A STUDY OF MENTORING IN VOLLEYBALL COACHING

by

JEFFREY SCOTT WHITE

(Under the Direction of Paul Schempp)

ABSTRACT

Research has suggested that formal mentoring programs can play a significant role in the development of mentees in business (Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & Dubois, 2008), nursing (Riley & Fearing, 2009), and education (Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008) but research on formal mentoring programs for sport coaches has been lacking (Bloom, 2013). One of the most important factors considered in formal mentoring programs was the matching method used in pairing mentors and mentees (Blake-Beard, O'Neill, & McGowan, 2007). The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. This study addressed the following research questions: a) what is the effect of matching methods on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program, b) how do matching methods contribute to perceptions of similarity, commitment, and investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program, and c) how do matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program? Participants were members of the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) that applied for the AVCA Coaches Mentor Program. The Coach Mentor Role Instrument (CMRI) (Schempp, McCullick, Berger, White, & Elliott, 2014) was administered to participants and Welch's t-tests were used to analyze the quantitative

data. Interviews were also conducted with 30 participants on the topics of similarity, commitment, investment, and overall mentoring. The notable results revealed several findings: a) the choice-based method did not appear to be a better matching method than administrator-assigned based on mentor roles and functions, b) choice-based mentors and mentees reported increased perceptions of similarity, commitment, and investment and c) choice-based mentors and mentees reported increased perceptions of overall mentoring when allowed to define the term in their own way. Future research should focus on a) continued comparisons of matching methods, b) examination of similarity, commitment, and investment in mentoring relationships, and c) e-mentoring in formal mentoring programs for sport coaches.
INDEX WORDS: Coaching (athletics), Mentoring, Matching Methods

A STUDY OF MENTORING IN VOLLEYBALL COACHING

by

JEFFREY SCOTT WHITE

B.A., California State University Northridge, Northridge, CA, 1992

M.A., The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, 2002

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

A STUDY OF MENTORING IN VOLLEYBALL COACHING

by

JEFFREY SCOTT WHITE

Major Professor: Paul Schempp

Committee: Bryan McCullick
James Zhang

Electronic Version Approved:

Julie Coffield
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2014

DEDICATION

To Stephanie

My Wife, Best Friend, and Inspiration

Without your love, support, and positive spirit,

This dissertation would never have been completed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Where do I start? At the beginning, of course! I would like to thank my parents for instilling a desire to always learn, grow, and improve throughout life. My father, Woodrow, exemplified sacrifice, ethics, and a drive to never quit, no matter what the circumstances. You taught me to always pursue my dreams and keep moving forward. Everything you do in your life is for the betterment of everyone around you and I hope that trait is genetic. My mother, Elvira, was strict and loving at the same time, which is quite difficult to pull off as a parent! You planted in my heart a love for teaching and helping others. I'll never forget being in the grocery store at eight years old and kids randomly walking up to you and thanking you for being their teacher. I thought you were a rock star! The look I saw in those kids' eyes gave me the desire to help people and reap rewards that can't be bought. Thank you mom and dad for never giving up on me as I navigate my journey through life.

I also want to thank the love and support of my soon to be 100 year-old grandmother who inspires me on a daily basis. Your smile, prayers, and positive attitude keep me going. Of course, I have to thank the Cline Clan (Doug, Bobbee, Brett, Elizabeth, Ulysses, Gavin, Cathy, Harper, Soryn, James, Paige, Trent, Melissa, Robbie) for all of your love and support over the past 44 years.

A huge thank you goes to Dr. Schempp for helping me traverse the treacherous waters of earning this degree and finishing this dissertation. I am not the easiest person to help, but you stuck with me and provided me with this great opportunity. Your guidance and patience were invaluable. Thank you to Dr. McCullick for the advice and support, and for exemplifying

everything that is good about education. Also, thank you to Dr. Zhang for serving on my committee and providing much needed support. Thank you to Brian and Jeremy for bringing laughter to my life while at UGA and giving me support when I needed it.

Finally, I would like to thank the American Volleyball Coaches Association, especially Executive Director Kathy DeBoer, for allowing access to their members and the participants in the AVCA Coaches Mentor Program. Without your kindness, support, and openness, this study would not have materialized.

Because of all of these people, my past teachers, coaches, family, and friends, I have been able to achieve things that I never dreamed possible! Thank you all so much!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Mentoring is a term with roots in Greek mythology and can be defined as "a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work" (Kram, 1985, p. 2). Mentoring relationships are traditionally informal, developed naturally over time and are willingly joined by both parties (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). However, workplace mentoring has been shown to be beneficial to the participants and the organization (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Eby et al., 2008; Underhill, 2006), including increased levels of personal gratification, refinement of managerial skills, and levels of learning reported by mentors (Eby & Lockwood, 2005). A large body of research focusing on the benefits to the mentee in formal mentoring programs has shown perceptions of enhanced power within the organization (Fagenson, 1989), increased self-esteem, lower work stress (Underhill, 2006), greater job satisfaction, career mobility, promotion rates (Allen et al., 2004; Fagenson, 1989; Kirchmeyer, 2005), and recognition (Eby et al., 2008; Fagenson, 1989). Organizations have increasingly looked to utilize the potential of mentoring to promote improvement within their workforce along with their growing interest in the benefits of employee development and planning efforts (Lewis & Heckman, 2006).

Formal mentoring programs where the organization paired employees together have provided support such as training, relationship kick-off events, and regular time to meet while on the job (Allen, Finkelstein, & Poteet, 2009). Benefits of mentoring for the organization included

greater perceptions of organizational attraction (Allen & O'Brien, 2006), greater levels of job and organizational commitment (Allen et al., 2004), as well as employee learning (Eby & Lockwood, 2005), development (Eby et al., 2008; Lankau & Scandura, 2002), and motivation and performance (Eby et al., 2008). Formal mentoring has been found to be a helpful tool for organizations in preparing future leaders and promoting workplace relationships. Therefore, from a review of the literature, the study of formal mentoring programs appeared to be valid.

In addition, the field of sport coaching has also begun to embrace the need for formal mentoring programs. Jones, Harris, and Miles (2009) suggested in their comprehensive literature review that mentoring "has come into common use within sports coaching" (p. 1). However, many of these relationships were a result of being at the right place at the right time for those lucky enough to stumble upon a quality mentor (Bloom, 2013). There was a lack of empirical research on formal mentoring programs for coaches, which may have been due to the lack of a consistent definition of the relationship (Bloom, Durand-Bush, Schinke, & Salmela, 1998). To widen the scope, Bloom (2013) recommended expanding the definition of mentoring to include relationships where coaches received assistance from a more experienced coach, even in an informal manner. Jones and her colleagues (2009) recognized that despite the lack of clarity on the definition of mentoring, it remained an important aspect in producing the next generation of productive workers, including coaches.

Despite the lack of consensus on a definition, the literature appeared to have promoted the need for extensive research on mentoring for coaches and formalized mentoring programs (Cushion, 2006). Recent studies cited experience and observation as primary sources for attaining coaching knowledge (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2004b). However, Erickson, Côté, and Fraser-Thomas (2007) concluded that mentoring was a necessary factor in career development in

their investigation of high performance coaches, especially "working with a mentor coach from the beginning of one's coaching involvement" (p. 315). Similarly, Narcotta, Petersen, and Johnson (2009) found that mentor functions served as significant variables in a working relationship of a soccer coaching staff dyad. Assistant coaches viewed their head coaches in this study as the providers of career and psychosocial functions (Narcotta et al., 2009). In a longitudinal study of 115 university students enrolled in their third year of a sport coaching degree, mentoring was found to have increased the participants' commitment to enhancing their effectiveness as a coach (Nash, 2003). Although not prevalent in the United States, formalized mentoring programs for coaches have been created in countries such as Canada and Australia and have started to take a stronghold in the United Kingdom as well (Bloom, 2013).

In Canada, the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC) governed coach education and was created in 1970. Four years later, the National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP) was created to educate and prepare all coaches "from the beginner to the most experienced practitioners" (Bloom, 2013, pp. 481-482). Canadian coaches of all types attended courses at National Coaching Institutes (NCI) at one of seven locations across the country. One of the services offered was a mentoring opportunity designed as "a coaching apprenticeship under the guidance of a highly qualified master coach" (Bloom, 2013, p. 482). Of course, within this program there were difficulties including a lack of qualified and available mentors. The Australian Sports Commission initiated the National Coaching Accreditation Scheme (NCAS) and provided coach education at various levels. Along with the NCAS, the commission created the National Coaching Scholarship Program (NCSP) consisting of three pillars, one of which was placement with a mentor. The Canadian and Australian mentoring programs experienced similar

difficulties such as mentor selection and training, as well as adapting and conforming to the time restrictions of the participants (Bloom, 2013).

Much of the research on coaches and mentoring presented the positive aspects of the interaction, although Cushion, Armour, and Jones (2003) suggested that without proper guidance and direction, mentoring relationships have simply reproduced the "existing culture, power relations, and more importantly, existing coaching practice" (p. 223). However, despite expert coaches calling for more formalized mentoring programs, "there is a lack of research on this topic combined with a lack of formalized structured mentoring programs for coaches around the world" (Bloom, 2013, p. 483). Therefore, from a review of the literature, a need for studying formal mentoring programs for sport coaches appeared to be warranted.

Mentoring instruments, such as the Mentor Roles Instrument (MRI), are used to monitor the effectiveness of mentoring relationships (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). Several research studies have used the MRI and other similar instruments to examine the role that mentoring played in the development of mentees within formal mentoring programs (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006a; Andrews & Chilton, 2000; Avery, Tonidandel, & Phillips, 2008; Chun, Sosik, & Yun, 2012; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006), specifically among coaches (Avery et al., 2008; Narcotta et al., 2009). Most notably, the MRI evaluated the career and psychosocial functions provided by the mentor in the relationship (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). Kram (1985) introduced several mentor roles and their impact on career and psychosocial functions within mentoring relationships. The career function was comprised of five roles played by the mentor: sponsor, promoter, coach, protector, and challenger (Kram, 1985). Five roles played by the mentor comprised the psychosocial function: role-model, acceptor, counselor friend, and social associate (Kram, 1985). Each of these ten roles, plus the

added role of parenting, were evaluated through the implementation of the MRI (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). An adapted version of the MRI called the Coach Mentor Roles Instrument (CMRI), created specifically for sport coaches mentoring relationships, was used in this study (Schempp, et al., 2014).

Matching methods have become a topic of interest in the formation of mentoring pairs in formal mentoring programs. A relatively recent trend involved formal mentoring relationships where two strangers were matched by a third party, usually an organization, for a pre-determined time period (Parise & Forret, 2008). Formal mentoring programs matched the mentor and mentee using their preferred method—or no method at all—and attempted to emulate the natural process of informal mentoring (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). One of the key characteristics of an effective formal mentoring program was an "attentive matching process" (Chao, 2009, p. 315). Elaine Cox (2005), as a result of her study, suggested that matching of mentors and mentees in formal mentoring programs, except for location and time availability, was unnecessary but several studies have shown that the methods used to match these dyads could alter the effectiveness of mentoring relationships (Bell & Treleaven, 2011, p. 339; Finkelstein, Allen, Ritchie, Lynch, & Montei, 2012; Gray & Goregaokar, 2010; Hale, 2000; Jarnagin, 2010; Kitchel & Torres, 2007; Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). Many aspects of formal mentoring programs have impacted their overall success (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006b; Parise & Forret, 2008) but the most critical was the process of matching mentors and mentees (Allen et al., 2009; Blake-Beard et al., 2007; O'Brien, Rodopman, & Allen, 2007).

Several formal matching methods have been identified in the literature—administrator-assigned, choice-based, assessment-assigned, and gender-based—that are implemented by organizations in hopes of replicating successful informal mentoring relationships (Blake-Beard et

al., 2007; Viator, 1999; Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003). Administrators of organizations attempted to create an interpersonal relationship between two strangers, a similar process to setting up two people on a "blind date" (Blake-Beard et al., 2007, p. 618). Increased participant input allowed for participants to experience higher levels of similarity (Blake-Beard et al., 2007, p. 624), along with an greater commitment (Nash, 2003; Viator, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2006), investment (Allen & Eby, 2008; Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Viator, 1999), and satisfaction in the relationship (Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Viator, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2003). Each matching method employed varying levels of participant input in the pairing process. Therefore, a comparison of matching methods in a formal mentoring program for sport coaches was selected as the objective of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching and addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the effect of matching methods on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
2. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of similarity of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
3. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of commitment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
4. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
5. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?

Definition of Terms

1. Mentoring: "A relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work" (Kram, 1985, p. 2).
2. Formal Mentoring: "...organizations play a role in facilitating mentoring relationships by providing some level of structure, guidelines, policies, and assistance for starting, maintaining, and ending mentor-protégé (mentee) relationships" (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007, p. 345).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching and addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the effect of matching methods on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
2. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of similarity of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
3. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of commitment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
4. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
5. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?

The purpose of this chapter was to present and synthesize research literature that justified the purpose of the study: to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. The following areas were covered in the literature review: a) formal mentoring, b) mentor role theory, and c) matching methods.

Formal Mentoring

The general feeling about formal mentoring programs was that they were less effective in promoting career and psychosocial growth than informal mentor-mentee relationships (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). However,

formal mentoring programs provided an organized method for attaining a mentoring relationship as opposed to leaving it to chance (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Formal mentoring programs were a recent phenomenon in United States based organizations, taking root in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Wanberg et al., 2003). In an attempt to replicate a naturally occurring mentoring dyad, formal mentoring programs in the workplace usually employed a third party who objectively matched the mentor-mentee pair, while encouraging and facilitating the interaction between the participants (Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). The body of research on mentoring programs was growing rapidly, especially as it pertained to acquisition of career and psychosocial functions in workplace settings (Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, & Cowan-Hathcock, 2007; Allen & O'Brien, 2006; Andrews & Chilton, 2000; Chao et al., 1992; Chun et al., 2012). Therefore, due to these findings, the next subsection of this review further addressed workplace mentoring and provided support for the existence of formal mentoring programs.

Mentoring in the Workplace

Mentoring in the workplace involved the relationship between a more experienced person, the mentor, and a less experienced person, the mentee, where the personal and professional growth of the mentee was the highest priority (Kram, 1985). Depending on whether the relationship was formal or informal, the mentor can be anyone within the organization including a supervisor, someone in another department, or even in another organization (Eby, 1997; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). Mentoring in the workplace could provide two types of assistance to mentees: career and psychosocial support (Eby et al., 2007). Career-related support furnished the mentee with the tools for career advancement and navigation within the organization, which included mentor actions such as "sponsorship, exposure-and-availability, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments" (Kram,

1985, pp. 24-25). Psychosocial-related support assisted the mentee to form their identity and a sense of competence "through the provision of acceptance, confirmation, counseling, role modeling, and friendship" (Kram, 1985, p. 32). These two support functions, career and psychosocial, established the basis of Kram's mentor role theory and were discussed later in this literature review.

Career success outcomes of workplace mentoring, such as salary, promotion, career satisfaction, and job commitment have been well studied (for a review see Allen et al., 2004) but the research indicated that not all outcomes from this type of mentoring are favorable (Eby & Allen, 2002; Eby, Butts, Lockwood, & Simon, 2004; Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000). In a series of studies by Eby and colleagues, mentees involved in mentoring relationships reported negative experiences concerning turnover intentions and stress (Eby & Allen, 2002), mismatch within the pairing (Eby et al., 2004), and dissimilar values, attitudes, and beliefs (Eby et al., 2000). Because of these negative mentoring experiences, formal mentoring programs in the workplace have been devised to replicate successful mentoring relationships and to fill a need within the organization to "compensate for what is not developing naturally" (Blake-Beard et al., 2007, p. 622).

By providing a formal mentoring program, organizations attempted to create a relationship between mentor and mentee that mimicked a naturally occurring informal relationship (Eby et al., 2007; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). Due to the rigidity of formal mentoring, reconstructing the interaction of an informal mentoring dyad was a difficult task, especially since many organizations often overlooked a pivotal factor in the process: matching methods (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Organizations tended to be more concerned with their goals, such as talent development, improvement of employee knowledge, skills and abilities, employee

retention, and diversity enhancement (Eddy, Tannenbaum, Alliger, D'Abate, & Givens, 2001), and less concerned with the similarities and dissimilarities of the participants (Hale, 2000). Lost in the details of organizing a start date, regulations, protocols, and contracted meeting times and locations, formal mentoring relationships have remained less effective at satisfying career and psychosocial functions than informal mentoring dyads (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). So, why did organizations continue to offer formal mentoring programs in the workplace?

The benefits of mentoring relationships were so compelling that organizations were constantly seeking the best methods for offering career and psychosocial support for their employees through formalized programs (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007). Some of the benefits of mentoring in a formal setting have been found to be job satisfaction, commitment, expectations for advancement, compensation, and promotions (Allen et al., 2004). Formal mentoring programs attended to the grooming of "early-career employees for succession planning purposes, facilitate the upward mobility of underrepresented groups, and respond to structural changes", which validated their existence and possible success (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007, p. 345). Because of the perceived benefits to mentees in the form of career and psychosocial support, formalized mentoring programs continued to exist in the workplace. The next subsection comprehensively explored the research on formal mentoring programs in the fields of business, nursing, education, and sport coaching.

Formal Mentoring in Business

Formal mentoring programs in business were born in the early 1980s out of a necessity for more structured versions of naturally occurring informal relationships in the workplace (Hunt & Michael, 1983). Informal mentoring relationships were built by individuals who evaluated

their common interests and similarities and developed a personal relationship (Parise & Forret, 2008). Unfortunately, this type of relationship was not always accessible or possible for all employees and businesses were trying to tap into this valuable resource to produce happier, more motivated, and productive workers (Finkelstein et al., 2012). The benefits of formal mentoring to the businesses included enhanced socialization of relatively new employees, increased performance of mentees as opposed to non-mentored employees, early identification of management prospects, improved organizational communication, and promotion of minorities, specifically women (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007). The ultimate goal of a formal mentoring program was to provide mentees with a sufficient amount of career and psychosocial support to propel them into successful careers.

Allen et al. (2004) introduced a meta-analysis of studies pertaining to the benefits of the mentee in terms of mentor functions within a formal mentoring relationship (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson, 1989; Noe, 1988a; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). In a study of 125 employees of a southeastern municipality, Day and Allen (2004) found that mentored individuals reported higher levels of career motivation and self-efficacy. Using the Career Motivation Scale, adapted from London (1993) and Noe and et al. (1990), the authors became the first to "examine the roles that career motivation and self-efficacy play in the processes involving mentorships and career success" (Day & Allen, 2004, p. 87). The employees involved in this study received the career and psychosocial support they needed as a result of their workplace mentoring experience.

While several studies have focused on the contrast of benefits of formal and informal mentorships (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999), two studies examined formal program characteristics and mentorship outcomes (Allen et al., 2006a). Ragins et al. (2000) studied the relationship between job and career attitudes, quality of

mentoring relationship, and perceived effectiveness of a formal mentoring program among 104 mentees employed in social work, engineering, and journalism. Of the characteristics studied, mentees in the formal mentoring program described fewer intentions to quit and stronger satisfaction with the mentor (Ragins et al., 2000). Viator (1999) examined the effects of perceived input into the matching process, setting goals and objectives, and meeting guidelines on satisfaction with the mentor among 723 certified public accountants in various formal mentoring programs. Results indicated that mentees were more satisfied with their mentor when they had input into the matching process, had regular meetings, and set goals and objectives (Viator, 1999). In both of these studies, mentees were satisfied with their mentors in a formal mentoring setting and received the career and psychosocial support they needed as a result of their workplace mentoring experience. However, the study by Viator opened up the conversation concerning matching methods, specifically the effect of participant input that was discussed comprehensively in a subsection later in this review.

Formal Mentoring in Nursing

Mentoring in nursing has existed since the late 1970s and has been accepted as beneficial to the profession (Poronsky, 2012). Although the definition of mentoring was unclear (Andrews & Chilton, 2000; Stewart & Krueger, 1996), Stewart and Krueger (1996) attempted to broaden the definition by including the following: "1) a teaching-learning process, 2) reciprocity or mutuality, 3) a career development relationship, 4) a knowledge or competence difference between novice and expert, 5) a time duration of several years, and 6) a resonating phenomenon", resulting in those who have been mentored serving as mentors for others (p. 312). Possibly due to a more encompassing definition of mentoring, research on formal mentoring

programs in nursing gained momentum after the turn of the millennium and several studies were published with positive results being reported by mentors and mentees (Poronsky, 2012).

Informal mentoring practices have dominated the nursing field for the past 30 years, but a new concentration on conducting research involving formalized mentoring programs has surfaced within the past 15 years (Poronsky, 2012). The term mentoring first appeared in the nursing literature in 1987 and since then research on the topic has increased every year (Bray & Nettleton, 2007). In a qualitative study involving 33 nursing students and staff nurses, Andrews and Chilton (2000) found that mentors and mentees were mutually satisfied with the level of mentoring during a three-month formal mentoring program. Likewise, two qualitative studies, with 26 and 34 participants respectively, both reported mentoring to be an effective means to prepare nurses in developing both professional and scholarly roles during a one-year formal mentoring program (Rosser, Rice, Campbell, & Jack, 2004; White, Brannan, & Wilson, 2010). While the researcher found very few research studies on formal mentoring programs in nursing, a new line of inquiry into the value of formal mentoring programs has begun, especially in Western Europe due to increased requirement to obtain a nursing certification (Andrews & Chilton, 2000; Rosser et al., 2004; White et al., 2010; Wilson, Brannan, & White, 2010).

Although the "overarching majority of articles in the medical field were descriptive in nature and seemed to focus on the value of engaging in mentoring" (Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004, p. 522), some studies have shown that students' enthusiasm and retention in the profession could increase with adequate support of students in placements and positive clinical experiences. Similar to the business field, successful mentoring in nursing included career and psychosocial functions being passed on from mentor to mentee.

Formal Mentoring in Education

As in the fields of business and nursing, mentoring programs in teaching began to emerge in the early 1980s in an attempt to satisfy a need for a more standardized program for training and supervising teachers (Bloom, 2013; Stroble & Cooper, 1988). Since that time, research on mentoring in teaching has demonstrated that such programs, often termed induction programs, have been effective in promoting success and satisfaction for mentor and mentee teachers (Hall et al., 2008; Strong & Baron, 2004) and education students (Campbell & Campbell, 2000; Erdem & Özen, 2003; Liang, Tracy, Taylor, & Williams, 2002; Van Gyn & Ricks, 1997). Research on the mentoring of teachers indicated that they also appeared to be more likely to remain in the profession when involved in mentoring programs (Ganser, 2002) and beginning teachers participating in these programs gained the tools necessary to become better teachers and managers in their classrooms (Abell, Dillon, Hopkins, McInerney, & O'Brien, 1995). Specifically, Odell and Ferraro (1992) found that beginning teachers most valued the emotional and psychosocial support that came with a mentoring relationship and that this was a major factor in their decision to remain in the profession.

Some international studies have highlighted the successes of teachers involved in a formal mentoring program. Yayli (2008) reported that mentoring increased self-efficacy of new teachers in Turkey and helped them transition from theory to practice in the classroom. In a study of Estonian teachers, formal mentoring was linked to the personal development of teachers during their first year of teaching, including experienced support in career and psychosocial functions (Löfström & Eisenschmidt, 2009). Similarly, college students have reported greater success, satisfaction, and retention as an outcome of formal mentoring (Hurte, 2002; Leung Mee-Lee & Bush, 2003; Pidcock, Fischer, & Munsch, 2001; R. W. Young & Cates, 2005). Induction

programs offered mentoring support for new teachers entering the profession in the form of career and psychosocial functions. However, much of the research conducted was of a qualitative nature, resulting in few statistical results in which to assess the overall value of these formal mentoring programs for teachers (Bloom, 2013). Research on formal mentoring programs in a similar field, sport coaching, was still in its infancy and served as the basis for the purpose of this study.

Formal Mentoring in Sport Coaching

According to Jones, Armour, and Potrac (2004a), coaching experience and observation of other coaches were the two most researched topics in the acquisition of knowledge by sport coaches. However, there seemed to be a lack of empirical evidence that mentoring exists in the world of sport coaches, especially if prominent definitions from other fields of mentoring were used (Pitney & Ehlers, 2004). According to Cushion (2006), mentoring could be defined as a coach learning from a more experienced person, thus expanding the scope of mentoring in a sport context. In his influential study of 21 expert team sport coaches, Bloom et al. (1998) found that mentoring in sport occurred as an ongoing process based on participant's answers in open-ended interviews. Mentoring for coaches began during participation as an athlete and continued on into coaching careers (Bloom, 2013). Athletes who became coaches had the advantage of building trusted relationships with those who trained them during and immediately following their playing days (Bloom et al., 1998). Coaches learned about their craft through ongoing interactions with other coaches, in addition to conversations with peers and observation (Cushion et al., 2003).

Some research studies have explored the concept of apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975; Sage, 1989; Schempp, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992), which was the

accumulation of knowledge about a topic through experience and time where "collective understandings begin to develop and the shared meanings about an occupational culture start to take shape" (Jones et al., 2009, p. 275). However, a clear path was not always available for those who did not have a mentor or coaches as athletes that they respected or wished to emulate. For this reason, experts in the field have called for the installation of formalized mentoring programs (Bloom et al., 1998). In Bloom's landmark study, participants in a formal training program for coaches reported that mentoring programs "need to be formalized and made available to a greater number of developing coaches" (Bloom et al., 1998, p. 279). Therefore, the lack of research on mentoring programs for sport coaches and the proposed need for studies examining formal mentoring programs in this field justified the purpose of this study.

Summary

Research has shown that in the hierarchy of mentoring, informal relationships tended to be the most fruitful, followed by formal mentoring and finally no mentoring at all (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura & Williams, 2001; Seibert, 1999; Viator, 2001). Understanding this reality, formal mentoring administrators must design their programs to emulate natural, informal mentoring processes as much as possible (Allen et al., 2006a). Formal mentoring programs for sport coaches were needed to strengthen the profession and provide opportunities that were not happening naturally in the profession (Bloom, 2013).

Mentor Role Theory

Overview

In researching mentoring in the development of adults, Levinson's (Levinson, Darrow, M., Klein, & McKee, 1978) seminal study was often cited. Levinson and his colleagues supplied

a descriptive account of the journeys of 40 men as they faced life's trials and tribulations (Levinson et al., 1978). A highlight in this study was the important role that mentoring relationships had in their lives. Levinson described a mentor as "a guide, teacher, counselor, and developer of skills who facilitates the realization of the (American) Dream" (p. 98). Other researchers realized the influence of mentoring on relationships and conducted influential studies in the late 1970s and 1980s (Eby et al., 2007). In a study of some of the country's most exemplary men, Vaillant (1977) found that the most successful leaders tended to have mentors as young adults. In a study of executives that were listed on the 'Who's News' column of the Wall Street Journal, Roche (1979) found that nearly two-thirds of those named reported having a mentor. Those claiming mentors reported earning more money at an early age, attaining higher levels of education, feeling more satisfied with their careers, and were more likely to mentor others (Roche, 1979). Studies by Levinson et al. (1978), Vaillant (1977), Roche (1979), and others blazed the trail for the pioneering work by Kram (1985), where she examined 18 mentor-mentee relationships and developed a mentor role theory. The next section of this chapter described, in greater detail, Kram's mentor role theory and its use in the development and evaluation of informal and formal mentoring relationships.

Kram's Mentor Role Theory

Mentoring relationships have been defined as "a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work" (Kram, 1985, p. 2). Mentoring relationships were usually categorized as either informal or formal. Informal relationships were characterized as a naturally occurring interaction between two willing parties with similar interests. Formal relationships were arranged by a third party based on the goals of the organization (Chao, 2009).

The seminal work of Kram (1985) described mentoring relationships in terms of functions a mentor could fulfill, consisting of two functions: career and psychosocial. The career function usually involved promoting career success and playing roles, such as sponsor, promoter, coach, protector and challenger (Ragins & Kram, 2007). The psychosocial function of mentoring helped the mentee feel a greater sense of competence and self-efficacy in their work role. These roles included role model, acceptor, counselor, and friend (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Kram, 2007; Turban, Dougherty, & Lee, 2002).

According to Kram (1985), there were five mentor roles that comprised the career function and enhanced a mentee's opportunities for advancement within an organization. The sponsor role was displaying public support by actively nominating the mentee for lateral moves or promotions in one-on-one conversations or formal meetings with other members of the organization. This role helped to create opportunities for advancement for the mentee and served as a measure of the mentor's credibility and influence within the organization. The promoter role was the creation of opportunities for the mentee to demonstrate competence and performance by delegating assignments that allowed the mentee to develop relationships with high-ranking members in the organization. This role facilitated a young mentee's entry into the higher levels of the organization as well as the mentor's decision-making on whom to support. The coach role enhanced the mentee's knowledge and understanding on how to navigate in the organization. The mentee was given advice for accomplishing work objectives, for achieving recognition, and for achieving career aspirations, while the mentor equipped the mentee with sufficient knowledge of the informal and political process. The protector role shielded the mentee from any potential damaging contact with senior members of the organization. This may have involved taking credit or blame in potentially controversial situations to shelter the mentee. The

challenger role was the provision of technical training and performance feedback intended to develop the mentee's experience and knowledge necessary to move forward in the organization. It was designed to develop specific competencies and enhance the mentee's sense of accomplishment while performing challenging work assignments.

Four mentor roles encompassed the psychosocial function (Kram, 1985). Being a role model characterized the mentor's modeling of values, attitudes, and behavior for the mentee to serve as an object of admiration, respect, and emulation. Through this interaction, the mentee discovered valuable parts of self and the mentor enjoys a process of rediscovery. The acceptor role allowed both parties to derive a sense of self from the assurances of other, including positive feedback on performance, mutual liking, and respect for both members. The mentor's acceptance provided support and encouragement, while the mentee's acceptance provided support for the wisdom and experience to be offered to the next generation of the organization's members. The counselor role extended help with personal problems such as anxieties and fears that may interfere with a positive sense of self in the organization. Mentors served as a sounding board, offered perspective, and provided problem resolution using feedback and active listening. The friend role represented the informal conversations about work and outside of work experiences, enhancing the environment in the workplace. Mentees began to look at their mentor as a peer and mentors can reminisce about their youth as the friendship emerges.

Two additional mentor roles, parent and social associate, were suggested by Ragins and McFarlin (1990) in response to concerns with cross-gender dyads. A parent role developed when a mentor was viewed as a parent figure in a cross-gender dyad to avoid any perception of sexual tension (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). The social associate role was an extension of the friend role, engaging in informal, after-work activities (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990, p. 326).

Kram's mentor role theory described the many functions and roles that mentors played in the lives of their mentees and constructed a framework for future studies on mentoring. To understand its application on the topic, one must first understand the complexity of mentoring relationships, whether they were informal or formal, and how the theory can be applied to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching.

Mentoring Relationships

Mentor functions and their associated roles were generally provided by informal and formal mentoring relationships, however, some research contended that these relationships differed in the extent to which they provide these functions, with informal pairs often yielding much better results (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura & Williams, 2001). Formal and informal mentorships had an array of differences, which may have explained their unequal outcomes: one of the most obvious was the manner in which the pairing was initiated (Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Chao et al., 1992; Underhill, 2006).

Kram (1985) termed the beginning of informal relationships when the mentor and mentee become acquainted and get to know each other as an initiation phase. During this time, both parties were full of positive energy as they embarked upon their journey together. Mentors saw the mentee as someone with whom they enjoyed working and who possessed the potential to excel; mentees saw their potential mentor as an admired and respected leader in the organization who was willing to share his/her wisdom. Positive expectations about the relationship's potential were formed based on observing and interpreting the other's behavior and mutual attraction followed. Both parties then initiated pursuit of realizing these expectations.

Mutual career needs by both parties drove the formation of informal relationships (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Seeking to fulfill a sense of accomplishment or satisfaction from sharing advice and knowledge may be one of the incentives for mentors (Allen, 2003). Becoming a mentor served as a revitalizing experience for those who felt they have reached a dead-end or desired a new challenge in their career (Levinson et al., 1978). Mentees could be seeking to establish a career and professional identity (Ragins & Cotton, 1999) and desired guidance on how to navigate the organization (Kram, 1985). During the initiation phase, both individuals recognized the potential for their needs to be met by the other person and the relationship moved forward as these needs began to be fulfilled. Thus, the scope and function of the relationship were often implicitly agreed-upon (Blake-Beard et al., 2007).

Perceptions of similarity, in addition to mutual need fulfillment, impacted the initiation phase of informal relationships in a few additional ways. First, the development of informal relationships was marked by mutual identification (Kram, 1985; Ragins et al., 2000), such that partners were able to see themselves in the other. Mentees often chose mentors who shared their own visions and goals for the future to serve as role models; mentors were likely to select mentees in whom they saw an earlier version of themselves (Kram, 1985; Ragins et al., 2000). For example, research has indicated that informal mentorship participants were more likely to pursue a partner of the same gender (Kalbfleisch, 2000) and race (Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991).

Formal mentoring relationships began much differently and emerged via entirely separate processes and protocols. To clearly distinguish these differences, Blake-Beard and colleagues (Blake-Beard et al., 2007) redefined the initiation phase of informal mentorships as an orientation phase during formal relationships. A series of events that occurred before the mentorship even begins determined the outlook of the orientation phase. As most formal

mentoring programs were voluntary, an individual's experience began by making a conscious decision to enter a mentoring relationship and either provided or expected receipt of mentoring functions (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Following registration, the mentoring relationship was then created by a third party, usually the organization, frequently based on the functions of the participant's job or other job-related variables (Ragins & Cotton, 1999), instead of measures of interpersonal compatibility (Eby et al., 2004). Participants were then notified of or introduced to their partner, often a person who was a complete stranger to them (Allen et al., 2006b).

Following these events, mentors and mentees ventured into the orientation phase of their relationship where they got acquainted with each other while setting goals and benchmarks for the relationship (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Some of the processes involved within the initiation of informal and orientation phases of formal mentorships were similar. However, a glaring difference was that these processes did not unfold gradually over time in a formal program (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Just as the mentoring program itself had an official kick-off date, so did the formal mentoring relationship (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). This was in sharp contrast to informal mentorships where the pair slowly developed over time, while observing the other's behaviors, work styles, and attitudes (Kram, 1985). Instead, individuals in formal mentorships faced the difficulty of trying to gauge their partner's mentoring interests and aligned these with their own immediately upon entering the relationship blindly (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Formal pairs were tasked with determining the shape and direction of their new relationship by establishing goals that corresponded to the organization's mission for the program before they even knew what their partner could and was willing to offer (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012).

Unlike informal relationships, participants in formal mentorships might not see themselves in their partner or the complementary needs that existed in naturally emerging

relationships. As mentioned above, formal mentoring program participants may have joined to serve a wider range of motivations or needs, and the pair may not agree on all factors (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). "These differences, coupled with limited knowledge about their partner overall, can likely leave mentors and mentees feeling unclear, and perhaps doubtful, about the motives, preferences, and compatibility of their partner" (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012, p. 9). This type of uncertainty could have complicated and retarded the process of identifying the relationship's purpose and direction.

As described above, pairs in formal mentorships did not select each other as partners and were often matched by the organization (Bell & Treleaven, 2011). Initiating processes in informal pairs such as mutual identification, similarity perceptions, and interpersonal attraction may be undeveloped at the start of the formal mentorship and its early orienting activities it was entirely possible that these qualities and perceptions never emerged (Kram, 1985). A formal mentoring relationship might not reach fruition and the mentee might not accept career advice if the mentor was not perceived as a role model (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Likewise, if there was a lack of similarities, it was unlikely that the relationship served psychosocial functions either (Blake-Beard et al., 2007).

Summary

Kram's (1985) mentor role theory has been embraced in the literature as a groundbreaking mentoring research framework. Career and psychosocial functions were generally accepted as the indicators for successful mentoring relationships. While Kram's theory originated as a guideline for mentors and mentees in the world of business, its application in other fields have become increasingly widespread. For the purposes of this study, Kram' mentor role theory served as the framework for defining mentoring success in terms of mentees'

perceptions of career and psychosocial support provided by their mentor. The next subsection of this review revealed the matching strategies suggested in the research literature, identifying those that were most likely to mimic natural relationship development processes.

Matching Methods

A wide range of strategies for matching pairs have been employed by formal mentoring program administrators (Allen et al., 2009), but three different matching methods have been suggested by Blake-Beard and colleagues (2007): administrator-assigned, choice-based, and assessment-based. Each method had its own set of benefits and challenges in terms of interpersonal compatibility and other organizational goals.

Administrator-assigned matching

In administrator-assigned matching, the discretion of the program designers was the determinant in the composition of the pairs. This method was common (Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007; Viator, 1999) and could take a variety of forms. Assignments could be made based on criteria that were aligned with the organization's goals for the program such as "developmental objectives, functional level, and geography" (Blake-Beard et al., 2007, p. 623). The overall style of the administrator and the particular goals of the program determined which criteria were chosen in the decision-making process (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). These criteria included job level or function, location, abilities, or hunches about the participants' personalities and interpersonal skills (Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007). With the hunch method, administrators matched participants based on personal assessments of the likelihood the pair interacted and developed a connection during the course of the term (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). One of the advantages of this method was that administrators had control over the pairings and could structure them to support the goals of the program (Blake-

Beard et al., 2007). However, the most practical advantage of this method was that it could be performed with very little cost to the organization in terms of time and money (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). There were no questionnaires, forms, or instruments to complete and administrators had total control of the operation.

Administrator-assigned matching presented several challenges. First, it was unlikely that mentoring program administrators would have enough information about the participants in order to make accurate judgments concerning each individual's potential compatibility, particularly in large programs (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Second, while basing matches on criteria related to the mentoring program's goals could have paved the way to meeting these goals, it was unlikely the pair would do so if they were interpersonally incompatible (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). In reality, participants may be negatively impacted by poor matches (Eby & Allen, 2002; Eby & Lockwood, 2005), as well as the reputation of the organization's mentoring program, the organization's effectiveness at launching new initiatives, and even participant psychological withdrawal from the organization (Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Eby & Allen, 2002).

Choice-based matching

Choice-based matching gave participants some degree of choice in the selection of their partner. Giving participants a voice in choosing their partner was considered one way to mimic the processes involved in naturally formed relationships; if pairs made partner choices based on interpersonal attraction and similarity perceptions, they tended to enjoy much more productive relationships (Allen et al., 2009). Research has begun to show that allowing participants some degree of choice or input in their partner led to better outcomes (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012).. Choice-based matching, specifically participant input, "introduces the forces of similarity and attraction that are naturally present at the formation of informal mentoring relationships" and

involved mentors and mentees choosing each other (Blake-Beard et al., 2007, p. 624). Along with an increased amount of input in the matching process came greater commitment (Nash, 2003; Viator, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2006), investment (Allen & Eby, 2008; Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Viator, 1999), and satisfaction in the relationship (Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Viator, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2003).

Choice-based matching was not without its challenges, however. Costs for the program ran high if face-to-face or virtual activities were planned during the matching process (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). Less diverse pairs resulted if participants chose partners with whom they were already comfortable or made decisions based on limited information (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Also, some mentors and mentees could not be selected and miss opportunities to experience the benefits of a mentoring relationship.

Assessment-based matching

Assessment-based matching utilized assessment tools and inventories to gather information about mentors and mentees and then incorporated this knowledge into matching decisions regarding compatibility (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Some of the instruments used in this method were the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to test personality traits and Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) to test emotional intelligence profiles (Mayer et al., 2011). Depending on the chosen tool, assessments could provide administrators with valuable information about a variety of participants' developmental needs (Allen et al., 2009), as well as deep-level characteristics including personality and emotional intelligence. Research has indicated that mentors and mentees consider deep-level characteristics such as personality and emotional intelligence when considering a mentoring partner's desired characteristics (Allen et al., 2009; Turban & Lee, 2007). Further, research has shown that deep-

level diversity was likely to have a significant effect on the mentoring relationship (Bearman, Blake-Beard, Hunt, & Crosby, 2007; Johnson, Xu, & Allen, 2007). Thus, deep level characteristic assessments, such as personality and emotional intelligence, could be very useful to inform and improve the matching process in meaningful ways.

For creating successful interpersonal relationships among mentors and mentees, the assessment-based method seemed to have purpose (Hale, 2000). As noted above, social theory on similarity and attraction suggested that perceptions of similarity were related to attraction and liking in mentoring relationships (Byrne, 1971). Evidence supported this idea through studies on both formal and informal relationships (Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Lankau, Riordan, & Thomas, 2005; Turban et al., 2002). Further, research also suggested that it was beneficial for a mentor and mentee to have both similarities (to help them feel connected) as well as differences (to expose them to alternative perspectives, ideas, experiences, skills, etc.) (Allen et al., 2009; Hale, 2000; Wanberg et al., 2003). This idea of similarities and differences was often referred to as complementarity in the mentoring literature (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Mentoring program administrators armed with information provided from assessments, such as the MBTI and MSCEIT, could create matches based on objective deep-level similarity and/or complementarity, depending on the measured sample (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Doing so might facilitate the perceptions of liking, attraction, and compatibility that were often naturally present in informal relationships (Byrne, 1971). Moreover, if participants were made aware of their results as well as their partner's, the similarities and differences that each partner was bringing to the relationship be identified and highlighted (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Common knowledge of the assessment results could serve to reduce awkwardness in the orientation phase of the formal relationship.

The assessment-based method of matching participants has its challenges. First and foremost, the cost of administering assessments to all mentor pairs could be daunting (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). Once the results were returned, the organization spent time systematically matching the pairs, generally without the required proper training to analyze such reports (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). While this method was being employed by some organizations (Blake-Beard et al., 2007), there were very few published empirical studies (Egan, 2005; Godshalk & Sosik, 2003) that tested the effectiveness of this method or the effectiveness of a particular assessment tool as a basis for matching similar or complementary individuals in a successful mentorship (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007; Turban & Lee, 2007).

Summary

The process of matching mentors with mentees was a distinguishing aspect of formal mentor programs that set it apart from informal mentoring (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007). Without the development of an interpersonal relationship, it was unlikely that the pair would survive, let alone succeed (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). Therefore, it was desired and recommended that formal programs were designed in ways that tried to simulate the attraction processes involved in informal relationships (Allen et al., 2006b; Ragins et al., 2000), particularly when it came to matching the pair.

Gender-based matching

A fourth and more transparent matching method was gender-based matching. The literature indicates that cross-gender and same-gender matching could affect the dynamic of formal mentoring relationships (Avery et al., 2008; Narcotta et al., 2009; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). In male-dominated fields such as coaching, males and females had an equal need for a mentor (Noe, 1988b). Due to the shortage of potential females in high power positions in many

organizations, the likelihood of a cross-gender mentorship was greatly increased (Scandura & Ragins, 1993). Thus, the most frequently observed cross-gender mentoring pair was that of a male mentor and a female mentee (O'Neill, Horton, & Crosby, 1999). There were gender differences that must be known and addressed for cross-gender working relationships to be successful (DeBoer, 2004). "These complexities must be managed effectively if individuals and organizations are to reap the benefits that positive cross-gender alliances have to offer" (Kram, 1985, p. 132).

In a study of women in mentoring relationships aspiring to attain administrative-level positions, female mentees involved in cross-gender mentorships demonstrated increased motivation to utilize the relationship because of the positive career outcomes male mentors provide, as well as general lack of mentors for women (Noe, 1988b). Young's (1990) study on athletic administrators suggested that females participated in cross-gender mentoring relationships far more than male participants. Of the female participants, 65 percent indicated having a male mentor while only 21 percent of the male respondents reported a female mentor. Considering the male-dominated nature in women's athletics at the time, this result was not surprising. Of the male administrators in this study, 64.9 percent specified having a preference for a male mentee to carry on their purpose in a similar way (D. Young, 1990). This preference may be attributed to male mentees' understanding that gender had a significant influence on the power structure of a male-dominated organization (Narcotta et al., 2009). Ragins and Cotton (1999) reported, when comparing male and female mentees in the professions of journalism, social work, and engineering, similar mentor function results in regards to gender. Compared to any other gender combination, male mentees with female mentors perceived receiving fewer career-related and psychosocial functions (Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

Ragins and McFarlin (1990) supported the notion of similarities in mentorships. These researchers found that mentees involved in same-gender mentoring dyads, as opposed to cross-gender, were more likely to perceive their mentors as providing the psychosocial function of role modeling. In a male-dominated profession, males have the opportunity to befriend many mentors but female mentees were far less often in the presence of a female they considered a role model. This was unfortunate because the experience of working with a female authority figure may help women to overcome gender-role stereotypes, step effectively into positions of leadership, and learn strategies to cope with work-family conflicts (Noe, 1988b; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990).

In 1972, over 90 percent of the coaches of women's college sports teams in the USA were women. Fast-forward 40 years to 2012 and one finds the proportion of female-led teams to be less than 43 percent (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). So what happened to cause such a dramatic change? Most notably, the passage of Title IX in 1972 established legislation increasing the funding received by women's sports programs, which made coaching opportunities a more appealing career option for men (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Between 2002 and 2004, men filled 143 of 270 or 57.1 percent of new head coaching positions (Acosta & Carpenter, 2004). Although there was an increase of 100 female coaches of women's teams from 2010 to 2012, the percentage of female head coaches of women's teams remains under 43 percent (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Access to female role models in positions of decision making and leadership was particularly important for females, which made mentoring of female coaches a priority for research (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012).

The rise in the percentage of male coaches created an interesting developmental dynamic on the coaching staffs of many women's teams. Mentoring, or the provision of developmental

support and guidance, to assistant coaches was an important component of being a head coach (Bloom et al., 1998). Research indicates it can elevate salaries, increase promotions, and improve performance for mentees (Allen et al., 2004; Tonidandel, Avery, & Phillips, 2007; Underhill, 2006). Cross-gender dyads, however, often function less effectively than those containing demographically similar pairs (Ragins, 1997). The influx of men into the coaching ranks of women's sports significantly increased the likelihood of cross-gender pairings. Unfortunately, this could impact women adversely because at least some research suggests mentoring had a disproportionately larger effect on career success for women than for men (Lockwood, 2006; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Tharenou, 2005). Thus, despite appearing equally likely to hire assistants of either sex (Sagas, Cunningham, & Pastore, 2006), male coaches may provide less mentoring to their female assistants who appear to need it more.

Although research in academic and business settings have explored the impact of sex similarity in mentoring pairs (Koberg, Boss, & Goodman, 1998; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Turban et al., 2002), studies in sport settings are far more rare. In fact, Sagas, Paetzold, and Ashley (2005) reported finding "no research related to the relational demography perspective with regard to the decline of female coaches" (p. 104). In the one study found directly assessing sex and mentoring, male and female athletic administrators were equally likely to have been mentored (Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002).

Summary

The process of matching mentors with mentees was a distinguishing aspect of formal mentor programs that set it apart from informal mentoring (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007). Without the development of an interpersonal relationship, it was unlikely that the pair would survive, let alone succeed (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). Therefore, it was desirable and recommended that

formal programs were designed in ways that tried to simulate the attraction processes involved in informal relationships (Allen et al., 2006b; Ragins et al., 2000), particularly when it came to matching the pair. Four matching processes have been examined in detail here, with the hope to ignite an increased amount of study on this topic. Future research involving the effectiveness of matching methods would allow the development of the most successful ways to match mentors and mentees and strengthen these relationships (Blake-Beard et al., 2007).

Summary

This chapter served as a review of the literature related to the purpose of the current study, which was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. The literature review underscored three topics of interest to this study: a) mentoring in the workplace b) mentor role theory, and c) matching methods. The findings in the literature indicated that formal mentoring programs exist in business, nursing, and education, although more research was necessary to fully understand these important relationships in the workplace. Research concerning formal mentoring programs in the field of sport coaching was lacking and promoted the demand for the current study. Matching methods have been found to be the under-utilized starting point for formal mentoring relationships, especially infusing participant input, and the lack of research on this topic propelled the need to examine these processes further. Therefore, this literature review served as a considerable defense for examining the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. In addition to introducing formal mentoring programs and the mentor roles introduced by Kram (1985), matching methods have been identified as influences on formal mentoring relationships and served as the focus of this study. Formal mentoring programs for sport coaches were rare and Bloom (2013) called for more research on this topic and an increase of these programs around the world. Matching methods were central to the design, implementation, and success of formal mentoring relationships and research was warranted to discover best practices (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methods and procedures utilized to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. The methods and procedures were introduced in the following order: a) study design, b) participant selection and recruitment c) data collection, and d) data analysis.

Study Design

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. In using Kram's (1985) mentor role theory as a framework, mentoring was studied in terms of mentors' and mentees' perception of mentor functions and roles during a one-year formal mentoring relationship. Typically, formal mentoring program characteristics consisted of organizational matching processes, designated length of relationship, monitoring during the time period, and evaluation at the completion of the program (Allen, Finkelstein, & Poteet, 2011). The organization involved in this study, the

American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA), was one of the few known national coaching entities that attempted to offer a formal mentoring program and possessed two of the four characteristics—organizational matching processes and designated length of relationship—previously mentioned. Developed in the fall of 2010, the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program's goal was "to present mentees with an opportunity for career and personal growth while offering mentors an outlet through which to provide guidance" (avca.org, 2013). Past members applied for the program each June and were paired by the AVCA administration in early July. Once pairings were generated and the participants notified, the formal program guidelines consisted of encouraged weekly contact via email or telephone, face-to-face contact at the AVCA Convention in December, a one-year time commitment, and confidentiality of shared information. Participants were given freedom to create their own structure for the relationship and the program lacked accountability of mentors and mentees in terms of commitment and investment by both parties. Additionally, the AVCA did not monitor the progress of the pairings or evaluate the effectiveness of the program upon completion of the one-year relationship.

The goal of the AVCA's Coaches Mentoring Program was to allow experienced coaches an opportunity to share their knowledge and talents with fellow coaches in the volleyball community (avca.org, 2013). However, based on communication with the AVCA, their matching method—administrator-assigned—considered limited input from the participants other than basic demographic information collected on the application. When informed of the importance of input and choice in the matching process, the AVCA partnered with the researcher to further examine their coaches mentor program. From the review of literature, matching methods in formal mentoring programs had been identified as a topic of interest in the literature and warranted further study (Allen et al., 2006b; Blake-Beard et al., 2007; Bloom, 2013; Cox,

2005; Narcotta et al., 2009). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching.

Matching Methods

Although four matching methods have been mentioned in the review of literature, two have been chosen for use in this study: administrator-assigned and choice-based. The AVCA have used the administrator-based method in their mentoring program, making it a good control group for this study. Choice-based matching was chosen to facilitate an increased level of similarities and served as the comparison group. As described earlier, higher levels of choice and participant input could have introduced mentors and mentees to "the forces of similarity and attraction that are naturally present at the formation of informal mentoring relationships" (Blake-Beard et al., 2007, p. 624).

Assessment-based was removed as a candidate due to the expense of conducting and processing online assessments and time commitment required for this method. Typical personality or emotional intelligence online assessments cost nearly $20 per response, and with the expected number of participants in the study at a minimum of 120, simple math told us the cost would be $2,400. This expense was not only unrealistic for the researcher, but the AVCA administration was not supportive of any type of expense related to the matching of mentor pairs within their mentoring program. Employing an assessment-based method in this study proved futile since it did not fit into the future plans of the organization. Gender-based was removed as a matching method for use in this study since the actual number of participants of each gender was not known until applications were completed in August. Therefore, administrator-assigned and choice-based were selected as the matching methods used for comparison in this study.

The data collection instrument employed to compare the effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches mentor relationships was the Coach mentor Roles Instrument (CMRI) (Schempp et al., 2014). On the CMRI, participants were asked to enter numerical data on thirty, 5-point Likert scale items appraising the mentor roles being served in the mentoring relationship (1="strongly disagree" and 5="strongly agree"). In addition, interviews were conducted to assess selected participants' evaluations and perceptions of their mentoring relationship. Due to the collection of quantitative and qualitative data, a mixed-method design was chosen to "provide a more accurate and detailed research project than traditional one-dimensional qualitative or quantitative approaches provide" (Mitra & Lankford, 1999, p. 46).

Participant Selection and Recruitment

Participants for this study consisted of members of the AVCA who applied for inclusion in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program as either a mentor or mentee. The criteria for eligibility in the mentor program included current membership in the AVCA and completion of a mentor or mentee application. To be a member of the AVCA, one must be a volleyball coach at a school or organization endorsed by one of the nationally recognized organizations including National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), United States of America Volleyball (USAV), National Christian Colleges Athletic Association (NCCAA), National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA), and National Federation of High Schools (NFHS). The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching, which made this an ideal population. Thus, purposive sampling was used to select participants for this study because subjects possessed certain characteristics or satisfied criteria that the researcher set (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006, p. 124).

Oyeyemi, Adewara, Adebola, and Salau (2010) suggested that determining the appropriate sample size for an investigation, regardless of the type of study "helps ensure that the study will yield reliable information" (p. 139). According to Baumgartner and Hensley (2006), a "long-standing convention in research is to consider 30 per group as the minimum acceptable sample size" (p. 126). The sample size for this study was 252 volleyball coaches—115 mentors and 137 mentees— who were volunteer participants in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program. The sample was controlled for incomplete responses to choice profile forms, which reduced the sample to 230 volleyball coaches, 109 mentors and 121 mentees. Of these, 58 mentors were randomly selected for the choice-based group and the remaining 51 were placed in the administrator assigned group. Similarly, 69 mentees were randomly selected for the choice group and the remaining 52 were moved to the administrator-assigned group. The goal was to keep half of the original mentor and mentee applicants in the choice-based group. Because the involvement in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program was completely voluntary, no recruiting efforts were necessary on the part of the researcher. However, the AVCA advertised the program for several weeks prior to the start date through its many publications, including *Coaching Volleyball Magazine*, *Coaching Volleyball 2.0* online magazine, and their *At the Net* monthly online newsletter, to alert as many members about this opportunity as possible.

Once all applications were received, a cover letter of introduction explaining the study and an informed consent form was sent electronically by the AVCA to all applicants requesting their voluntary participation. The sample for this study consisted of the members who completed and returned the required application and responded with a "yes" on the consent form. To encourage as a large of a sample as possible, a follow-up email was sent out one week after the initial letter as a reminder. Once the deadline for application had passed, the mentor and mentee

applications and choice forms were separated in preparation for the implementation of the matching methods. Incomplete choice forms were placed in the administrator-assigned group prior to beginning the matching process.

Data Collection

Instruments

Several instruments were used for data collection: application, choice profiles, CMRI, and interview guide. Each of these documents was explained in greater detail in the following paragraphs.

All members interested in participating in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program completed the application, providing basic demographic and career data such as level coaching, number of years coached, age, gender, and geographic location. The applications for mentors and mentees were available for download on avca.org and returned electronically to an AVCA administrator (see Appendices A, B). Applicants completed a signed consent form prior to being considered for inclusion in the study. Informed consent forms were sent to all applicants, along with an introduction letter explaining and inviting them to participate in the study. The sample consisted of the applicants that returned a signed (electronic or otherwise) informed consent form (see Appendix D), however, applicants to the mentoring program had no obligation to participate in the study.

The randomly assigned participants of the choice-based group completed profiles, which were offered in an online format (see Appendices E, F). Mentors and mentees were asked for their input on several topics concerning desired mentoring qualities, including the following: short and long term goals, optimal mentor characteristics, current skills and abilities, personality traits, and perceived areas of improvement (Allen et al., 2009). Open-ended questions allowed

for mentees' expression of needs and qualities desired in the mentoring relationship. When participants express input in the matching process, they tend to have pairings with higher levels of similarity and become more committed and invested in the relationship (Allen et al., 2006a).

Both groups, administrator-assessed and choice-based, took the CMRI (see Appendix G), which is an adaptation of the MRI (Schempp et al., 2014). Based on Kram's (1985) mentor role theory, the MRI assessed a mentee's perception of career (sponsorship, coaching, protection, challenging assignments, and exposure) and psychosocial (friendship, role modeling, counseling, and acceptance) mentor functions and roles (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990). The MRI consisted of 33 items to measure the original nine roles, plus two roles Ragins and McFarlin (1990) added to accommodate cross-gender relationships (parenting and social). Each prompt on the MRI is a 7-point Likert item (1="strongly disagree" and 7="strongly agree"). Ragins and McFarlin (1990) tested the MRI for validity and reliability and reported reliability coefficients for all of the mentor roles: sponsor (.81), coach (.81), protection (.77), challenging assignments (.92), exposure (.80), friendship (.82), role model (.84), counseling (.83), acceptance (.89), parenting (.89), and social (.93). Each of these roles has been thoroughly reviewed in chapter two of this document. In testing the construct validity of the 27-item MRI (minus parent and social roles), the instrument was compared to the 15-item SRMMM resulting in a correlation value of $r=.73$ ($p<.01$), which is acceptable.

In the development of the CMRI, (Schempp et al., 2014) altered the wording of the directions and each item to represent appropriate coaching jargon. Originally, the MRI had 33 items, which was reduced to 30 prompts consisting of three items for each of the ten mentor roles being tested. The role of parent used in the MRI was removed from use on the CMRI because it "was not directly related to mentor-peer relationships in coaching" (Schempp et al., 2014).

Study participants consisted of 30 current and former high school and college coaches with at least five years of experience at either or both levels. Each participant took the CMRI twice, with a two to four week interim between sessions, in an attempt to establish instrument reliability. The two-way intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC = .83, CI95 = 0.67 - 0.92) "revealed a non-significant difference of means between test and retest", which is above the accepted standard of .60 for questionnaires (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006, p. 335). Participants also took the SRMMM following the second CMRI administration to establish validity. A high, positive correlation value ($r = .90$, $p < 0.05$) shows convergent validity, as it exceeds the accepted minimum of .70 (Schempp et al., 2014). From these results, the CMRI can be considered reliable and valid for use in this study (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006).

For this study, interviews were chosen to add greater depth to understanding the quality and effectiveness of matching methods in formal mentoring relationships using grounded theory (Patton, 2002). Interview guide(s) were followed when questioning participants about their experience in the mentoring relationship at two time points during the one-year program (see Appendix H, I). The guide(s) consisted of between 10 and 15 questions and the interviews lasted approximately 15 minutes. Interview questions covered topics that were suggested in the research relating to matching methods such as similarities, commitment to the mentoring process, investment in the relationship, and overall satisfaction (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). In addition to the CMRI, interviews were included as a data collection method because interviewing "suggests that people's knowledge, views, understandings, interpretations, experiences, and interactions are meaningful properties" when answering research questions (Mason, 2002, p. 63).

Procedures

Between August 1 and August 15, 2013, members of the AVCA had the opportunity to complete an online application for participation in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program. In previous years, the program start date was July 1, but due to delay in the obtaining the IRB and final approval for the study, the AVCA graciously extended the proposed start date to August 31, 2013. The online application called for demographic (i.e. age, gender, address) and basic career (i.e. years coached, level coaching) information. All AVCA members were given the opportunity to complete and return the application for inclusion in the Coaches mentoring program. However, on August 15, 2013, the AVCA experienced technical difficulties and lost all application data. At that time, the AVCA re-opened the application process and requested all previous applicants to re-apply for the mentoring program. The new deadline for applications was August 26, 2013.

On August 26, 2013, a cover letter and informed consent form were electronically sent to all applicants informing them of the opportunity to be participants in the current study. The deadline for return of these forms was September 8, 2013, when the researcher began the process of matching the mentor pairs as described in a previous subsection. After signing informed consent and completing the application, mentors and mentees were randomly assigned to one of two groups: administrator-assigned or choice-based. Those assigned to the choice-based group were sent mentor or mentee profile forms to be completed by September 15, 2013.

Mentor's names were written on a slip of paper, placed in a bowl, and randomly assigned to either the administrator-assigned or choice-based groups using simple random sampling (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006). Names for the administrator-assigned group were sent to AVCA administrators, who used this information to match mentors and mentees using the

administrator-assigned method. Application data was considered as the basis for their decisions along with the goals and direction of the organization. According to the AVCA, mentors and mentees had to be within one coaching level of each other. For example, an NCAA Division I coach will not be paired with a coach lower than NCAA Division II. Mentors and mentees also had an age difference of at least five years, were as geographically desirable as possible, and had different job descriptions (i.e. head coach and assistant coach). While adhering to all of these stipulations was not always plausible, the administration attempted to match mentors and mentors while satisfying as many demographic similarities as possible.

Names assigned to the choice-based group were paired using their completed choice profiles. The researcher, using the data collected on the profile form, implemented the choice-based matching method in the second group. The top three choices (level, experience, characteristics) of each mentor and mentee were highlighted on their form to be used for pairing. Level of coaching was a major consideration in the process as mentors were only assigned mentees within one level of their own. The researcher then matched mentors and mentees based on the compatibility of each pair based on the top three choice form responses. Mentors have rarely been given any choice or consideration in the mentoring process and that opportunity was provided in this study (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). If some mentees were not chosen due to lack of mentors, the names were forwarded to the AVCA to be paired using their administrator-assigned method. Following the completion of the matching process, the AVCA notified all participants of their pairing in an introduction email on September 20, 2013, 20 days later than the proposed start date and 51 days later than the start date used in previous years.

During two operating windows, November 14 to December 15, 2013 and February 10 to March 2, 2014, mentees involved in this study were asked to complete the online version of the

CMRI. Online submission of the CMRI, through the qualtrics.com website, was available for 20 to 30 days on each occasion, giving ample access for completion. A distributed (online) questionnaire method was used to collect data on two occasions due to the geographic spread of the participants in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006). The AVCA was a national coaching organization with members across all 50 states and Puerto Rico. A link was sent by the AVCA via email to all participants in the program, guiding them to the qualtrics.com website for completion of the CMRI at the appropriate times. Welch's t-tests were employed to analyze the data to compare means compiled from the CMRI (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006). The results of the CMRI were stored on the qualtrics.com website until the deadline for completion and then exported to SPSS for analysis.

During two operating windows, December 26, 2013 to February 12, 2014 and April 9 to May 15, 2014, interviews were conducted with 30 randomly selected participants in the study consisting of 15 participants from each matching method group. Random selection without replacement by the fishbowl technique was instituted to select interviewees (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006). The names of all study participants were placed in two bowls, one for mentors and one for mentees, and fifteen participants were chosen from each bowl. These thirty individuals were contacted by phone to set up times and dates for interviews. Semi-structured interviews using an interview guide guaranteed consistency for each participant and the questions were clear and included words that were familiar to the participants (Patton, 1990). If any of those contacted refused to be interviewed, more names were extracted from the appropriate bowl until a total of thirty interviews were completed to include fifteen mentors and fifteen mentees. The interviews were recorded using a digital hand held device and stored on the researcher's computer until the completion of the study.

Data Analysis

Participants were coded using identifiers according to their status as a mentor or mentee in the choice-based or administrator-assigned groups as follows: RC = Mentor Choice, RA = Mentor Administrator-Assigned, EC = Mentee Choice, and EA = Mentee Administrator-Assigned. Along with the letter identifiers, each participant within each group was given a number. For example, the number 22 mentor in the choice-based group would be RC22. Once the participants were identified and coded, the data was analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods.

Quantitative

Several subscales were generated for comparison each time the CMRI was administered. The mentor role subscales represented the sum of scores assigned to each of the ten mentor roles. A total of three CMRI Likert items comprised each mentor role subscale and was summed using the following groupings: sponsor (items 1, 11, 20), coach (items 2, 12, 21), protector (items 3, 13, 22), challenger (items 4, 14, 23), promoter (items 5, 15, 24), friend (items 6, 16, 25), social associate (items 7, 17, 26), role model (items 8, 18, 27), counselor (items 9, 28, 29), and acceptor (items 10, 19, 30). The two mentor function subscales were represented by the sum of scores assigned to career or psychosocial functions. A total of 15 items comprised each mentor function subscale. The career function subscale was the sum of items 1-5, 11-15 and 20-24, and the psychosocial function subscale consisted of the sum of items 6-10, 16-19 and 25-30. An overall mentoring scale was constructed using the sum of all 30 items on the CMRI. Cronbach's alpha reliability assessment was conducted using the data collected in this study and the CMRI was found to be highly reliable on all subscales, as shown in Table 3.1 (see Appendix J).

Descriptive statistics and Welch's t-test were employed to calculate the mean differences of perceived mentor functions and roles for each administration of the CMRI based on matching method (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006, p. 293). Welch's t-test corrected for unequal variance and unequal sample size (Kohr & Games, 1974). Likert scale data has been considered ordinal, but the subscales derived from Likert scale data in this study were processed as interval data using parametric tests for mean comparison of two independent samples (Boone Jr & Boone, 2012). Previous studies involving the MRI have utilized parametric tests, including descriptive statistics and t-tests, to analyze this type of questionnaire data in business environments (Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Tonidandel et al., 2007; Wanberg et al., 2006), and more specifically in sport coaching (Avery et al., 2008; Narcotta et al., 2009). Therefore, parametric tests were used to analyze the data collected in this study.

Qualitative

The recorded answers from the interviews were transcribed and separated for analysis by themes infused in the interview guide including similarity, commitment, and investment. Once all responses were compiled, interview responses were analyzed for any differences between the two matching method groups. In this study, both mentors and mentees were interviewed because it is important to collect data from all parties to fully account for the nature of the relationship (Godshalk & Sosik, 2003). Higher levels of similarity, commitment, investment, and overall satisfaction have been associated in the literature with the choice-based matching method (Blake-Beard et al., 2007) and served as the basis of the questions constructed in the semi-structured interview guide.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. An application and personal choice questionnaire were used as determinants to match mentors and mentees using two methods mentioned in the literature: administrator-assessed and choice-based. The CMRI was chosen to evaluate the mentoring relationships, roles, and overall mentoring relationships of volleyball coaches as a valid and reliable adaptation of the MRI. Interviews were used to add rich data and depth to understanding of the complexity of formal mentoring relationships, especially the levels of similarity, commitment, investment, and overall satisfaction in formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. The results of the statistical tests and the themes derived from the interview content could contribute to an improved ability to appropriately match participants in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. This study was designed to provide information on the following questions:

1. What is the effect of matching methods on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
2. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of similarity of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
3. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of commitment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
4. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
5. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?

Mentor Functions and Roles

The first research question inquired if matching methods had an effect on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. The null hypothesis was that there were no statistically significant differences between matching methods on mentor functions and roles. Welch's t-tests were utilized to examine the statistical mean differences on mentor roles and functions between the matching method groups:

a) administrator-assigned or b) choice-based. This section will report the results in the following manner: a) descriptive statistics for each subscale, c) statistics from the Welch's t-test, d) the decision to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis and e) a synthesis of qualitative data pertaining to mentor functions and roles.

Descriptive statistics were employed to identify the perceptions of mentor roles and functions reported by participants in this study and are summarized in Table 4.1 (see Appendix J). The means and standard deviations were calculated for each role and function. The results indicate that the role of friend was the highest rated and social associate was rated lowest, while the psychosocial function was rated higher than the career function on both CMRI results. On both occasions, the top four rated roles were psychosocial in nature, suggesting that mentors were providing sufficient mentoring in these areas. Roles and functions were displayed in rank order on Table 4.2 (see Appendix J). By deduction, it appears that for the participants in this study the mentors served the psychosocial roles significantly better than the career roles with five of the six lowest rated roles in the career construct.

Findings from the Welch's t-tests involving the matching methods groups provided very little evidence that matching methods have an effect on mentor roles and functions in formal volleyball coaching mentoring relationships. The CMRI data had unequal variance and unequal sample size and the Welch's t-test was used to test the difference between the means of the two groups in this study because it was considered robust to these assumption violations (Kohr & Games, 1974). This meant that some violation of this assumption could be tolerated and the test provided valid results.

On CMRI #1, mentees in the choice-based group ($M = 8.83$, $SD = 3.25$) rated their mentors significantly higher on the sponsor role than those in the administrator-assigned group

($M = 7.16$, $SD = 3.125$), $t\ (77) = 2.32$, $p = 0.024$, yet no significant differences were found on the remaining nine roles, two functions or overall mentoring. The sponsor role is displaying public support by actively nominating the mentee for lateral moves or promotions in one-on-one conversations or formal meetings with other members of the organization. The data from CMRI #2 indicated the administrator-assigned group means were not statistically different on any role or function when compared to the choice-based group. These findings suggest that there is no statistical difference between matching methods, administrator-assigned and choice-based, and their effect on perceptions of mentor roles and functions in formal volleyball coaching relationships was not significant.

Welch's t-tests were used to detect any significant mean differences over time using data from CMRI #1 to CMRI #2. For example, the choice-based group means and standard deviations from CMRI #1 and CMRI #2 were compared. Based on these tests, no significant differences could be reported in the administrator-assigned or choice-based groups at two time periods as shown on Table 4.3 (see Appendix J). These findings suggested that the perceived level of mentoring did not change due to the length of relationship in this formal mentoring program.

Pairing mentors and mentees in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program using administrator-assigned or choice-based methods seemed to have no distinguishable effects on perceptions of mentor roles and functions. Since the AVCA currently utilizes the administrator-assigned method, the researcher could not report any reason for the organization to change to choice-based as their matching method. For these reasons, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Participants were asked in the interviews about the quantitative findings from the CMRI specifically why the top four rated roles by the mentee coaches were all psychosocial in nature. From the responses, participants reported psychosocial needs than career needs. Of the 30 choice-based participants interviewed, 24 reported psychosocial roles were more important to them than career roles. For example, RC01 stated, "I volunteered in this program to help people become better coaches and be a sounding board for them", RA42 said, "I think this program is more geared toward providing support for our fellow coaches and less for career guidance", EC10 reported, "The AVCA provides a job board online, so I was looking for a mentor that could be there to listen to me when I needed help", and EA28 added, "Coaches join this program in search of a friend in the coaching world who they can trust and they can learn from." Mentors and mentees from each matching method group expressed similar reactions when asked about four psychosocial roles being highest rated by mentee coaches. When asked about what they were looking for in this program, 24 of 30 interviewed participants agreed that psychosocial roles were more important to them than career roles in mentoring relationships. These qualitative data support the findings in this study that the top four rated roles were psychosocial in nature.

Similarity

The second research question asked how matching methods contributed to perceptions of similarity of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. Interviews with mentors and mentees were conducted and the results are reported in this section. Mentors and mentees from each matching method group, administrator-assigned and choice-based, were asked a series of questions about the level of similarities perceived in their current formal mentoring relationship.

From the responses, participants in the choice-based group reported higher levels of similarity than those in the administrator-assigned group. Of the 15 choice-based participants interviewed, 14 reported high levels of similarity within their pairing. Many of the mentors were satisfied with their pairing in the choice-based group. For example, RC06 said, "You could tell immediately that we were very similar in personality. I thought the matching was actually very good", while RC10 explained, "It was a good fit. I think I was able to help her and give her words of wisdom on how to be an assistant coach." Other mentors echoed these sentiments, as RC04 added, "Like me, it looked like he cared more about the athlete than winning", and RC51 said, "We are very similar as far as our philosophies." Mentees in the choice-based group also appeared to have found similarities within their pairing. For example, EC11 stated, "We had a lot in common, in the same conference, same thoughts and beliefs, and our similarities helped our conversations", while EC45 added, "I feel like I got what I requested." Participants in the choice-based group reported positive experiences and high levels of similarity within their mentor pairing.

In the administrator-assigned group, participants reported levels of similarity at a much lower level. Of the 15 choice-based participants interviewed, only seven reported moderate levels of similarity within their pairing, while eight did not feel they had any similarities with their mentoring match. Several mentors were disappointed with the level of similarities. For example, RA05 stated, "My mentee must not have felt they were matched up with the right person because we didn't connect", and RA42 added, "I feel like they've done a fairly good job of matching but he was a fairly young coach building a program and that's not my strength." Mentees in the administrator-assigned group were the most disappointed in the level of similarities. For example, EA24 explained, "The only thing we had in common was that one of

my past players coaches at her school", while EA37 stated, "I did not have any similarities with my mentor."

Participants in the choice-based group reported higher levels of similarity than those in the administrator-assigned group. From these findings, matching methods contributed to perceptions of similarity by producing more positive results in the choice-based group as opposed to more negative responses in the administrator-assigned group. It appeared that level of similarity depended on the participant's assigned matching method group in this study.

Commitment

The third research question inquired how matching methods contributed to perceptions of commitment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. Interviews with mentors and mentees were conducted and the results are reported in this section. Mentors and mentees from each matching method group, administrator-assigned and choice-based, were asked a series of questions about the level of commitment perceived in their current formal mentoring relationship.

From the responses, participants in the choice-based group reported higher levels of commitment than those in the administrator-assigned group. Of the choice-based participants interviewed, nine of 15 reported that they set up regular contact with their mentor or mentee. For example, RC10 said, "We set up a weekly time to speak and got together at the convention", and EC04 stated, "We set up a regular time, once per week, and both decided on the frequency." In contrast, some participants made no effort to commit to the relationship, as RC04 explained, "I make no effort to make contact with my mentee", and RC53 stated, "I sent a couple of emails to get things started but we never formally set anything up." This result suggested that the choice-

based group had a mixture of commitment levels in this study but the majority showed high levels of commitment.

Administrator-assigned participants, mentors and mentees, were consistently low with their commitment levels. Of the administrator-assigned participants interviewed, only two of 15 reported that they set up regular contact with their mentor or mentee. One was a mentor, RA28, who stated, "Commitment was moderate, although intention was high", and the other was a mentee, EA24, who said, "We set up a regular time right away and the commitment from my mentor was very good." The remaining 13 administrator-assigned participants were not so positive about their commitment level, as RA42 reported, "We did not establish strong communication", and EA23 said, "We had no commitment! The season is a rough time to start a developing relationship." These results suggested that the participants in the administrator-assigned group were not committed to their mentoring relationships in this study.

A possible explanation for the lack of commitment would be confusion about who was supposed to make first contact and suggest a schedule. Participants from the choice-based group admitted they were not aware of any protocol, as RC45 stated, "I'm the one who initiated contact, but I feel it should be almost the other way around", RC01 asked, "Does she initiate it? Do I initiate it? I assume she does because she is the one that has the questions." One administrator-assigned participant, EC31 said, "There is more responsibility on the mentor to keep the relationship moving". These responses, suggested that commitment levels could be higher if mentors and mentees had some guidance on who is responsible for setting up regularly schedule contact in the early stages of this formal mentoring program.

Participants in the choice-based group reported higher levels of commitment than those in the administrator-assigned group. From these findings, matching methods contributed to

perceptions of commitment by producing more positive results in the choice-based group as opposed to more negative responses in the administrator-assigned group. It appeared that level of commitment depended on the participant's assigned matching method group in this study.

Investment

The fourth research question asked how matching methods contributed to perceptions of investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. Interviews with mentors and mentees were conducted and the results were reported in this section. Mentors and mentees from each matching method group, administrator-assigned and choice-based, were asked a series of questions about the level of investment perceived in their current formal mentoring relationship.

Similar to the responses on commitment, the choice-based group was split on perceptions of investment. Eight of the 15 choice-based participants that were interviewed reported that they communicated with their mentor or mentee on a regular basis. For the purposes of this study, "regular basis" was defined as at least once per month. For example, RC10 stated that "We talked every week and I'm trying to get her to come out and do some of our camps", RC46 reported that "We spoke on the phone every other week and I tried to prioritize the relationship", and EC11 said, "Our investment was very good and we were able to connect on a regular basis. Every week she calls me at exactly 9:30 am." Some choice-based participants weren't as fortunate, as RC04 revealed, "We only made a couple of contacts", RC53 said, "A couple of emails but it never formally happened", and EC45 stated, "We did not connect a lot, only twice in four months." While not all choice-based participants experienced high levels of investment, half of those interviewed reported contact on a regular basis as defined earlier.

Administrator-assigned group participants reported low levels of investment in the mentoring relationship. Two of the 15 administrator-assigned participants that were interviewed reported that they communicated with their mentor or mentee on a regular basis. Two administrator-assigned participants that reported moderate levels of investment: RA32 who said, "We set up a weekly time and tried to honor it, although we usually didn't have time", and EA14 responded, "We had a lot in common so we spoke on the phone once per week." Aside from those two respondents, the remainder of the administrator-assigned group experienced low levels of investment. RA05 stated, "I sent multiple emails with no responses", RA16 said, "We had limited interaction because our introduction came late", and RA53 reported, "We didn't speak a whole lot. It was my fault for dropping the ball once season started." These results suggested many of the participants in the administrator-assigned group did not experience a high level of investment in this study.

Participants in the choice-based group reported higher levels of investment than those in the administrator-assigned group. From these findings, matching methods contributed to perceptions of investment by producing more positive results in the choice-based group as opposed to more negative responses in the administrator-assigned group. It appeared that level of investment depended on the participant's assigned matching method group in this study.

Overall Mentoring

The fifth research question inquired how matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in formal mentoring program. The null hypothesis was that there was significant difference between matching methods when considering their effect on perceptions of overall mentoring. Welch's t-tests were utilized to examine the statistical mean differences on overall mentoring based on perceptions of overall

mentoring. Interviews with mentors and mentees were also conducted to complement the statistical results on overall mentoring. This section will provide results in the following manner: a) statistics from Welch's t-tests, b) the decision to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis and c) a synthesis of qualitative data on overall mentoring.

To address the fifth research question, Welch's t-tests and interviews were utilized to examine matching methods and their effect on overall mentoring of volleyball coaches in formal mentoring relationships. Overall mentoring using the quantitative data from the CMRI was the sum of the rating scores for the 10 mentor roles from the perspective of the mentee only. The data from CMRI #1 and CMRI #2 indicated the administrator-assigned group means were not statistically different on overall mentoring when compared to the choice-based group as shown on Table 4.4 (see Appendix J). These findings suggest that there is no statistical difference between matching methods, administrator-assigned and choice-based, when considering their effect on perceptions of overall mentoring in formal volleyball coaching relationships.

Welch's t-tests were also used to detect any significant mean differences over time using data from CMRI #1 to CMRI #2. For example, the choice-based group means and standard deviations of overall mentoring from CMRI #1 and CMRI #2 were compared. Based on these tests, no significant differences could be reported in the administrator-assigned or choice-based groups at two time periods as shown on Table 4.5 (see Appendix J). These findings suggested that the perceived overall level of mentoring did not change due to the length of relationship in either group.

However, qualitative data was collected to assist in answering the fifth research question concerning overall mentoring. The definition of overall mentoring was left to the participant's interpretation when answering on this topic and participants were asked to rate the relationship.

Interviews with mentors and mentees were conducted and the results are reported in this subsection. Mentors and mentees from each matching method group, administrator-assigned and choice-based, were asked a series of questions about the level of overall mentoring perceived in their current formal mentoring relationship. Two-thirds of the choice-based group participants rated overall mentoring over 70 and only one-fifth of the administrator-assigned group participants rated overall mentoring over 70.

Ten of 15 participants rated their mentor above 70 on a scale of 1 to 100 for overall mentoring in the choice-based group. For them, their experience in this program has been a positive one, as expressed by RC12, "Oh, I had a blast and had a really good experience. 85 out of 100", EC04, "My mentor was just great, it was just perfect for what I was looking for, 90 out of 100", and EC11, "This was the best mentoring experience I've had with the AVCA program, 100 out of 100." The lowest ranking in the choice-based group was a 55 out of 100 by EC45, who said, "My mentor was great through my decision-making processes but we just didn't really hit it off, 55 out of 100." Based on these responses, the data suggests that the choice-based group experienced a high level of overall mentoring in this mentoring program.

Only three of 15 rated their mentor above 70 on a scale of 1 to 100 in the administrator-assigned group. The range of ratings for this group was much lower than that of the choice-based group. High overall mentor ratings were given by three members of this group, including RA03 who said, "It was great, 90 out of 100", EA14, "I'm very satisfied with the mentoring relationship this year, 80 out of 100", and EA28, "Very satisfied with my mentor, 98 out of 100." Unfortunately, these responses were the exception to the rule. The remaining 12 responses were much more critical: RA05, "Worst experience yet, 1 out of 100", RA32, "Terribly disappointing, 25 out of 100", EA14, "I wanted to learn and didn't get that opportunity with this mentor, 30 out

of 100", and EA37, "Unsatisfactory, this was not a great experience, 20 out of 100." Based on the levels of similarity, commitment, and investment reported earlier for this group, these results were not surprising to the researcher.

Regardless of whether mentees were assigned to the choice-based or administrator-assigned groups, statistical results from this study indicated that perception of overall mentoring, as defined by the sum of mentor roles, was not significantly different. For this reason, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. However, qualitative analysis suggested that participants in the choice-based group reported higher levels of overall mentoring than those in the administrator-assigned group. From these findings, matching methods contributed to perceptions of overall mentoring by producing more positive results in the choice-based group as opposed to more negative responses in the administrator-assigned group. The results suggested the level of overall mentoring, as defined by the participant, depended on the participant's assigned matching method group in this study. Overall mentoring was examined in two ways in this study: quantitatively by comparing the sum of scores on mentor roles using the CMRI and qualitatively by allowing participants to personally define mentoring. The results presented here suggested that there was no significant difference on overall mentoring between the two matching methods using CMRI results, but there does seem to be a qualitative difference once participants were allowed to define the relationship in their own way.

Summary

Five research questions were addressed in this section in support of addressing the purpose of the study, to examine the effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches mentoring relationships. No significant statistical differences of mentor roles, functions, and overall mentoring were found between the matching methods chosen for comparison in this

study, administrator-assigned and choice-based. However, through qualitative methods, perceptions of similarity, commitment, and investment were found to be different between the two groups in this study, with higher levels of each in the choice-based group.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. This study was designed to provide information on the following questions:

1. What is the effect of matching methods on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
2. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of similarity of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
3. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of commitment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
4. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?
5. How do matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?

This chapter discusses the results drawn from the research study and consists of five major sections. Section one highlights the descriptive information from the study, section two discusses the findings in relation to each research question, section three provides a summary of the study and section four introduces future research considerations. Finally, section five indicates program recommendations.

Descriptive Results

Bloom (2013) identified a lack of empirical research on formal mentoring programs for coaches and called for increased analysis of the topic. In an effort to add to the current research, this study examined the effect of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. One of the instruments designed to measure the level of roles and functions mentors play in mentoring relationships was the CMRI, which was used in this study (Schempp et al., 2014). To place this study in context, the descriptive statistics for the entire sample were described here.

The mentee coaches in this study rated their mentors the highest on four psychosocial roles: a) friend, b) role model, c) counselor, and d) acceptor. Similar to the findings in this study, research examining formal mentoring programs generally found that mentors provided more psychosocial support than career-related support to their mentees (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007). More specifically, research has indicated that in sport coach mentoring relationships, psychosocial functions were rated higher than career functions (Avery et al., 2008; Narcotta et al., 2009). It can be speculated that mentors and mentees were preparing to give and receive psychosocial support when signing up for the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program. Mentors and mentees from each matching method group expressed similar reactions when interviewed and asked about why four of the five psychosocial roles were rated highest by mentee coaches. When asked about what they were looking for in this program, most of the interviewed participants agreed that psychosocial roles were more important to them than career roles in mentoring relationships. These data support the findings in this study that top four rated roles were psychosocial in nature. Therefore, the findings of this study are in-line with and support

previous research on strength of mentor psychosocial roles over career roles in a mentoring relationship.

The mentee coaches in this study rated the fifth psychosocial role—social associate—as the lowest rated role overall. Social associate was described as engaging in social roles that involved informal, after-work activities (Kram, 1985). It may be speculated that social associate may not be a vital part of mentoring relationships involving sport coaches. In a study of 433 soccer coaches, social associate was also found to be the lowest rated of the ten roles (Narcotta et al., 2009). The AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program had participants in all 50 states, Canada, and Puerto Rico, which made informal, after-work activities nearly impossible. The criteria for pairing did not involve geographic parameters and many of the mentors and mentees were located in different states and time zones. Therefore, the findings of this study are in-line with and support previous research of social associate being ranked as the lowest rated role.

The mentee coaches in this study rated the five career roles—coach, sponsor, challenger, protector, and promoter—in the bottom six, just above social associate. It may be speculated that the mentee coaches in this study were less concerned with moving up the coaching ladder and more interested in having someone to provide them with psychosocial support. From the interview data, both mentors and mentees expressed their lack of interest in giving and receiving career guidance in this program. Many mentee coaches cited that the AVCA provided a job board online and that they were not looking for a career promoter in their mentor, which coincided with the desires of many mentors that were interviewed who were more interested in serving as a sounding board and providing psychosocial support. In a study supporting this claim, Odell and Ferraro (1992) suggested that beginning teachers in a formal induction program most valued the emotional and psychosocial support that came with a mentoring relationship and

that this was a major factor in their decision to remain in the profession. Therefore, based on the current findings and findings from previous studies it may be speculated that mentee coaches perceived the importance of the roles played by their mentors as follows: a) the top four roles were psychosocial in nature, b) social associate was the lowest rated role, and c) the five career roles rated in the bottom six overall.

Discussion of Research Questions

Mentor Roles and Functions

The first research question inquired if matching methods had an effect on mentor functions and roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. Data analysis revealed very little statistically significant evidence that matching methods had an effect on mentor roles and functions in this study, including only one significant finding from the results of the CMRI. The mean rating of the sponsor role was found to be significantly higher in the choice-based group on CMRI #1, which was administered in mid-December of 2013. By the time CMRI #2 was given in March 2014, the significance between the groups on the mean rating of the sponsor role no longer existed. The sponsor role is displaying public support by actively nominating the mentee for lateral moves or promotions in one-on-one conversations or formal meetings with other members of the organization (Kram, 1985). During the months of November and December each year, many open positions were posted as seasons come to an end and the "coaching shuffle" began (avca.org, 2013). Mentee coaches in the choice-based group searching for a new position in 2014 may have been relying on their mentor for assistance in their search for another job. By March, when the second CMRI was administered, the hiring season had passed and the need for "actively nominating the mentee for lateral moves or promotions" may not have been needed (Ragins & Kram, 2007, p. 12). This may, therefore,

explain the mentee coaches in the choice-based group rating the sponsor role higher in December than in March.

On the remaining nine roles, mentee coaches' ratings were not significantly higher in the choice-based group as opposed to the administrator-assigned group. This finding suggested that the choice-based method, incorporating participant input, was not more influential on mentor roles than administrator-assigned method in this study. Cox (2005) proposed that participant input and matching of mentors and mentees was unnecessary in successful formal mentoring relationships. In her study of 52 formal mentoring partnerships, mentees that were allowed to choose their mentors did not experience higher levels of satisfaction in the relationship than those who were not allowed choice (Cox, 2005). Similarly, in a longitudinal study of 121 mentoring pairs over the course of five years, Bell and Treleaven (2011) concluded that there is no best way of matching mentees and mentors in formal mentoring programs. These findings differ from previous studies that claimed participant input was vital in matching mentors and mentees and demonstrated that participant input into the pairing process was preferable (Allen et al., 2006b; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Viator, 1999). Based on the results of this study, matching methods did not have a significant effect on mentee coaches' ratings of mentor roles and functions, possibly indicating that they may not be a vital part of producing satisfying formal mentoring relationships or the most effective methods were not employed.

One of the reasons for the lack of significant differences between the matching methods could have been the brevity of the mentoring relationship. The AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program was advertised as a one-year commitment, from July1 to June 30. However, many of the participants the researcher interviewed stated that they thought the program was terminated at the end of the volleyball season, a six-month timeframe, and not at the one-year mark on June

30. A six-month mentoring relationship may have been too short to produce significant results in this study. The CMRI was based on the development of mentor roles and functions, as defined by Kram (1985), who suggested that it took lengthy periods of time to develop and mature into satisfying mentoring relationships. Kram (1985) suggested that the initiation phase of mentoring relationships developed during the first six months to one year, and the fulfillment of mentor roles and functions may not mature until two or more years into the dyad during what she termed the cultivation phase. Longer mentoring relationships have been found in research studies to provide more career and psychosocial functions than shorter ones (Allen et al., 2004; Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2005; Chao et al., 1992; Turban et al., 2002). Therefore, the abbreviated length of the AVCA Coaches Mentor Program may have had an effect on the lack of significance of mentor ratings between the choice-based and administrator-assigned groups.

The AVCA Coaches Mentoring program may have also been at a disadvantage since it only provided two of the four components that make up a formal mentoring program to its members. Typically, formal mentoring program characteristics employed the following: a) organizational matching processes, b) designated length of relationship, c) monitoring during the time period, and d) evaluation at the completion of the program (Allen et al., 2011). While the AVCA did participate in the matching process (administrator-assigned group) and designated the length of relationship (one year), they did not fulfill the final two components of typical formal mentoring programs. The lack of monitoring and evaluation could have had a negative impact on mentee coaches' ratings on mentor roles and functions in both matching method groups. "In order to determine whether or not a mentoring program is achieving the business goals and objectives it was designed to achieve, it is imperative that companies create and implement a monitoring and evaluation process as part of their programs" (Allen et al., 2011, p. 1960).

Participants in a formal mentoring program should be supported throughout the length of the entire program, including monitoring and evaluation. In a study of 185 members of the U.S. Navy working on submarines, the relationship between continuous learning and peer mentoring suggested that a supportive environment encouraged peers to help each other (Eddy et al., 2001). Therefore, matching methods used in this one-year, formal mentoring program in volleyball coaching may not have had an effect on mentee coaches' ratings of mentor roles and functions due to several factors: a) matching methods may not be needed to produce satisfying mentoring relationships, b) the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program was not long enough to develop mentor roles and functions, and c) the lack of monitoring and evaluation provided for participants in the program detracted from the relationship.

Similarity

The second research question asked how matching methods contributed to perceptions of similarity of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. The choice-based matching method, with increased participant input, has been associated with higher levels of perceived similarity (Allen et al., 2009). From the interview data, volleyball coaches reported higher levels of similarity in the choice-based group over than the administrator-assigned group. This finding was aligned with research on participant input and levels of similarity in formal mentoring relationships. In a study of 249 business men and women, mentors in relationships with others perceived to be similar to them reported the mentorship to be of higher quality and greater learning than did mentors in relationships with less similarity (Allen & Eby, 2003). When participants were allowed to give their input, their feelings of similarity increased and suggested importance for mentees in previous research studies (Alleman, J., Doverspike, & Newman, 1984; Ensher & Murphy, 1997). The more similar mentees perceived themselves to be

to their mentors in outlook, values, or perspective, the more likely they were to report liking their mentor, being satisfied with their mentor, and having more contact with their mentor (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Allowing participant input in a formal mentoring program has indicated increased perceptions of similarity, which have been associated with greater satisfaction in mentoring relationships (Allen et al., 2011).

The findings in this study differed from one previous study suggesting that similarities did not provide positive results. Clutterbuck (1998) proposed that differences, not similarities, in experience and personality led to an area of maximum learning in mentoring relationships. The usefulness of similarities may lie in the goals of the participant. For instance, if the mentee hoped the mentor would be a sounding board and provide friendship, then similarity would be particularly important to foster identification and liking (Allen et al., 2009). In contrast, Allen et al. (2011) also reported that if the mentee entered the program to gain a better understanding of the organization and learn new skills to prepare him or her for career opportunities, then dissimilarity with the mentor, particularly in terms of job type, background, and educational specialty may become key to facilitating that goal. Therefore, the qualitative data in this study supported research suggesting that participant input could increase perceptions of similarities and produce more satisfying mentoring relationships.

Commitment

The third research question inquired how matching methods contributed to perceptions of commitment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. The choice-based matching method, with increased participant input, has been associated with higher levels of perceived commitment in research studies (Allen et al., 2006b; Viator, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2003). From the interview data, mentor and mentee coaches reported higher levels of

commitment in the choice-based group than the administrator-assigned group. This finding was aligned with research on levels of commitment in formal mentoring relationships. Wanberg et al. (2003) proposed that having input into the match likely increased psychological commitment to the mentoring process. The findings in a similar study of 275 healthcare employees (Allen et al., 2006b) suggested that match input had direct effects on instilling mentor commitment. Having input into the matching process should increase mentor commitment and "buy in" within the formal mentoring program (Allen et al., 2006b). No contradictory findings that showed a negative relationship between input and commitment were found in previous research. Therefore, participant input may be considered when pairing mentors and mentees in formal mentoring programs to increase perceptions of commitment and produce more satisfying mentoring relationships.

Investment

The fourth research question asked how matching methods contributed to perceptions of investment of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. The choice-based matching method, with increased participant input, has been associated with higher levels of perceived investment in research studies (Allen et al., 2006b). From the interview data, mentor and mentee coaches reported higher levels of investment in the choice-based group than the administrator-assigned group. This finding was aligned with research on levels of investment in formal mentoring relationships. By perceiving that they have a voice in the matching process, mentors and mentees may start to invest in the relationship prior to its official beginning and this greater investment may explain why perceived input into the matching process appeared to be a key component of effective formal mentoring practice (Allen et al., 2006a). This greater investment may explain why perceived input into the matching process appeared to be a key

component of effective formal mentoring practice (Allen & Eby, 2008). It has been suggested that when participants were not allowed input, their level of investment decreased. Ragins (1997) suggested that mentors who do not have input to the matching process may perceive the match as incompatible, lessening the probability that the pair will invest in the relationship. The researcher did not locate any contradictory findings that showed a contradictory or negative relationship between input and investment. Therefore, participant input may be considered when pairing mentors and mentees in formal mentoring programs to increase perceptions of investment and produce more satisfying mentoring relationships.

Overall Mentoring

The fifth research question inquired how matching methods contribute to perceptions of overall mentoring of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program. Overall mentoring on the CMRI was defined as the sum of the items representing career and psychosocial roles and functions (Kram, 1985). However, the CMRI data from this study did not show any statistically significant difference between means of the two groups. Matching methods did not influence the overall mentoring and satisfaction in these formal mentoring relationships. Research supported the lack of separation with several studies suggesting that mentor pairs formed without participant input achieved satisfactory relationships (Boice, 1992; D'Abate & Eddy, 2008; Parise & Forret, 2008; Ragins et al., 2000). In a study with mixed results, matches were more likely to be perceived as positive if both partners had a choice in the process; however, participation in the matching process did not guarantee success (Lankau et al., 2005).

In contrast to the indications of this study, much of the research on participant input in the matching process has reported findings that reflect positive outcomes of overall mentoring.

The choice-based matching method, with increased participant input, has been associated with higher levels of perceived overall mentoring in research studies using the MRI (Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2006). Research on choice-based matching has indicated higher levels of input led to better outcomes and more productive relationships (Matarazzo-Moran, 2012). In a study of 723 certified public accountants, mentees were more satisfied with their mentor when they had input into the matching process (Viator, 1999). Blake-Beard et al. (2007) summarized that choice-based matching and participant input led to higher levels of satisfaction, better management of conflict, and longer lasting relationships.

Participants in the administrator-assigned group were not given the same level of input as the choice-based group, which theoretically should have led to lower overall mentoring and satisfaction ratings. However, the overall mentoring rating on the CMRI in the administrator-assigned group was not significantly lower than the choice-based group. Research on the administrator-assigned method has indicated that the level of mentoring should have been lower in this group due to lack of information about participants to make accurate judgments (Blake-Beard et al., 2007), and participants should be negatively impacted by being placed in poor matches (Eby & Allen, 2002; Eby & Lockwood, 2005). It seemed that the level of input in the matching process did not affect the participants in this study. The quantitative findings in this study did not support any advantage of using the choice-based over the administrator-assigned method in creating better overall mentoring and more satisfying mentoring relationships.

The qualitative data reported in this study did support perceptions of higher levels of overall mentoring in the choice-based group than the administrator-assigned group. When interviewed, participants were allowed the freedom of defining overall mentoring in their own terms. This finding was supportive of research on participant input in formal mentoring

relationships and satisfaction. In a program where the coordinator matched mentors and mentees based on informal knowledge and biographical data about participants, mentors were extremely satisfied with the pairing process (D'Abate & Eddy, 2008). Allen et al. (2006a) reported that mentor or mentee input into the matching process was positively related to the perceived quality of the mentorship. Viator (1999) identified the importance of participant input in the pairing process and mentees who had no input into the pairing process were much less satisfied with their mentor. By enabling mentee choice of mentor, participants reported a positive experience of the pairing process and went on to have successful mentoring relationships (Bell & Treleaven, 2011). Therefore, although the quantitative data did not suggest significantly higher levels of overall mentoring in the choice-based group, the qualitative data reported in this study did support research on participant input and its positive effect on overall mentoring. Participants in the choice-based group that were interviewed expressed positive perceptions of overall mentoring and rated their satisfaction level higher on a scale of 1 to 100 than participants in the administrator-assigned group.

Summary

This study examined the effects of matching methods on formal mentoring relationships in volleyball coaching. When using the CMRI to compare matching methods, statistical evidence did not support a difference between choice-based and administrator-assigned methods, except on the sponsor role. Statistical evidence also did not support a difference between groups on overall mentoring. During interviews, choice-based matching participants reported better perceptions of similarities, commitment, investment, and overall mentoring. According to these interview responses, participants in the choice-based group were more satisfied with their pairing in the formal mentoring program. Limitations of this study include a fairly small sample size for

statistical comparison and a lack of control on the administrator-assigned matching method. Of the 135 mentees in the study, 79 completed the first CMRI and only 48 completed it the second time. After dividing into the two study groups, the group sizes obviously became smaller. On the second CMRI, the two groups were 20 in choice-based and 27 in administrator-assigned. Not only were the groups small, they were not the same size. Greater participation and larger sample sizes would be goals in future studies.

If the study were to be done again, the researcher would be more involved in monitoring the administrator-assigned matching process done by the organization. There was a case of a participant in the administrator-assigned group that was allowed more input than the choice-based group participants. This mentee reported to me in an interview that he was contacted by a colleague with influence at the AVCA prior to the pairing process and asked if he would prefer a specific, high-level mentor. Of course, he said, "Yes!" He was in the administrator-assigned group, yet his responses should have been included in the choice-based group. Hopefully, this type of interaction was isolated, but it may have tainted the purity of the distinction between the two groups and altered the results of the study. The researcher could have worked closer with the administrators of the AVCA in an effort to retain the purity of the pairing process. Hopefully, these findings will contribute to the literature on formal mentoring programs, especially for sport coaches, and provoke future research on these types of relationships.

Future Research

The findings from this study suggest several avenues for future research. First, future research should further examine matching methods that best suit the climate and culture of different organizations, specifically in formal mentoring programs for sport coaches. Mentor roles and functions take a great deal of time to develop, something most formal mentoring

programs do not enjoy. To evolve into the cultivation phase, mentoring pairs must pass through the initiation phase, usually during the first six months to one year of informal mentoring relationships (Kram, 1985). This process may take an even longer period of time in formal mentoring relationships due to the 'forced' nature of the pairing (Allen et al., 2011). In order to facilitate the process, organizers of formal mentoring programs for sport coaches should employ the best matching methods to help participants move through the initiation phase and promote greater satisfaction in the program. Mentors and mentees should be paired in a way that helps to foster an accelerated bond between mentoring pairs while achieving the purpose and objectives of the program. To be able to do this, more research needs to be done on matching methods in short (one year) formal mentoring programs, especially for sport coaches.

Finding the most effective matching methods to increase levels of similarity, commitment, investment, and overall mentoring is another possible topic for future research. Although the choice-based and administrator-assigned methods were examined in this study, there may be a better method available for this specific type of organization. For example, assessment-based method was not used in this study but may serve as a better method than choice-based (Blake-Beard et al., 2007). By incorporating personality tests or other computer-based assessments, higher levels of similarity, commitment, and investment may be achieved using algorithms for matching mentors and mentees. Future research on the use of assessment tools in formal mentoring programs for sport coaches would be helpful in deciding if assessment-based matching is a significantly more effective method for pairing mentors and mentees.

Future research should also investigate the use of e-mentoring (email, text, video conference, websites) in formal mentoring programs for sport coaches, especially in national organizations where long-distance relationships are common. Some formal mentoring programs

have turned to e-mentoring to accommodate the vast geographical distance between many participants and it serves as a low cost alternative to face-to-face mentoring (Allen et al., 2011). In a study of business students, perceived similarity in terms of attitudes and values was positively related to effective e-mentoring (De Janasz, Ensher, & Heun, 2008). De Janasz et al. (2008) also suggested that effective e-mentoring may lead to mentees' enhanced academic performance, professional network and job opportunities. E-mentoring has already been used in several fields including nursing. In a study of 184 mentors and 561 mentees in a nursing program designed to attract young people into the profession, participants reported a high degree of satisfaction and mentors found it to be an innovative program and reduced the barriers of scheduling (Kalisch, Falzetta, & Cooke, 2005). E-mentoring does have its drawbacks, including an impersonal feel and a lack of face-to-face contact that does not allow for sharing of nonverbal messages, such as facial expression, eye gaze, and gestures. Body language, posture, touch, and tone of voice are all missing in electronic communication (Kalisch et al., 2005). Therefore, future research on e-mentoring for use in formal mentoring programs for sport coaches is suggested.

Program Recommendations

An initial recommendation for this program includes pairing participants within the same geographical region to facilitate more live interaction. The lack of face-to-face contact in this program created a disconnection and did not allow for relationships to flourish since an e-mentoring program is not currently in use. One suggestion by a participant was to pair people who are within a reasonable distance to facilitate the opportunity to meet in person, attend each other's practices, and possibly add the social aspect to the relationship. A benefit of regional pairing would be the ability to personally initiate the relationship as early as possible, by meeting

in July, and encourage the building of trust and communication before the season got too busy. If this is not a feasible option for the AVCA, then a transition to e-mentoring would be recommended.

A second recommendation for this program would be to consider monitoring the participants, especially in the early stages of the mentoring relationship. To do this, the AVCA could improve their communication with participants and remind them of their responsibilities within the program. The AVCA could send out a bi-weekly or monthly newsletter with conversation topics and ideas to facilitate conversations and discussions. Several participants indicated that the mentoring program "slips their mind", especially in October and November, when the season became extremely hectic. Reminder emails would be helpful to keep the mentoring relationship in the minds of busy coaches and would promote consistent contact throughout the entire program.

A third recommendation for this program would be to consider evaluating the program, at the end of the volleyball season and then again at the end of the one-year time period. The data from these evaluations could be used to improve the program and provide the best opportunity for satisfaction in formal mentoring relationships. A simple online survey link could be sent to every member at zero cost to the AVCA but the information collected could be invaluable in the future success of the program.

Finally, mentor selection and training are recommended to improve the quality of the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program. Many of the mentors that the researcher interviewed had no training, were not aware of their responsibilities, and did not know which topics of conversation could aid in the nurturing of the mentoring relationship. Mentor selection and training may be the most important step in formal mentoring and should be addressed in this

program (Allen et al., 2011; Cox, 2005). Mentor selection and training, in combination with e-mentoring, would allow for each mentor to be competent, confident, and able to take on multiple mentees at one time and improve the quality of the program.

REFERENCES

Abell, S. K., Dillon, D. R., Hopkins, C. J., McInerney, W. D., & O'Brien, D. G. (1995). 'Somebody to count on': Mentor/intern relationships in a beginning teacher internship program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(2), 173-188. doi: 10.1016/0742-051X(94)00025-2

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2004). *Women in intercollegiate sport: a longitudinal national study 27 year update 1977-2004*. Retrieved from http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport/AcostaCarp_2004.pdf

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2012). *Women in Intercollegiate Sport: A longitudinal, national study, Thirty-five year update: 1977-2012*. Brooklyn College. Retrieved from http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport/AcostaCarpenter2012.pdf

Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Queen, A. J., & Cowan-Hathcock, M. (2007). Beginning Teachers' Perceptions of Their Induction Program Experiences. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 80*(3), 137-143.

Alleman, E., J., C., Doverspike, J., & Newman, I. (1984). Enriching Mentoring Relationships. *Personnel & Guidance Journal, 62*(6), 329.

Allen, T. D. (2003). Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62*(1), 134. doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00046-5

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2003). Relationship Effectiveness for Mentors: Factors Associated with Learning and Quality. *Journal of Management, 29*(4), 469-486. doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00021-7

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2008). Mentor Commitment in Formal Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(3), 309-316.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006a). Mentorship Behaviors and Mentorship Quality Associated With Formal Mentoring Programs: Closing the Gap Between Research and Practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(3), 567-578.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006b). The relationship between formal mentoring program characteristics and perceived program effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 125. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00747.x

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career Benefits Associated With Mentoring for Protégés: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 127-136. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.127

Allen, T. D., Finkelstein, L. M., & Poteet, M. L. (2009). *Designing workplace mentoring programs: An evidence-based approach*: Wiley-Blackwell.

Allen, T. D., Finkelstein, L. M., & Poteet, M. L. (2011). *Designing workplace mentoring programs: An evidence-based approach*

Allen, T. D., & O'Brien, K. E. (2006). Formal mentoring programs and organizational attraction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 17*(1), 43-58.

Andrews, M., & Chilton, F. (2000). Student and mentor perceptions of mentoring effectiveness. *Nurse Education Today, 20*(7), 555-562.

avca.org. (2013). AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program. from http://www.avca.org/education-resources/coaches-mentoring-program/

Avery, D., Tonidandel, S., & Phillips, M. (2008). Similarity on Sports Sidelines: How Mentor–Protégé Sex Similarity Affects Mentoring. *Sex Roles, 58*(1/2), 72-80.

Baugh, S. G., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (2005). Boundaryless Mentoring: An Exploratory Study of the Functions Provided by Internal Versus External Organizational Mentors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(5), 939-955.

Baugh, S. G., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (2007). Formal mentoring programs: A "poor cousim" to informal relationships? In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 249-271). Thousand Oaks, Ca: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Baumgartner, T. A., & Hensley, L. D. (2006). *Conducting & reading research in health and human performance* (Fourth ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bearman, S., Blake-Beard, S., Hunt, L., & Crosby, F. J. (2007). New directions in mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach.* (pp. 375-395). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Bell, A., & Treleaven, L. (2011). Looking for Professor Right: mentee selection of mentors in a formal mentoring program. *Higher Education, 61*(5), 545-561. doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9348-0

Blake-Beard, S., O'Neill, R., & McGowan, E. (2007). Blind Dates?: The Importance of Matching in Successful Formal Mentoring Relationships. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 617-633). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bloom, G. A. (2013). Mentoring for sport coaches. In P. Potrac & W. Gilbert (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching* (pp. 476-485). London: Routledge.

Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1998). The importance of mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 29*(3), 267-281.

Boice, R. (1992). Lessons Learned about Mentoring. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*(50), 51-61.

Boone Jr, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing Likert Data. *Journal of Extension, 50*(2), 30-30.

Bray, L., & Nettleton, P. (2007). Assessor or mentor? Role confusion in professional education. *Nurse Education Today, 27*(8), 848-855.

Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Campbell, D. E., & Campbell, T. A. (2000). The mentoring relationship: differing perceptions of benefits. *College Student Journal, 34*(4), 516.

Chao, G. T. (2009). Formal mentoring: Lessons learned from past practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*(3), 314-320. doi: 10.1037/a0012658

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(3), 619-636.

Chun, J. U., Sosik, J. J., & Yun, N. Y. (2012). A longitudinal study of mentor and protégé outcomes in formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(8), 1071-1094. doi: 10.1002/job.1781

Clutterbuck, D. (1998). *Learning alliances: Tapping into talent*: CIPD Publishing.

Cox, E. (2005). For Better, for Worse: The Matching Process in Formal Mentoring Schemes. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 13*(3), 403-414.

Cushion, C. (2006). Mentoring: Harnessing the power of experience. In R. Jones (Ed.), *The Sports Coach as Educator: Reconceptualising Sports*: Taylor & Francis.

Cushion, C., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: experience and learning to coach. *Quest, 55*(3), 215-230.

D'Abate, C. P., & Eddy, E. R. (2008). Mentoring as a Learning Tool: Enhancing the Effectiveness of an Undergraduate Business Mentoring Program. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*(4), 363-378.

Day, R., & Allen, T. D. (2004). The relationship between career motivation and self-efficacy with protégé career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(1), 72. doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00036-8

De Janasz, S. C., Ensher, E. A., & Heun, C. (2008). Virtual Relationships and Real Benefits: Using E-Mentoring to Connect Business Students with Practicing Managers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*(4), 394-411.

DeBoer, K. J. (2004). *Gender and competition: how men and women approach work and play differently*. Monterey, CA: Coaches Choice.

Eby, L. T. (1997). Alternative Forms of Mentoring in Changing Organizational Environments: A Conceptual Extension of the Mentoring Literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*(1), 125-144.

Eby, L. T., & Allen, T. D. (2002). Further investigation of proteges' negative mentoring experiences. *Group & Organization Management, 27*(4), 456-479. doi: 10.1177/1059601102238357

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & Dubois, D. (2008). Does Mentoring Matter? A Multidisciplinary Meta-Analysis Comparing Mentored and Non-Mentored Individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(2), 254-267.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S. A. (2004). Protégés negative mentoring experiences: Construct development and nomological validation. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(2), 411-447.

Eby, L. T., & Lockwood, A. (2005). Proteges' and Mentors' Reactions to Participating in Formal Mentoring Programs: A Qualitative Investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(3), 441-458.

Eby, L. T., McManus, S. E., Simon, S. A., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). The Protege's Perspective Regarding Negative Mentoring Experiences: The Development of a Taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*(1), 1-21.

Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach.* (pp. 7-20). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Eddy, E., Tannenbaum, S., Alliger, G., D'Abate, C., & Givens, S. (2001). Mentoring in industry: The top 10 issues when building and supporting a mentoring program *Technical report prepared for the Naval Air Warfare Training Systems Division (Contract No. N61339-99-D-0012)*.

Egan, T. M. (2005). The Impact of Learning Goal Orientation Similarity on Formal Mentoring Relationship Outcomes. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 7*(4), 489-504. doi: 10.1177/I523422105279679

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal Mentoring Programs in Education and Other Professions: A Review of the Literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(4), 518-540.

Ensher, E. A., & Murphy, S. E. (1997). Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*(3), 460-481.

Erdem, F., & Özen, J. (2003). The perceptions of protégés in academic organizations in regard to the functions of monitoring. *Higher Education in Europe, 28*(4), 569-575. doi: 10.1080/0379772032000170543

Erickson, K., Côté, J., & Fraser-Thomas, J. (2007). Sport Experiences, Milestones, and Educational Activities Associated With High-Performance Coaches' Development. *Sport Psychologist, 21*(3), 302-316.

Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: perceived career/job experiences of proteges versus non-proteges. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*(4), 309-320.

Fagenson-Eland, E. A., Marks, M. A., & Amendola, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*(1), 29-42. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1997.1592

Finkelstein, L. M., Allen, T. D., Ritchie, T. D., Lynch, J. E., & Montei, M. S. (2012). A dyadic examination of the role of relationship characteristics and age on relationship satisfaction in a formal mentoring programme. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 21*(6), 803-827. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2011.594574

Finkelstein, L. M., & Poteet, M. L. (2007). Best practices for workplace formal mentoring programs. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach.* (pp. 345-367). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Ganser, T. (2002). *Supporting New Teacher Mentor Programs: Strategies for Principals*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Mentoring Association, Fort Worth, TX.

Godshalk, V. M., & Sosik, J. J. (2003). Aiming for Career Success: The Role of Learning Goal Orientation in Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(3), 417-437.

Gray, D. E., & Goregaokar, H. (2010). Choosing an executive coach: The influence of gender on the coach-coachee matching process. *Management Learning, 41*(5), 525-544. doi: 10.1177/1350507610371608

Hale, R. (2000). To Match or Mis-match? The Dynamics of Mentoring as a Route to Personal and Organisational Learning. *Career Development International, 5*(4-5), 223-234.

Hall, K. M., Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., & Bullough, R. V., Jr. (2008). More than a Place to Teach: Exploring the Perceptions of the Roles and Responsibilities of Mentor Teachers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*(3), 328-345.

Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool. *Academy of Management Review, 8*(3), 475-485. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1983.4284603

Hurte, V. J. (2002). Mentoring: The Forgotten Retention Tool. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 19*(18), 49.

Jarnagin, L. M. (2010). *Mentors Are from Venus and Mars: Exploring the Benefits of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Gender Pairings in the Mentoring Relationships of Female Senior Student Affairs Officers.* (Ed. D. Dissertation), University of California, Los Angeles, ProQuest LLC.

Johnson, H.-A. M., Xu, X., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Reflections on diversity and mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach.* (pp. 301-304). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Jones, R., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2004a). *Sports coaching cultures: from practice to theory*. London; UK: Routledge.

Jones, R., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2004b). Sports coaching cultures: from practice to theory. In R. Jones, K. Armour & P. Potrac (Eds.), *Sports coaching cultures: from practice to theory*. London; UK: Routledge.

Jones, R., Harris, R., & Miles, A. (2009). Mentoring in sports coaching: a review of the literature. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 14*(3), 267-284.

Kalbfleisch, P. J. (2000). Similarity and Attraction in Business and Academic Environments: Same and Cross-Sex Mentoring Relationships. *Review of Business, 21*(1/2), 58.

Kalbfleisch, P. J., & Davies, A. B. (1991). Minorities and Mentoring: Managing the multicultural institution. *Communication Education, 40*(3), 266.

Kalisch, B. J., Falzetta, L., & Cooke, J. (2005). Group e-mentoring: a new approach to recruitment into nursing. *Nursing Outlook, 53*(4), 199-205.

Kirchmeyer, C. (2005). The effects of mentoring on academic careers over time: Testing performance and political perspectives. *Human Relations, 58*(5), 637-660. doi: 10.1177/0018726705055966

Kitchel, T., & Torres, R. M. (2007). Possible Factors in Matching Student Teachers with Cooperating Teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 48*(3), 13-24.

Koberg, C. S., Boss, R. W., & Goodman, E. (1998). Factors and outcomes associated with mentoring among health-care professionals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 53*(1), 58-72. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1997.1607

Kohr, R. L., & Games, P. A. (1974). *Robustness of the Analysis of Variance, the Welch Procedure, and a Box Procedure to Heterogeneous Variances*: Journal of Experimental Education.

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

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(1), 110-132. doi: 10.2307/256064

Lankau, M. J., Riordan, C. M., & Thomas, C. H. (2005). The Effects of Similarity and Liking in Formal Relationships between Mentors and Proteges. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(2), 252-265.

Lankau, M. J., & Scandura, T. A. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 779-790. doi: 10.2307/3069311

Leung Mee-Lee, D., & Bush, T. (2003). Student mentoring in higher education: Hong Kong Baptist University. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 11*(3), 263-271. doi: 10.1080/1361126032000149319

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, D., M., L., Klein, E. B., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.

Lewis, R. E., & Heckman, R. J. (2006). Talent management: A critical review. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 139-154. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.001

Liang, B., Tracy, A. J., Taylor, C. A., & Williams, L. M. (2002). Mentoring College- Age Women: A Relational Approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(2), 271.

Lockwood, P. (2006). "Someone like Me Can Be Successful": Do College Students Need Same-Gender Role Models. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(1), 36-46.

Löfström, E., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2009). Novice teachers' perspectives on mentoring: The case of the Estonian induction year. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(5), 681-689.

London, M. (1993). Relationships between career motivation, empowerment and support for career development. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 66*(1), 55-69.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *The schoolteacher: a sociological study*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching* (Second ed.). London, England: Sage Publications.

Matarazzo-Moran, K. L. (2012). *An investigation of formal mentoring pair composition: The impact of deep-level characteristics and perceived similarity on match fit and relationship retention.* (Ph.D.), Northern Illinois University, US.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., Kaplowitz, M. J., Safran, J. D., & Muran, C. J. (2011). Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. *Impact of therapist emotional intelligence on psychotherapy, 199*(2), 74-84.

Mitra, A., & Lankford, S. (1999). *Research Methods in Park, Recreation, and Leisure Services*. Champaign, Ill: Sagamore Pub.

Narcotta, E. M., Petersen, J. C., & Johnson, S. R. (2009). Mentor functions in NCAA women's soccer coaching dyads. *Team Performance Management, 15*(3/4), 100-116.

Nash, C. (2003). Development of a Mentoring System within Coaching Practice. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education (Oxford Brookes University), 2*(2), 39-47.

Noe, R. A. (1988a). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(3), 457-479.

Noe, R. A. (1988b). Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(1), 65-78. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1988.4306784

Noe, R. A., & et al. (1990). An Investigation of the Correlates of Career Motivation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37*(3), 340-356.

Noe, R. A., Greenberger, D. B., & Wang, S. (2002). Mentoring: What We Know and Where We Might Go. In G. R. Ferris & J. J. Martocchio (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management.* (Vol. 21, pp. 129-173). Amsterdam, London and New York: Elsevier Science.

O'Brien, K. E., Rodopman, O. B., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Reflections on best practices for formal mentoring programs. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach.* (pp. 369-372). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

O'Neill, R. M., Horton, S., & Crosby, F. J. (1999). Gender issues in developmental relationships. In A. J. Murrell, F. J. Crosby & R. J. Ely (Eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations.* (pp. 63-80). Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Odell, S. J., & Ferraro, D. P. (1992). Teacher mentoring and teacher retention. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(3), 200.

Oyeyemi, G. M., Adewara, A. A., Adebola, F. B., & Salau, S. I. (2010). On the Estimation of Power and Sample Size in Test of Independence. *Asian Journal of Mathematics & Statistics, 3*(3), 139-146.

Parise, M. R., & Forret, M. L. (2008). Formal Mentoring Programs: The Relationship of Program Design and Support to Mentors' Perceptions of Benefits and Costs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(2), 225-240.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Pidcock, B. W., Fischer, J. L., & Munsch, J. (2001). Family, personality, and social risk factors impacting the retention rates of first-year Hispanic and Anglo college students. *Adolescence, 36*(144), 803-818.

Pitney, W. A., & Ehlers, G. G. (2004). A Grounded Theory Study of the Mentoring Process Involved With Undergraduate Athletic Training Students. *Journal of Athletic Training, 39*(4), 344-344.

Poronsky, C. B. (2012). A literature review of mentoring for RN-to-FNP transition. *The Journal Of Nursing Education, 51*(11), 623-631. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20120914-03

Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(2), 482-521. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1997.9707154067

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(4), 529-550. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.529

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1177-1194.

Ragins, B. R., & Kram, K. E. (2007). The Roots and Meaning of Mentoring. . In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work* (pp. 3-15). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1990). Perceptions of Mentor Roles in Cross-Gender Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37*(3), 321-339.

Riley, M., & Fearing, A. D. (2009). Mentoring as a teaching-learning strategy in nursing. *MEDSURG Nursing, 18*(4), 228-233.

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(1), 14-28.

Rosser, M., Rice, A. M., Campbell, H., & Jack, C. (2004). Evaluation of a mentorship programme for specialist practitioners. *Nurse Education Today, 24*(8), 596-604.

Sagas, M., Cunningham, G., & Pastore, D. (2006). Predicting Head Coaching Intentions of Male and Female Assistant Coaches: An Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Sex Roles, 54*(9/10), 695-705. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9035-x

Sagas, M., Paetzold, R., & Ashley, F. (2005). Relational Demography in Coaching Dyads. *Physical Educator, 62*(2), 103-112.

Sage, G. H. (1989). Becoming a High School Coach: From Playing Sports to Coaching. *Research Quarterly For Exercise And Sport, 60*(1), 81-92.

Scandura, T. A., & Ragins, B. R. (1993). The Effects of Sex and Gender Role Orientation on Mentorship in Male-Dominated Occupations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 43*(3), 251-265.

Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary constructs in leadership research. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(6), 1588-1602. doi: 10.2307/256800

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2001). An Investigation of the Moderating Effects of Gender on the Relationships between Mentorship Initiation and Protege Perceptions of Mentoring Functions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*(3), 342-363.

Schempp, P. (1989). Apprenticeship-of-observation and the development of physical education teachers *In, Templin, T.J. and Schempp, P.G. (eds.), Socialization into physical education: learning to teach, Indianapolis, Ind., Benchmark, c1989, p. 13-38.* United States.

Schempp, P., & Graber, K. C. (1992). Teacher Socialization From a Dialectical Perspective: Pretraining Through Induction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 11*(4), 329-348.

Schempp, P., McCullick, B., Berger, B., White, J., & Elliott, J. (2014). *The Development of the Coach Mentor Role Instrument*. Paper presented at the Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d'Education Physique World Congress, Auckland, New Zealand.

Seibert, S. (1999). The Effectiveness of Facilitated Mentoring: A Longitudinal Quasi-Experiment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*(3), 483-502.

Stewart, B. M., & Krueger, L. E. (1996). An evolutionary concept analysis of mentoring in nursing. *Journal Of Professional Nursing: Official Journal Of The American Association Of Colleges Of Nursing, 12*(5), 311-321.

Stroble, E., & Cooper, J. M. (1988). Mentor Teachers: Coaches or Referees. *Theory into Practice, 27*(3), 231.

Strong, M., & Baron, W. (2004). An Analysis of Mentoring Conversations with Beginning Teachers: Suggestions and Responses. *Teaching & Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 20*(1), 47-57.

Tharenou, P. (2005). Chapter 4: Does Mentor Support Increase Women's Career Advancement More than Men's? The Differential Effects of Career and Psychosocial Support. *Australian Journal of Management (University of New South Wales), 30*(1), 77-109.

Tonidandel, S., Avery, D. R., & Phillips, M. G. (2007). Maximizing returns on mentoring: factors affecting subsequent protégé performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(1), 89-110.

Turban, D. B., Dougherty, T. W., & Lee, F. K. (2002). Gender, Race, and Perceived Similarity Effects in Developmental Relationships: The Moderating Role of Relationship Duration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(2), 240. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1855

Turban, D. B., & Lee, F. K. (2007). The role of personality in mentoring relationships: formation, dynamics and outcomes. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 21-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Underhill, C. M. (2006). The Effectiveness of Mentoring Programs in Corporate Settings: A Meta-Analytical Review of the Literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(2), 292-307.

Vaillant, G. E. (1977). *Adaptation to life*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Van Gyn, G. H., & Ricks, F. (1997). Proteges' perceptions of the characteristics of the mentoring relationship and its impact. *Journal of Cooperative Education, 32*(3), 80.

Viator, R. E. (1999). An Analysis of Formal Mentoring Programs and Perceived Barriers to Obtaining a Mentor at Large Public Accounting Firms. *Accounting Horizons, 13*(1), 37-53.

Viator, R. E. (2001). The association of formal and informal public accounting mentoring with role stress and related job outcomes. *Accounting, Organizations & Society, 26*(1), 73-93.

Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protégé predictors and outcomes of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(3), 410-423. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.010

Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T., & Hezlett, S. A. (2003). Mentoring Research: A Review and Dynamic Process Model. In J. J. Martocchio & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management. Volume 22* (pp. 39-124). Amsterdam; New York and Oxford: Elsevier, JAI.

Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Mentoring in Intercollegiate Athletic Administration. *Journal of Sport Management, 16*(2), 96.

White, A., Brannan, J., & Wilson, C. (2010). A Mentor-Protégé Program for New Faculty, Part I: Stories of Protégés. *Journal of Nursing Education, 49*(11), 601-607. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20100630-04

Wilson, C. B., Brannan, J., & White, A. (2010). A Mentor-Protégé Program for New Faculty, Part II: Stories of Mentors. *Journal of Nursing Education, 49*(12), 665-671. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20100730-08

Yayli, D. (2008). Theory–practice dichotomy in inquiry: Meanings and preservice teacher–mentor teacher tension in Turkish literacy classrooms. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 24*(4), 889-900. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2007.10.004

Young, D. (1990). Mentoring and networking: perceptions by athletic administrators. *Journal of Sport Management, 4*(1), 71-79.

Young, R. W., & Cates, C. M. (2005). Playful Communication in Mentoring. *College Student Journal, 39*(3), 692-701.

APPENDIX A

MENTOR APPLICATION

AVCA COACHES MENTORING PROGRAM
2013-14 MENTOR APPLICATION

Name:	
School/Organization:	
Title at current place of employment:	
Affiliation (NCAA I, II, III, NAIA, JUCO, High School, Club, etc.):	
Number of Years at Current Level:	
Number of Years Coaching Volleyball:	
City:	State:
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	
Age:	Gender:
How many mentees would you prefer?	
Do you have any specific requests?	

Please return to Kali Andress at kali.andress@avca.org or fax to 859-226-4338.

APPENDIX B

MENTEE APPLICATION

AVCA COACHES MENTORING PROGRAM
2013-14 MENTEE APPLICATION

Name:	
School/Organization:	
Title at current place of employment:	
Affiliation (NCAA I, II, III, NAIA, High School, Club, etc.):	
Number of Years at Current Level:	
Number of Years Coaching Volleyball:	
City:	State:
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	
Age:	Gender:
What level of coach would you prefer to be paired with? Circle all that apply. (Please include your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd preferences as your first choice may not be available.) NCAA I NCAA II NCAA III NAIA, 2-Year College, NCCAA Club High School	

Please return to Kali Andress at kali.andress@avca.org or fax to 859-226-4338.

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Informed Consent Letter

Date

Dear :

I am a PhD candidate under the direction of Dr. Paul G. Schempp in the Department of Kinesiology at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study entitled "The effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships" that is being conducted under the auspices of the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA). The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships.

Your participation will involve completing the Coaches Mentor Roles Instrument (CMRI) on two occasions and the possibility of being interviewed on two occasions between August 15, 2013 and February 15, 2014. The CMRI should only take about 15 minutes to complete and the interviews will consist of five questions and should only last about 10 minutes. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to withdraw from the study, the information that can be identified as yours will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed, unless you make a written request to remove, return, or destroy the information.

Your information will be kept confidential and the only parties that will have access will be the AVCA administration and the researcher. Each participant will be assigned an identifier, mentors will receive numbers and mentees will receive letters, and these identifiers will be the only link to the identity of the participant. Identifiers will be used in the report of the study and no names will appear in the write-up. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. The findings from this project may provide information on improving formal mentoring relationships for volleyball coaches. Research has shown that matching methods may be a vital factor in the success of mentoring pairs but very little research has been done with sport coaches. The time commitment is minimal.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me, Jeff White, at (706) 542-4210 or send an e-mail to jwhite21@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu. By completing and returning the attached consent form, you are agreeing to participate in this study, complete the CMRI on two occasions and have the possibility of being interviewed on two occasions.

Thank you for your consideration! Please keep this letter for your records.

Jeff White

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, _____, agree to participate in a research study entitled "The effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships" conducted by Jeff White from the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Georgia (542-4210) under the direction of Dr. Paul Schempp, Sport Instruction Research Laboratory, Department of Kinesiology, 330 River Rd., University of Georgia, Athens, GA. 30602, Tel: (706) 542-4210. I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at anytime without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. If I decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected from or about me up to the point of my withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed, unless I make a written request to remove, return, or destroy the data that can be identified with me.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships. I will be asked to do the following things:

1) **Complete the Coaches Mentor Role Instrument (CMRI), which should take, on average, 15 minutes to complete on two occasions. The CMRI will be administered in November 2013 and January 2014.**
2) **If randomly chosen, participate in a short interview, about 10 minutes, on two occasions, December 2013 and February 2014.**
3) **Someone from the study may call or e-mail me to clarify my information**

In terms of risk, participants' gender, highest degree obtained, and nature of their mentoring relationship will be noted. It is not anticipated that this information, when shared with the individual, will represent a risk or cause discomfort. Investigators will discuss participating coaches' gender, highest degree obtained, and the nature of their mentoring relationship, only with each individual coach. No identifying information will be released connecting participants with the data or data analysis UNLESS REQUIRED BY LAW. Identifiers will be used to allow the investigators to more effectively recognize the difference between mentors and mentees and to organize the CMRI surveys for data analysis. Mentors will be assigned numbers (1, 2, 3, etc.) and mentees will be assigned letters (a, b, c, aa, etc.) and will be stored on the researcher's computer. The identifiers will be deleted from the server where they will be stored until the completion of the study. Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However, once the researcher receives the materials, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. Participants will be asked permission prior to commencement of the interview. The recorded data collected from interviews will be transcribed and deleted at the end of the study.

This information will allow participants to possess a greater awareness of the roles their mentors play in their development as volleyball coaches, and help the AVCA to monitor their current mentoring program. Ultimately, the benefits of this project will identify positive mentor roles that could potentially be linked with and predict success in mentoring relationships for volleyball coaches. This information should prove helpful to individuals choosing a mentor in volleyball coaching and add to the literature for sports coaching mentoring.

By clicking "yes", you are indicating that you understand the above-described research procedures, have had all of your questions answered, and agree to participate in the research study.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX E

MENTOR PROFILE FORM

AVCA COACHES MENTORING PROGRAM
2013-14 MENTOR PROFILE FORM

Name:
Please complete all sections of this form in order that the mentoring committee can learn as much about your background as possible. This information will be used only to pair you with a suitable mentor.
Current job role and responsibilities
How long have you worked in this job (# of seasons)?
What are your 3-year goals? 5-year? 10-year?
What do you hope to gain by being a mentor?
What are you looking for in your ideal mentee?
What are you hoping you can provide to your mentee?

In what ways or areas can you help him or her the most?
What skills, abilities, personality characteristics, and knowledge areas would you want your mentee to have?
What do you foresee as the major obstacles you will encounter in providing quality mentoring (e.g., time, availability, location, schedule)?

Please return to Kali Andress at kali.andress@avca.org or fax to 859-226-4338.

American Volleyball Coaches Association
2365 Harrodsburg Road Suite A325
Lexington, KY 40504

APPENDIX F

MENTEE PROFILE FORM

AVCA COACHES MENTORING PROGRAM
2013-14 MENTEE PROFILE FORM

Name:
Please complete all sections of this form in order that the mentoring committee can learn as much about your background as possible. This information will be used only to pair you with a suitable mentor.
Current job role and responsibilities
How long have you worked in this job (# of seasons)?
What are your 3-year goals? 5-year? 10-year?
What knowledge, skills or abilities do you believe you excel at?
What knowledge, skills, or abilities do you believe you need further development to reach your goals?
What do you hope to gain by having a mentor?

What activities are you expecting your mentor to undertake in your development?
What skills, abilities, personality characteristics, and knowledge areas do you want your mentor to have?
What do you foresee as the major obstacles you will encounter in participating in the mentoring relationship (e.g., time, availability, location)?

Please return to Kali Andress at kali.andress@avca.org or fax to 859-226-4338.

American Volleyball Coaches Association
2365 Harrodsburg Road Suite A325
Lexington, KY 40504

APPENDIX G

COACH MENTOR ROLE INSTRUMENT (CMRI)

My mentor…	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. helped me attain desirable positions.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. helped me learn about other parts of the organization.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. protected me from those who may be out to get me.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. gave me tasks that required me to learn new skills.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. helped me be more visible in the organization.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. is someone I can confide in.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. and I frequently got together informally after work by ourselves.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. served as a role-model for me.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. served as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. accepted me as a competent professional.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. used his/her influence to support my advancement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. gave me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. “ran interference” for me in the organization.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. provided me with challenging assignments.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. created opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. provided support and encouragement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. and I frequently socialized one-on-one outside the work setting.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. is someone I identified with.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. saw me as competent.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. used his/her influence in the organization for my benefit.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. suggested specific strategies for achieving career aspirations.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. shielded me from damaging contact with important people in the profession	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

23. assigned me tasks that pushed me into developing new skills.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. brought my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. was someone I could trust.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. and I frequently had one-on-one, informal social interactions.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. represented who I wanted to be.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. guided my professional development.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. guided my personal development.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. thought highly of me.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW GUIDE #1

Interview Guide #1

The effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships

I want to thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. My name is Jeff White and I am conducting a study on the effects of matching methods on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships. I would like to talk to you about your experiences participating in the AVCA's Coaches Mentoring Program. Specifically, as one of the components of my overall research interest, I am interested in assessing your perceptions of your current formal mentoring relationship. Three important topics concerning formal mentoring are similarity, commitment, and time investment and I would like to ask you some questions covering these areas.

The interview should take about 10 minutes. I will be recording the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments, and I will be taking some notes during the session for clarification purposes only. Please be sure to speak clearly so that I don't miss any of your comments during the interview.

All responses will be kept confidential. This means that I will be the only one to hear your interview responses and I will ensure that any information I include in my report does not identify you as the respondent. Remember, you don't have to talk about anything that you are uncomfortable addressing. Are there any questions about what I have just explained?

I'd like to get a little background information about your volleyball experiences:

Please tell me about your athletic history.

- How long have you played sports?
- How many years have you been coaching volleyball?
- What do you enjoy about coaching volleyball?

Transition: I am hoping to learn about your experiences in a formal mentoring relationship and your level of satisfaction with the pairing. I have several questions I would like to ask you about your mentor/mentee and your interaction with that person over the past 4/6 months.

Research Question

What is the qualitative effect of matching methods on perceptions of similarity, commitment, and time investment of volleyball coaches involved in formal mentoring program?

1. Think about your current mentor/mentee. Describe the similarities you have with that person.

   Probing questions: How do you feel the amount of similarities affects your relationship? What similarities are important to you as a volleyball coach?

2. Describe the level of commitment you experience within your mentoring relationship.

   Probing question: What do you think would improve this level of commitment?

3. Tell me about the amount of time that your mentor/mentee invests in this mentoring relationship.

   Probing questions: What are the boundaries and restrictions keeping them from investing more time? Are you satisfied with the level at this time?

4. How important is participant input in the matching process when initiating formal mentoring pairs?

   Probing questions: How can the AVCA improve participant input? What kinds of input would be important to you?

5. Describe your level of satisfaction with your current formal mentoring relationship.

   Probing question: How can the AVCA improve their Coaches Mentoring Program? What are some ways the AVCA can attract more members to participate in the program?

Final Question: Is there anything else you would like to share with me about formal mentoring relationships or the AVCA's Coaches Mentoring Program?

Summary Statement: In closing, I would like to thank you for taking the time to speak with me to discuss your formal mentoring relationship. If I need more information on this topic at a later date, may I contact you for a follow-up interview? Thank you for your contributions during this interview.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW GUIDE #2

Interview Guide #2: Follow-Up Interviews based on Preliminary CMRI Results

If they don't answer (leave message):

Hello, _____. This is Jeff White from the University of Georgia. I'm conducting a follow up interview for my dissertation study on formal volleyball coaches' mentoring relationships. I would like to ask you about your experiences participating in the AVCA's Coaches Mentoring Program since our last phone conversation and will be contacting you again soon. Thank you and have a great day!

If they answer:

May I speak to _____ please? This is Jeff White and we spoke a few months ago about the AVCA mentoring program. Do you remember that conversation? Do you have time for a follow up conversation? I would like to ask you about some of the findings from the Coaches Mentor Role Instrument (CMRI) that was given to study participants on two occasions this past year.

The interview should take only about 10 minutes. I will be recording the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments, and I will be taking some notes during the session for clarification purposes only. Please be sure to speak clearly so that I don't miss any of your comments during the interview.

All responses will be kept confidential. This means that I will be the only one to hear your interview responses and I will ensure that any information I include in my report does not identify you as the respondent. Remember, you don't have to talk about anything that you are uncomfortable addressing. Are there any questions about what I have just explained?

Transition: I am hoping to learn about your perceptions of the preliminary results of the CMRI analysis.

Research Question

Descriptive Statistics

1. From the results of the CMRI, the top four roles played by mentors are psychosocial in nature: friend, role model, counselor, and acceptor. From your experiences, can you explain why we could have found this?
2. Why do you think the fifth psychosocial role, social associate, was rated the lowest overall by mentees in this mentoring program?
3. None of the five career roles were rated in the top 4. Based on your perceptions of mentoring relationships, why do you think we found this to be the case?

What is the statistical effect of matching methods on mentor functions of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?

1. The two groups in the study were assigned using two different matching methods, choice and administrator assigned, yet no significant difference was found between the mentor functions,

career and psychosocial. Why do you think there was no difference between the groups?

What is the statistical effect of matching methods on mentor roles of volleyball coaches involved in a formal mentoring program?

1. The only significant difference between the two groups was on the role of sponsor, with the choice group rating their mentors higher. Why do you think sponsor was the only role showing significance? (The *sponsor* role is displaying public support by actively nominating the mentee for lateral moves or promotions in one-on-one conversations or formal meetings with other members of the organization)

What is the qualitative effect of matching methods on perceptions of similarity, commitment, and time investment of volleyball coaches involved in formal mentoring program?

1. When mentees felt they were matched with a mentor that fulfilled their preferences (choice), their ratings on all functions and roles were significantly higher than those who did not feel that way. Why do you think this is the case?
2. Mentees who were in contact with their mentor on or before October 1, 2013 rated their mentors significantly higher on all functions and roles than those contacted after that date. What do you think explains this difference?
3. Why do you think mentors that set up regularly scheduled contact times were rated higher on all functions and roles than those who did not set up scheduled contact times?
4. From your perspective, why did female mentees rate their mentors significantly higher on the psychosocial function (not career), three psychosocial roles (friend, role model, and counselor) and only one career role (coach) than male mentees?
5. Females also rated their mentors significantly higher on the overall mentoring experience than male mentees. Why do you think this is our finding?

Final Question: On a scale of 1 to 100, 100 being best, how would you rate your overall level of satisfaction in the AVCA Coaches Mentoring Program this year?

Summary Statement: In closing, I would like to thank you for taking the time to speak with me to discuss your formal mentoring relationship. Thank you for your contributions during my study!

APPENDIX J

DATA TABLES

Table 3.1

Cronbach's alpha values for the CMRI

Construct	CMRI #1	CMRI #2
Sponsor	0.94	0.90
Coach	0.93	0.90
Protector	0.92	0.90
Challenger	0.94	0.94
Promoter	0.93	0.93
Friend	0.95	0.90
Social Associate	0.94	0.90
Role Model	0.91	0.94
Counselor	0.96	0.93
Acceptor	0.89	0.89
Composite		
Career	0.98	0.98
Psychosocial	0.98	0.98

Note. A value above 0.70 is considered acceptable (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006)

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics for the Coach Mentor Role Instrument (CMRI)

	CMRI #1 (*n=79*)		CMRI #2 (*n=48*)	
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Sponsor	7.90	3.27	8.09	2.84
Coach	8.51	3.76	8.74	3.40
Protector	7.43	2.66	7.64	2.52
Challenger	7.53	3.15	7.53	2.99
Promoter	7.22	2.78	7.57	2.86
Friend	10.08	3.96	10.47	3.56
Social Associate	6.66	2.89	6.98	2.68
Role Model	9.18	3.58	9.55	3.34
Counselor	8.75	3.88	9.04	3.32
Acceptor	8.72	3.08	9.30	3.01
Composite				
Career	38.58	14.74	39.57	13.58
Psychosocial	43.38	16.27	45.34	14.86

Note. *M* = Sample Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation

Table 4.2

Mentor Roles in rank order for the Coach Mentor Role Instrument (CMRI)

	CMRI #1 (*n=79*)			CMRI #2 (*n=48*)	
Construct	*M*	*SD*	Construct	*M*	*SD*
Friend	10.08	3.96	Friend	10.47	3.56
Role Model	9.18	3.58	Role Model	9.55	3.34
Counselor	8.75	3.88	Acceptor	9.30	3.01
Acceptor	8.72	3.08	Counselor	9.04	3.32
Coach	8.51	3.76	Coach	8.74	3.40
Sponsor	7.90	3.27	Sponsor	8.09	2.84
Challenger	7.53	3.15	Protector	7.64	2.52
Protector	7.43	2.66	Promoter	7.57	2.86
Promoter	7.22	2.78	Challenger	7.53	2.99
Social Associate	6.66	2.89	Social Associate	6.98	2.68

Note. *M* = Sample Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation

Table 4.3

Welch's t-test analysis of Mentoring Roles and Functions over Time

	Administrator-Assigned					Choice-Based				
	CMRI #1 (*n=44*)		CMRI #2 (*n=27*)			CMRI #1 (*n=35*)		CMRI #2 (*n=20*)		
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Sig.	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Sig.
Sponsor	7.16	3.13	7.78	3.24	.842	8.83	3.25	8.50	2.21	.981
Coach	7.89	3.73	8.56	3.76	.873	9.29	3.71	9.00	2.92	.992
Protector	6.95	2.60	7.26	2.78	.963	8.03	2.67	8.15	2.08	.998
Challenger	7.02	3.13	7.63	3.44	.852	8.17	3.10	7.40	2.33	.809
Promoter	6.70	2.62	7.48	3.16	.666	7.86	2.87	7.70	2.47	.997
Friend	9.52	3.86	9.85	3.83	.985	10.77	4.04	11.30	3.06	.959
Social Associate	6.30	2.91	7.00	2.99	.736	7.11	2.83	6.95	2.28	.997
Role Model	8.61	3.45	9.00	3.48	.968	9.89	3.66	10.30	3.06	.974
Counselor	8.16	3.87	8.63	3.66	.953	9.49	3.83	9.60	2.80	1.00
Acceptor	8.18	3.14	8.96	3.46	.717	9.40	2.90	9.75	2.27	.976
Composite										
Career	35.73	14.18	38.70	15.34	.827	42.17	14.85	40.75	11.05	.984
Psychosocial	40.77	16.13	43.44	16.76	.898	46.66	16.07	47.90	11.74	.992

Note. *M*=Sample Mean, *SD*=Standard Deviation, Sig=p-value

Table 4.4

Welch's t-test analysis of Overall Mentoring

	CMRI #1 (*n=79*)		CMRI #2 (*n=48*)	
Groups	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
AA	76.50	29.72	82.15	31.16
CB	88.83	30.52	88.65	22.10

Note. *M* = Sample Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation.
AA = Administrator-Assigned, CB = Choice-Based.

Table 4.5

Welch's t-test analysis of Overall Mentoring over Time

	Administrator-Assigned					Choice-Based				
	CMRI #1 (*n=44*)		CMRI #2 (*n=27*)			CMRI #1 (*n=35*)		CMRI #2 (*n=20*)		
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Sig.	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Sig.
Overall Mentoring	88.83	30.52	88.65	22.10	.982	76.50	29.72	82.15	31.16	.448

Note. *M* = sample mean, *SD* = Standard Deviation