helicopter mentoring measure. Factor 1, Supervising, 2, Relationships, and 3, Independent, included 3 items, while factor 4, Controlling, included all of the original items. The items which were removed had high modification indices indicating that they load on several factors (see Table 5) as well as had high standardized residuals indicating that the model was not reproducing relationships between items (see Table 6). Although these items were removed, the items left in each factor were deemed to be sufficient in defining the factor. The 14 item four factor model illustrated adequate goodness of fit in CFI, NFI, RFI, and SRMR. The RMSEA was .09, slightly higher than the adequate level of .05. Overall, this combination of fit indices provides good evidence for adequate fit. Because the model provided a good fit to the data, it is appropriate to examine standardized factor loadings. These values are listed in Table 7, along with the listing of the final 14 items. All items had factor loadings above .63, showing that items loaded strongly on their particular factor.

Table 5. *Modification Indices*

	Supervising	Relationship	Independent	Controlling
Item 1	- -	9.10	8.45	11.51
Item 2	- -	14.55	11.80	20.65
Item 3	- -	1.85	0.80	3.05
Item 8	2.83	- -	6.08	4.01
Item 9	0.31	- -	4.30	4.02
Item 10	6.96	- -	26.47	21.16
Item 12	3.31	9.64	- -	13.36
Item 14	0.92	0.06	- -	19.16
Item 15	9.50	10.43	- -	66.63
Item 16	1.04	0.01	5.02	- -
Item 17	0.53	0.43	6.82	- -
Item 18	30.43	8.76	0.82	- -
Item 19	9.21	0.41	3.02	- -
Item 20	2.27	6.72	1.31	- -

Note: The table is describing the modification indices for the final four factor 14-item CFA model.

Table 6. *Standardized Residuals*

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
Item 1	- -					
Item 2	-1.30	- -				
Item 3	3.68	-2.81	- -			
Item 8	-3.04	1.08	-1.72	- -		
Item 9	-2.61	2.68	-1.35	5.01	- -	
Item 10	-0.79	4.23	-0.10	-2.24	-2.21	- -
Item 12	-2.38	-0.18	-0.54	0.30	1.51	5.11
Item 14	-1.40	-0.37	0.03	-1.53	-0.02	1.43
Item 15	1.09	3.50	0.75	-2.85	-3.77	0.03
Item 16	-0.55	1.33	1.88	-1.40	-0.03	1.10
Item 17	-2.40	0.52	-0.14	-1.56	-1.13	1.58
Item 18	1.97	6.39	2.55	-2.66	-3.30	0.19
Item 19	-4.01	0.84	-3.69	-0.53	-0.39	3.39
Item 20	-2.23	1.08	-3.76	1.28	1.75	4.09

	Item 12	Item 14	Item 15	Item 16	Item 17	Item 18
Item 12	- -					
Item 14	5.26	- -				
Item 15	-4.13	-1.28	- -			
Item 16	1.12	0.42	3.57	- -		
Item 17	1.07	0.73	4.91	10.28	- -	
Item 18	-2.31	-0.41	3.04	0.32	1.85	- -
Item 19	-2.18	-4.94	4.65	-4.23	-4.67	-0.13
Item 20	-2.80	-3.68	3.48	-5.95	-5.26	-1.84

	Item 19	Item 20
Item 19	- -	
Item 20	9.91	- -

Note: The table is describing the standardized residuals from the CFA of the four factor 14-item model

Table 7. *Completely Standardized Solutions*

	Supervising	Relationship	Independent	Controlling
My mentor constantly double checks my work. (1)	0.80	- -	- -	- -
My mentor seems to micro manage my work. (2)	0.86	- -	- -	- -
My mentor gives me extremely detailed instruction on how to complete my work (3)	0.64	- -	- -	- -
My mentor does not encourage me to work with others. (8)	- -	0.88	- -	- -
My mentor does not allow me to work in a team. (9)	- -	0.94	- -	- -
My mentor does not allow me to seek other mentors or supervisors for help. (10)	- -	0.84	- -	- -
My mentor does not allow me to work on my own. (12)	- -	- -	0.79	- -
My mentor does not give me independent work. (14)	- -	- -	0.63	- -
My mentor makes me feel as if I need him/her to be successful (15)	- -	- -	0.64	- -
My mentor asks to read my emails. (16)	- -	- -	- -	0.64
My mentor asks specific details about conversations that I have with other employees. (17)	- -	- -	- -	0.71
My mentor constantly fixes my work, even when it does not seem like it needs to be fixed (18)	- -	- -	- -	0.73
My mentor threatens me with poor evaluations if I do not want to do things his / her way. (19)	- -	- -	- -	0.86
I sometimes feel like I can't be myself because my mentor does not approve of what I say and do (20)	- -	- -	- -	0.78

Note: The table is describing the completely standardized solutions (factor loadings) from the CFA of the four factor 14-item model and their appropriate items.

Reliability Analyses

Reliability coefficients were used to examine the consistency of the items within the measure. The reliability coefficients for the four factors of the helicopter mentoring measure are high, all well above .7. Factor two, Relationships, illustrated the highest reliability at .92. Factor 3, Independent, had the lowest reliability of .72. Overall, all of the subscales demonstrated adequate reliability estimates.

Examining Correlations

To examine the nomological net, I chose several theoretically-relevant measures. The purpose of correlating these measures with helicopter mentoring was to inspect validity evidence (see Table 8). Correlations between the four factors of helicopter mentoring were first observed. As expected the four factors of helicopter mentoring were related to one another, however they are also distinct, show by the range of correlations from .15 to .69. The lowest correlation was between Supervising and Relationships. The highest was between Independent and Controlling.

Table 8. *Correlations*

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Supervising	1.00								
2. Relationship	.15**	1.00							
3. Independent	.29**	.59**	1.00						
4. Controlling	.33**	.63**	.69**	1.00					
5. Typical Mentor Effective	-.05	-.42**	-.36**	-.37**	1.00				
6. Typical Mentor Learning	-.01	-.40**	-.31**	-.32**	.85**	1.00			
7. General Dysfunctionality	.10*	.57**	.47**	.53**	-.43**	-.39**	1.00		
8. Anxiety	.02	.05	.06	.07	.01	-.002	-.03	1.00	
9. Self Esteem	-.15**	-.29**	-.33**	-.34**	.22**	.17**	-.27**	-.40**	1.00
M	2.80	1.54	1.86	1.67	4.11	4.02	1.54	2.96	1.97
SD	.91	.66	.70	.70	.78	.72	.68	.61	.68

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis one involves the relationship between the four factor model and the two sections of the typical mentoring measure: effectiveness and learning. As expected, all of the correlations were negative, showing a negative relationship between helicopter mentoring and typical mentors. Factor two, Relationships, holds the highest correlation with both typical effective and learning mentoring.

A general dysfunctionality measure was used to establish discriminate validity. Hypothesis two stated that these two measures should be moderately related, however should show that they are distinct. The correlations demonstrate that general dysfunctionality and helicopter mentoring are indeed related, but noticeably distinct. The correlations span from .10 to .57, which are indicative of a range of weak to strong relationships. Factor two, Relationships, and factor four, Controlling, held the highest correlations.

Hypotheses three and four focus on examining a relationship between the helicopter mentoring scale and anxiety and self esteem. The correlations found little association between the helicopter mentoring measure and anxiety. The correlations for helicopter mentoring and anxiety ranged from .02 to .07, of which none were statistically significant. The correlation between helicopter mentoring and self esteem showed a moderate correlation. The correlations for helicopter mentoring and self esteem ranged from -.15to -.34, of which all were statistically significant.

Testing Only Employees

The participant pool for this study included those with and without a job. To further examine the psychometric functioning of the measure, correlations were run including only those who stated that they were currently employed (see Table 9). As expected, the correlations of the

employed participants were close to the correlations of the entire participant pool. Most of the relationships were slightly stronger for employed participants; however the scores were slightly lower in the correlations between self-esteem and factor two, Relationships, and four, Controlling, of the helicopter mentoring scale.

Table 9. *Correlations Employed Participants*

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Supervising	1.00								
2. Relationship	.19**	1.00							
3. Independent	.34**	.66**	1.00						
4. Controlling	.34**	.67**	.73**	1.00					
5. Typical Mentor Effective	-.09	-.44**	-.39**	-.40**	1.00				
6. Typical Mentor Learning	-.04	-.41**	-.33**	-.35**	.86**	1.00			
7. General Dysfunctionality	.18**	.61**	.54**	.60**	-.48**	-.47**	1.00		
8. Anxiety	.04	.01	.06	.05	.01	.03	-.07	1.00	
9. Self Esteem	-.16*	-.28**	-.34**	-.33**	.23*	.16**	-.27**	-.46**	1.00
10. *M*	2.70	1.50	1.75	1.61	4.08	3.99	1.60	2.81	2.10
10. SD	.94	.66	.67	.70	.83	.75	.71	.63	.66

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The current study examined a helicopter mentoring measure. As defined by its four sub sections, a helicopter mentor is: 1) highly supervising, 2) shows difficulties allowing the protégés to have relationships with others, 3) discourages independent work, and 4) is highly controlling. The current study also included four comparison measures in order to establish the nomological net of helicopter mentoring. There are five main conclusions that can be reached from this study. First, this study shows that the newly established helicopter mentoring measure is psychometrically sound. Second, the study shows that there is a negative relationship between typical mentoring behaviors and helicopter mentoring. Third, although dysfunctional mentoring and helicopter mentoring are related, helicopter mentoring is distinct from dysfunctional mentoring. Fourth, helicopter mentoring is not strongly related to anxiety. Lastly, helicopter mentoring is negatively correlated with self-esteem. Although with the five conclusions, the current study offers implications for theory. The current study is filling a gap in the literature and gives support that employees in the work place are experiencing this type of dysfunctional mentor. Furthermore the study provides evidence that may be used by organizations to help train their future mentors. Finally the study has an outlook for additional research. There is a much research to be done due to the findings of the current study.

A CFA was performed to confirm that the newly-developed measure of helicopter mentoring fit the proposed four-factor model. The model was analyzed using all 20 items of the helicopter mentor measure. Using goodness of fit statistics, the 20-item four-factor model revealed poor fit. Using theoretical considerations and the modification indices and standardized residuals, six items were removed. The revised 14-item four-factor model was analyzed using CFA and revealed adequate model fit. Model fit was examined by inspecting goodness of fit

statistics. Standardized factor loadings demonstrated that all items were strongly related to their respective latent variables. Table 10 indicates the final 14-items in the four factor helicopter mentoring model.

Table 10. *Final Helicopter Mentoring Items*

Supervising	My mentor constantly double checks my work.
Supervising	My mentor seems to micro manage my work.
Supervising	My mentor gives me extremely detailed instruction on how to complete my work.
Relationships	My mentor does not encourage me to work with others.
Relationships	My mentor does not allow me to work in a team.
Relationships	My mentor does not allow me to seek other mentors or supervisors for help.
Independent	My mentor does not allow me to work on my own.
Independent	My mentor does not give me independent work.
Independent	My mentor makes me feel as if I need him/her to be successful.
Controlling	My mentor asks to read my emails.
Controlling	My mentor asks specific details about conversations that I have with other employees.
Controlling	My mentor constantly fixes my work, even when it does not seem like it needs to be fixed.
Controlling	My mentor threatens me with poor evaluations if I do not want to do things his / her way.
Controlling	I sometimes feel like I can't be myself because my mentor does not approve of what I say and do.

To ensure that the new helicopter mentoring measure was psychometrically sound, measures of typical mentoring, dysfunctional mentoring, anxiety, and self-esteem were used to examine evidence for its convergent and discriminant validity. Hypothesis 1 questioned the convergent validity between the helicopter mentor measure and a typical mentoring measure. As hypothesized, the four dimensions of helicopter mentoring were negatively related to mentoring effectiveness and learning. Factor two, Relationships, holds the highest correlations with both typical effectiveness (*r = -.42)* and learning mentoring (*r = -.40).* One explanation for this is that factor two, Relationships, is indicative of behaviors that mentors engage in that prevent their protégés from growing; not allowing new employees to connect with others will hinder their development within the organization. Additionally, an employee who wants to reach out to other employees for feedback or help, behaviors which are encouraged in most organizations, might feel as though a mentoring relationships that prohibits these important behaviors are more ineffective than effective. Factor one, Supervising, on the other hand, had the smallest negative correlation with typical effectiveness and learning, and did not demonstrate statistically significant relationships with either. A possible explanation for this is that factor one, Supervising, is not as harmful for protégés as the other factors are. For example, constantly double-checking a protégés work, an item under Supervising, might actually be appreciated by some employees, or in some circumstances. Another explanation is that there is an overall quandary with factor one, Supervising. This factor has the lowest correlations with all other measures and has the lowest correlations with the other factors in the helicopter mentoring measure.

Hypothesis 2 states that the four dimensions of helicopter mentoring will demonstrate a medium to large effect size with dysfunctional mentoring, without being so highly correlated as

to be redundant. As hypothesized, the correlations were no higher than .57, which is slightly higher than medium effect size, which spans from .3 to .5 (Cohen, 1988). The correlations ranged from .10 to .57, with factor one, Supervising, resulting in the lowest correlation with dysfunctional mentoring. Many of the dysfunctional questions in this measure are concerning the attitudes of the mentors, and Supervising, consists of very specific behaviors that the mentors exhibit. The two measures both describe a type of dysfunctional mentor; however, the helicopter mentor measure focuses on behaviors that impact the protégé. The component that had the highest correlation with dysfunction mentoring was factor two, Relationships, at .57. Although there are similarities between the measures, helicopter mentoring is unique in that the mentors are too involved with their protégés.

Hypothesis 3 questioned the correlation between anxiety and the helicopter mentoring measure. It was hypothesized that helicopter mentoring would positively relate to anxiety level. The correlation was not statistically significant. One explanation for this could be that adults, unlike children, find less stress in having someone hover over them, especially in a work environment. In today's high-paced, stressful work environments, some employees may actually find helicopter mentoring behaviors to relieve stress, as the mentor's desire to take on more responsibility relieves the employee from those pressures. Another interpretation of the null relationship between helicopter mentoring and anxiety may simply be because of the perception of the protégés. Protégés with helicopter mentors may feel that the relationship that they have with their mentors is a strong, positive one. Since the helicopter mentors are giving their protégés so much attention, and the mentors have the protégés best interest in mind, the protégés may feel at ease with their mentors, canceling out any feelings of anxiety.

Lastly, Hypothesis 4 involves the correlation between helicopter mentoring and self-esteem. Three of the four factors of the helicopter mentoring measure have a moderate correlation with self-esteem, Relationships, Independent, and Controlling. One possible explanation for this is that protégés are held back from growth due to their experience with a helicopter mentor; therefore, they do not have the ability to become comfortable with themselves as an employee. Kram (1983) indicated the psychosocial functions of a mentoring relationship are used to increase the self-esteem of the protégé. In a helicopter mentoring relationship, the protégé is smothered with supported. The prompts protégés are given at every task can make them feel as if they are not capable of completing a task on their own, which may lead to lowered self-esteem. Another explanation could be that protégés with helicopter mentors are not exposed to the organizational culture as much as a protégé without a helicopter mentor. These protégés do not have the ability to network within the organization, making them feel alone and isolated. These feelings of isolation can lead employees to lose confidence in themselves, lose confidence in connecting with others at work, which can possibly lead to lowered self-esteem.

Further analyses were conducted on only the participants who were employed. Much of the mentoring research is focused specifically on mentoring relationship within an organization. Although most of the relationships for the employed participants were slightly stronger than the overall participant pool, correlations between self esteem and factor two, Relationships, and factor four, Controlling, of the helicopter mentoring scale was lower than the unemployed participants. Despite these slightly different correlations, they are not thought to be exceptionally different than those of the entire participant pool. The results of the employed participants showed a pattern similar to that of the entire participant pool, giving more support and confidence for the results listed above.

Implications for Theory

The current study makes a number of contributions to the mentoring research. First, the concept of a helicopter mentor appears to be a construct that employees perceive in their work environments. This is confirmed by reviewing the means of each factor of the helicopter mentor (see Table 7). These means suggest that some of the participants indicated that they had experienced this type of mentoring behavior. In fact, the means for all four of the Helicopter Mentoring subscales were as high as or higher than the more typically studied general dysfunctional mentoring measure, indicating that helicopter mentoring may be just as salient as general dysfunctional mentoring relationships. Second, the study finds that the measure of helicopter mentoring has a stronger correlation with self-esteem than dysfunctional and typical mentoring measures. Kram, (1983) discusses the effects of a supporting mentor on the increased self-esteem of the protégé. The current study shows the opposite effect, in that a protégé will experience lowered self-esteem due to the extreme amount of support which a helicopter mentor gives. The current study uses previously validated measures to help provide support for the new helicopter mentor measure. Using these measures has further defined the measure's reliability.

Much of previous dysfunctional mentoring research has focused on the mentoring relationships that are characterized by missing critical psychosocial or career functions, which Kram (1983) indicated as important and indicative of an effective mentoring relationship. The current study focuses on "too many functions". The mentor in this type of dysfunctional relationship is giving too many of the functions and possibly for too long. Although the "too caring" mentor is hinted at by Duck (1994), in that the mentor has the best interest of protégé in

mind, this study is the first to provide empirical evidence that over-mentoring is related to detrimental outcomes, such as lower reports of self-esteem.

Implications for Practice

The current study contains findings that can assist organizations in better understanding the types of mentoring relationships that can occur in the workplace and the outcomes of mentoring relationships. The current study explores a new type of dysfunctional mentoring that can be exceptionally dangerous for an organization, as helicopter mentoring may be harder to detect than other dysfunctional relationships since some protégés may perceive it as having a mentor who cares a lot about them. Previous research has discussed some the difficulties protégés face with mentors that do not want to be part of the mentoring relationship, and this study focused on mentors who are too involved. Managers should be wary of mentors who seem to be supervising their protégés too closely or seem too invested in their protégés, as well as protégés who seem to keep to themselves and not seek out opportunities to work with other employees.

The results of this study show that lowered self-esteem is correlated with helicopter mentoring relationships. Organizations should take this into account as this lowered self-esteem may hinder the protégé's ability to be a productive and effective member of the business. Organizations may consider setting up formal training that warns of the dangers of helicopter mentoring for their managers and all potential mentors when implementing formal training programs. The organization may also produce mentoring satisfaction surveys that protégés could take at different stages of their mentoring relationships to ensure the success of the relationship.

Also without a satisfaction measure, the progress of the mentoring relationship may not be evaluated accurately.

Organizations should also investigate how to resolve the helicopter mentoring issue. Training methods should be produced to help mentors understand how to become effective mentors and explain the hazards of hovering. Once the training is completed, organizations should implement a formal mentoring program which may prevent any type of helicopter or dysfunctional mentoring from occurring. That way, organizations can reap the benefits of mentoring, such as reduced turnover intentions (Eby, Butts, Lockwood & Simon, 2004) rather than inadvertently placing employees in potentially harmful helicopter mentoring or other dysfunctional mentoring relationships.

Future Research

The helicopter mentoring measure is psychometrically sound, however should be further researched to examine the psychometric properties across samples. Factor one, Supervising, should be closely observed and analyzed as it is a possible issue. Factor one has the lowest correlations with the other factors of the helicopter mentoring measure as well as the lowest correlations with the other measures used in this study. Future research could attempt to see if the Supervising component is problematic on other samples, comparing the results to this study.

As previously discussed with anxiety, it is unknown if protégés perceived the mentoring relationship as a positive one. The perception of the mentoring relationship from the point of view of the protégé should be sought out through measures specifically questioning the protégés' satisfaction with their mentors and the relationships they have. It would also be interesting to see the mentor's perception of the relationship and satisfaction with their protégés' development.

Another reason for mentors' hovering behavior may be the mentors' thoughts on their protégés' development. Are mentors more likely to hover if they feel that their protégés are not developing is an acceptable amount of time? A longitudinal study should be conducted with mentor/protégé dyads who have been defined as in the three types of relationships described in this study (i.e., typical, dysfunctional, and helicopter). The longitudinal study should research the perception of the protégés, mentors and someone who is not directly in the relationship, such as the mentor's boss. With this information, we can further understand how these relationships are perceived and how they can affect all persons involved.

In the current study, anxiety was found to not correlate highly with helicopter mentoring. Future research should explore why anxiety and helicopter mentoring are not related. Is the protégés perception of the relationship causing this lack of correlation between anxiety and helicopter mentoring? The research should also search for other outcomes of the helicopter mentoring relationship. Along with studying potential mediators or moderators that may explain why anxiety and helicopter mentoring were not significantly correlated, it would be interesting to see if there are other outcomes affiliated with helicopter mentoring. Some of the other outcomes which could be researched are animosity towards the mentor, depression, or negative work attitudes, such as turnover intentions.

Lastly, future research could use individual difference measures or climate perceptions to pinpoint if there are any environmental or personality triggers for helicopter mentoring. These issues could be researched both for the protégés and for the mentors. It is possible that protégés who are more introverted could produce more helicopter mentors than protégés who are extroverted. It is also possible that different types of environments are more prone to having helicopter mentors. Research should focus on fast paced environments versus slower paced

environments. Environments where mentors can spend more time with their protégés might reveal a difference from those where mentors have less or no time for their protégés.

Limitations

Despite the strengths of this study, some limitations are present. The first limitation is the participant pool. Fifty seven percent of the participants were not employed. Although the study involved analyses of those who were employed, it was not certain how long they had been with their current mentor. It is suggested that future research examine full time, working employees.

A second limitation of the current study is the measures that were used. Although a second Confirmatory Factor Analysis, found that the 14-item, four-factor model had adequate measures of fit, future research should confirm that the 14-item model is generalizable. Along with this, the typical mentoring measure used was originally written in mentor perspective and was revised in a protégé perspective for the study. A future study should try to use another typical mentor measure that was produced in the protégé perspective to ensure that the helicopter mentoring measure is distinct from the typical mentor.

Lastly a major limitation of the study is the inability to identify or confirm causation. It is uncertain whether a helicopter mentor causes the lowered self-esteem within the protégé or if a protégé with lowered self-esteem causes a mentor to hover. Due to this uncertain causation direction it is difficult to make conclusions concerning the effects of the behaviors of a helicopter mentor. Future research should define the causation of the self-esteem/helicopter mentoring relationship.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of the current study was to develop a measure of helicopter mentoring relationships. Research on dysfunctional mentoring relationships is limited and this study was focused on a unique view on dysfunctionality. The parenting literature was used to define the helicopter mentor, apply their thoughts and ideas into the workplace. It is important to understand the negative side of mentoring relationships and how they can affect individuals and organizations.

References

Allen, T., & Eby, L. (2003). Relationship effectiveness for mentors: Factors associated with learning and quality. *Journal of Management, 29,* 469-486.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 70-89.

Bragg, A. (1989). Is a mentor program in your future? *Sales and Marketing Management, 141,* 54-59.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1989). Developing formal mentoring programs in organizations. *Business Quarterly, 53,* 76-99.

Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawerence Erlbaum.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Duck, S. (1994). Strategems, spoils, and a serpent's tooth: On the delights and dilemmas of personal relationships. In W.R. Cupach & B.H. Spitzberg (Eds.). The dark side of interpersonal communication (pp.3-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S. A. (2004). Protégés' negative mentoring experiences: Construct development and nomological validation. *Personnel Psychology, 57,* 411–447.

Fagenson, E. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10,* 309-320.

Koberg, C. S., Boss, R. W., Chappell, D., & Ringer, R. C. (1994). Correlates and consequences of protégé mentoring in a large hospital. *Group and Organization Management, 19*, 219-239.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 608-625.

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Levinson, D. J., Darow, C. H., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M.H. & McKee, B. 1978. *The seasons of a man's life*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Levy, D. M. (1970). The concept of maternal overprotection. In E. J.Anthony & T. Benedek (Eds.), Parenthood (pp. 387–409). New York, NY: Little-Brown.

Murray, M. (1991). *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring program.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479.

Nunnally, Um C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.); New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1978

Olian, J. D., Carroll, S. J., & Giannantonio, C. M. (1993). Mentor reactions to protégés: An experiment with managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 43*, 266-278.

Olian, J. D., Carroll, S. J., Giannantonio, C. M., & Feren, D. B. (1988). What do protégés look for in a mentor? Results of three experimental studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 33,* 15-37.

Parker. G. B., Barrett, B. A., Hickie, I. (1992) From nurture to network: Examining links between perceptions of parenting received in childhood and social bonds in adulthood. *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 149:877-885.

Parker, G. (1983). Parental overprotection: A risk factor in psychosocial development. New York, NY: Grune & Stratton.

Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology, 52*, 1–10.

Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1999). Burden or blessing? Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 493–509.

Rapee, R. M. (1997). Potential role of childrearing practices in the development of anxiety and depression. *Clinical Psychology Review, 17*, 47–67.

Rork, K., & Morris, T. (2009). Influence of parenting factors on childhood social anxiety: Direct observation of parental warmth and control. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 31*, 220-235.

Scandura, T. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. *Journal of Management, 24*, 449-467.

Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. Journal *of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169–174.

Smith, C. S., Tisak, J., Hahn, S. E., & Schmieder, R. A. (1997). The measurement of job control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*, 225–237.

Thomasgard, M., & Metz, W. (1993). Parental overprotection revisited. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 24*, 67-80.

Trumpeter, N. N., Watson, P. J., O'Leary, B. J., & Weathington, B. L. (2008). Self-functioning and perceived parenting: Relations of parental empathy and love inconsistency with narcissism, depression, and self-esteem. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 169, 51-71.

Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T., & Hezlett, S. A. (2003). Mentoring research: A review and dynamic process model. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 22*, 39–124.

Wright, L., Mullen, T., West, K., & Wyatt, P. (1993). The VCOP Scale: A measure of overprotection in parents of physically vulnerable children. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49*, 790-798.

Yu, C., & Muthen, B. (2002, April). *Evaluation of model fit indices for latent variable models with categorical and continuous outcomes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

APPENDIX A: IRB Approval Letter

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
1L-09 Brody Medical Sciences Building• 600 Moye Boulevard • Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914** • Fax **252-744-2284** • **www.ecu.edu/irb**

Date: February 15, 2011

Principal Investigator: Catherine Buria, Student
Dept./Ctr./Institute: Dept of Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Mailstop or Address: 300 Treybrooke Cir., Apt/ 11, Greenville, NC 27834

RE: **Exempt Certification**
UMCIRB# **11-0106**
Funding Source: Unfunded

Title: "Stop the Hovering: Helicopter Mentor, A New View on the Dysfunctional Mentor"

Dear Ms. Buria:

On 2.14.11, the University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) determined that your research meets ECU requirements and federal exemption criterion #2 which includes research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects and any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your Internal Processing Form and Protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

The UMCIRB Office will hold your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit an Exemption Certification Request at least 30 days before the end of the five year period.

Sincerely,

Chairperson, University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board

Pc: Dr. Lisa Baranik

APPENDIX B: Informed Consent

Informed Consent to Participate in Research
Information to consider before taking part in research that has no more than minimal risk.

Title of Research Study: Stop the Hovering: Helicopter Mentor, A New View on the Dysfunctional Mentor

Principal Investigator: Catherine Buria, Industrial/Organizational Psychology Graduate Student
Institution/Department or Division: East Carolina University
Address: 300 Treybrooke Cir. Apt 11, Greenville, NC
Telephone #: 407-257-9182

Researchers at East Carolina University (ECU) study problems in society, health problems, environmental problems, behavior problems and the human condition. Our goal is to try to find ways to improve the lives of you and others. To do this, we need the help of volunteers who are willing to take part in research.

Why is this research being done?
The purpose of this research is to validate a new measure of a helicopter mentor. This measure will be used to identify the difference between types of mentoring behaviors and styles. The decision to take part in this research is yours to make. By doing this research, we hope that you gain a stronger perspective on different types of mentoring behaviors and their outcomes.

Why am I being invited to take part in this research?
You are being invited to take part in this research because you have been a part of a mentoring relationship in t he past. If you choose to take part in this study, you will be one of 300 participants.

What other choices do I have if I do not take part in this research?
You can choose not to participate.

Where is the research going to take place and how long will it last?
The research procedures will be conducted solely online via a secured online survey system. This is a onetime study that should take approximately 20 minutes.

What will I be asked to do?
You are being asked complete an online survey concerning a mentoring relationship that you have been involved in. You will need to keep in mind a mentor that you have had, either current or in the past. Please do not include your name at any point in the survey. You may stop the survey at any point, or refuse to answer any of the questions. By completing the online survey it indicates participant consent. Please be honest when indicating responses to the questionnaire.

What possible harms or discomforts might I experience if I take part in the research?
It has been determined that the risks associated with this research are no more than what you would experience in everyday life.

What are the possible benefits I may experience from taking part in this research?
We do not know if you will get any benefits by taking part in this study. This research might help us learn more about the different types of mentoring relationships and their outcomes. There may be no personal benefit from your participation but the information gained by doing this research may help others in the future.

Will I be paid for taking part in this research?
We will not be able to pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study.

What will it cost me to take part in this research?
There will be no cost to you for taking this survey.

How will you keep the information you collect about me secure? How long will you keep it?
At no point in the survey process will any identifying information be associated with your responses. All responses to this survey will remain completely anonymous and confidential, as you will never be asked to identify yourself. The final report for this study will include only aggregated data; no individual data will be singled out for separate

analysis. The responses that you provide will be encoded and analyzed by the research team at East Carolina University. Only members of the East Carolina University research team will be permitted to view the responses to the survey. The information collected from this study will be stored in a private database and will only be kept throughout the duration of analysis. All analyses will be conducted prior to May 2011.

What if I decide I do not want to continue in this research?

If you decide you no longer want to take part in this research after it has already started, you may stop at any time. It should be noted that if any questions have been answered prior to ending your session, these questions will remain in the data and are not able to be removed. You will not be penalized or criticized for stopping. You will not lose any benefits that you should normally receive.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

The people conducting this study will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the Principal Investigator at 407-257-9182, Monday through Friday from 9am-6pm.
If you have questions about your rights as someone taking part in research, you may call the UMCIRB Office at phone number 252-744-2914 (days, 8:00 am-5:00 pm). If you would like to report a complaint or concern about this research study, you may call the Director of UMCIRB Office, at 252-744-1971.

I have decided I want to take part in this research. What should I do now?

If you agree, you should check the **"yes"** circle below this form, which will serve as your electronic signature:
I have read all of the above information. I know that I can stop taking part in this study at any time. By electronically signing this informed consent form, I am not giving up any of my rights. If you desire a copy of this document, please feel free to print this page.

APPENDIX C: Current Study Survey

Question	Responses						
1. Gender	Male (1)	Female (2)					
2. Age	25 years and under (1)	26-30 (2)	31-35 (3)	36- 40 (4)	Over 40 (5)		
3. Race	American Indian or Alaska Native (1)	Asian (2)	Black or African American (3)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (4)	White or Caucasian (5)		
4. Ethnicity	Hispanic or Latino (1)	Non Hispanic or Latino (2)					
5. What is your highest level of education?	High School (1)	Associates Degree (2)	College (BA/ BS) (3)	Professional Degree (4)	Masters Degree (5)	Ph.D. (6)	
6. Are you currently employed?	Yes (1)	No (2)					
7. Employment Type	Government / State (1)	Factory/ Production (2)	Organizational Management (3)	Food/ Beverage (4)	Academic (5)	N/A (6)	
8. How long have you been with your current organization?	Less than 1 year (1)	1-2 years (2)	3-4 years (3)	5-9 years (4)	10-14 years (5)	15 years or more (6)	N/A (7)
9. How much time have you spent with your mentor?	Less than 3 months (1)	3-6 months (2)	6-9 months (3)	9- 1 year (4)	1-2 years (5)	Over 2 years (6)	

The Following were measured on a 1-5 scale, 1 being Strongly Disagree and 5 being Strongly Agree

Typical Mentor
The mentoring relationship between my mentor and me was very effective. (1)
I am very satisfied with the mentoring relationship my mentor and I developed. (2)
I was effectively utilized by my mentor. (3)
My mentor and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship. (4)
Both my mentor and I benefited from the mentoring relationship. (5)
I learned a lot from my mentor. (6)
My mentor gave me a new perspective on many things. (7)
There was reciprocal learning that took place between my mentor and I. (8)
My mentor shared a lot of information with me that helped my own professional development. (9)
My mentor and I were "co-learners" in the mentoring relationship. (10)

Dysfunctional Mentor
My mentor has a bad attitude. (1)
My mentor is bitter toward the organization. (2)
My mentor has personal problems (e.g., drinking problem, marital problems). (3)
My mentor tends to bring his/her personal problems to work. (4)
My mentor approaches tasks with a negative attitude. (5)
My mentor complains a lot about the organization. (6)
My mentor has a pessimistic attitude. (7)
My mentor allows non-business related issues to interfere with his/her work. (8)

Helicopter Mentor

Supervising	My mentor constantly double checks my work. (1)
Supervising	My mentor seems to micro manage my work. (2)
Supervising	My mentor gives me extremely detailed instruction on how to complete my work (3)
Supervising	My mentor second guesses my ability to do my job. (4)
Supervising	My mentor leaves out important project information, making it so I have to go ask them how to finish. (5)
Relationships	My mentor seems to get angry if I speak with others. (6)
Relationships	My mentor does not allow me to build my work network (7)
Relationships	My mentor does not encourage me to work with others. (8)
Relationships	My mentor does not allow me to work in a team. (9)
Relationships	My mentor does not allow me to seek other mentors or supervisors for help. (10)
Independent	My mentor constantly helps me with my work. (11)
Independent	My mentor does not allow me to work on my own. (12)
Independent	My mentor gives me ideas for projects even if I do not ask for them. (13)
Independent	My mentor does not give me independent work. (14)
Independent	My mentor makes me feel as if I need him/her to be successful (15)
Controlling	My mentor asks to read my emails. (16)
Controlling	My mentor asks specific details about conversations that I have with other employees. (17)
Controlling	My mentor constantly fixes my work, even when it does not seem like it needs to be fixed (18)
Controlling	My mentor threatens me with poor evaluations if I do not want to do things his / her way. (19)
Controlling	I sometimes feel like I can't be myself because my mentor does not approve of what I say and do (20)

Anxiety

I am not a worrier. (1)
I am easily frightened (2)
I rarely feel fearful or anxious. (3)
I often feel tense and jittery. (4)
I'm seldom apprehensive about the future. (5)
I often worry about things that might go wrong. (6)
I have fewer fears than most people. (7)
Frightening thoughts sometimes come into my head. (8)

Self Esteem

I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. (1)
I feel that I have a number of good qualities. (2)
All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (3)
I am able to do things as well as most other people. (4)
I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (5)
I take a positive attitude toward myself, (6)
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. (7)
I wish I could have more respect for myself. (8)
I certainly feel useless at times. (9)
At times I feel I am no good at all. (10)