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Abstract

Purpose – A continued focus in organizational research has been on career development, and mentoring has been identified as a key determinant of career success. The purpose of this paper is to focus on the interpersonal dynamics which contribute to variations in the effectiveness of mentoring support behaviors. Specifically, the effects of mentoring relational quality (MRQ) (i.e. affective perceptions held by mentors and protégés) on mentoring behaviors (i.e. vocational and psychosocial) as well as professional identification are considered. Interpersonal skills (e.g. behavioral integrity and political skill) of mentors and protégés are examined for their impact on MRQ.

Design/methodology/approach – Utilizing matched dyadic survey data from 100 mentor-protégé pairs in academe (i.e. dissertation chairs and doctoral candidates or recent doctoral alumni), partial least squares was used to test the research model.

Findings – Results support MRQ as an integral component in mentoring dynamics. MRQ for mentors and protégés was significantly linked with mentor support behaviors provided and received, respectively. Mentors’ perceptions of MRQ were predicted by protégés’ behavioral integrity and mentors’ political skill. Similarly, protégés’ political skill and mentors’ behavioral integrity significantly predicted protégés’ perceptions of MRQ. Further, mentors and protégés reported higher levels of professional identification when MRQ was high.

Originality/value – This study links affective and behavioral perspectives of mentoring, revealing the importance of interpersonal skill in career development. The interpersonal dynamics characteristic of mentor-protégé interactions determine the extent to which mentoring support behaviors may actually be provided by mentors and received by protégés.

Keywords Mentoring, Political skill, Partial least squares, Behavioural integrity, Professional identification
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Mentoring has become widely renowned for the breadth and depth of its relevant outcomes. Protégés can expect greater career mobility (Scandura, 1992), recognition, and job satisfaction (Fagenson, 1989), and promotion and compensation (Dreher and Ash, 1990). Meanwhile mentors benefit, though often in less tangible ways, through a sense of rejuvenation, technical support, and generation of an organizational power base (Hunt and Michael, 1983); all as a result of participating in mentorships. Mentoring promotes strong, cross-level social bonds, which can provide power, protect political interests, and enhance the career prospects of both mentors and protégés (Ferris et al., 2007).

Research into these outcomes consistently reaffirms mentoring as a critical tool in career development (see Dougherty and Dreher, 2007 for a review).

While the value of mentoring is clear, less is known about how affective interpersonal dynamics can link individual characteristics of mentors and protégés with desired
outcomes, such as career mobility and job satisfaction. Mentoring support functions are delivered through interpersonal interactions, and like all interpersonal relationships, interpersonal exchanges within mentorships, should be expected to vary in quality. To this point, most research assumed that mentorships with positive outcomes also had high-quality interpersonal relationships. However, Kram (1985) described mentorships with wide ranges in relational quality. We propose that relational quality is distinct from the provision of mentoring support behaviors. Closer examination of these variations in relational quality should extend scholarly understanding of the dynamics of mentoring and its role in career development.

This study begins to explore the roles of, and distinctions between, mentoring relational quality (MRQ) and the effectiveness of mentoring support functions to understand how the quality of the interpersonal relationship affects the extent to which support is provided and received within the mentorship. The aim is to illustrate that mentoring relationships vary in affect-driven perceptions of MRQ. These variations in quality are intertwined with, yet distinct from, the effectiveness of mentoring support functions. As defined by Allen and Eby (2003), mentoring support functions include behaviors provided by mentors and received by protegés within mentorships. Mentoring support functions are either vocational, such that they improve protégés’ understanding of work, or psychosocial, such that they support the protégés confidence or emotional state. MRQ and mentoring support functions are complementary factors because MRQ represents the affective perceptions within mentorships while mentoring support represents exhibited vocational and psychosocial support behaviors. Conceptually, separating the constructs of MRQ and mentoring support behaviors allows for better understanding of the interpersonal dynamics of mentorships and the process of mentoring. In addition, we examine the role of MRQ in enhancing professional identity for mentors and protégés.

Relational mentoring

Mentoring scholars are only beginning to understand how mentoring relations vary as to the quality of the relationship (Ragins et al., 2000). Relational mentoring is a relatively new concept depicting mentoring relationships as those that promote mutual growth, learning, and development within the career context (Fletcher and Ragins, 2007). This differs from more traditional paradigms on mentoring which tend to be top down, one-directional, and hierarchical. The relational perspective captures the interdependence between the mentor and protegé and considers outcomes for both mentors and protegés. Further, there has been a call for researchers to examine the antecedents, processes, and outcomes of relational mentoring (Fletcher and Ragins, 2007). The focus of this research reflects the important role of relational mentoring by highlighting the antecedents and outcomes of MRQ.

Regarding important antecedents to MRQ, we examine two individual characteristics argued to be key indicators of relational quality, namely, behavioral integrity and political skill. Behavioral integrity and political skill provide insight into how mentors and protegés are perceived and how they interact. People with strong behavioral integrity are more likely to behave in manners consistent with their espoused values (Simons, 2002). This characteristic of word-deed alignment leads to trust, organizational citizenship, and increased satisfaction (Davis and Rothstein, 2006; Dineen et al., 2006). Researchers have called for empirical research examining the role of relational skills for both mentors and protegés (Fletcher and Ragins, 2007) on mentoring relationships. Thus, another characteristic argued to affect relationship
quality is political skill. Political skill has been defined as the aptitude for creating meaningful relationships, influencing others, and understanding social cues (Ferris et al., 2007). Politically skilled individuals are better equipped to develop and maintain strong working relationships. Together, behavioral integrity and political skill represent characteristics argued to enhance relationship quality.

Regarding important outcomes of MRQ, this study focuses on the role of MRQ in predicting vocational and psychosocial mentoring support behaviors provided by mentors to protégés as well as professional identification. MRQ and mentoring support behaviors are delineated as conceptually separate but interrelated dynamics that occur within matched mentor-protégé dyads. This study answers various calls for research (Ibarra, 1999; Pratt et al., 2006) by considering the role of mentoring as a means of developing professional identity. To see themselves as professionals, people must gain necessary education and certifications and also engage in the cognitive process of professional identification which occurs as people come to view themselves as members of a particular profession, complete with the relevant values, experiences, and motives (Ibarra, 1999). We argue that MRQ can help to enhance professional values and motives, thus, enhancing professional identity. This research can help inform the importance of relational quality in mentorships for developing professional attachment and identification (Figure 1).

**Academia as a context**

The study of mentoring relationships in an academic context has gained favor (e.g. Poteat et al., 2009) and these relationships are critical for students’ personal and professional development (Clark et al., 2000). Dissertation advisors’ most basic duty is to honor the integrity of a research-driven field by ensuring that doctoral students have achieved the benchmark of independent researcher prior to finalizing their degree. Advisors are also charged with provision of career orientation and preparation for the job market.

One important concern that emerges is that not all dissertation chairs are high-quality mentors, but instead serve as advisors to the students, and guide them through the dissertation process. Hawley (2003), for example, argued that only exceptional dissertation chairs deserve to be called “mentors.” She argued that mentors do much more than advise and provide direction, but instead they make a commitment and

![Figure 1. Research model](image-url)
become involved with the doctoral students and their unique circumstances. Further, she advises new PhD students that doctoral programs are more than simply intellectual ventures. She argues that doctoral programs can be intensely emotional and ego-threatening within a highly political environment. Because effective mentoring relies upon the nature of the mentor-protégé relationship (Ferris et al., 2009), we suggest that high-quality relationships between professor/mentors and PhD protégés are characterized by some common characteristics that include trust, commitment, loyalty, and satisfaction.

**Literature review and hypotheses development**

Mentoring has received vast attention since Kram’s *Mentoring at Work* was published in 1985. This informal transmission of knowledge and support is now viewed as a crucial indicator for the future success of young professionals and organizations at large. Mentorships have been recognized for their individual, team, and organizational benefits. Research supports the vital role of mentoring in protégé career development, yet the nature and quality of the interpersonal relationship between mentor and protégé has received little attention. Mentorships are inherently interpersonal, and thus, like all interpersonal relationships, should be expected to vary in quality (Kram, 1985). However, research in the area of MRQ is limited. Allen and Eby (2003) developed a measure of mentoring quality, but their conceptualization grouped together affective and behavioral aspects of mentoring, furthering the assumption that mentorships with positive outcomes also had high-quality interpersonal relationships.

To the extent that MRQ has been considered, researchers have used the terms quality and effectiveness synonymously (Allen and Eby, 2003), or they have inferred relational quality based on positive mentoring outcomes (Godshalk and Sosik, 2000). Instead, we argue that the affective and behavioral components of mentorships are separate and should be conceptually developed and empirically assessed as such. Specifically, MRQ may be high, such that mentors and protégés have positive interpersonal exchanges, while the effectiveness of mentoring support functions is low. Conversely, mentoring support behaviors may be provided effectively although MRQ is low. Conceptually separating MRQ from the effectiveness of mentoring support behaviors provides greater distinction to the intricacy of the interpersonal dynamics within mentoring relationships.

**MRQ**

Although previous research has not identified MRQ as a unique construct, the idea has received some attention. One study found that mentorships are higher in quality when mentors and protégés perceive greater similarity in values, beliefs, and personality (Allen and Eby, 2003). According to Feldman (1999), mentorships are low-quality, or dysfunctional, if they fail to meet the needs of either person or if long-term costs outweigh long-term benefits. This is in line with Thibaut and Kelley (1959) observation that relational quality is judged based on a comparison of costs and benefits. Relational quality also has been discussed in terms of satisfaction with the relationship, mutuality of benefits, and relational depth (Huston and Burgess, 1979). Mentoring quality has also been equated with dyadic fit (Eby and Allen, 2002). Together, these studies indicate that affect-based MRQ adds information over and above assessments of mentoring support functions.

Based on Kram’s (1985) work, it seems appropriate to extrapolate knowledge of the inner workings of other common dyadic relationships to mentorships.
Allen et al. (2004) recently noted these similarities and called for more research “articulating [sic] the interpersonal processes (e.g. liking, reciprocity, trust) linking mentoring to protégé outcomes” (p. 132). Following this logic, we explore several literature streams as a basis for a theoretical development of MRQ.

Mentorships are unique in their duration, intensity, and objectives (Kram, 1985), but there are structural similarities with romantic, customer-sales, and supervisor-subordinate relationships. Mentorships often begin with an attraction, similar to the initiation of a romantic relationship and involve interpersonal confidences and social support, but the primary focus of mentorships is career development (Kram, 1985). Studies examining romantic relationships have considered relational quality as encompassing disagreement, fairness, happiness, conflict management, and interaction (Brown and Booth, 1996). Additionally, Spanier (1976) suggested that romantic relational quality was explained by dyadic satisfaction, cohesion, consensus, and affectional expression. Relational quality between customers and salespersons has been considered in terms of trust and satisfaction (Crosby et al., 1990) and cooperative norms (Dorsch et al., 1998).

Many supervisor-subordinate relationships also resemble or evolve into mentorships, but mentors need not be direct supervisors (Burke et al., 1991). The main similarity is the built-in difference in hierarchical level and experience. Supervisors and mentors typically have more professional and organizational tenure and power than subordinates and protégés (Kram, 1985). High-quality relationships provide subordinates with greater levels of influence, autonomy, information, and career mobility than do low-quality supervisor-subordinate relationships (Graen and Scandura, 1987). High-quality relationships also enhance ratings for in-role and extra-role performance (Gerstner and Day, 1997). The mirrored effects of mentorships and supervisor-subordinate relationships have been recognized in the past.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, which posits that leaders establish different types and qualities of relationships with followers depending on their status relative to one another (Graen and Scandura, 1987), is a well-recognized theory of relational quality. Leaders differentially exercise position power and leverage organizational resources based on relational quality with each subordinate (Liden and Maslyn, 1998). Affect, loyalty, contribution, and respect are characteristics of a high-quality LMX relationship (Liden et al., 1997), as is strong mutuality of influence (Dansereau et al., 1975). In contrast, low-quality LMX relationships are more likely to be minimally instrumental or transactional (Liden et al., 1997).

These literature streams were useful in guiding thought in the conceptualization of MRQ. Taken together, extant research indicated that trust, satisfaction, engagement, interpersonal connection, and communication were among key traits that drive perceptions of relational quality. Feelings, attitudes, and behaviors experienced in the mentoring context contribute to perceptions of MRQ. MRQ is an affect-based perception of the extent to which interpersonal interactions between mentors and protégés are characterized by connection to the mentorship and connection to the other (e.g. mentor or protégé).

Consequences of MRQ

Mentoring support behaviors. Mentors provide two main types of support behaviors, psychosocial and vocational, to their protégés, resulting in an array of positive outcomes. Psychosocial support, provided in the form of counseling or friendship, is focussed on enhancing the relationship (Kram, 1985), and leads to increased job involvement, self-esteem, and reduced turnover (Koberg et al., 1998). In contrast,
vocational support focuses on career advancement and task-related knowledge (Kram, 1985), and has been linked to career mobility (Scandura, 1992) and higher protégé incomes (Chao et al., 1992; Dreher and Ash, 1990). The effectiveness of mentoring support functions is the extent to which mentors (protégés) perceive they are providing (receiving) vocational and psychosocial support.

As stated, MRQ and the effectiveness of mentoring support behaviors are conceptually distinct, but closely related constructs. MRQ is an affect-based account of the quality of the interpersonal nature of the relationship. In contrast, the effectiveness of mentoring support functions assesses the vocational and psychosocial support behaviors provided in mentorships. Mentors and protégés who experience high-quality relationships will be more likely to provide and receive, respectively, important mentoring support behaviors. It is evident that there is a strong link between perceptions of MRQ and mentoring effectiveness for mentors and protégés. These two constructs, one of which is affective and one of which is behavioral, remain distinct conceptually. It is important to mention that vocational and psychosocial support likely have a reciprocal relationship with MRQ such that when MRQ is high, more support is given and received. That being said, it is likely that the more support given and received also enhances MRQ. Given the present study is cross-sectional in nature we hypothesize one direction but acknowledge the potential reciprocal nature of these relationships:

\[ H1a. \] Mentors’ perceptions of MRQ will positively influence vocational support provided by mentors.

\[ H1b. \] Mentors’ perceptions of MRQ will positively influence psychosocial support provided by mentors.

\[ H2a. \] Protégés’ perceptions of MRQ will positively influence vocational support received by protégés.

\[ H2b. \] Protégés’ perceptions of MRQ will positively influence psychosocial support received by protégés.

MRQ will impact not only the delivery and reception of mentoring support, but also how mentors and protégés connect with their professions. Mentoring is an established socialization technique which encourages the cultivation of professional identity (Kram, 1985). Professionals possess specialized or esoteric knowledge, which may be systematically organized and applied to solve problems (MacDonald, 1995). Modern professions include medicine, law, and academia. In these fields, professionals have economic incentives to apply their unique skill sets, and typically they are granted the autonomy to continue to develop them (Larson, 1977).

**Professional identification.** Professional identity has been defined as “the relatively stable and enduring constellation of attributes, beliefs, values, motives, and experiences in terms of which people define themselves in a professional role” (Ibarra, 1999, pp. 764-765). Even with the significant time and intellectual investment necessary to earn the requisite degrees and certifications to become a professional, coming to view oneself as a professional also requires a cognitive identification process. Identification is the process that allows systematic differentiation of others in the social environment, and self-definition and location within that environment (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). Identification with a group is based on a perception of psychological oneness, and
involves taking part in successes or failures that the group may encounter (Foote, 1951). This process permits people to declare who they are relative to others, and may be used to boost self-esteem (Hogg and Turner, 1985).

In an academic setting, professional identification is critical for new scholars’ adaptation to the field. Identification with a profession influences one’s information processing regarding the appropriateness of behaviors, attitudes, and emotions (Gioia and Thomas, 1996). Steadfast identification allows for protection against threats to identity (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996). Identity threats in academe include students’ disparaging remarks and job insecurity due to repeated budget cuts. Professional identification is necessary for becoming an independent scholar.

Several studies have linked mentoring relationships with the development of professional identities (e.g. Dobrow and Higgins, 2005; Kram, 1985; Pratt et al., 2006). Strong mentoring encourages protégés to develop their professional identities. Ibarra (1999) found that professional identities may be learned by observing role models and refined through external feedback. Acting as role models and providing feedback are among the key support functions which mentors enact. Role modeling, a type of psychosocial support provided to proteges, is a salient way for mentors to pass on the norms associated with professional identification. A study found that medical residents validated their professional identities by viewing select physicians as role models (Pratt et al., 2006). Mentors also give protégés access to professional social networks so that protégés begin to develop a sense of belonging amongst established professionals. Recent mentoring research has focused on the value of constellations of developmental relationships over time (Higgins and Kram, 2001; Higgins and Thomas, 2001). Yet, dense developmental networks may create too much noise, causing a lack of clarity of professional identity for protégés (Dobrow and Higgins, 2005). Many agree that mentoring drives professional identification, yet the discussion of how professional identities are formed continues.

This study examined the role of MRQ and the level of professional identity. Mentors who experience strong relational quality will be reinforced in their roles as academic mentors. The strength of professional identity often results from successfully aiding the career development of young professionals (Blackburn et al., 1981). Having positive interactions with their protégés and working to develop protégés’ careers and academia at large will confirm mentors’ professional competency. Passing specialized knowledge and political understanding onto protégés will lead mentors to develop stronger professional identities. Thus, mentors who perceive high levels of MRQ will report higher levels of professional identification:

$H3.$ Mentors’ perceptions of MRQ will positively influence mentors’ professional identification.

Protégés’ professional identity also will be affected by MRQ. Bruss and Kopala (1993) emphasized the importance of attending to protégés’ needs and fostering mutual respect in the healthy development of professional identification. This conceptualization indicates that strong MRQ will foster the development of professional identity among protégés. Thus, protégés who experience higher quality mentoring are more likely to develop a professional identity:

$H4.$ Protégés’ perceptions of MRQ will positively influence protégés’ professional identification.
Interpersonal predictors of MRQ

Perceptions of MRQ are based on interactions between mentors and protégés and the quality of interpersonal dynamics. To achieve high levels of MRQ, mentors and protégés must develop strong working relationships which may be characterized with positive affective perceptions of trust, communication, and satisfaction within the mentorship.

Doctoral mentors do much more than give advice to students and provide direction; good doctoral mentors make a commitment to the doctoral student and good relationships are characterized by trust, satisfaction, loyalty, and commitment (Ferris et al., 2009). Thus, it is important to study individual characteristics that might enhance the likelihood that high quality mentoring relationships can occur. Given Hawley’s (2003) argument that doctoral programs can be emotional as well as ego-threatening for doctoral students, identifying characteristics that might enhance the relationship quality is important.

We focussed on two interpersonal characteristics which have been previously shown to impact relational quality, behavioral integrity, and political skill.

**Behavioral integrity.** MRQ represents feelings of trust, satisfaction, and loyalty. As mentors and protégés work together, they observe the consistency between words and deeds demonstrated by the other. Consideration of “the perceived pattern of alignment between an actor’s words and deeds” has been termed behavioral integrity (Simons, 2002, p. 19). Behavioral integrity includes the perceived match between espoused and enacted values as well as a judgment of the extent to which promises are kept.

Behavioral integrity has become an established antecedent of trust and respect, such that individuals who demonstrate consistency between their words and actions earn the trust of others (Simons, 1999, 2002). In a study by Palanski and Yammarino (2011), trust was predicted by behavioral integrity and mediated the relationship between leader behavioral integrity and follower job performance. The connection between behavioral integrity and trust has also been demonstrated in a team context (Palanski et al., 2011).

Behavioral integrity is demonstrated when actions closely align with words and espoused values, and has most often been studied as “the extent to which employees perceive that their managers tend to represent themselves and their motivating values accurately in their communications with employee” (Simons, 2002, 19). This study seeks to extend the traditional operationalization of behavioral integrity in two ways: by studying dual perspectives and by extending the application to mentorships.

Results of past studies clearly indicate that behavioral integrity is a characteristic which is attributed to one person while affecting outcomes for another. Simons (2002) specifically posited that an actor’s behavioral integrity would impact the trust felt by another. As previously discussed, trust is an important component of relational quality, so we posit that behavioral integrity of one actor will be related to MRQ as it is perceived by the other actor:

\[ H5. \text{Mentors’ behavioral integrity will positively influence protégés’ perceptions of MRQ.} \]

\[ H6. \text{Protégés’ behavioral integrity will positively influence mentors’ perceptions of MRQ.} \]

**Political skill.** Political skill is an important component of interpersonal facilitation that allows for creation and maintenance of high-quality interpersonal relationships.
Political skill aids both mentors and protégés in exerting influence in purposeful ways to obtain desired outcomes and to optimize relational quality (Ferris et al., 2007). Political skill is the “ability to effectively understand others at work, and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives” (Ferris et al., 2005, p. 127). Political skill combines social astuteness with the capacity to adjust behavior to meet changing situational demands in ways that appear sincere, inspire support, and effect controlled responses from others. Political skill may have “cognitive, affective, and behavioral manifestations” (Ferris et al., 2007, p. 291) and is characterized by social astuteness, networking ability, interpersonal influence, and apparent sincerity (Ferris et al., 2005). A facet of social effectiveness, political skill is important for leadership (Lord and Maher, 1991), managerial effectiveness (Semadar et al., 2006), and effective execution of influence tactics (Treadway et al., 2007).

Political skill has been linked to positive outcomes in a wide variety of situations. Political skill neutralizes strain reactions (e.g. job tension, intent to turnover, or job dissatisfaction) created by common workplace stressors, including role conflict (Perrewe´ et al., 2004), role overload (Perrewé et al., 2005), felt accountability (Hochwarter et al., 2007), and generational conflict (Hochwarter et al., 2009). Politically skilled subordinates who actively managed impressions received higher supervisor ratings than their less politically skilled colleagues (Harris et al., 2007). Political skill is the enhanced ability to select and implement social influence tactics that build reputation (Ferris et al., 2003) and allow for desirable maneuvering throughout informal organizational networks (Seibert et al., 2001).

Political skill can enhance MRQ for mentors and protégés. Politically skilled individuals have a greater sense of personal control in work situations, so they are more likely to form strong interpersonal bonds and have a positive outlook on relations with others. Thus, political skill is hypothesized as a positive predictor of MRQ as perceived by both mentors and protégés. Additionally, politically skilled individuals are capable of exerting influence over others and creating interpersonal rapport that is conducive to accomplishing goals and furthering development. For example, politically skilled mentors will quickly establish themselves as trustworthy and committed, such that protégés will respond with more positive perceptions of MRQ. For these reasons, political skill also was hypothesized as a crossover predictor of MRQ:

H7. Mentors’ political skill will positively influence mentors’ perceptions of MRQ.
H8. Protégés’ political skill will positively influence protégés’ perceptions of MRQ.
H9. Mentors’ political skill will positively influence protégés’ perceptions of MRQ.
H10. Protégés’ political skill will positively influence mentors’ perceptions of MRQ.

Method
To focus on the academic context, this study only included respondents who were actively involved with a dissertation during the previous five years as either dissertation chairs (mentors) or doctoral candidates (protégés). This temporal boundary ensured that respondents were not too far removed from the mentoring relationship that surrounded their dissertations. To ensure consistency, respondents were only solicited from social science fields that are sustained through publication of
peer-reviewed, scientific articles. Respondents reported fields of study including psychology, education, political science, and the full range of business disciplines.

Respondents were contacted using automatic daily mailing lists (listservs) organized by professional associations, such as the Academy of Management, and through Facebook invitations. Using widely distributed online invitations posed some methodological threats. First, there was no reliable way to determine a response rate. Second, the design allowed two response scenarios (i.e. protégé first, mentor second and mentor first, protégé second). When initial respondents (either mentor or protégé) completed a survey, they provided contact information for their partner. Second respondents were contacted directly by e-mail indicating that they had been named as a mentor or protégé by the first respondent. Initial sections regarding identification varied as necessary, but all major sections of the survey were the same for each group. To preserve power and complete as many dyads as possible, second respondents were sent follow-up invitations after two weeks. Thank you emails were automatically distributed to all respondents. This collection effort resulted in 100 matched pairs with an additional 111 single respondents (n = 211).

Measures
Except when noted, the following variables were measured on five-point Likert-type scales with 1 signifying “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree.” Therefore, a higher score on an item or measure represents a higher level of the variable. All measures were asked of both mentors and protégés. All measures were self-reported, except for behavioral integrity was originally validated as an “other-reported” measure (Simons et al., 2007).

MRQ. Based on several pilot studies, the authors developed a 14-item measure of MRQ which demonstrated good reliability (complete scale included in the Appendix). A pool of 49 items was adapted from established scales used to measure interpersonal attraction, trust, and engagement, as well as related concepts such as communication, satisfaction, and relational quality. For example, some of the trust-related items were adapted from Schoorman and Ballinger (2006). Exploratory factor analyses were conducted on data from a preliminary and a pilot study, the resulting best model fit was an 18 item scale which loaded onto two factors. This factor structure was conceptually compelling because all items on the first factor addressed “connection to mentorships” and all items on the second factor addressed “perceptions of other (i.e. mentors or protégés)”. This 18-item scale was used to survey mentors’ and protégés’ perceptions of MRQ.

Confirmatory factor analyses were used to confirm the hypothesized factor structure. First, the 18 indicators were attached to two latent variables as denoted in Table II. The model was tested simultaneously in one model using AMOS 18, and items were not allowed to cross-load. This procedure was followed for both mentors’ and protégés’ data sets. Although prior empirical evidence supported the two-factor solution, it seemed prudent to compare the results to a forced, single-factor model. Thus, all 18 indicators were loaded onto a single latent variable. Model fit was evaluated using the Tucker-Lewis Index, comparative fit index, and root mean square error of approximation as these indices are relatively stable and insensitive to sample size (Bearden et al., 1982; Hu and Bentler, 1999). For both mentors’ and protégés’ perceptions of MRQ, the two-factor solution was a better fit to the data than the one-factor solution (see Table I).

Further analysis of the two-factor solution revealed several indicators with standardized regression weights that did not exceed the 0.70 threshold (Nunnally, 1978).
For three items, the standardized regression weights were below 0.70 in both response sets. A fourth item was dropped because it had a standardized regression weight of 0.71 in the protégé response set but only 0.62 in the mentor response set and did not conceptually fit with the emergent factors. The resulting MRQ scale contained the same 14 items for both mentors and protégés. These 14 items also represented the empirically supported two-factor solution. The two-factor, 14-item had strong reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.98 for the mentor sample and 0.97 for the protégé sample), and the model fit the data moderately well, as explained in Table I.

The 14-items measuring MRQ were included in a single scale in this study as we theorized higher order effects. Differential predictions based on the dimensionality were beyond the scope of this study, but some implications of these dimensions are considered as areas for future research. Representative items asked of protégés (mentors) included “I feel a sense of belonging in my mentorship” and “I respect my mentor (protégé)” which represent the dimensions of connection to mentorship and perception of other, respectively.

**Mentoring support behaviors.** The effectiveness of mentoring support functions provided and received was measured using an adapted version of the Mentor Role Instrument developed by Ragins and McFarlin (1990). Vocational support behaviors were measured with 15 items, while psychosocial support behaviors were measured on a nine-item scale. All items were weighted from 1 (to no extent) to 5 (to a great extent). Representative psychosocial support items asked of protégés included “My mentor guides my professional development” and “My mentor serves as a role model for me.” When presented to mentors, these items read “I guide my protégé’s professional development” and “I serve as a role model for my protégé.” Representative vocational support items asked of protégés included “My mentor uses his/her influence in the organization for my benefit” and “My mentor provides me with challenging assignments.” When presented to mentors, these items read “I use my influence in the organization for my protégé’s benefit” and “I provide my protégé with challenging assignments.”

**Behavioral integrity.** Behavioral integrity was measured using the eight-item scale initially developed to gauge subordinates’ perceptions of supervisors’ behavioral integrity (Simons et al., 2007). For this study, the wording was altered as necessary to gauge protégés’ and mentors’ perceptions of the other’s behavioral integrity. Sample items included “There is a match between my protégé’s (mentor’s) words and actions” and “My protégé (mentor) practices what he/she preaches.”

**Political skill.** Mentors’ and protégés’ political skill was measured using the 18-item, seven-point Likert-type measure developed by Ferris et al. (2005). Representative items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Fit statistic</th>
<th>One-factor (18 items)</th>
<th>Two-factor (18 items)</th>
<th>Two-factor (14 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor perception of MRQ</td>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protégé perception of MRQ</td>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Comparison of model fit for confirmatory factor analyses
include “I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others,” “I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others,” “I understand people very well,” and “I try to show a genuine interest in other people,” and represent the construct’s four dimensions of networking ability, interpersonal influence, social astuteness, and apparent sincerity, respectively.

Professional identity. Professional identity was measured using an adapted 15-item measure developed by Stoner et al. (2011). Representative items include “I am a member of this profession,” “I am like other members of this profession,” “I have a feeling of connection with this profession,” and “I display objects (e.g. bumper stickers, pins, tee-shirts, etc.) that illustrate I am a member of this profession,” and represent the construct’s four dimensions of self-categorization, goodness-of-fit, affective-attachment, and behavioral involvement, respectively.

Control variables. Extant research has emphasized the impact of mentors’ and protégés’ age and gender on mentoring dynamics (Finkelstein et al., 2003; O’Brien et al., 2010). To account for this, age and gender for both participants were included as controls. We also controlled for mentors’ experiences working with other doctoral students. Mentors reported the number of protégés they had concurrently with the focal protégé as well as the total number of dissertations chaired. These controls were included in the analysis to constrain any variance which might occur because mentors had multiple mentorships.

Results
Preliminary analysis
Frequencies and descriptive statistics were utilized to check for coding errors and outliers. Reliability analyses did not suggest the deletion of any items except as already noted on the MRQ scale. Because respondents self-reported on many of the focal constructs and items were measured in a single time period, there is a risk for common method bias. To mitigate potential effects of common method bias, we examined the correlations (Spector, 2006). As demonstrated in Table II, none of the correlations between independent variables exceed the 0.75 threshold, which is when method bias may become problematic (Tsui et al., 1995). Analysis of the correlations revealed that the control variables did not significantly correlate with the variables of interest, so they were not included in further analysis. Correlations and average variance extracted for the focal variables are presented in Table II.

Measurement model
Partial least squares (PLS) was used to test the hypothesized model (Ringle et al., 2005). PLS is a “variance based” structural equation modeling technique, which focuses on maximizing the variance in the dependent variables that is explained by independent variables and serves to minimize error (Sosik et al., 2009; Wold, 1974). In contrast, covariance-based structural equation modeling seeks to minimize the discrepancy between the data and the theoretically driven hypotheses. PLS is appropriate in larger more complex models (Fornell and Bookstein, 1982; Fornell et al., 1990; Wold, 1985) and tends to be robust in small sample sizes (Cassel et al., 1999; Chin, 1998a; Fornell and Bookstein, 1982). PLS is oriented toward maximizing the variance in the dependent variables which is explained by independent variables. PLS is also more robust to multicollinearity than other analysis techniques (Graber et al., 2002). PLS “is a powerful and legitimate means of testing nomological networks of variables based on theory in the early stage of development” (Sosik et al., 2009, p. 7), and is an appropriate
### Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mentor perception of MRQ</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Protégé perception of MRQ</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mentor perceptions of vocational support provided</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mentor perceptions of psychosocial support provided</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Protégé perception of vocational support received</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Protégé perception of psychosocial support received</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mentor professional identity</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Protégé professional identity</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mentor behavioral integrity (P)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.72***</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Protégé behavioral integrity (M)</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mentor political skill</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Protégé political skill</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mentor gender (1 = M, 2 = F)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Protégé gender (1 = M, 2 = F)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mentor age</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Protégé age</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mentors’ number of dissertations chaired</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mentors’ number of current protégés</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.130.31** n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** M, mentor reports on protégé; P, protégé reports on mentor. Two-tailed tests, pairwise deletion, range of n = 34-207. Cronbach’s α reported on diagonal. All constructs are self-report unless noted. *p < 0.10; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01
technique for this data due to the large number of mismatched responses. The data collection effort resulted in 100 matched pairs with an additional 111 single respondents. The bootstrapping estimation technique informs on the significance and stability of parameter estimates by adjusting for error and missing values (Chin, 1998a).

A measurement model was used to assess the psychometric properties of the 12 latent constructs and their indicators. All items were simultaneously tested and restricted to load only on their assigned factors. The internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the model also were assessed. Construct reliability was estimated using the Fornell and Larcker (1981) method. Per Nunnally (1978), construct reliability for each dimension exceeded the 0.70 threshold (range of \( \alpha = 0.92 \) to 0.99). Convergent validity was established because average variance extracted for all variables was > 0.50 threshold (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Discriminant validity was evaluated by comparing the average variance extracted for each construct with the shared variance between the constructs. All average variances extracted were greater than the observed shared variances indicating discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

**Parameter estimates and hypotheses**

The hypothesized model was tested as a whole \((n = 211)\) using the PLS technique followed by a bootstrapping estimation method with 500 iterations in SmartPLS 2.0 (Ringle et al., 2005). Table III outlines the PLS results, showing the completely standardized path coefficients and \(R^2\) values.

The results (see Figure 2) show support for several hypotheses, including H1a, H1b, H2a, H2b, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H8 with parameter estimates of 0.94, 0.96, 0.88, 0.87, 0.89, 0.70, 0.76, 0.56, 0.34, and 0.13, respectively. In terms of variance explained, the endogenous variables featured \(R^2\) values ranging from 0.49 for protégé professional identification to 0.92 for mentor perceptions of psychosocial support provided (see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>SMART PLS CS</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mentor political skill (\rightarrow) mentor perceptions of MRQ</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Protégé behavioral integrity (\rightarrow) mentor perceptions of MRQ</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Protégé political skill (\rightarrow) mentor perceptions of MRQ</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mentor political skill (\rightarrow) protégé perceptions of MRQ</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentor behavioral integrity (\rightarrow) protégé perceptions of MRQ</td>
<td>0.76***</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Protégé political skill (\rightarrow) protégé perceptions of MRQ</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Mentor perceptions of MRQ (\rightarrow) mentor perceptions of vocational support provided</td>
<td>0.94***</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Mentor perceptions of MRQ (\rightarrow) mentor perceptions of psychosocial support provided</td>
<td>0.96***</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Protégé perceptions of MRQ (\rightarrow) protégé perception of vocational support received</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Protégé perceptions of MRQ (\rightarrow) protégé perception of psychosocial support received</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mentor perceptions of MRQ (\rightarrow) mentor professional identity</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Protégé perceptions of MRQ (\rightarrow) protégé professional identity</td>
<td>0.70***</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** CS, completely standardized path coefficient. *\( p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01**
Table III. These values are moderate to strong; suggesting that a substantial amount of variance is explained by the hypothesized model (Chin, 1998b).

Discussion
This research sought to understand the role of MRQ in academic mentorships, and to assess empirically mentor and protégé characteristics that might enhance MRQ. MRQ, the affect-based perceptions held by mentoring partners, was considered conceptually distinct from more established views of mentoring, which have focused on the effectiveness of mentoring support behaviors provided by mentors to protégés. Empirical results, however, did not support a clear distinction between the constructs. Results indicated that, while conceptual differences may exist, individuals closely align their affective perceptions with their perceptions of mentoring support behaviors. This supports a strong link between affect-based perceptions and actual behaviors.

Findings and conceptual contributions
In the course of this study, we identified a number of important relationships. First, both mentors' and protégés' perceptions of MRQ predicted the extent to which mentoring support behaviors were reported (H1a, H1b and H2a, H2b). High levels of MRQ for mentors were directly linked to increased provision of mentoring support behaviors. Similarly, protégés who reported strong MRQ also reported receiving high levels of mentoring support behaviors.

Further, professional identification was supported as an outcome of MRQ for mentors and protégés (H3 and H4). This implies that through quality mentoring relationships, protégés come to socially identify with their chosen profession. Further, mentors' sense of identification is reinforced by providing mentoring support to protégés. Identification is an on-going process that enables mentors and protégés to bond within the context of the profession (Foote, 1951) and gain insight into their individual roles (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). Moving forward, researchers should more closely examine the specific intermediating linkages between professional identification and mentoring.

Regarding the proposed antecedents to MRQ, strong relationships were found between behavioral integrity and perceptions of MRQ (H4 and H5). Specifically, mentors who reported their protégés as having strong behavioral integrity were more likely to perceive high levels of MRQ. Protégés also experienced more MRQ in instances when
their mentors were rated higher on behavioral integrity. Behavioral integrity has been linked with increased organizational citizenship and decreased deviance in the workplace (Dineen et al., 2006). This finding has implications for selection of mentors and protégés, such that organizations or individuals wishing to facilitate mentoring programs should consider potential participants’ levels of behavioral integrity before inviting them to join a mentoring program. These findings also expand the literature by considering the role that behavioral integrity plays in developing and maintaining close work relationships.

Research has demonstrated that politically skilled individuals are more able to neutralize stressful situations, develop and maintain interpersonal relationships, and exert influence over others in the work environment (Ferris et al., 2007). This study found that mentors who are politically skilled are more likely to report higher levels of MRQ ($H_7$ and $H_8$). Further, protégés who perceive themselves as politically skilled, report higher levels of MRQ. Thus, the findings supported prior research suggesting that politically skilled individuals are more comfortable during interpersonal interactions, and experience less strain when it becomes necessary to enact influence on their environments (Hochwarter et al., 2007). Politically skilled mentors and protégés likely have the social astuteness and interpersonal influence style necessary to not only create and maintain strong MRQ, but also to survive less than optimal mentorships with resiliency.

Interestingly, mentors’ perceptions of their own political skill were not associated with protégés perceptions of MRQ. Similarly, protégés’ perceptions of their own political skill were not associated with mentors’ perceptions of MRQ. Thus, it appears individuals’ perceptions of their own political skill are highly associated with perceived MRQ. It would be interesting to examine whether perceptions of political skill for the relevant other is associated with MRQ. Specifically, future research should examine mentor (protégé) perceptions of protégé (mentor) political skill on MRQ.

**Strengths and limitations**

The main strength and contribution of this study is to highlight the crucial and dynamic role of interpersonal relationships within the mentoring context. Mentorships consist of two individuals who may be incredibly different on a host of dispositional traits, goal orientations, and perceptions of work but have an inherent need to work together to prepare the protégé for success. Much of the extant mentoring research has focussed on the mentoring behaviors involved in molding protégés. Based on this strong foundation, the current study sought to expand our understanding of the inner, affect-based workings of mentorships.

The study of MRQ represents a new characterization of mentorships. Focusing on MRQ as a higher order construct limited the scope such that dimensionality of MRQ could not also be addressed. Construct development supported two dimensions to MRQ: connection to mentorship and perception of other. Connection to mentorship indicates participants’ satisfaction and engagement with the mentoring relationship, while perception of other deals with feelings of trust, loyalty, and respect attributed to the other. Future studies might explore antecedents and consequences which differentially predict or result from these separate dimensions.

Another important strength of this research is the matched dyadic data. In recent research, there have been numerous calls for studies which assess mentoring issues from both mentors’ and protégés’ points of view (Eby et al., 2008; Ragins, 1997). Examining dual perspectives improves our understanding of the interpersonal dynamics of mentoring relationships.
Practical contributions
The current study provides insights into the dynamics between mentors and protégés. New knowledge about mentoring is useful to managers because they often facilitate organizationally designated mentoring programs and serve as mentors. While the terms manager and mentor are not synonymous, the roles often overlap (Booth, 1996). The findings demonstrate that protégés’ perceptions of mentors’ behavioral integrity influences MRQ. Thus, practicing transparency and behaving in accord with stated values can help develop strong relationships and lead to positive supervisory mentorships.

Another key finding supports the generally positive effects of mentoring on mentors, protégés, and the organization at large. Individuals who felt their mentoring relationships had a strong interpersonal quality were more likely to report an open flow of mentoring support behaviors from mentors to protégés. Mentoring support behaviors, which include vocational and psychosocial support, are keys to reaping success from these mentorships. Strong relational quality helps to ensure that protégés recognize support behaviors provided by mentors which may be less salient or have more distal consequences. For example, mentors may provide vocational support by telling others in the organization or field about certain qualities and successes of their protégés. When MRQ is high, communication within the mentorship will be stronger, so protégés are more likely to be told about this type of support and understand how it will impact their careers. In sum, managers should seek to encourage mentors and protégés to develop strong relational quality as key component of successful mentorships.

Conclusion
The objective of this research was to gain insights into the role and importance of MRQ in academic mentorships. We analyzed the proposed model using data from a sample of matched mentor-protégé dyads. Although not all hypotheses were empirically supported, the findings from this study highlight important areas of future research which should serve to further explore these relationships. Mentoring relationships are inherently interactive, and the extended study of political skill, behavioral integrity, and other constructs of interpersonal influence and style should provide a better understanding of the drivers of mentoring quality and success.
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**Appendix. Mentoring relational quality scale**

I feel a strong sense of loyalty to my mentor.
Communication seems good within my mentorship.
I feel a sense of belonging in my mentorship.
I feel very well connected in my relationship with my mentor.
I find my mentorship full of meaning and purpose.
I am enthusiastic about my mentorship.
I am very satisfied with the mentoring relationship my mentor and I have developed.
My mentor and I enjoy a high-quality relationship.
I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my mentor.
I am proud to be mentored by this person.
I like my mentor very much.
I respect my mentor.
My mentor is trustworthy.
I feel that I can trust my mentor completely.
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