National Defence / Défense nationale

Canadian
Forces
College

Collège
des
Forces
Canadiennes

ACCELERATING FUTURE LEADER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A MENTORING CONSTRUCT IN THE MARITIME SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE OCCUPATION

Lieutenant-Commander J. Jeffrey Hutchinson

JCSP 37

Master of Defence Studies

Disclaimer

PCEMI 37

Maîtrise en études de la défense

Avertissement

Canada

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE - COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 37 - PCEMI 37

MASTER OF DEFENCE STUDIES - MAITRISE EN ÉTUDES DE LA DÉFENSE

ACCELERATING FUTURE LEADER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A MENTORING CONSTRUCT IN THE MARITIME SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE OCCUPATION

By Lieutenant-Command J. Jeffrey Hutchinson
par la Capitaine de corvette J. Jeffrey Hutchinson

Word Count: 18102

Compte de mots : 18102

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I suppose it only makes sense to start at the beginning. While awaiting the commencement of classes at the Canadian Forces College, I quite accidently happened upon W. Brad Johnson and Gene R. Anderson's article, *Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions and Recommendations*. In reading this excellent article, I was struck by the maturity of mentoring application in the United States military and by how far I perceived that the Canadian Forces, and the Navy in particular, lagged in taking advantage of mentoring as a tool for the development of its officers. More specifically, it was apparent to me that mentoring, coupled to the Navy's Naval Succession Planning Process, had the potential to accelerate the senior leader development it so desired to achieve. So, for providing the spark, the idea, for this project, I must thank Dr. Brad Johnson and Gene Anderson.

I must also thank those who assisted me in arriving at a reasonable end product. Dr. Daniel Lagacé-Roy as my thesis advisor was instrumental in providing me guidance and feedback throughout the process which allowed me to focus my thoughts. Similarly, I must thank Lieutenant-Colonel Glenn Taylor who provided much appreciated and necessary editorial support.

Lastly, and most importantly, I must thank my wife, Hye-Jin Hutchinson. While completing a project of this magnitude is certainly not easy, the effort is insignificant to the challenges of raising a baby on your own. For her understanding when I wasn't able to come home to help, for her encouragement when I couldn't

encourage myself and for her constant positive support throughout the process, I will

be forever grateful and indebted.

CONTENTS

List of Tables

ACCELERATING FUTURE LEADER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A MENTORING CONSTRUCT IN THE MARITIME SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE OCCUPATION

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The Navy is looking to produce a different type of officer, one who has been prepared for institutional leadership.[1]

Vice-Admiral Drew Robertson, Chief of Maritime Staff, 2008

Then Chief of Maritime Staff (CMS), Vice-Admiral (VAdm) Drew Robertson, directed the initiation of a Navy Succession Planning (NSP) Process in August 2008. The intent of the NSP Process was to

> . . . effect an objective assessment of the long term potential of naval officers to perform in Command and senior appointments, and then to ensure that those identified are properly developed and prepared to deal with the complex strategic, force development, operations, fiscal and human resource, and change management challenges that will confront them in the future.[2]

If this then was the desired end state, the way proposed to achieve that end was the selection of appropriate candidates and to provide those candidates with the leader development required, through "command appointments, professional development opportunities and key employment experiences."[3] By this methodology, sequenced appropriately, candidates showing the aptitude, performance and potential to become

---

[1] Vice-Admiral D. W. Robertson, "Navy Succession Planning Process - Interim Approach" (Chief of Maritime Staff: 3371-5000-1 (CMS/RDIMS #155441), National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, 18 August 2008), C-2.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1.

future institutional leaders in the Navy and Canadian Forces (CF) would be prepared

through the four traditional pillars of professional development: training, experience,

education and self-development. Generally, Command appointments and key

employment in operational and strategic staff positions provide experience. At the

level with which this paper is concerned, that of a Lieutenant-Commander (LCdr)

transitioning into Developmental Period (DP) 3, the Canadian Forces College Joint

Command and Staff Program (JCSP) provides training and education. The self-

development portion is primarily left to the discretion and the responsibility of the

member.

What was absent from the Navy's developmental plan as it was expressed in the

2008 *Navy Succession Planning Process – Interim Approach* was mention of

mentoring as a means by which potential future institutional leaders can be prepared

for senior responsibility in the Navy and the CF. In the CMS's 2009 *Navy Succession*

Planning Process/Policy, VAdm P. Dean McFadden directed that

> . . . once identified, those officers [selected by the Succession Planning
> Process] can be deliberately mentored and managed…thus better
> preparing them for successful fulfillment of senior command, staff and
> key strategic-level appointments in the future.[4]

In direction provided for 2010, mention of mentoring as a means to shape and groom

future leaders was again absent.

It can be argued that mentorship is the doctrinal leadership responsibility of all

leaders within the CF organization and therefore it need not be explicitly expressed in

direction to NSP Boards or explicitly identified as one of the ways by which the Navy

---

[4] Vice-Admiral P. Dean McFadden, "Naval Succession Planning Process/Policy" (Chief of Maritime Staff: 3371-5075-1 (D HR Strat/RDIMS #182365), National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, 19 October 2009), 1.

intends to achieve its aim. CF leadership doctrine as stated in *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* and *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution* both designate mentoring as a primary responsibility of all leaders within the organization. As expressed in *Conceptual Foundations*, critical to leading the people is a requirement to ensure member well-being and effectiveness. In order to contribute to this effectiveness dimension, leaders "mentor people in apprenticeship positions and challenging assignments, and encourage and support subordinate participation in educational, professional, and personal-growth activities over the career span."[5] It is reasonable therefore to assume that senior leaders, to whom NSP candidates are subordinate in "command appointments, professional development opportunities and key employment experiences," would mentor in accordance with CF leadership doctrine.

In *Leading the Institution*, the second volume published on leadership by the CF, the value of mentoring in ensuring leadership succession is similarly emphasized. It stated that "through mentoring, the wisdom and experience of institutional leaders is passed to others, facilitating personal and professional growth for those being mentored" and further that mentoring "needs to be viewed not only as a responsibility but as an obligation."[6] This assertion is supported by research conducted by J.J. Bennett for her Master's thesis, *Leadership Challenges of the 21st Century: Effective Professional Development of Senior Canadian Forces Leaders*, wherein a Senior

---

[5] Canada. Department of National Defence, *A-PA-005-000/AP-004 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* (Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2005), 50.

[6] Canada. Department of National Defence, *A-PA-005-000/AP-006 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution* (Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2007), 136.

Maritime Surface Officer survey respondent expressed that "if you haven't served as a mentor than you have failed as a senior leader in this organization."[7] Again, it is therefore reasonable to argue that mentoring need not be specifically mentioned in NSP Board guidance.

Leading the Institution goes on however to acknowledge that "often mentoring does not attain the level of implementation that it should. Frequently leaders are insufficiently familiar with the process and its value."[8] Generally this appears to be the case. That is not to say however that mentoring is not occurring in the Navy. It would be difficult to refute the fact that spontaneous relationships (called informal mentoring) develop between supervisors and subordinates. These mentoring exchanges, called dyads, can develop into long term, meaningful and fulfilling relationships. However, given the acknowledged benefits of mentoring to protégé, mentor and the organization alike, coupled with the Navy's desire to take a more proactive approach to developing the institutional leaders of tomorrow, mentoring relationships cannot be allowed to occur only by good luck or chance. This assertion is emphasized by Cheryl and Scott Wright in their article *The Role of Mentors in the Career Development of Young Professionals* where one mentor warned that "[b]y not mentoring, we are wasting talent.

---

[7] Jennifer Jane Bennett, "Leadership Challenges of the 21st Century: Effective Professional Development of Senior Canadian Forces Leaders" (Victoria: Master of Arts in Leadership and Training, Royal Roads University, 2005), 93.

[8] Canada. Department of National Defence, *A-PA-005-000/AP-006 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*, 136.

We educate, and train, but don't nurture. We should be concerned with capitalizing on the young professional's talent."[9]

With this in mind, it is the objective of this paper to demonstrate that a Navy facilitated semi-formal mentoring program, when coupled with the significant initial successes achieved by the NSP Process, will better ensure that the Navy receives the best product from those individuals that it designates as candidates to become the next intuitional leaders of the Navy and Canadian Forces by accelerating their development.

While the NSP Process in its latest iteration provides for succession planning of all Captains (Navy), Maritime Surface and Subsurface (MARS) and Naval Engineer Commanders, MARS LCdrs, and Non-Commissioned Members (NCMs) from the rank of Petty Officer First Class to Chief Petty Officer First Class, this paper will focus specifically on command stream MARS LCdrs. The reason for this is fourfold. First, the CMS has reinforced that where the NSP Process seeks to identify potential senior leaders for the Navy and CF, "the longstanding practice of selecting of our most senior leaders from the sea-going command stream will not change."[10] Second, it was felt that the variance of individual requirements across the breadth of ranks served by the NSP Process would make it practically impossible to treat the subject with any degree of focus for all ranks and occupations. Third, as suggested

---

[9] Cheryl A. Wright and Scott D. Wright, "The Role of Mentors in the Career Development of Young Professionals," *Family Relations*, no. 26 (1987), 207, [journal on-line]; available from http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?hid=119&sid=e99aa030-83aa-4b91-b2af-2916a0a7c40a%40sessionmgr110&vid=4; Internet; accessed 2 March 2011.

[10] Vice-Admiral P. Dean McFadden, "Naval Officer Career Progression" (Chief of Maritime Staff: 3371-5075-1 (DGNP/RDIMS #182808), National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, 19 October 2008), 2.

by Jennifer Bennett, "[e]asing the transition of military senior leaders to strategic leadership means being proactive in preparing potential leaders at earlier stages of their career beginning with the rank of Major [(LCdr)] at DP3 so they are better prepared for future responsibilities."[11] Mentoring LCdrs will provide both career and psychosocial development to officers transitioning from leading the people to leading the institution so that they have the greatest likelihood of having "the right job knowledge, skill set and experience, at the right time, to fill any senior leadership position."[12] Lastly, evidence suggests that "individuals who have previously been in a mentoring relationship are more willing to serve as mentors than those who have not."[13] Introducing LCdrs to mentoring constructs at DP3 will serve to provide a basis of potential future mentors for the Navy so that any mentoring initiative may be perpetuated over time.

To emphasize how important such an initiative could be for leader development, it is important to stress that Maritime Command is behind the power curve with respect to implementing a mentoring program to its benefit. Such an initiative would only mirror what had already been implemented in nearly a third of

---

[11] Bennett, *Leadership Challenges of the 21st Century: Effective Professional Development of Senior Canadian Forces Leaders*, 114.

[12] Vice-Admiral P. Dean McFadden, "Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010" (Chief of Maritime Staff: 3371-5075-1 (D HR Strat/RDIMS #203510), National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, 19 October 2010), C-1.

[13] Thomas W. Dougherty, Daniel B. Turban and Dana L. Haggard, "Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees," in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, eds. Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007), 146 and Belle Rose Ragins and Terri A. Scandura, "Burden Or Blessing? Expected Costs and Benefits of Being a Mentor," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 20, no. 4 (Jul, 1999) [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=43824132&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 2 February 2011.

major civilian companies, who by 1989 had formal mentoring programs in place.[14]
The recent perceived successes of the NSP Process indicate that it is providing a
better prepared officer for employment in the Navy and the CF. Now is the time to
leverage off that success and introduce mentoring as another means to achieve the
Navy's objective. The result can only be a corps of younger officers even better
prepared to take on institutional leadership responsibilities in a challenging and fast
changing post-millennial organization.

In order to demonstrate the potential benefits of marrying a facilitated mentoring
program to the developmental process currently employed by the NSP Process this
paper will explore the nature of mentoring, general roles and responsibilities, types of
mentoring including degrees of formalization, and the demonstrated benefits it
provides to protégés, mentors and the organization so as to demonstrate how it may
contribute to officer professional development. This paper will then examine
mentoring initiatives that have been undertaken in another military organization to
determine what best practices have been implemented. It will broadly examine
mentoring intent in the forces of the United States (US) with particular focus on
implementation in the US Army. Through the use of peer sample survey research, the
author will demonstrate that mentoring relationships do not in fact exist widely in the
Navy and therefore that the Navy is not receiving the potential benefits for individual
careers or for the organization. Finally this paper will revisit the intent of the NSP

---

[14] Belle Rose Ragins, John L. Cotton and Janice S. Miller, "Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of
Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes," *The
Academy of Management Journal* 43, no. 6 (2000), 1177, [journal on-line]; available from
http://www.jstor.org/stable/1556344; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

Process and propose a mentoring program that may be imbedded in the process as a

means to better achieve its aim.

CHAPTER 2 – THE NATURE OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS IN THE WORKPLACE

BACKGROUND

Mentoring as a concept, although based in antiquity and certainly present as a tool for personal development since its first mention in Homer's *Odyssey*, has become a topic of considerable study. Mentoring relationships are found in most all professions including science (e.g. – Sigmund Freud mentored Carl Jung), entertainment (e.g. – Duke Ellington mentored Tony Bennett) and the military (e.g. – General John J. Pershing mentored General George C. Marshal who in turn mentored General and later President Dwight D. Eisenhower).[15] However, despite the suggested existence of mentoring since at least the 12th century BC, it remains a topic that has only recently been tackled with any real academic rigour.[16] Even after approximately thirty years of study, questions remain as to the myriad effects of mentoring, particularly in the workplace. It is not surprising then that the precise definition of what mentoring is remains a subject of some confusion.[17] Therefore, the social construct is poorly understood by most people in various professions, including the

---

[15] Nate Hunsinger Major, "Mentorship: Growing Company Grade Officers," *Military Review* 84, no. 5 (2004), 80, [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=737515611&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010 and Lillian T. Eby, Jean E. Rhodes and Tammy D. Allen, "Definition and Evolution of Mentoring," in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, eds. Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 1st ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 7.

[16] Most early work regarding the nature of mentoring traces its roots to Levinson, et al.'s *Seasons of a Man's Life*, 1978. The second influential early work, and the one used as a primary reference herein, as it was the first and most comprehensive view offered on mentoring in an organizational context, is Kathy E. Kram's *Mentoring at Work,* 1985.

[17] Eby, Rhodes and Allen, *Definition and Evolution of Mentoring*, 16. As an example, Eby, Rhodes and Allen cite the work of Maryann Jacobi (1991) who found 15 different definitions of mentoring in her review of literature pertaining to mentoring in undergraduate programs.

profession of arms. This undoubtedly contributed (and still contributes) a great deal

to the less than satisfactory implementation of mentoring in the CF and the lack of

understanding by leaders, as expressed in *Leading the Institution*.

MENTORING DEFINED

Kathy E. Kram in her seminal 1985 work, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental*

Relationships in Organizational Life defines mentoring simply 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."[18]

Leading the Institution refines the definition to include amplification on the nature

of the mentoring relationship. Mentoring is defined as:

> A supportive learning relationship, based upon mutual commitment,
> trust and respect, between an individual "mentor" who shares his or her
> knowledge, experience and insights with a less-experienced person, a
> "mentee," who is willing and ready to benefit from this exchange.[19]

Differing only slightly is the definition provided by Daniel Lagacé-Roy and Janine

Knackstedt in their *Mentoring Handbook* prepared for use by leaders in the CF in

2007 wherein they introduce a further defining factor, that of duration:

> Mentoring is a professional relationship in which a more experienced
> person (a mentor) voluntarily shares knowledge, insights, and wisdom
> with a less-experienced person (a mentee) who wishes to benefit from

---

[18] Kathy E. Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1985), 2.

[19] Canada. Department of National Defence, *A-PA-005-000/AP-006 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*, 15.

> that exchange. It is a medium to long-term learning relationship founded on respect, honesty, trust and mutual goals.[20]

It should be noted that none of the definitions provided explicitly refer to rank or hierarchical status within the organization in defining the mentor's relationship to the mentee or protégé. Kram, in her research for *Mentoring at Work* identified peer mentoring as a viable mentoring relationship and Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt express that "[a]n effective mentor helps mentees achieve their long-term professional goals and aspirations. If an individual is able to accomplish this, s/he can be a mentor, regardless of the position in the organization."[21] This is echoed by Lillian Eby, Jean Rhodes and Tammy Allen in their work *Definition and Evolution of Mentoring* wherein they suggest that "[t]he mentor may be a peer at work, supervisor, someone else within the organization but outside the protégé's chain of command, or even an individual in another organization."[22] The *Mentoring Handbook* places the definition of Eby, Rhodes and Allen into a military context by suggesting that a mentor can range anywhere from a more senior officer to a peer, NCO or technically skilled junior NCM, dependent upon the specific needs of the protégé.[23]

---

[20] Daniel Lagacé-Roy and Lieutenant-Colonel Janine Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook* (Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2007), 5.

[21] *Ibid.*, 16.

[22] Eby, Rhodes and Allen, *Definition and Evolution of Mentoring*, 16.

[23] Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 8.

MENTORING, COACHING AND SUPERVISING: DIFFERENTIATING

Equally as problematic as trying to define mentoring is differentiating between mentoring and other closely related professional development constructs. Most prevalent amongst those found in the CF are coaching relationships, supervisory relationships and mentoring relationships.

Beverly Kaye suggests in *Coaching and Mentoring: New Twists, Old Theme – An Introduction*, that the difficulty in providing a distinct differentiation between these three developmental constructs resides in their intertwined relationship with each other.[24] By combining Kaye's definition of the nature of a managing (supervising) relationship with those proposed by Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt for coaching and mentoring, it becomes clearer that at least by their nature, roles and responsibilities, the three types of relationship can provide different aspects to the junior member of the dyad if and when they occur independently. Table 2.1 compares the characteristic elements of each relationship.

However, by examining the different characteristics of the three relationships in Table 2.1, the possibility that one or more of the positions, roles or responsibilities may be fulfilled by a single person is evident. It is conceivable that a supervisor may also fulfill roles and responsibilities inherent in coaching or mentoring relationships. It is equally possible that the junior member in these relationships may have independent seniors fulfilling each role; that of coach, mentor and supervisor. Combinations can run from a junior member taking part in three independent

---

[24] Beverly Kaye, "Coaching and Mentoring: New Twists, Old Theme - An Introduction," in *Linkage Inc.: Best Practices in Organization Development and Change*, eds. Louis Carter, David Giber and Marshall Goldsmith, 1st ed. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer, 2001), 439.

Table 2.1: Comparative Characteristics of Mentoring, Coaching and Managerial (Supervisory) Relationships

Characteristic	Mentoring Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt (2007)	Coaching Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt (2007)	Supervising/Managing Kaye (2001)
Duration	Long-term relationship usually lasting for a few years to several years.	Short-term relationship lasting until the individual acquires the skills and behaviours sought out.	*Not explicitly stated by Kaye. However, it is implicit that the relationship will endure for as long as the supervisor/subordinate relationship exists.*
Focus	Holistic: Focused on empowering the individual to build insights, self-awareness and unique ways of handling issues.	Focused on helping the individual develop specific skills or behaviours.	Responsible for the learner's performance and job success. Concerned with the learner's success on the job.
Feedback Mechanism	Mentors provide guidance in terms of leadership, career, professional and personal development.	Coaches observe the individual doing a specific task and provide objective feedback and encouragement	[Manager is able] to provide feedback on an on-going basis so the learner knows how he or she is performing in relation to goals and objectives. Fosters accountability: responsible for monitoring performance and progress through appraisals and other formal systems.
Drivers for Relationship Initiation	Mentors are sought when individuals: Are keen to increase the pace of their learning; Recognize the need for constructive challenges; Want to build and follow through personal learning plans; Want to explore a wide range of issues as they emerge and become more important.	Coaches are sought when individuals: Are concerned about some aspect of their performance; Want to make some specific changes in behaviour; Want to acquire some specific skill.	*Although not specifically stated by Kaye, it is implicit that in most major organizations a supervisor/subordinate relationship will exist.*

Source: Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 6 and Kaye, *Coaching and Mentoring*, 439.

relationships to a single relationship that fulfills all or some of the roles and responsibilities from each of the relationship models, with possible combinations in between.

While Table 2.1, and Kaye in her assertion that the three relationships may be intertwined, allow for the possibility of a single person fulfilling all senior roles in the relationships, that is not to suggest that this is necessarily ideal nor that it will automatically work.

FUNCTIONS IN A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

It should be noted however that authors such as Kram, in particular in the model of mentoring functions Kram proposed in *Mentoring at Work*, suggest that coaching is a function that contributes to a prototypical mentoring relationship.[25] It is therefore conceivable that a junior member may have a separate coach and supervisor, or mentor and supervisor, but if the member has an ideal mentoring relationship, it is likely that the mentor also functions as a coach.

Coaching is only one of nine mentoring functions identified by Kram. The functional model proposed by her has been widely adopted by researchers and mentoring scholars and is the structure on which much subsequent research has been based.[26] It will therefore be used here as the definitive description of mentoring functions.

---

[25] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 23, 28.

[26] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 140-142.

Kram identified two broad categories into which mentoring functions can be grouped: career functions and psychosocial functions. Career functions are those elements of a relationship that contribute primarily to the protégé becoming more familiar with the organization and to preparing for advancement. Psychosocial functions are those that enhance the protégé's sense of competence, self-identity and effectiveness.[27] Kram notes that it is only "[w]hen a hierarchical relationship provides all of these functions, [that] it best approximates the prototype of a mentor relationship."[28] Table 2.2 below lists each of the nine functions by category. Each will be expanded and explained in turn.

Table 2.2: Mentoring Functions by Category

Career Functions	Psychosocial Function
Sponsorship	Role Modelling
Exposure and Visibility	Acceptance and Confirmation
Coaching	Counselling
Protection	Friendship
Challenging Assignments	

Source: Kram, *Mentoring at Work*, 23.

Career Functions

Generally, in accordance with Kram's model, career functions are made possible through the mentor's seniority, experience, rank or influence within the organization. Career functions serve each the protégé and the mentor. The protégé is provided career assistance in acclimatizing to the organization, gaining exposure and obtaining promotions. The mentor is provided respect by his peers, superiors and

---

[27] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 22.

[28] *Ibid.*, 23.

subordinates by demonstrating a willingness to develop junior personnel on behalf of the organization.[29] The five career functions are sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments.

Sponsorship

Kram suggests that a mentor's public sponsorship of the protégé is essential to the advancement of the protégé's career. Such sponsorship can occur at formal meetings or in informal discussions with the mentor's peers, superiors or subordinates. The protégé's career can also be affected through indirect sponsorship or association; through the knowledge that the more senior, experienced or more powerful mentor acts as mentor to the protégé, the protégé can gain "reflected power" that can contribute to promotion or beneficial lateral moves.[30] The sponsorship function may also benefit the mentor. The sponsor of a protégé that goes on to prove themselves in the positions or role for which they were nominated will be seen by senior management as having good judgement. This is however a double-edged sword. Having nominated a protégé who subsequently performs poorly can reflect badly on the mentor, thereby placing into question his credibility and judgement.

Exposure and Visibility

The exposure and visibility function involves purposefully assigning tasks and responsibilities to a protégé that will ensure he or she is exposed and made visible to,

[29] *Ibid.*, 25.

[30] *Ibid.*, 25.

through written work and personal contact, other influential, powerful and high

ranking individuals in the organization.[31] Through exposure and visibility, the

protégé is able to gain contact with personnel at higher levels of the organization. As

Kram relates, the function "not only makes an individual visible to others who may

influence his organizational fate, but it also exposes the individual to future

opportunities."[32] As mentioned previously in discussion on the sponsorship function,

the mentor may be reticent to provide the exposure and visibility function due to

potential negative consequences for the mentor such as protégé failure. Providing the

protégé exposure and visibility and having that protégé subsequently fail to impress

the targeted senior manager can result in the mentor losing legitimacy and reputation.

Similarly, a mentor may be more concerned with the advancement of his own career

and may choose to reserve such opportunities for his own benefit.

Coaching

        To reiterate some aspects of coaching that have previously been outlined in

Table 2.1, coaching involves enhancement of the protégé's knowledge base and skills

in the interest of accomplishing a specific goal or modifying a particular behaviour.

Where Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt focussed primarily on skill and behavioural

benefits, Kram suggests that there are additional benefits to be gained from the

coaching function. Mentors are able to provide protégés knowledge, advice and

understanding of the informal and political processes of an organization that will

---

[31] *Ibid*., 27.

[32] *Ibid*., 27.

affect their career. Kram offers that "[o]ften, coaching involves sharing a senior

person's understanding of the important players [in an organization] – who can be

trusted, who has the power, and who is likely to support or attack in a particular

situation."[33] That is not to say however that coaching is without its risks. The

protégé must always keep in mind that the information and advice offered by the

mentor is simply a reflection of one person's perspective. For the mentor, the

coaching function ensures that the mentor's views are carried on by the next

generation. Just as for the protégé, this comes with risk to the organization; the

viewpoint of the mentor may have diverged from that of the organization over time,

particularly in today's world where significant change and transformation are taking

place. The view passed on by the mentor can lead to stagnation in the organization as

new generations are provided obsolete knowledge, understanding, behaviours and

skills.

Protection

        Protection, as described by Kram, is for all intents and purposes the antithesis

of the functions of sponsorship and exposure and visibility. The mentor is able to

shield or caution the protégé from exposure to situations that may not benefit him or

her. Like coaching, the protection function is not without risks. On the one hand, it

can prevent the protégé from being exposed to situations they are not prepared for or

equipped to manage. On the other, if over-emphasized, it can prevent the protégé

---

[33] *Ibid*., 29.

from being exposed to challenging situations that might contribute to personal growth

and development.[34]

Challenging Assignments

This function is characterized by the assignment of difficult tasks to the

protégé by the mentor and is normally only found in those relationships where the

mentor is also a supervisor. It is similar to the coaching function. In the case of the

challenging assignments function however, the protégé is developing not through the

provision of knowledge, advice or skills by the mentor but through experience gained

from completing difficult jobs. The mentor provides ongoing support and feedback

on performance.[35] In reviewing the roles and responsibilities of the

supervisor/manager offered by Kaye in Table 2.1 they appear distinctly similar to the

elements of the challenging assignments function. It is only in this instance, where

the mentor is also a supervisor and is exercising the challenging assignments

function, that one individual can fulfill all of the roles and responsibilities of coach,

mentor and supervisor as outlined in Table 2.1.

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 29-30.

[35] *Ibid.*, 31.

Psychosocial Functions

Functions within the psychosocial category are those functions that "enhance an individual's sense of competence, identity and effectiveness in a professional role."[36] These are distinctly different from career functions in a number of ways. Firstly, the benefits of psychosocial functions tend to have impact outside the workplace. Second, where career functions can depend very heavily on the power, influence, experience and rank of the mentor, psychosocial functions depend more directly on the health of the interpersonal relationship between the mentor and protégé. Lastly, whereas career functions contribute to the protégé's relationship with the organization, psychosocial functions contribute to the protégé's sense of self and his or her relationship to others within and outside the organization.[37] The four functions that make up the psychosocial category are role modelling, acceptance and confirmation, counselling and friendship.

Role Modelling

Role modelling as a mentoring function occurs when a protégé emulates the model of behaviour, attitudes and values exhibited by their mentor. It can be both explicit and implicit in its nature whereby the mentor may not be fully aware of the example he or she is providing for the junior member. Similarly, the protégé may be unaware of how much they are being affected by the example set by the mentor. As Kram suggests, the identification process can be complex. The protégé may seek to

---

[36] *Ibid.*, 32.

[37] *Ibid.*, 32.

emulate certain aspects of the mentor's behaviour while rejecting other aspects.

Throughout the process, the protégé, by observing the mentor, is able to gain a better

understanding of themselves by identifying what aspects he or she has chosen to

emulate and which to reject and why. The role modelling relationship can be

beneficial for both protégé and mentor. The protégé "discovers valued parts of self

by identifying with the senior person [mentor], and the senior person rediscovers

valued parts of self in observing the extent to which these parts are incorporated by

his or her junior colleague."[38]

Terri A. Scandura in her 1992 work *Mentorship and Career Mobility: An

Empirical Investigation* suggests that role modelling is not a sub-function of the

psychosocial category but a standalone function.[39] This makes some logical sense

when the nature of this function is considered. Role modelling or emulation is likely

to take place regardless of whether the mentoring relationship is providing career or

psychosocial functions to the protégé and can have effects in both the career and

psychosocial domains.

Acceptance and Confirmation

The acceptance and confirmation function in a mentoring relationship can be

particularly rewarding both for protégé and mentor. Acceptance and confirmation

speaks to the support and encouragement provided by the mentor to the protégé as the

---

[38] *Ibid*., 34.

[39] Terri A. Scandura, "Mentorship and Career Mobility: An Empirical Investigation," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13, no. 2 (1992), 169, [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?index=0&did=393034611&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1299079452&clientId=1711; Internet; accessed 2 March 2011.

relationship matures in the workplace. In relationships where there is a great deal of trust between protégé and mentor, protégés have demonstrated a greater willingness to take risks in the organization and to try new ways of dealing with situations with an understanding that they will remain accepted by their mentors. The mentor also benefits from the relationship as they receive acceptance and confirmation from the protégé of the value of the knowledge, experience and skill of the mentor. This can be particularly rewarding for mentors late in their careers when the mentor's other sources of validation, promotion for instance, may no longer be reasonably available to them.[40]

Counselling

The counselling function is one familiar to most people in one sense or another. As it is defined by Kram, "counselling is a psychosocial function that enables an individual to explore personal concerns that may interfere with a positive sense of self in the organization."[41] With a trusted mentor, the protégé is afforded the opportunity to discuss issues that are affecting their ability to work effectively in the organization. Trust is especially important as part of the counselling function. The protégé must feel comfortable in sharing his or her doubts and fears. Any betrayal of that trust can bring the relationship to an abrupt and bitter end.

Predominantly, the issues tackled through counselling are emotional in nature; purely performance or skill related issues would more appropriately be dealt with as a

---

[40] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 35.

[41] *Ibid.*, 36.

coaching function. In a counselling relationship, the mentor provides perspective and advice gained from experience to assist the protégé in overcoming a problem. In general, the more junior member of the relationship will be concerned broadly with the interplay between the needs of the self, their careers and their family. It is the responsibility of the mentor to offer alternative perspectives, acceptance and support to the protégé so that they may approach their issues better educated. Sometimes simply the knowledge that one is not the only person or the first person to face such problems can be instrumental in allowing the protégé to shed the anxiety associated with the issue and deal with it effectively. Much like the acceptance and confirmation function, mentors who provide counselling are made to feel a valued and productive part of the organization, especially in instances where the mentor is suffering from career stagnation.

Friendship

The friendship function develops between the mentor and protégé and results in mutual liking, understanding and informal exchanges. It can make the work experience more enjoyable for both parties. Friendship affords the protégé the ability to experience a relationship wherein he or she feels more as a peer to the mentor. Normally a relationship between a junior and more senior individual in an organization would be more distant and evaluative. The opportunity to act in an informal manner with a superior allows the protégé to become more comfortable interacting with those who are more senior, more experienced or of greater rank. For the mentor, the relationship can be equally rewarding as it provides him or her the

opportunity to maintain a connection with the more youthful side of themselves.

Fears about age and obsolescence are diminished through identifying with a younger

generation. Kram warns however that there are limits to the friendship function.

Each mentor must maintain boundaries in the friendship so that they are able to

function effectively as a supervisor in the workplace.[42]

MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS – PHASES AND TYPES

In Kram's research, the eighteen mentoring relationships she studied

demonstrated similarities in chronological patterns. In examining these patterns and

the behaviours observed in each, she determined that mentoring relationships consist

of a series of four overlapping phases. They are initiation, cultivation, separation and

redefinition. Kram's model has remained the accepted phase framework amongst

researchers and is well-accepted in academic literature.[43] In order to understand the

phases of mentoring and their resultant impact on the type of mentoring relationship,

this paper will examine each phase in turn.

Initiation

The initiation phase of a mentoring relationship generally lasts between six

and twelve months. The means of initiation is what differentiates types of mentoring.

Mentoring relationships that develop naturally or spontaneously between protégé and

mentor without outside assistance are deemed to be informal mentoring

---

[42] *Ibid*., 38-39.

[43] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 143.

relationships.[44] They are "not managed, structured, nor formally recognized by the organization."[45] The perceived benefits to be gained from mentoring in the workplace have given rise to a newer type of mentoring where relationships are initiated by the organization, usually through matching protégés to perspective mentors.[46] These are termed formal mentoring relationships and are usually characterized by organizationally mandated or facilitated matching, structured coordination, funding, and education for mentor and protégé and outcome measures of effectiveness. Other types of mentoring relationships include semi-formal mentoring, which Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt suggest is similar to formal mentoring but with natural rather than mandated initiation.[47] Terri Scandura in *Perspectives on Mentoring* advocates leader-supported mentoring whereby the leader of an organization, rather than forcing mentoring relationships to occur, encourages their formation through education of the organization's personnel on the benefits of mentoring.[48] Table 2.3 below summarizes the four broad types of mentoring in a continuum from most formal and structured to least formal.

---

[44] Eby, Rhodes and Allen, *Definition and Evolution of Mentoring*, 12.

[45] Georgia T. Chao, Pat M. Walz and Philip D. Gardner, "Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Non-mentored Counterparts," *Personnel Psychology* 45, no. 3 (Autumn, 1992) [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=742724&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 28 January 2011.

[46] Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1177.; Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 7. and Eby, Rhodes and Allen, *Definition and Evolution of Mentoring*, 12.

[47] Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 7.

[48] Terri A. Scandura and others, "Perspectives on Mentoring," *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 17, no. 3 (1996) [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=117542758&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 2 February 2011.

Table 2.3 – Mentoring Relationship Types

Level of Formality	Type	Initiation Mechanism	Program Control
Most Formal ↓ Least Formal	**Formal**	Organizationally mandated or facilitated.	Normally coordinated, funded and measured for effectiveness.
	Semi-Formal	Naturally occurring.	May be coordinated, possibly funded.
	Leader-Supported	Naturally occurring.	Leader encouraged through awareness. Not controlled.
	Informal	Naturally occurring.	Not controlled.

Source: Lagace-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 7-8; Scandura, et al., *Perspectives on Mentoring.*

In informal mentoring relationships, Kram found that the initiation phase is characterized by both members of the potential relationship having extremely positive expectations "which encourage an ongoing and significant relationship."[49] Protégés develop expectations for the potential of a relationship. The mentor is viewed by the protégé as someone of power, experience, influence and expertise through which they can benefit. The mentor experiences a similar effect, seeing the protégé as a source of potential that can benefit from the mentor's influence.[50]

Georgia Chao in *Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Non-mentored Counterparts* suggests that the initiation phase in a formal relationship can be more problematic for protégé and mentor and that a "longer adjustment period may be required for formal mentors and

---

[49] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 51.

[50] *Ibid.*, 51.

protégés to get to know one another."[51] This is not to be unexpected. Where in an informal initiation, the protégé would have previous exposure to the potential mentor, exposure that would allow the protégé to gauge the mentor's suitability, strengths and weakness and to form the aforementioned expectations, that exposure may not occur in a formal mentoring construct. Mentors and protégés in a formal or directed program may have little or no knowledge of their counterpart and would therefore require what might be termed a "pre-initiation" phase wherein they would develop an understanding of the other's power, influence, skills, experience and potential.

Whatever the source of initiation, whether formally or informally commenced, the initiation phase culminates as protégé and mentor expectations are realized and tangible evidence serves to confirm their expectations.

Cultivation

During the cultivation phase, which Kram suggests can last from two to five years, the expectations of the initiation phase continue to be tested against reality. It is in this phase that the range of career and psychosocial functions of the mentoring relationship reach their peak, noting of course that the number of functions served by the relationship will be dictated primarily by the needs of the protégé.[52] It is also during this phase that the relationship will develop into a more reciprocal exchange between the mentor and protégé. As the protégé gains more experience, confidence and skill, so too does the mentor gain greater satisfaction from the relationship.

---

[51] Chao, Walz and Gardner, *Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Non-mentored Counterparts.*

[52] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 53.

Through his or her growth, the protégé may come to provide technical or

psychological support to the mentor, thereby making the mentor's work life easier

and more enjoyable.[53]

While Kram suggests that the cultivation phase is often the phase least

characterized by conflict and doubt, she also recognizes that it is towards the end of

the cultivation phase that the protégé or mentor may realize a requirement for

something greater from the relationship. For example, the protégé may recognize a

need for functions of a mentoring relationship that are not being provided by the

mentor. The protégé may also develop to a level of competence, confidence and

influence that outstrips that which might be provided by the mentor. Either of these

cases, and others, based in a basic change of needs or circumstances, can lead to

dissatisfaction with the relationship. This dissatisfaction often signals the transition

to the separation phase.

Separation

Separation can occur structurally or psychologically. Psychological

separation occurs when either one or both of the members have outgrown or become

dissatisfied with the relationship as it existed in the cultivation period. Structural

separation, as suggested by Kram and reinforced by Dougherty, et al., involves the

dissolution of a relationship because one of the members of the relationship left the

organization, whether that is the immediate organization (e.g. – the section, division,

or unit) or the grander organization. The separation period can be one of loss for one

---

[53] *Ibid*., 54.

or both of the parties involved. The protégé can lose the protection and influence of the mentor on their career and personal development. The mentor may lose influence over the protégé's career and development and the technical and psychological support of the protégé.[54] The primary work to be completed in this phases is for the members to come to grips with the losses incurred through separation. Without dealing with this loss, whether the separation is psychologically or structurally based, protégé and mentor are less likely to seek new relationships.

Although it is possible or perhaps even likely that the separation phase will be a time of turmoil, doubt and anxiety for the members of the relationship, this need not always be the case. When the members are aware that the relationship has reached culmination and/or of the impending separation, each may conceivably go their separate ways with some degree of satisfaction. The protégé may gain a sense of personal accomplishment in having risen to a state of career and psychosocial aptitude whereby they no longer require the mentor's tutelage. The mentor can similarly take pride in the success of the protégé.

Interestingly and perhaps contrary to the evidence presented by Kram, Anne M. Fallow, in her Doctoral thesis *Mentoring Experiences Among Navy Flag Officers: A Narrative Survey Approach*, found that among respondents only 2.6% of mentoring relationships in a military context ended due to psychological separation.[55]

---

[54] *Ibid.*, 57.

[55] Anne M. Fallow, "Mentoring Experiences Among Navy Flag Officers: A Narrative Survey Approach" (Newberg, OR: Doctor of Psychology, George Fox University, 2000), 35. 1.3% of respondents cited that the relationship ended because mentoring was no longer needed whereas a further 1.3% ended their mentoring relationship because the two individuals "drifted apart."

The vast majority of the reasons given for the end of the mentoring relationship in her research were structural: retirement (of one or the other members of the relationship), reassignment (leaving the immediate organization or unit) or the mentor's death. Surprisingly, 15% of respondents replied that their mentoring relationships were still ongoing.

One potential criticism of Fallow's survey research however is the absence of consideration of redefinition and of how it may have provided greater than expected longevity to the relationships of her survey respondents. Redefinition is the final phase of a mentoring relationship as proposed by Kram.

Redefinition

Some mentoring relationships simply end when the conflict of the separation phase is recognized as irreparable. Others can develop beyond the separation phase through redefinition. In the redefinition phase, the mentor and protégé may sometimes recognize that there remains value to be gained from the relationship though perhaps under a different dynamic. Redefinition can range from a transition to friendship and mutual support (which would constitute the satisfied end of a mentoring relationship but continuance of a social relationship), continued mentoring in select functions where the mentor may still offer insight and guidance or a transition to a peer mentoring relationship wherein each mentors the other based on individual strengths and weaknesses.

This is where Fallow's survey evidence may be somewhat misleading. For those relationships that ended in retirement, death or continued to endure, she did not

differentiate with emphasis as to whether those relationships had gone through a redefinition phase, thereby leading one to assume that the mentoring relationships in her survey remained prototypical to the end. It is possible that the relationships reported by Fallow's respondents had proceeded through redefinition and that the members continued to enjoy relationships with their mentors albeit significantly different than the prototypical relationship suggested by Kram. Because Fallow did not test for the impact of redefinition in her research it is difficult to differentiate which relationships transitioned from a traditional or prototypical mentoring relationship to one of friendship, selective mentoring or peer mentoring.

The Next Mentoring Relationship

For those relationships that survive the separation phase and move through the redefinition phase, it is logical that they will return to the beginning of the phase cycle. While Kram does not explicitly state this as fact, it is reasonable to assume that those dyads who choose to move from a prototypical mentoring relationship, through redefinition, to a peer mentoring relationship or mentoring of selected functions will return to the initiation stage to one degree or another where the members form new expectations for the redefined relationship.

Based primarily on Kram's *Mentoring at Work*, this paper has provided an overview of the characteristics and structures, types and functions of mentoring relationships in the workplace environment. In order for the Navy to be convinced of the effectiveness of mentoring as a tool for leader development it is necessary to

examine the expected outcomes of mentoring for the protégé, mentor and the

organization.

CHAPTER 3 – MENTORING RELATIONSHIP OUTCOMES – EFFECTS, COSTS AND BENEFITS

MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS - EFFECTS

While Kram suggests that a prototypical mentoring relationship will include all of the nine functions detailed above, that is not to say that every mentoring relationship will develop in each functional area to the same degree. Furthermore, a mentoring relationship need not include all of the mentoring functions to be deemed a mentoring relationship. For instance, in Kram's research for *Mentoring at Work*, all of the eighteen developmental relationships she studied provided functions from the career category whereas three of the relationships had no functionality in the psychosocial category whatsoever.[56] Yet each of the eighteen was found by Kram's definition to constitute a mentoring relationship.

Research into the nature of mentoring relationships has also indicated that there is a continuum of satisfaction, either for protégé, mentor or both. Some relationships can be highly satisfying and rewarding. Some can be marginally satisfying while others can range to dissatisfying, dysfunctional and harmful.[57] Sources of dissatisfaction for mentors can originate in the time cost of maintaining the relationship, cost in energy or in that a poorly performing protégé may reflect poorly on the mentor.[58] Protégés can become dissatisfied with a mentoring

---

[56] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 142.

[57] Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1178.

[58] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 146.

relationship when the mentor provides unsound advice or when that mentor, responsible for the functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility and protection, falls out of favour in the organization.[59] At the extreme end of the spectrum, dysfunctional and harmful mentoring relationships can result from exploitation, harassment and sabotage, perpetrated by the protégé or mentor on the other half of the dyad. That is not to say however that mentoring relationships do not have benefits. A great deal of research indicates that mentoring, whether informal or formal, provides tangible and intangible benefits to protégé, mentor and the organization alike.

MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS - OUTCOMES

The impact of mentoring relationships and the benefits gained from those relationships has been a focus of much research in the field since the introduction of Kram's *Mentoring at Work* in 1985. Leaders in this field include Terri Scandura, Georgia Chao, Belle Rose Ragins and their associates. Specific study of the outcomes of mentoring relationships in the military setting has been done by Brad Johnson and Gene Anderson.

Most broadly, mentoring has been shown to provide benefits to each the protégé, mentor and organization.

---

[59] *Ibid.*, 146.

For the protégé, mentoring has demonstrated benefits toward job security, career advancement, improved job performance, retention, personal health and financial reward.[60] Perhaps more importantly for the question at hand, that of developing institutional leaders for the Navy and the CF, research suggests that members of the organization who are mentored are more likely to become future leaders of the organization than those who are not.[61]

Mentors similarly benefit from mentoring relationships. Mentors have proven to show greater personal satisfaction, job performance, role validation, and gains in referent power and legitimization with the organization.[62]

Organizations benefit from what Scandura, et al. have termed the "three-way reciprocal context" of mentoring; "the mentor gives, the protégé gets and the organization benefits."[63]

---

[60] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*; Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1179.; Scandura, *Mentorship and Career Mobility: An Empirical Investigation*, 169.; W. Brad Johnson and Gene R. Andersen, "Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations," *Naval War College Review* 63, no. 2 (2010), 114, [journal on-line]; available from http://www.usnwc.edu/Publications/Naval-War-College-Review/2010---Spring.aspx; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

[61] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*.

[62] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 145.; Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*; Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 26.

[63] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*; Aarti Ramaswami and George F. Dreher, "The Benefits Associated with Workplace Mentoring Relationships," in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, eds. Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007), 213.

Through mentoring relationships, whether they be informally or formally initiated, organizations gain the benefit of more satisfied, committed and productive members, both mentor and protégé.[64] Further, mentoring provides organizations with the perpetuation of organizational norms and values. For the purposes of this paper then, the following assertion will be taken as fact: as the members of the mentoring relationship develop and benefit from that relationship, so does the organization benefit from that development.

The greatest body of research on the benefits of mentoring has focussed on the benefits accrued to protégé. Such research has been conducted with varying degrees of focus and fidelity. The intent has been to verify, so far as practicable, that mentoring does in fact provide benefit to the mentored protégé beyond that which is likely to be received by non-mentored counterparts.

Informal vs. Formal vs. Non-Mentored Protégé Outcomes

Georgia Chao, Pat Walz and Philip Gardner in *Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Non-mentored Counterparts* sought to compare the benefits gained by individuals in informal mentorship relationships those in formal relationships and those who were not mentored. They hypothesized that informal relationships were more likely to replicate the prototypical mentoring relationship proposed by Kram and therefore that informal protégés would report receiving a greater number of career and psychosocial functions than their formally or non-mentored counterparts.

---

[64] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring* and Ramaswami and Dreher, *The Benefits Associated with Workplace Mentoring Relationships*, 214.

What Chao, et al. discovered was that, as it pertained to functional support, informally mentored individuals reported greater career-related support than formally mentored protégés. There was little variance however between the two groups in the degree of psychosocial support provided. It was proposed that the reason for this result, which at first appears to be the opposite of what might reasonably have been expected, is potential risk of exposure on the part of the mentor. First, that there is more risk to the mentor in the execution of career-related functions, a risk that formally assigned mentors are less willing to accept. That is to say that many career functions, most notably sponsorship, protection and visibility and exposure, expose the relationship to outside scrutiny. Because formal mentors were forced into the relationship, rather than choosing to enter the relationship voluntarily, they were less willing to expose themselves to the consequences of protégé failure. Second, as it pertains to the willingness of both formal and informal mentors to engage in psychosocial functions, psychosocial functions do not expose the mentor necessarily to outside scrutiny. What occurs between protégé and mentor in the psychosocial realm remains between the two individuals.[65] Because there was little perceived risk, both formal and informal mentors were seen equally to engage in psychosocial functions.

In considering protégé outcomes or benefits, Chao, et al. found that formal protégés reported insignificant differences in benefits compared to their informally mentored counterparts, thereby dispelling the hypothesis that those in informal relationships necessarily accrue more benefit than those in formal relationships.

---

[65] Chao, Walz and Gardner, *Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Non-mentored Counterparts.*

However, when compared against non-mentored individuals, the results were slightly different. Informally mentored protégés reported significantly greater levels of organizational socialization, job satisfaction and better salaries, suggesting a clear advantage in informal mentoring relationships over no mentoring whatsoever. Formally mentored protégés however showed only slight differences in reported outcomes, falling between those reported by informal protégés and non-mentored individuals. The only significant variance noted between formal protégés and non-mentored individuals was in the degree of organizational socialization experienced.[66]

In summary, Chao, et al.'s research demonstrated that informal mentoring and formal mentoring both provided greater benefit to the protégé than no mentoring, that the difference in the degree of organizational socialization, job satisfaction and salaries was insignificant between formal and informal protégés and that formally mentored protégés showed significant benefit over non-mentored counterparts only as it pertained to organizational socialization.

The Impact of Relationship Satisfaction on Informal and Formal Mentored Protégé Outcomes

In *Marginal Mentoring: the Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes* researchers Belle Rose Ragins, John Cotton and Janice Miller sought to further the research of Chao, et al.. They felt that the data collected and the conclusions drawn by earlier researchers did not adequately take into account the impact of the quality of the mentoring relationship when considering the influence of relationship type on protégé outcomes.

---

[66] *Ibid.*

They argued that by grouping all relationships, from highly satisfying to marginal or perhaps even dysfunctional, under a single heading as simply informal and formal relationships, outcomes were necessarily skewed. In order to test their hypothesis, they conducted research that enabled them to compare informal and formal protégés in highly satisfying, less satisfying and dissatisfying mentoring relationships against non-mentored individuals.

What Ragins, et al. discovered was that satisfaction with the relationship was more influential on protégé outcomes than relationship type. Only informally and formally mentored individuals in highly satisfying relationships reported significantly greater outcomes than non-mentored individuals in any of the reporting categories.[67] Informally mentored individuals in less satisfying relationships differed from their non-mentored counterparts only slightly while marginally mentored individuals in formal relationships and those in dissatisfying relationships (of either type) showed either no significant difference in outcomes or less benefit than their non-mentored counterparts. The hierarchy of benefit as it pertains to satisfaction versus mentoring type versus outcome is summarized in Table 3.1 from most beneficial to possibly destructive.[68]

---

[67] Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1183-1185. Outcome categories studied included protégé career commitment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organization-based self-esteem, perceived opportunities for promotion, intentions to quit and perceived procedural justice.

[68] *Ibid.*, 1187. Informally and formally mentored individuals in dissatisfying relationships reported greater intentions to quit than their non-mentored counterparts.

Table 3.1 – Relationship Satisfaction vs. Relationship Type vs. Outcome

Outcome	Informal	Formal	Non-Mentored
Most positive	Highly Satisfying		
		Highly Satisfying	
	Marginally Satisfying		
Least positive, potentially destructive		Marginally Satisfying	Non-Mentored
	Dissatisfying	Dissatisfying	

Source – Ragins, et al., *Marginal Mentoring: the Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*.

The conclusion to be taken away from the work of Ragins, et al. is that "mentoring is not a simple, all-or-none matter but falls along a continuum of effectiveness."[69] Generally, the quality of the relationship weighed heavier in determining possible outcomes than did the type of mentoring relationship. Furthermore, it reinforced that there are risks inherent in mentoring relationships in that mentoring, improperly executed, can in fact do more damage than good. This is cautionary for any organization seeking to introduce a formal mentoring program. Informal relationships, initiating naturally, can dissolve just as easily with no repercussions. However, organizations implementing formal programs where the organization mandates that the relationship shall be maintained must be careful to monitor the health of the relationships and carefully select perspective mentors so as to avoid destructive or dissatisfying relationships. Despite the risks however, certainly the research of Ragins, et al. and to a lesser degree Chao, et al., suggests that

[69] *Ibid*., 1190.

there is sufficient potential benefit to be gained from implementing formal mentoring for organizations to take the risk.

PEER RESENTMENT

While there are risks associated with implementing a formal mentoring program, peer resentment may represent a level of risk in not implementing a mentoring program that outweighs the risks previously discussed. In organizations that choose not to implement mentoring programs, informal natural mentoring relationships are going to develop on their own. The perception that those who enjoy such mentoring relationships are benefitting ahead of others, particularly in competitive environments where there are limited opportunities for advancement, can cause the protégé's peers to react negatively to the mentoring relationship, ranging from passive resentment to hostility.[70] Assessment of the full impact of such a non-egalitarian work environment, where some receive preferential treatment through mentoring, whether that preferential treatment is real or simply perceived, has not as of yet been completed and remains an area for further research. While Kram alludes to the problem, her research speaks almost exclusively of cross-gender mentoring and the perception of inequality created thereby. Here, in an absence of empirical evidence, it is sufficient to understand that peer resentment can and likely will exist in any organization that does not provide a mode of mentoring, or at least the option, equally to peer groups.

---

[70] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring* and Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 127.

SUMMARY

What precedes this is a lengthy literature review that outlines the nature of mentoring, proposed definitions and differentiates between supervisory, coaching and mentoring relationships. It has outlined the functions that may be found in a prototypical mentoring relationship in accordance with the framework proposed by Kathy Kram in *Mentoring at Work*. The career-related and psychosocial categories were broken down and described by way of their constituent functions. In the career-related category are the functions of coaching, sponsorship, visibility and exposure, protection and challenging assignments. Comprising the psychosocial category are the functions of acceptance and confirmation, friendship, role modelling and counselling. It was reinforced however that only prototypical mentoring relationship are likely to include all of these functions and even then, with varying degrees of focus. Marginal mentoring relationships were defined as those that may include only some of the nine functions offered and that mentoring relationships may at times range to the dysfunctional and harmful at the low extreme.

Again using the framework proposed by Kram, the phases of a mentoring relationship were described beginning with initiation and continuing through cultivation, separation and redefinition. It is during the initiation phase that mentoring relationships are normally typed. Those that are initiated naturally and without organizational control are deemed informal relationships whereas those facilitated or directed by a third party are designated formal relationships. There are type variations in between these two extremes.

Finally, the impacts of mentoring types and levels of satisfaction with relationships were compared against expected outcomes, thereby demonstrating potential benefits for the protégé, mentor and the organization. It was concluded that healthy mentoring relationships offer the greatest likelihood of positive outcomes whereas dysfunctional or dissatisfying relationships may cause more damage than not mentoring at all. There is equal risk however, perhaps greater risk, that an organization not having a mentoring program can subject its personnel to peer resentment due to perceived unequal opportunity for advancement and development.

Two questions remain: how have mentoring programs been implemented in military organizations and to what effect and finally, how can mentoring be made to benefit the Navy as it seeks to prepare its younger officers to become institutional leaders of the future? To address the first question, this paper will next examine the mentoring program in place in the US Army. The intent and structure of the US Army mentoring program can be used as a valuable comparison of mentoring constructs in place in other military organizations and provide lessons learned or demonstrate best practices that may be leveraged for use in a Navy program.

CHAPTER 4 – MENTORING IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY – AN ORGANIZATIONAL EXAMPLE

The Army training and leader development model and tools, such as counselling, coaching and mentorship, are development multipliers that can enhance and influence maturity, self-awareness, adaptability, and conceptual and team-building skills in all leaders.[71]

Army Regulation 600-100, *Army Leadership*

Mentoring as a keystone developmental tool has been emphasized by the US Army, with varying degrees of perceived success, since at least 1985. Then Chief of Staff of the Army, General John A. Wickham, provided a framework for leadership that challenged leaders in the Army to make mentoring an integral part of the development of their subordinates.[72] It was only in 2005 however that the US Army finally released its *Army Mentoring Handbook*. In the 20 years between Wickham's initial impetus and the introduction of the *Army Mentoring Handbook*, the US Army suffered through much of the same challenges that were noted in *Leading the Institution* as barriers to successful mentoring in the CF; namely a deficiency in implementation and a lack of understanding of mentoring by leaders within the organization.

---

[71] United States. Department of the Army, *Army Regulation 600-100 Army Leadership* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2007), 6, [publication on-line]; available from http://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/pdf/R600_100.PDF; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

[72] Hunsinger, *Mentorship: Growing Company Grade Officers*, 1.

MENTORING IN THE US ARMY AT THE TURN OF THE 21ST CENTURY – CONFUSION AND DENIAL

Generally, what criticism has been levelled at the US Army's mentoring initiative centred on the themes noted above. The US Army's program put the cart before the horse, for lack of a better term. Before fully understanding what mentoring entailed or how to best implement mentoring practices, the US Army's 1999 Field Manual (FM) 22-100 *Army Leadership: Be, Know, Do* made mentoring one of the key requirements of any leader in developing subordinates. The definitions contained in FM 22-100 however led the Army toward a mentoring culture of confusion, frustration and an unreasonable expectation of entitlement.[73] This was primarily because the Army attempted to make mentoring something that it could not by definition be. The Army attempted to make mentoring an inclusive process, something that all leaders must do for all subordinates. In the section on Direct Leadership Actions[74], FM 22-100 offered the following guidance:

> Mentoring (in the Army) is the proactive development of each subordinate through observing, assessing, coaching, teaching, developmental counselling, and evaluating that results in people being treated with fairness and equal opportunity. Mentoring is an inclusive process (not an exclusive one) for everyone under a leader's charge.[75]

---

[73] Edward Cox Major, "The Mentorship Dilemma Continues," *Military Review* 89, no. 6 (2009), 100-101, [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1924300631&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010 and Hunsinger, *Mentorship: Growing Company Grade Officers*, 82.

[74] Direct Leadership Actions as expressed in FM 22-100 Army Leadership most closely equate to the concept of Leading the People, as contained in CF leadership doctrine, specifically *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations*.

[75] United States. Department of the Army, *Field Manual 22-100 Army Leadership: Be, Know, Do* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1999), 5-16, [publication on-line]; available from http://www.fs.fed.us/fire/doctrine/genesis_and_evolution/source_materials/FM-22-100_army_leadership.pdf; Internet; accessed 4 March 2011.

FM 22-100 went on to describe mentoring as "totally inclusive, real-life leader development for every subordinate."[76] Much of the criticism of the Army mentoring concept espoused by FM 22-100, concentrates on two areas pertinent to the issues to be tackled by this paper: inclusiveness intent versus prototypical mentoring relationships, and lack of consistency and clarity.

The US Army implemented their inclusive mentoring concept at least in part to attempt to reconcile Army values of equity and fairness against the functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility and protection, key functions in a mentoring relationship as expressed by Kram.[77] Attitudes towards mentoring led to the following observations by Gregg Martin, George Reed, Ruth Collins and Cortez Dial in their article *The Road to Mentoring: Paved With Good Intentions*, 2002:

> . . . many Army War College students and faculty members reacted with concern and unease over the term "mentorship." …Many related emotionally that the word "mentoring" has negative baggage, such as exclusivity, unfairness, cronyism, etc. – connotations that run counter to good leadership and the Army values of fairness and equality.[78]

If such attitudes then were the impetus for the Army to implement an inclusive concept of mentoring at the Direct Leadership level, FM 22-100 to an extent

---

[76] *Ibid.*, 5-16.

[77] While Major Edward Cox cites Kram as defining the exclusive nature of mentoring relationships the author can find no finite expression of that assertion. It is true however that throughout Kram's descriptions, particularly of mentoring functions, one is led to assume that exclusivity is a component of mentoring relationships. For instance, a mentor is most likely to seek only protégés who show promise or potential and protégé's are only likely to seek mentors who have power, influence and experience. Not all junior individuals will have potential and promise. Neither will all senior individuals have power, influence and experience. Therefore, while not explicitly stated, prototypical informal mentoring relationships are de facto not inclusive.

[78] Gregg F. Martin and others, "The Road to Mentoring: Paved with Good Intentions," *Parameters* 32, no. 3 (2002), 117-118, [journal on-line]; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=159475341&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

contradicted itself and added confusion in defining mentoring at the Strategic

Leadership level. At the Strategic level, the mentoring process was expressed as

being exclusive and reintroduced the concepts of sponsorship and exposure and

visibility.

> Strategic leaders act as a kind of sponsor, introducing [subordinates] to the
> important players and pointing out the important places and activities…
> [M]entoring by strategic leaders means giving the right people an
> intellectual boost so that they can make the leap to … thinking at the
> highest levels. Because those being groomed for strategic leadership
> positions are among the most talented Army leaders, the manner in which
> leaders and subordinates act also changes.[79]

The US Army found itself in a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, it

recognized the potential of mentoring for the development of its subordinates. On the

other, it directed the implementation of a mentoring construct at the Direct

Leadership level that denied one of the fundamental truths of mentoring relationships;

they are not for everyone. Not every junior individual has the potential and promise

to be selected as a protégé; not every more senior individual has the power, influence

and experience to be a potential mentor. It may be a harsh truth, that of exclusivity,

but the description provided in the Strategic Leadership section of FM 22-100 most

accurately approximates the nature of a prototypical mentoring relationship, and its

functions. In an attempt to deny the fundamental functions of mentoring relationships

but at the same time trying to gain from its purported benefits, what the Army arrived

at in FM 22-100 was a twisted and confused mentoring concept. It tried to make

mentoring inclusive, leading members of the US Army to "believe that they should all

receive an equal share of mentorship, when in fact, in the classical sense, it will never

---

[79] United States. Department of the Army, *Field Manual 22-100 Army Leadership: Be, Know, Do*, 7-23.

be equally distributed or inclusive of everyone."[80] FM 22-100 also tried to present

mentoring as *the* panacea for leader development when it is but one tool that may

contribute to leader development. The Army's logic in presenting mentoring in this

light is best summarized by Martin, et al. based on their discussion with a senior

officer who was involved in writing FM 22-100.

> Since it was believed that all Army leaders must develop all of their
> subordinates to their fullest potential in a fair, impartial, and inclusive
> manner, the final document reinforced the message that "good leadership
> equals mentoring, and mentoring equals good leadership."[81]

Martin, et al. quite rightly point out that the roles and responsibilities expressed in FM

22-100 at the Direct Leadership level as mentoring roles are simply elements of good

leadership, namely: coaching; teaching; counseling; and, leading by example. Their

recommendation was that the Army calls it simply that, good leadership, and not call

it mentoring, to avoid confusion.[82] This makes a great deal of sense as it pertains to

subordinate expectations and understanding of mentoring concepts. In recalling the

characteristics of supervisory and coaching relationships as expressed by Lagacé-Roy

and Knackstedt and Kaye in Table 2.1, the recommendation of Martin, et al. is

deemed fundamentally sound. Of particular importance is the duration of the

relationship. Direct leaders are likely to only be provided a finite period of time in

which to influence the subordinate. Whereas Kram and subsequently Lagacé-Roy

and Knackstedt point out that mentoring relationships are likely to be long term,

ranging from 3 to 6 years, the length of time a supervisor is able to directly influence

---

[80] Martin and others, *The Road to Mentoring: Paved with Good Intentions*, 122.

[81] *Ibid*., 121.

[82] *Ibid*., 122.

a subordinate in the military is bounded by posting cycles of normally 2 to 3 years. The likelihood of that cycle being shortened is high when accounting for one part of the relationship being posted out of phase with the other.

By introducing mentoring as a leadership function at the Direct Leadership level, the US Army confused its members and denied the fundamental nature of mentoring in order to make it fit its culture. In reaction to such criticism as was brought by Martin, et al. and others, the Army introduced the *Army Mentoring Handbook* in 2005 and replaced FM 22-100 with FM 6-22 *Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile* in 2006. That is not to suggest that these new publications have completely solved all of the issues associated with mentoring in the US Army. However, FM 6-22 has distinguished good leadership from mentoring (one is no longer led to believe that they are one in the same), and, when taken at face value and decoupled form the influence of FM 22-100, is a sound document.

MENTORING IN THE US ARMY – A LEADER-SUPPORTED APPROACH

The place of mentorship in the US Army in the present day should be less confusing. FM 6-22 has softened its emphasis on the inclusive nature of Army mentoring, yet mentoring remains one of the principle ways by which leaders are expected to develop their subordinates.[83] FM 6-22 has addressed many of the issues raised by Martin, et al. as faults in US Army doctrine as it was expressed in FM 22-100.

---

[83] United States. Department of the Army, *Field Manual 6-22 Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2006), 8-11.

In FM 6-22, mentoring is suggested as merely one of the supporting behaviours of the core competency of leadership development that the US Army desires in its leaders.[84] Purely from this perspective, the intent is both doctrinally and theoretically sound. It is not unreasonable to expect that leaders should develop the capacity to mentor through understanding mentoring concepts, and the benefits and potential risks of mentoring relationships. The strength of FM 6-22 as it pertains to mentoring is that it no longer purports that mentoring is inclusive by its nature, or that it is the panacea of leader development. It caveats many of the suggested uses of mentoring by stating that it "may" or "can" occur (but need not necessarily). For example, a well written paragraph on the development of sound judgment in FM 6-22 suggests that:

> Leaders acquire sound judgment through trial and error and by watching the experiences of others. Learning from others **can** occur through mentoring and coaching by superiors, peers and even some subordinates.[85]

Further, from paragraph 8-83 on mentoring:

> . . . the Army relies on a leader development system that compresses and accelerates development of professional expertise, maturity, and conceptual and team building skills. Mentoring is a developmental tool that **can** support many of these learning objectives.[86]

Unfortunately, the wording on mentoring and sponsorship at the strategic level has also been adjusted, in this case to the detriment of the publication and the clarity of the nature of mentoring. Whereas FM 22-100 correctly cited sponsorship as one of the roles of the strategic mentor, FM 6-22 makes no mention of sponsorship. The

---

[84] *Ibid.*, 2-7.

[85] *Ibid.*, 6-2. Emphasis added.

[86] *Ibid.*, 8-14. Emphasis added.

wording of the paragraph is only subtly different and the intent of the paragraph

remains the same. It is merely disappointing that what the US Army had right in FM

22-100, it felt the need to change in FM 6-22.

The second influential Army publication released in 2005 is the *Army Mentorship*

Handbook. It provides guidance on who should mentor. It is suggested that a mentor

should be someone "from beyond the chain of command; about two grade levels

above the individual; [and] someone in [the protégé's] Branch/Career

Field/MOS/Career Program."[87] The reader will note that the recommendation that the

mentor should be two levels higher than the protégé is different than evidence

provided by Kram, Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt and Eby, et al. earlier in this paper.

They suggested that mentors could possibly be peers, supervisors, senior NCOs,

technically skilled NCMs *or* senior personnel outside the chain or command. FM 6-

22 clarifies however that mentoring relationships can exist in the US Army other than

with someone outside the chain of command and two ranks higher than the protégé:

"mentoring relationships are not confined to the superior-subordinate relationship.

They may also be found between peers and notably between senior NCOs and junior

officers."[88] It is assumed, yet not explicitly stated, that the *Army Mentorship*

Handbook is making a recommendation for the ideal mentor in a classical mentoring

relationship when it recommends someone two levels higher than the protégé and

outside the chain of command. The suggestion is sound theoretically but comes with

[87] United States. Department of the Army, *Army Mentoring Handbook* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2005), 8, [publication on-line] available from http://www.armyg1.army.mil/hr/mentorship/docs/Army%20Mentorship%20Handbook%202005.pdf; Internet; accessed 4 March 2011.

[88] United States. Department of the Army, *Field Manual 6-22 Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile*, 8-14.

both potential risk and benefit. When able to receive guidance from both the chain of command and a mentor from outside the chain of command, potential benefits for the protégé include multiple perspectives on a problem and greater potential for openness. Kram warned of the risks inherent in a junior individual receiving only one opinion, one perspective or having a single sponsor or champion.[89] When a protégé receives support from many sources, be they mentor, coach or supervisor or multiples of each, they are provided a broader perspective in functions such as coaching, counselling and role modelling.

Protégés may also have a more open relationship with a mentor who is outside their chain of command. Practically, it is difficult to sit down and honestly discuss hopes, fears, weaknesses and deficiencies with a supervisor who will eventually write an individual's performance report for the year. Similarly, it is potentially dangerous to discuss with a supervisor why they made a particular decision. The supervisor may feel that their authority or competency is being called into question by the subordinate. Such interchanges are likely to be easier with someone from outside the protégé's chain of command and to involve a greater degree of trust due to a lower perceived level of career risk.

Having a mentor from outside the chain of command does pose risks however. This possibility is dealt with reasonably well by the *Army Mentorship Handbook*. It reinforces that "[a] mentor should never be used to bypass normal and appropriate procedures or chains of command" nor should a mentor attempt to influence the

---

[89] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 25.

protégé's supervisor on behalf of the protégé.[90] What the *Handbook* fails to address however is the potential that a mentor can undermine the trust that the protégé has in their chain of command. For instance, should a protégé seek to discuss a particular decision that was made by his chain of command, the mentor must take care to offer advice that will not place the protégé's supervisor in a bad light.

US Army doctrine has also been aligned on the voluntary nature of mentorship. Each of Army Regulation 600-100 *Army Leadership*, FM 6-22 *Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile* and the *Army Mentoring Handbook* define mentoring as "the voluntary developmental relationship that exists between a person of greater experience and a person of lesser experience that is characterized by mutual trust and respect."[91] It is seen as an essential tool in accelerating the leader development of its members. In accordance with FM 6-22, mentorship contributes to the "development of professional expertise, maturity and conceptual and team building skills" and is characterized by the following:

- Mentoring takes place when the mentor provides a less experienced leader with advice and counsel over time to help with professional and personal growth.

- The developing leader often initiates the relationship and seeks counsel from the mentor. The mentor takes the initiative to check on the well-being and development of that person.

- Mentorship affects both personal development (maturity, interpersonal and communication skills) as well as professional development (technical and tactical knowledge and career path knowledge).

- Mentorship helps the Army maintain a highly competent set of leaders.

---

[90] United States. Department of the Army, *Army Mentoring Handbook*, 18.

[91] *Ibid*., 3

- The strength of the mentoring relationship is based on mutual trust and respect. The mentored carefully consider assessment, feedback, and guidance; these considerations become valuable for the growth that occurs.[92]

The model as it is expressed in current US Army doctrine is a good example of what Scandura, et al. termed leader-supported mentoring. It is interesting to note that the *Army Mentorship Handbook* begins by citing the benefits that can be gained by the protégé, the mentor and the organization. This aligns very closely with Scandura's recommendation for leader-supported mentoring, calling on "an organization's leader to create awareness throughout the organization of the benefits to be derived from mentoring efforts."[93] Leader-supported mentoring is a step down in control intent from formal or semi-formal mentoring constructs. The US Army has not mandated that mentoring relationships must exist or forced their initiation and has moved away from the inclusive, de facto forced mentoring rhetoric of FM 22-100. Leader-supported mentoring is a step up in control intent from simply allowing mentoring relationships to develop naturally. The Army has taken great pains throughout its leadership doctrine to emphasize the benefits and importance of mentoring to leadership development, particularly in the *Army Mentorship Handbook*. They have taken steps to create a mentoring culture, encouraging leaders to mentor and subordinates to seek mentors, but have left the formation of mentoring relationships voluntary.

---

[92] United States. Department of the Army, *Field Manual 6-22 Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile*, 8-14.

[93] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*.

Major Edward Cox in his article *The Mentorship Dilemma Continues* has argued however that even under its current constructs and definitions, mentoring should not be encourage by the US Army. He contends that the Army continues to "make mentorship seem inclusive and reflective of Army values."[94] From a purely doctrinal viewpoint, the evidence reviewed previously in this paper, if completely divorced from the doctrine of FM 22-100, indicates otherwise. FM 6-22 no longer refers to mentoring as inclusive. As it pertains to Army values of fairness and equality however, Cox is correct. All of the Army doctrinal publications reviewed deny sponsorship, protection and exposure and visibility as consequences of mentoring. Again, this is a paradox of encouraging mentoring in the military context. The Army values fairness and equality, yet it encourages mentoring, mentoring can result in sponsorship, protection and exposure and visibility, these functions contradict Army values. Mentoring can therefore not be good for the Army because it is neither fair nor equitable because mentoring is necessarily exclusive and selective; or so Cox's logic goes.

Yet even Cox acknowledges that mentorship will naturally occur whether the Army supports it or not and that sponsorship, exposure and visibility and protection will be a by-product of those naturally occurring mentoring relationships.[95] The counter-argument to Cox's suggestion that Army leader-supported mentoring should be done away with due to its denial of the sponsorship consequences of mentoring is therefore: if sponsorship, protection

---

[94] Cox, *The Mentorship Dilemma Continues*, 99.

[95] *Ibid*., 102.

and exposure and visibility are going to occur as a consequence of naturally occurring mentoring relationships, will the Army not more closely align with the values of fairness and equity by encouraging mentoring across a broader range of personnel?

It is an argument that frankly has no right answer. Mentoring, as Cox contends, is exclusive and selective and therefore will never be fair or equitable. Yet it will occur with or without the influence of the Army. Therefore, not supporting mentoring on the part of the Army will violate Army values, as will encouraging mentoring. The only solution would be a formal mentoring program for all members of the US Army and as Cox points out, this is impractical as there are far too few mentors for the potential number of protégés.[96] Furthermore, survey evidence suggests that while members of the US Army desire the benefits of mentoring, they do not advocate the implementation of a formal mentoring program.[97]

WHAT IS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE US ARMY?

Any organization, in this case, the Canadian Navy, seeking to introduce mentoring as a leader development tool can learn from the experience of the US Army. First of all, it is imperative that the organization understand what mentoring is and what mentoring is not before implementing a mentoring policy.

---

[96] *Ibid.*, 102.

[97] Martin and others, *The Road to Mentoring: Paved with Good Intentions*, 123. Martin, et al. cite *The Army Training and Leader Development Panel Officer Study Report to the Army*, p. OS-10 which found that officers want mentorship but not a formal program.

Mentoring is not inclusive; it is exclusive by its nature. Second, sponsorship, protection and exposure and visibility are potential consequences of mentoring and may occur. It is better to recognize this fact and take steps to mitigate the influence of these functions than to deny that they will happen. Third, there will always be some personnel in the organization who will see mentoring as nothing more than favouritism and cronyism. As explained in Chapter 3, the term used by Kram to describe this effect is peer resentment and it is normally only those who are not receiving the benefits of mentoring who feel that mentoring is unfair. The example of the US Army suggests that there really is no mitigation strategy that can reasonably deal with peer resentment except honesty.

Mentorship, when allowed to initiate informally, either through natural causes or as the result of a leader-supported mentoring program, will remain a developmental construct that is by its very nature exclusive. Further, as the research of Ragins, et al. has found, not everyone who finds a mentoring relationship is likely to maximize benefit from it. In fact, it is reasonable to assume that even individuals in mentoring relationships that are marginal or dissatisfying could experience peer resentment. The best strategy then seems to be for the organization, regardless of the mentoring strategy in place, to be honest about what members of the organization can expect. For leader-supported and informal strategies, it is imperative for the organization that the exclusive nature of mentoring be explained and that it be made clear that not having a mentor does not mean that an individual is invaluable to the organization. Those in the non-mentored out-group must be made to feel an integral and important part of the

organization by leadership. Furthermore, in formal mentoring structures, the

organization should explain to mentored individuals that not all mentoring

relationships are likely to achieve the same degree of satisfaction. This will allow

individuals to modify their expectations and so warned, take steps to guard

against the possible undesirable impact of marginal or dissatisfying mentoring

relationships.

The lessons identified through an examination of the experiences of the

US Army must therefore significantly influence any proposal offered for the

implementation of a mentoring construct to be used by the Canadian Navy.

Leadership must be aware of the potential consequences for the organization but

also of the probable benefits offered by mentoring that can enable it to accelerate

the development of those officers selected as future institutional leaders through

the NSP Process.

CHAPTER 5 – THE NAVY SUCCESSION PLANNING CONSTRUCT

If high-quality and purposeful mentoring offers one avenue for military leadership succession planning, the military will need both to encourage broad career-development and selective mentoring pipelines for its most promising junior talent.[98]

Brad Johnson and Gene Anderson, *Formal Mentoring in the US Military*

BACKGROUND

The Navy Succession Planning (NSP) Process was conceived of and shaped into is current form beginning in 2004.[99] The impetus for the initiative was a realization on the part of the Navy that in the years following the introduction of the HALIFAX-class frigates, the Navy had focussed heavily on excellence in operations and had become adept at producing tactical commanders to the exclusion of most other leader competencies. The result was a paucity of naval officers with the skillsets, experience, exposure and knowledge-base required to effectively represent the Navy and influence the CF at the operational and strategic levels.[100] The NSP Process was designed as a means by which the Navy could develop its officers and senior leaders to overcome this perceived deficiency. It was believed that this could be achieved through assessment of the "long(er) term potential of senior naval

---

[98] Johnson and Andersen, *Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations*, 119.

[99] Lieutenant-Commander Dave Halfkenny, e-mail correspondence with the author, 28 February 2011.

[100] Lieutenant-Commander Dave Halfkenny, "Update: Navy Succession Planning Process - A Deliberate Plan to Produce the Right People for the Right Place at any Time" (Powerpoint Presentation, 2011).

personnel to perform in command and senior appointments across the CF" and the

subsequent management of officer careers to achieve that aim.[101]

DESIRED ENDS AND WAYS TO ACHIEVE THOSE ENDS

The aim of the NSP Process therefore was to ensure that those candidates

identified as having the potential to perform in command and senior appointments

were:

> Properly developed and prepared to deal with the complex strategic, force
> development, operations, fiscal and human resource, change management
> and institutional leadership challenges that confront the CF and the Navy
> in particular, now and into the future.[102]

Additionally, the Navy saw the NSP Process as a way to ensure a continuum of

philosophy and approach for the Navy at the strategic level.[103]

The way the Navy envisioned these aims being achieved was through the

early identification of those candidates with the requisite potential and sufficient time

left to serve to achieve command and senior appointments. This would allow the

Navy to ensure that those candidates selected would be exposed to command

appointments, professional development opportunities and key positions thereby

enabling them to develop the "competencies necessary to challenge for the highest

offices in the CF" through longer term career management.[104]

---

[101] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, 1.

[102] *Ibid.*, 1.

[103] LCdr Halfkenny, *Update: Navy Succession Planning Process - A Deliberate Plan to Produce the Right People for the Right Place at any Time*.

[104] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, A-4.

WHY COMMAND STREAM MARITIME SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE LIEUTENANT-COMMANDERS?

The NSP Process guidance provided by VAdm McFadden for 2010 included provisions for the succession planning of all Captains (Navy), Maritime Surface and Subsurface (MARS) and Naval Engineer Commanders, MARS LCdrs, and NCMs from the rank of Petty Officer First Class to Chief Petty Officer First Class. Why then focus this paper solely on command stream MARS LCdrs?

The rationale is threefold. First and most pragmatically, it was felt that tackling the full breadth of the rank structure supported by the NSP Process included far too much variance in individual requirements to allow sufficient focus to be achieved or for concrete conclusions to be drawn in such a short document as this paper. Second, as suggested by Jennifer Bennett, "[e]asing the transition of military senior leaders to strategic leadership means being proactive in preparing potential leaders at earlier stages of their career beginning with the rank of Major [(LCdrs)] at DP3 so they are better prepared for future responsibilities."[105] Mentoring LCdrs will provide both career and psychosocial development to officers transitioning from leading the people to leading the institution so that they have the greatest likelihood of having "the right job knowledge, skill set and experience, at the right time, to fill any senior leadership position."[106] Third, evidence suggests that "individuals who have previously been in a mentoring relationship are more willing to serve as mentors

---

[105] Bennett, *Leadership Challenges of the 21st Century: Effective Professional Development of Senior Canadian Forces Leaders*, 114.

[106] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, C-1.

than those who have not."[107] Introducing LCdrs to mentoring constructs at this point

in their careers will serve to provide a basis of potential future mentors for the Navy

so that any mentoring initiative for the occupation may be perpetuated over time.

NSP Board guidance also suggests that succession planning, even at the

MARS LCdr level, should include those officers with the potential to perform as

subject matter experts at the strategic level in key areas such as force development,

project management, resource management and human resources. Those fulfilling

such roles are expected to be drawn from the institutional leader cadre as expressed

the CMS *Naval Officer Career Progression* letter of 2008. Institutional leaders are

those officers who have completed their Operation Room Officer (ORO) tour but

have not achieved command qualification.[108] However, while VAdm McFadden

clearly recognizes the role to be played by these institutional leaders and the value

that they can provide to the Navy and the CF, he concedes that "the long standing

practice of selecting of our most senior leaders from the sea-going command stream

will not change."[109] Command stream MARS officers are defined as those who have

completed a tour as an ORO and have achieved their command qualification.

Because the intent of this paper is to suggest the provision of mentoring to MARS

LCdrs for the purposes of meeting the Navy's aim of producing future institutional

leaders and based in the assertion that only command stream officers are likely to

---

[107] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 146 and Ragins and Scandura, *Burden Or Blessing? Expected Costs and Benefits of being a Mentor*

[108] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Officer Career Progression*, 3.

[109] *Ibid.*, 2.

become the Navy's most senior leaders, it must therefore limit its focus to command stream MARS LCdrs.

That should not however preclude that the conclusions drawn and recommendations offered by this paper may not or should not be extrapolated for use at other ranks or streams in the MARS occupation or by other occupations in the Navy or the CF. It is seen as entirely reasonable that should other occupations or the Navy in general see value in the broader recommendations and conclusions drawn by this paper that they could not be adapted for use.[110]

PROCESS AND WAYS OF ACHIEVING THE NAVY'S AIM

The NSP Board is convened annually under the chairmanship of the Assistant CMS with board membership comprising Director General Naval Personnel (DGNP), Director General Maritime Force Development, Director General Maritime Equipment Program Management, Commanders Canadian Fleets Atlantic and Pacific, Special Assistant to Director General Naval Personnel (SA to DGNP) as well as members from Director Military Careers 2 (Navy). The membership of the board has been specifically designed so as to "ensure that the collective membership is familiar with the candidates they are tasked with reviewing" based in a fairly reasonable assumption that throughout their careers, one or many of the board members will have had some interaction with potential candidates.[111] This familiarity is necessary

---

[110] Of note, senior NCOs already have a formal mentoring program that is executed as part Non-Commissioned Member Professional Development Course.

[111] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, A-4.

because the NSP Process is not entirely objective.

The basis on which the NSP Board begins is objective. All candidates are compared against criteria including: time left to serve to retirement; NDHQ experience; leadership at sea (based on ORO performance for LCdrs); professional development progress (Joint Command and Staff Program (JCSP), Initial Baccalaureate Degree Program (IBDP), second language, post-graduate degree(s)), potential rankings from Personnel Evaluation Reports, overall potential and performance. However, these are only feeder material. It is the responsibility of the Board members, based on the information provided, to assign a score to each candidate on their readiness to command. This is a subjective process based on objective information.

The NSP Board is tasked with the "evaluation of the medium to long term potential of naval officers and to make recommendations on their employment and professional development."[112] Candidates are banded by time remaining to serve, ranked and selected for appropriate employment in consideration of "service requirements, individual competencies, experiences, and the availability of specific appointments."[113] It is not a mathematical process whereby the top rated officer is automatically selected for the top position. Many elements are considered before the NSP Board makes a recommendation.

 Specific deliverables from the NSP Board for MARS command stream LCdrs include recommendations for selection to command appointments as an Executive

---

[112] *Ibid*., A-3.

[113] LCdr Halfkenny, *Update: Navy Succession Planning Process - A Deliberate Plan to Produce the Right People for the Right Place at any Time*.

Officer (XO), selection for professional development, predominantly to the JCSP, IBDP, second language training or other post graduate opportunities, or to key operational and strategic staff positions.[114] Such key positions would invariably be focussed in the Maritime Pacific or Atlantic Headquarters or National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ). Key appointments, particularly at NDHQ, are seen as particularly essential by VAdm McFadden. As he expressed in his *Naval Officer Career Progression* letter, "[t]he requirement for senior leaders to have awareness of, exposure to, and an ability to successfully operate in the strategic environment, something which can only be gained through work in NDHQ, cannot be overstated."[115]

Based in these three broad options for employment, the NSP Board is charged with the generation of a five year employment plan for each command stream LCdr who has served, is currently serving or has been selected as an XO or to attend JCSP. Such plans are expected to ensure:

- The available time is best utilized to prepare candidates for success as Commanders;

- Conscientious manoeuvring of candidates to ensure continuity through the Navy's key positions; and

- Any gap in [individual] core competencies is addressed.[116]

---

[114] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, C4-2.

[115] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Officer Career Progression*, 2.

[116] VAdm McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, C4-2.

These shorter term aims seek to guarantee that the individual candidates continue to develop towards the Navy's ultimate aim of preparing officers to perform in command and senior appointments across the CF.

The means by which the Navy seeks to develop its future leaders is through the traditional developmental pillars of experience, training, education and self-development. Longer term career management and the selection of appropriate candidates for command appointments and key staff positions guarantees development through experience. JCSP, IBDP and second language instruction provide education and training. Self-development remains the responsibility and at the discretion of the member.

Leader development through career management is perceived to have the Navy moving in the right direction towards meeting its objective of producing officers better prepared to lead the Navy and the CF. The successes gained from the NSP Process should not be underestimated. Previous discussion in this paper indicates however that the Navy is, as the US Army expresses it, missing out on an opportunity to "accelerate development of professional expertise, maturity and conceptual and team building skills" through the use of mentoring as a leader development tool. The current constructs of the NSP Process need not change. It is making positive progress in achieving better leader development for naval officers. However, this paper contends that layering mentoring over the current NSP construct will allow the Navy to accelerate the positive effects it is currently achieving by providing officers with both career and psychosocial support.

CHAPTER 6 – A MENTORING CONSTRUCT FOR MARS COMMAND STREAM LIEUTENANT-COMMANDER DEVELOPMENT

. . . many Admirals believe that star-quality officers get mentored and that such extra attention is well deserved and even essential if the Navy is to achieve sound succession planning in its leadership.[117]

Brad Johnson and Gene Anderson, *Formal Mentoring in the US Military*

CONCEPTUAL ASSERTIONS

Before making any recommendation on how mentoring might be implemented by the Navy to accelerate the development of command stream MARS LCdrs, the experience of the US Army suggests that it is necessary to deal with two significant issues: exclusivity and career-related functions versus organization values of fairness and equality.

The first issue has already been resolved by the Navy. In documents such as *Naval Officer Career Progression* and guidance provided to the NSP Boards over the past three years, the Navy has signalled its intent to focus its developmental efforts on those officers with the best potential to become the future institutional leaders of the Navy and CF. It has been frank about who is likely to be its future institutional leaders by maintaining that the practice of selecting the Navy's senior leaders will continue to be from within the command stream. It follows therefore that those command qualified LCdr MARS officers with the greatest potential represent the future leaders of the Navy.

---

[117] Johnson and Andersen, *Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations*, 119.

Much as the Navy has chosen to focus its NSP on "the deliberate investment in a few as the size of the force and limited resources precludes investing in all," so should it focus any mentoring effort.[118]   It has established exclusivity as a pragmatic necessity in order to achieve economy of effort.

This aligns reasonably well with mentoring theory. Kram suggests that protégé potential is one of the determining factors in mentoring relationship initiation; managers are most likely to initiate mentoring relationships with those who "represent someone with potential."[119] In this instance however, rather than leaving the determination of potential to the perspective mentor, the Navy selects those with the greatest potential through the NSP Process. This clears the way for the implementation of an organizationally facilitated mentoring program, at least as it pertains to exclusivity.

The second issue that has been raised consistently in research regarding mentoring in the military is the perception that mentoring is nothing more than a mechanism for favoritism, cronyism or nepotism. Such criticism focuses very heavily on the career-related functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility and protection, often in complete ignorance of the other benefits that mentoring can offer. This theme was evident parts of Anne Fallow's research on US Navy Flag Officers. One Flag Officer respondent offered:

> As I understand your definition, I reject mentoring (favoritism) as a means
> to get an outstanding technical and operational officer corps. To sponsor
> (whatever you mean by that) could be the reason we have found few

---

[118] LCdr Halfkenny, *Update: Navy Succession Planning Process - A Deliberate Plan to Produce the Right People for the Right Place at any Time*.

[119] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 51.

> replacements for our best Admirals in the last 30 years. When "politics" become more important than the consequences of the Command, we lose the thread that had previously kept up a top professional organization ready to protect our nation.[120]

The research of Martin, et al. at the US Army War College reflected similar attitudes. These comments appear to be the product of peer resentment. It is the contention of this author that such attitudes predominantly, but not always, represent the views of the dissatisfied out-group that is not being mentored. The impact of peer resentment on any mentoring program cannot be neglected. The "fear" of favoritism can even exist amongst the in-group of mentored individuals in a formal mentoring construct when one feels that they have not received the same benefit from the relationship as another protégé. Dr. Lagacé-Roy, co-author of the *Mentoring Handbook* confirmed that in his experience this antagonistic attitude towards mentoring exists and that some military members have refused categorically to be part of a mentoring relationship because of a very negative perception of mentoring as little more than a vehicle for favoritism and nepotism.[121]

In a military setting, particularly at the level with which this paper is concerned, sponsorship properly managed need not be a source for resentment and strong negative criticism. Given that NSP Board scoring is a subjective process based on the information made available to the Board members, it is unclear how sponsorship by way of a letter of recommendation or assessment, provided by the mentor on the part of the protégé, would not add to the Board membership's understanding of the candidates' potential to act as a future institutional leader for the

---

[120] Fallow, *Mentoring Experiences among Navy Flag Officers: A Narrative Survey Approach*, 45.

[121] Dr. Daniel Lagacé-Roy, e-mail correspondence with the author, 26 March 2011.

Navy. The opinion of a senior MARS officer, in whom the Navy has placed its trust

to act as a mentor for its potential future leaders, should be seen as a source of expert

and reliable insight. In order to avoid peer resentment issues, it is suggested that the

following guidelines would need to be put in place in any mentoring program:

- Mentors must be required to provide a letter of recommendation or assessment of potential to the NSP Board for their protégé(s);

- Any assessment must be honestly completed and reflect the mentor's expert evaluation of the protégé's potential to perform in positions of greater responsibility in the Navy;

- The Personnel Evaluation Report, prepared by the chain of command, must maintain its primacy amongst those documents considered by the NSP Board.

To deny that sponsorship, exposure and visibility and protection occur in military

organizations as a result of mentoring relationships, or otherwise, is to ignore reality.

As Cox contends in *The Mentorship Dilemma Continues*, sponsorship is going to

occur whether the military (in his case, the US Army) recognizes it or not.[122]

Anecdotal evidence suggests that this is true. One foreign JCSP student attributes his

selection to attend Staff College in Canada to two letters of recommendation sent to

the selection committee by US Army mentors.[123] Another JCSP colleague attributes

his selection for a key command appointment to the intervention of a senior officer on

his behalf; again by way of a letter of recommendation.[124] At the Canadian Forces

College (CFC) between mid-October and mid-February, as discussions at the mess

centre on postings and promotions, it is difficult to pass the day without hearing the

---

[122] Cox, *The Mentorship Dilemma Continues*, 100.

[123] Major Will Freds, US Army, conversation with the author, 3 March 2011.

[124] Name withheld at the member's request, conversation with the author, 15 February 2011.

word "godfather" mentioned. Sponsorship occurs in the CF, whether the CF chooses

to admit it or not. The rhetorical question therefore is: if sponsorship is going to

happen, mentoring program or not, is it not better for the Navy to regulate it and take

advantage of the insight it may provide than to pretend that it does not exist?

The conclusion therefore, as it pertains to mentoring, exclusivity and

sponsorship is that exclusivity has already been established by the Navy and

sponsorship is likely to happen. The Navy, in order to ensure that its efforts are

focused on those with the greatest potential to become future senior leaders in the

Navy and the CF, has already made the NSP Process an exclusive endeavour.

Further, if sponsorship is going to happen, as evidence suggests it will, it should be

leveraged as a tool that can contribute to the Navy's understanding of the strengths,

weaknesses and ultimately the potential of its future leader candidates. Adding

mentoring as a tool to accelerate leader development is unlikely to result in any

greater resentment on the part of the out-group than already exists.

IS INFORMAL MENTORING ENOUGH TO MEET THE NAVY'S NEEDS?

Research by Chao, et al. and Ragins, et al. indicates that the benefits accrued

to the mentor, protégé and the organization in informal relationships generally exceed

those that are expected in formal mentoring constructs. This begs the question then

as to whether the Navy should take a role in the formation of mentoring relationships

or leave them to develop naturally. Would it not be better to assume that those who

desire mentoring are able to find mentors and that mentoring is occurring within the

Navy without influence by the organization? After all, both *Conceptual Foundations*

and *Leading the Institution* dictate that it is the responsibility both of those leading the people and those leading the institution to mentor their subordinates. Students of JCSP 37 are told continuously that they are the top 10% at our ranks in our occupations. It would be reasonable to assume then that if mentoring is a doctrinally supported process and the students of the JCSP fit the profile of typical protégés, a high percentage of JCSP students would enjoy informal mentoring relationships within their specific MOCs. Survey results suggest that such an assumption would be misguided.

Past (sample) survey research conducted at the CFC can give an indication of what mentoring is experienced by senior officers in the CF. Students in the JCSP represent the future leaders of the CF as Majors/LCdrs and Lieutenant-Colonels/Commanders entering DP 3. Major L.P. McGarry asked his classmates in 2008: "have you had a mentor during your military career?" 62% of the JCSP class responded that they had not.[125] Similar research was conducted in support of this paper where 23 Canadian naval personnel were asked "are you currently in a mentoring relationship as a protégé?" In order to avoid confusion, a definition of mentoring versus coaching relationships was provided using the characteristics provided by Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt in their *Mentoring Handbook*. 16 of 23 Naval officers responded to the survey; 81% reported that they were not currently in a mentoring relationship as a protégé. Among MARS officers surveyed, all command qualified, 80% responded that they were not currently being mentored. Although the sample size is small, responses to this survey serve to indicate that if the Navy intends

---

[125] Major L. P. McGarry, "Strategic Success: Mentoring and Army Succession Planning" (Canadian Forces College Masters of Defence Studies Research Project, Toronto, 2008), 47.

to get the maximum benefit in leader development, it cannot leave mentoring to informal initiation alone.

THE PROPOSAL

Based on the literature review conducted, the lessons learned from the experiences of the US Army and responses from the JCSP class, it is recommended that the Navy institute a facilitated, semi-formal mentoring program to accelerate the leader development of its command stream MARS LCdrs. Senior Navy leadership must be seen to be the champion of the initiative by being visibly and enthusiastically supportive. Participants are found to be more committed to the program if they believe leaders value it.[126] The Navy should signal its commitment by assigning an appropriate senior officer to administer the initiation of the program. The Navy must be clear in its definition of mentoring relationships and in particular, differentiate mentoring from coaching relationships and supervisory relationships. It must be clear about the roles and responsibilities of protégés and mentors. The program would be semi-formal in that once relationship dyads are formed, the relationships would only be structured for a period of one year. Thereafter the relationship would be allowed to run its course. The intent of the first structured year is to facilitate the initiation process between two individuals who may have little prior knowledge of each other.

The program must be voluntary but the Navy must first educate potential mentors and protégés so that they can make an informed decision. More senior

---

[126] Lisa M. Finkelstein and Mark L. Poteet, "Best Practices For Workplace Formal Mentoring Programs," in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, eds. Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007), 346.

officers must volunteer to be mentors and MARS LCdrs must volunteer to be

protégés. Junior members should be strongly encouraged to participate because of

the potential benefits to be gained by all involved, including the organization, but

must have the option to opt out of the program. Potential protégés could conceivably

opt out of the program based on the fact that they have an existing mentoring

relationship that they intend to maintain or, despite the education provided on the

potential benefits, have opted to "go it alone."

PROVIDING A CLEAR MESSAGE

Researchers suggest that one of the most critical steps in the successful

execution of an organizationally driven mentoring program is a clear statement of the

goals of the program.[127] In the Navy's example, this is reasonably simple as the goals

remain the same as the intent of the NSP Process. Simply stated, a Navy facilitated,

semi-formal mentoring program would have the following suggested goal:

> The Navy seeks to provide accelerated leader development through a
> facilitated, semi-formal mentoring process for command stream MARS
> LCdrs coupled with long(er) term focused career management. Mentoring
> has proven through research that it can contribute positively to the
> development of future institutional leaders capable of dealing effectively
> with the complex strategic, force development, operations, fiscal and
> human resource, change management and institutional leadership
> challenges that confront the CF and the Navy in particular, now and into
> the future.[128]

The Navy must also define for all involved what mentoring entails and

differentiate it particularly from coaching relationships. This is perhaps the second

---

[127] *Ibid.*, 357-358

[128] Derived from McFadden, *Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010*, 1.

most important step in embarking on a mentoring program. In order for people to

understand what mentoring is, it needs to be more than a corporate buzzword that is

used far too loosely. The following two definitions are offered for the Navy's use:

> Mentoring.
>
> Mentoring is a professional relationship in which a more experienced person (a mentor) voluntarily shares knowledge, insights, and wisdom with a less-experienced person (a mentee) for the purpose of enabling career and psychosocial growth in that individual. It is a medium to long-term learning relationship founded on respect, honesty, trust and mutual goals.[129]
>
> Coaching.
>
> Coaching is a professional relationship in which a more experienced or technically proficient person (a coach) shares knowledge with and provides feedback and encouragement to a less experienced person who desires to learn a specific skill or behaviour. It is a short(er) term relationship lasting until the desired skill or behaviour has been learned.[130]

These definitions are derived from the work of Drs. Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt,

whose *Mentoring Handbook* is an excellent resource, sorely underutilized in the CF it

appears.

The Navy must also define what functions a mentoring relationship is likely to

provide. A modified-Kram model is recommended so as to reconcile the functions of

the mentoring relationship with the responsibilities of the chain of command. Recall

that Kram's model consisted of two categories of functions, career-related and

psychosocial. Each function will be discussed in turn with recommendations on

whether it should be included in the Navy's definition of mentoring relationships, and

---

[129] Derived from Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 5.

[130] Derived from *Ibid.*, 5

if so, whether the breadth of the function's application should be caveated. Rationale will be provided for the recommendations.

Career Functions

Sponsorship

Sponsoring will continue to exist in the Navy with or without the implementation of a mentoring construct. Sponsorship should exist in a Navy mentoring construct, if controlled. Mentors should be clear that honest and insightful sponsorship of protégés based on real and observable performance and potential will be welcomed by the Navy. Just as Kram suggests that sponsorship of a protégé that goes on to be successful can be beneficial to the mentor, so also can dishonest or unjustified sponsorship subsequently reflect poorly on a mentor and provides a disservice to the organization.

Exposure and Visibility

A certain degree of exposure and visibility should exist in Navy mentoring constructs. While a mentor outside the chain of command cannot assign work tasks or responsibilities to their protégé, they can suggest activities that are extracurricular to the normal daily responsibilities of the member that may provide similar benefits. A good example of where the exposure and visibility function might be exercised by a mentor without violating the chain of command would be to suggest a topic on which a protégé might conduct research and submit a service paper on a particular problem facing Navy leadership.

Coaching

Coaching should exist in any Navy mentoring construct and should be unfettered in its application. The provision of advice by the mentor as part of the coaching function will greatly assist the protégé to develop or refine those skills and behaviours most desired by the Navy in its future institutional leaders.

Protection

Much like the exposure and visibility function, the protection function might be exercised by a mentor provided that it does not impinge upon the roles and responsibilities of the chain of command. That is to say that a mentor cannot and should not attempt to protect a protégé from a particularly challenging assignment in which they might fail but could caution the protégé against taking on extracurricular responsibilities for which they are not prepared.

Challenging Assignments

This function cannot be exercised by a mentor in a Navy mentoring construct. It is purely the purview of the chain of command, at the local level, and the NSP Board and Career Managers, as it pertains to postings.

Psychosocial Functions

Role Modelling

This psychosocial function is essential. The complex process of trait emulation and rejection on the part of the protégé leads to self-awareness. The more role models available to the protégé, the more models the protégé has to consider, the more robust the introspection process becomes. While this function is essential in any mentoring relationship, it must be reinforced that role modelling is not blind copying. Role modelling merely provides behavioural examples that may be used (or rejected) by the protégé to develop their own means to become a better naval officer.

Acceptance and Confirmation

Acceptance and confirmation is a particularly powerful function that must be carefully managed by a mentor in a Navy mentoring construct. It consists of positive feedback and mutual respect that can allow the protégé the confidence and freedom thought to take risks and adopt new behaviours in the organization.[131] The mentor must remain aware that the protégé's loyalty, duty and responsibility are not to the mentor but to the unit, the organization and the chain of command. While trust and mutual respect between the mentor and the protégé are a highly desirable and healthy part of any mentoring relationship, the primacy of the protégé's focus towards the organization and the chain of command must always be emphasized. Otherwise, the protégé may take risks and try new behaviours in the workplace that have detrimental

---

[131] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 35.

effects on the organization and undermine the trust of the chain of command in their abilities.

Counselling

Counselling absolutely must be exercised in any Navy mentoring construct. A second opinion provided to a protégé will broaden the individual's understanding of any situation and allow them to come to a decision having considered more diverse options.

Friendship

This function need not be mentioned in any Navy definition of a mentoring construct. Certainly friendship can be a pleasing and rewarding end result of a mentoring result. However, for the Navy, the primary goal of the mentoring construct is the organizational benefit that will be gained through the development of the protégé and the mentor. If friendship develops, it can make the mentoring relationship stronger yet it need not occur for leader development to progress through mentoring. Furthermore, there are risks for the organization in encouraging the pursuit of the friendship function in mentoring relationships. Friendship can potentially colour the objectivity of the mentor in executing career functions, particularly sponsorship and protection.

Potential Risks, Costs and Benefits

Protégé

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the mentored protégé is likely to experience greater job satisfaction and a deeper sense of attachment to the organization, greater opportunity for promotion, career stability, and improved job performance.[132] Furthermore, individuals who have been mentored are more likely to become the future institutional leaders of an organization and to become future mentors.[133] The research of Ragins, et al. and Chao, et al. found that only marginally greater benefits were enjoyed by members of informal mentoring relationships than those in satisfying formal relationships, suggesting that the Navy can implement a semi-formal program with insignificant loss of benefit to the dyad members.[134]

Risks to the protégé include the potentially destructive effects of dysfunctional mentoring relationships that have in fact proven to be less beneficial than having no mentoring relationship at all.[135] Forewarned with this information, it is envisioned that protégés, or mentors for that matter, who find themselves in dysfunctional relationships would be able to extricate themselves from the dyad before incurring irreparable damage.

---

[132] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*; Johnson and Andersen, *Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations*, 114.; Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1179.; Scandura, *Mentorship and Career Mobility: An Empirical Investigation*, 169.

[133] Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*; Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 146.; Ragins and Scandura, *Burden Or Blessing? Expected Costs and Benefits of Being a Mentor*.

[134] Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1188.

[135] *Ibid*., 1183-1185.

Mentor

Research has determined that mentors can benefit through career reinvigoration and repurposing, role validation, greater career satisfaction in general, gains in referent power, and legitimization.[136] Costs for mentors include the time and effort required to act as a mentor. This is important for the Navy to emphasize to potential mentors, particularly at a time when many personnel are double and sometimes triple-hatted with duties within the organization.

The Organization

The Navy is likely to benefit from the growth in its officers, both mentors and protégés. The "three-way reciprocal context" of mentoring suggested by Scandura, et al. indicates that the organization benefits from members experiencing greater job satisfaction and commitment, protégé development and greater job performance.[137] These factors will provide for greater retention of highly skilled, highly motivated potential future leaders of the Navy and the CF.

THE FIRST STEPS

Lisa Finkelstein and Mark Poteet in *Best Practices in Workplace Formal Mentoring Programs* find that mentor and protégé orientation and training are widely suggested in academic literature and have proven through research to contribute to

---

[136] Dougherty, Turban and Haggard, *Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees*, 145.; Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*; Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 26.

[137] Ramaswami and Dreher, *The Benefits Associated with Workplace Mentoring Relationships*, 213.; Scandura and others, *Perspectives on Mentoring*.

perceptions of program effectiveness and to positively impacted program commitment.[138] Further, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution* admits that mentoring is poorly understood and therefore poorly implemented in the CF.[139]

It is therefore recommended that before any mentoring initiative is undertaken, perspective protégés and mentors must be educated on mentoring, its definition, functions, costs, risks and benefits as detailed within this paper. Mentoring must be clearly differentiated from coaching, with which it is often confused, particularly in the CF.[140] Education is important for protégés so that they can become familiar with the nature of the relationship they may enjoy with a mentor, what potential benefits mentoring can have on leader development and what potential risks there are in any mentoring relationship. Education is perhaps even more important for potential mentors. They will become familiar with what mentoring can provide to them, the benefits that can be gained by the organization and the commitment that will be required to the relationship.

In order for any mentoring initiative to be successful, the program must be seen as supported by senior Navy leadership. To this end, an appropriate senior officer must be appointed as the champion of the program. To facilitate the

---

[138] Finkelstein and Poteet, *Best Practices Fro Workplace Formal Mentoring Programs*, 356-357.

[139] Canada. Department of National Defence, *A-PA-005-000/AP-006 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*, 136.

[140] This is the author's own observation based on research for this paper. For instance, Command Development Courses and Workshops in the regular and reserve Navy are often referred to as mentoring. They're coaching and teaching, not mentoring, primarily because of their short duration and specific focus on providing skills and behaviours to the junior member of the relationship. Mentoring both as a concept and a word are very loosely and too often improperly used in the author's experience.

integration of the mentoring program with the NSP Process, the champion must be a

member of the NSP Board. Such a champion would be responsible for the education

of potential protégés and mentors, the management of the mentoring program, to

include the selection of potential mentors, matching of mentors to protégés, and

monitoring the program for effectiveness. This task most appropriately rests within

the scope of responsibility of DGNP. Pragmatically, it is recommended that DGNP

would be the champion with SA to DGNP responsible for execution, supported by

appropriate staff.

WHO ARE THE MENTORS?

Mentors are purported to have a number of defining characteristics. Kram's

research found that traditional mentors were generally several years older than their

protégés and one to two levels senior.[141] They were also perceived by their protégés

to have power, influence and experience to offer. Fallow's survey research found that

protégés valued the following attributes in a mentor: integrity; genuine concern for

people, professional, intelligent, leadership, hard-working, dedicated to the Navy, and

loyal.[142] The US *Army Mentorship Handbook* would add the following attributes to

that list: supportive, patient, respected and self-confident.[143] Put together, these

defining characteristics are a daunting list for any individual to fulfill. Further, any

potential mentor must be willing to commit the time and energy required to make the

---

[141] Kram, *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*, 6.

[142] Fallow, *Mentoring Experiences among Navy Flag Officers: A Narrative Survey Approach*, 25.

[143] United States. Department of the Army, *Army Mentoring Handbook*, 12.

mentoring relationship work. It is little wonder then that Johnson and Anderson

assert that "frankly, not just anyone can become a successful mentor."[144]

The selection of mentors must therefore be a three-step process. First,

potential mentors must be canvassed by the Navy and educated as to the potential

benefits, costs and the commitment required of any mentor. It is suggested that the

pool of potential mentors that will provide the most benefit to command stream

MARS LCdrs are post-Command MARS Commanders, Captains (Navy), currently

serving or recently retired. Such personnel will very likely fit Kram's criteria in that

they are likely older and at least one step (possibly three) removed from most of the

LCdrs who would become protégés.[145]

Second, some of these individuals, so educated and willing to accept the

responsibility, would volunteer to act as mentors in the Navy program. It is important

that mentors volunteer. Forcing individuals to mentor can result in dissatisfactory

mentoring relationships. The research of Ragins, et al. indicates dissatisfying

mentoring relationships, particularly formal relationships, can actually cause less

benefit to the protégé and the organization than not mentoring at all.[146] Best practices

in mentor selection suggest that having the volunteer mentor submit to the

---

[144] Johnson and Andersen, *Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations*, 120.

[145] Most LCdrs would be immediately pre-XO, currently serving XOs or just finished their XO tour. Post-Command Commanders would have completed their XO tour, likely a coastal HQ or NDHQ tour, and a CO tour, placing them at least one significant career step removed from the protégés and potentially two.

[146] Ragins, Cotton and Miller, *Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes*, 1183-1185.

organization what skills and attributes they will bring to the table can assist in mentor selection.[147]

Finally, the Navy must select from the list of volunteers those that are best able to act as mentors. The lists of attributes provided by Fallow's research, the US *Army Mentorship Handbook* and the *Mentoring Handbook* of Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt can all provide guidance to the Navy in helping it to determine which of the volunteers is best suited to act as mentors for its potential future leaders. Desirable attributes included but are not limited to: integrity, a genuine concern for people, professional, intelligent, honest, patient, non-judgmental, supportive, respected and respectful.[148] The list of volunteers so selected will form a pool of potential mentors that can be utilized by the Navy.

EXECUTION

Having educated mentors and potential protégés and established a pool of desirable volunteer mentors, the remainder of the process really should be reasonably simple. The NSP Process naturally creates a list of potential protégés by way of its current construct. Protégés, when receiving their Career Manager interviews would be advised of their selection as a potential protégé based on their perceived potential to perform at the highest ranks in the Navy and of the Navy's desire to accelerate their development by way of a mentoring relationship. The protégés would be given

---

[147] Finkelstein and Poteet, *Best Practices Fro Workplace Formal Mentoring Programs*, 349.

[148] Lagacé-Roy and Knackstedt, *Mentoring Handbook*, 13.; United States. Department of the Army, *Army Mentoring Handbook*, 12.; Fallow, *Mentoring Experiences Among Navy Flag Officers: A Narrative Survey Approach*, 25.

the option to participate, forego the Navy's mentoring program if an existing

mentoring relationship already existed or choose to "go it alone" despite the potential

benefits to be gained from the mentoring program.

Mentor Selection, Relationship Initiation

Research has shown that relationships that are formed by participant choice

are superior to random matching.[149] It is recommended then that the Navy propose a

number of potential mentors to the protégé so that the protégé may choose his or her

mentor. The recommendation of mentors should be based first on geography and

then on an assessment of best likely fit for the protégé's needs. Geographical co-

location is deemed desirable during the initiation phase as it is the most important of

the four phases identified by Kram in the formation of a healthy relationship. Given

the prevalence of e-mail and telephone communications in the modern world, it is

conceivable that once the relationship has been established, geographical co-location

would not be necessary. To be more precise, co-location is preferred but not

necessary. Where Kram cited structural separation as a primary contributor to

relationships ending, this need no longer be the case given the communication means

available to members of the mentoring relationship.

The protégé would be directed to contact potential mentors to establish a

dialogue and begin the initiation process. If the match seems satisfactory to the

protégé, he or she would advise the Navy of the match.

---

[149] Finkelstein and Poteet, *Best Practices Fro Workplace Formal Mentoring Programs*, 352.

Directed Meeting Frequency

The initiation phase should be the only phase structured by the Navy. Because initiation has been found to be more difficult when the protégé and mentor have a lesser degree of prior knowledge or familiarity with their counterpart in the relationship, it is recommended that the Navy assist in accelerating the process through mandating meeting frequency for the first year at no less than one meeting every two weeks. Research to date has not definitively determined the impact of meeting frequency on perceived or real program effectiveness.[150] The frequency suggested is a pragmatic balance between the time expected to be available to protégés and mentors at this rank level given their other responsibilities and the need to overcome "initiation lag" known to exist in some organizationally facilitated formal or semi-formal mentoring programs. In an informal mentoring relationship, the mentor and protégé will have had an opportunity to assess the potential of the relationship through prior interaction with the potential mentor or protégé, allowing the initiation phase to culminate after six months to a year. In a formal or semi-formal mentoring construct, the protégé and/or mentor may have little or no prior knowledge of each other, causing the initiation phase to potentially be prolonged; the resultant need for a period of familiarization may be termed "initiation lag". After the initial year, it is expected that protégé and mentor will have come to some agreement on the frequency of meetings required.

---

[150] *Ibid.*, 359.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Research into the importance of program monitoring and evaluation of outcomes remains inconclusive. It is recommended therefore that the Navy not formalize a monitoring or evaluation construct. Over time, the impact of a mentoring program should become evident. Much as the Navy perceives that two years of longer term career management are having a positive effect on the development of the future leaders it requires, so would it be expected to be able to judge the impact of any mentoring program over time.

WARNINGS

It is important before concluding this chapter to relate some of the warnings that have become evident during the research conducted for this paper. These are offered to avoid unreasonable expectations on the part of the organization and those involved in the program.

Mentoring is not a cure-all and it should not be represented as one. Any mentoring program must be entered with eyes open and expectations measured. One need only look at the criticism levelled at FM 22-100 to see the problems that can be caused by representing mentoring as the panacea of leader development. Some mentoring relationships, despite the best efforts of the organization and the best intentions of the relationship members, simply do not come to full fruition or obtain the same results as other relationships. Generally, however, research indicates that mentoring can contribute positively as a way to achieve accelerated leader development.

Not every senior leader will be an effective mentor. Contrary to what CF leadership doctrine suggests, mentoring cannot and should not be the responsibility of every leader in the CF. Coaching, perhaps, supervising, certainly, but not mentoring. Some people do not have the interpersonal skills to be mentors. Some do not have the power, influence, expertise or experience to offer any likelihood of benefit to perspective protégés. Mentorship is a "may happen, may be satisfying, is likely to be beneficial" exercise. For leadership doctrine to suggest that every leader must be a mentor will lead to unsatisfactory mentoring relationships that research indicates may provide less benefit to the protégé, and therefore, to the organization, than not mentoring at all.

Finally, to reiterate, mentoring should never usurp or threaten the roles and responsibilities of the chain of command or the primacy of its authority. The two relationships can however exist in parallel to great benefit for the protégé and the organization.

CHAPTER 7 – CONCLUSION

Many people have gone further than they thought they could because someone else thought they could.[151]

Unknown

This paper has progressed through a fairly lengthy literature review of mentoring, a subject that has only fairly recently taken the interest of researchers seeking to define the nature and outcomes of the concept and caught the attention of organizations seeking to gain from its purported benefits. The review allowed a better understanding of mentoring, its characteristics, function, types, phases and outcomes. This was deemed particularly necessary as research indicates that mentoring is poorly understood and poorly implemented in most instances. As it pertains specifically to the CF, even *Leading the Institution* admits that "often mentoring does not attain the level of implementation that it should. Frequently leaders are insufficiently familiar with the process and its value."[152] Based primarily on the constructs and definitions proposed by Kathy Kram in her seminal book *Mentoring at Work*, and verified by a review of research that supports her assertions, this paper determined that mentoring generally provides benefit to the protégé, mentor and the organization by way of what Terri Scandura termed the three-way reciprocal context of mentoring.

---

[151] Johnson and Andersen, *Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military: Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations*, 119.

[152] Canada. Department of National Defence, *A-PA-005-000/AP-006 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*, 136.

By conducting a review of the mentoring approach of the US Army since 1985, one perspective of how mentoring can be implemented by a large military organization was explored. Foremost from this review were findings on the importance of institutional clarity in the execution of any mentoring initiative, the need to be honest about the exclusive nature of mentoring and the need to reconcile the sponsorship function and perceived favouritism against military values of fairness and equality.

The current Navy Succession Plan Process was reviewed to ascertain the Navy's intent and the ways in which it intends to groom and develop the future leaders of the Navy and the CF. It was suggested that the Navy could achieve greatest long term effect towards achieving its aim by marrying a mentoring program to its already successful longer term career management strategy for leader development.

Based on the literature review, the characteristics of mentoring relationships and their types, the perceived costs, benefits and risks of such relationships, lessons learned from the US Army, and on the aims of the Navy's Succession Planning Process, a detailed mentoring program was suggested for employment by the Navy. Informal mentoring is simply not happening with enough frequency for the Navy to rely on it as an effective means to achieve the benefits that can be gained from mentoring its future leaders. It was determined that a Navy facilitated semi-formal mentoring program, when coupled with the significant initial successes garnered by the NSP Process, would better ensure that the Navy receives the best product from those individuals that it designates as candidates to become the next intuitional leaders of the Navy and Canadian Forces by accelerating their development.

The program is characterized by leadership support, clarity of intent and education of the potential members. Voluntary participation by protégés and mentors is deemed essential and the Navy must select mentors it sees as best suited to the role in order to provide the greatest likelihood of relationship success.

If the Navy is truly committed to producing well developed, intelligent and competent officers to lead the Navy of tomorrow and the Navy after next, it cannot ignore the positive impact that a mentoring program can have in accelerating the development of the potential seen in its most promising senior leader candidates. The current NSP developmental strategy is good. With the assistance of a mentoring program, it could be better.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bearman, Steve, Stacy Blake-Beard, Laurie Hunt, and Faye J. Crosby. "New Directions in Mentoring." Chap. 23, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 375-396. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007.

Bennett, Jennifer Jane. "Leadership Challenges of the 21st Century: Effective Professional Development of Senior Canadian Forces Leaders." Victoria: Master of Arts in Leadership and Training, Royal Roads University, 2005.

Canada. Department of National Defence. "Air Command Order 1000-7 Air Force Personnel Management - Officers." Ottawa: Chief of the Air Staff, 2004.

———. *A-PA-005-000/AP-001 Duty with Honour: The Profession of Arms in Canada*. Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2003.

———. *A-PA-005-000/AP-003 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Doctrine*. Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2005. Publication on-line; available from http://www.cda-acd.forces.gc.ca/cfli-ilfc/doc/dnddoc-eng.pdf; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

———. *A-PA-005-000/AP-004 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations*. Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2005.

———. *A-PA-005-000/AP-006 Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Leading the Institution*. Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2007.

———. *Canadian Officership in the 21st Century (Officership 2020): Strategic Guidance for the Canadian Forces Officer Corps and the Officer Professional Development System*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2001. Publication on-line; available from http://www.cda-acd.forces.gc.ca/pub/2020/officer/doc/off-2020-s-eng.pdf; Internet; accessed 28 January 2011.

———. *D2-139/2002. Military HR Strategy 2020: Facing the People Challenges of the Future*. Ottawa: Chief of Staff ADM Human Resources (Military), 2002. Publication on-line; available from http://www.cmp-cpm.forces.gc.ca/pd/hrs-smr/doc/hrs-smr-2020-eng.pdf; Internet; accessed 30 January 2011.

———. "DAOD 5038-1 Canadian Forces Professional Development." Director General Personnel Generation Policy. Directive on-line; available from

http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/5000/5031-8-eng.asp; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

————. "DAOD 5038-8 Canadian Forces Professional Development." Director General Personnel Generation Policy. Directive on-line; available from http://www.admfincs.forces.gc.ca/dao-doa/5000/5031-8-eng.asp; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

Chao, Georgia T. "Formal Mentoring: Lessons Learned from Past Practice." *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 40, no. 3 (Jun, 2009): 314-320. Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1801317131&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

Chao, Georgia T., Pat M. Walz, and Philip D. Gardner. "Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Non-mentored Counterparts." *Personnel Psychology* 45, no. 3 (Autumn, 1992). Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=742724&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 28 January 2011.

Cox, Major Edward. "The Mentorship Dilemma Continues." *Military Review* 89, no. 6 (2009): 99-103, Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1924300631&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Dalcourt, Major Charles J., Jr.. "Mentoring: Establishing a Legacy, Shaping the Future." *Military Review* 82, no. 6 (2002): 35-39, Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=282615961&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

Dougherty, Thomas W., Daniel B. Turban, and Dana L. Haggard. "Naturally Occurring Mentoring Relationships Involving Workplace Employees." Chap. 9, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 139-158. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007.

Eby, Lillian T., Jean E. Rhodes, and Tammy D. Allen. "Definition and Evolution of Mentoring." Chap. 2, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby. 1st ed., 7-20. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Fallow, Anne M. "Mentoring Experiences among Navy Flag Officers: A Narrative Survey Approach." Newberg, OR: Doctor of Psychology Thesis, George Fox University, 1999.

Finkelstein, Lisa M. and Mark L. Poteet. "Best Practices For Workplace Formal
    Mentoring Programs." Chap. 21, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A
    Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 345-
    368. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007.

Hagee, General M. W.. "Marine Corps Order 1500.58: Marine Corps Mentoring
    Program." Washington, DC: Department of the Navy Headquarters United States
    Marine Corps, 2006. Document on-line; available from
    http://www.usmc.mil/news/publications/Documents/MCO%201500.58.pdf; Internet;
    accessed 18 September 2010.

Halfkenny, Lieutenant-Commander Dave. "Update: Navy Succession Planning Process -
    A Deliberate Plan to Produce the Right People for the Right Place at any Time."
    Powerpoint Presentation, 2010.

Higgins, Monica C. and Kathy E. Kram. "Reconceptualizing Mentoring at Work: A
    Developmental Network Perspective." *The Academy of Management Review* 26, no.
    2 (2001): 264-288.

Hunsinger, Major Nate. "Mentorship: Growing Company Grade Officers." *Military
    Review* 84, no. 5 (2004): 78. Journal on-line; available from
    http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=737515611&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=30
    9&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Hutchins, Major C. L.. "Mentorship: A Tool for Leadership Development in the
    Canadian Forces." Toronto: Canadian Forces College Command and Staff Course
    Exercise New Horizons Paper, 2004.

Johnson, W. Brad and Gene R. Andersen. "Formal Mentoring in the U.S. Military:
    Research Evidence, Lingering Questions, and Recommendations." *Naval War
    College Review* 63, no. 2 (2010): 113-126. Journal on-line; available from
    http://www.usnwc.edu/Publications/Naval-War-College-Review/2010---
    Spring.aspx; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Johnson, W. Brad, Gene R. Andersen, and Captain L. Franchetti. "How to Make
    Mentoring Work." *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* 135, no. 4 (2009): 26.
    Journal on-line; available from
    http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1680742501&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=3
    09&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Johnson, W. Brad, Jennifer M. Huwe, Anne M. Fallow, and Rakesh Lall. "Does
    Mentoring Foster Success?" *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* 125, no. 12
    (1999): 44. Journal on-line; available from
    http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=46981058&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309
    &VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

Kaye, Beverly. "Coaching and Mentoring: New Twists, Old Theme - An Introduction." Chap. 5, in *Linkage Inc.: Best Practies in Organization Development and Change*, edited by Louis Carter, David Giber and Marshall Goldsmith. 1st ed., 438-517. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer, 2001.

Kem, Colonel (Ret'd) Jack D.. "Mentoring: Building a Legacy." *Military Review* 83, no. 4 (2003): 62-64. Journal on-line; available from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0PBZ/is_4_83/ai_109268864/; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Knouse, Stephen B. "Virtual Mentors: Mentoring on the Internet." *Journal of Employment Counseling* 38, no. 4 (2001): 162-169. Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=99529661&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Knouse, Stephen B. and Schuyler C. Webb. "Unique Types of Mentoring for Diverse Groups in the Military (Statistical Data Included)." *Review of Business* 21, no. 1/2 (2000): 48-52. Journal on-line; available from http://www.entrepreneur.com/tradejournals/article/73182590.html; Internet; accessed 18 September 2010.

Kram, Kathy E. *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1985.

Lagacé-Roy, Daniel and Lieutenant-Colonel Janine Knackstedt. *Mentoring Handbook*. Ottawa: Published under the auspices of the Chief of the Defence Staff by the Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2007.

Lockwood, Angie L., Sarah Carr Evans, and Lillian T. Eby. "Reflections on the Benefits of Mentoring." Chap. 14, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 233-236. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007.

Martin, Gregg F., George E. Reed, Ruth B. Collins, and Cortez K. Dial. "The Road to Mentoring: Paved with Good Intentions." *Parameters* 32, no. 3 (2002): 115-127. Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=159475341&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

McFadden, Vice-Admiral P. Dean. "Naval Officer Career Progression." Ottawa: CMS 3371-5075-1 (DGNP/RDIMS #182808), National Defence Headquarters, 2008.

———. "Naval Succession Planning (NSP) Process - Fall 2010." Ottawa: CMS 3371-5075-1 (D HR Strat/RDIMS #203510), National Defence Headquarters, 2010.

———. "Naval Succession Planning Process/Policy." Ottawa: CMS 3371-5075-1 (D HR Strat/RDIMS #182365), National Defence Headquarters, 2009.

McGarry, Major L. P.. "Strategic Success: Mentoring and Army Succession Planning." Toronto: Canadian Forces College Masters of Defence Studies Research Project, 2008.

Offstein, Evan H. and Jason M. Morwick. "Follow My Lead." *Quality Progress* 37, no. 9 (2004): 104. Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=697773821&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

Ragins, Belle Rose, John L. Cotton, and Janice S. Miller. "Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes." *The Academy of Management Journal* 43, no. 6 (2000): 1177-1194. Journal on-line; available from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1556344; Internet; accessed 20 September 2010.

Ragins, Belle Rose and Terri A. Scandura. "Burden Or Blessing? Expected Costs and Benefits of Being a Mentor." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 20, no. 4 (Jul, 1999).

Ramaswami, Aarti and George F. Dreher. "The Benefits Associated with Workplace Mentoring Relationships." Chap. 13, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 211-232. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007.

Robertson, Vice-Admiral D. W.. "Navy Succession Planning Process - Interim Approach." Ottawa: CMS 3371-5000-1 (CMS/RDIMS #155441), National Defence Headquarters, 2008.

Scandura, Terri A. "Mentorship and Career Mobility: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13, no. 2 (1992): 169-174. Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?index=0&did=393034611&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1299079452&clientId=1711; Internet; accessed 2 March 2011.

Scandura, Terri A. and Ekin K. Pellegrini. "Workplace Mentoring: Theoretical Approaches and Methodological Issues." Chap. 5, in *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*, edited by Tammy D. Allen and Lillian T. Eby, 71-92. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007.

Scandura, Terri A. and Chester A. Schriesheim. "Leader-Member Exchange and Supervisor Career Mentoring as Complementary Constructs in Leadership Research." *Academy of Management Journal* 37, no. 6 (1994): 1588-1602. Journal

on-line; available from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=heh&AN=9501101011&site=ehost-live; Internet; accessed 2 February 2011.

Scandura, Terri A., Manuel J. Tejeda, William B. Werther, and Melenie J. Lankau. "Perspectives on Mentoring." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 17, no. 3 (1996). Journal on-line; available from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=117542758&Fmt=7&clientId=1711&RQT=309&VName=PQD; Internet; accessed 2 February 2011.

Tanner, Leesa. *DRDC CORA TM 2010-283. Who are the Millennials?*. Ottawa: Defence Research and Development Canada - Centre for Operational Research and Analysis, December 2010.

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. *Guidelines for Development of a Mentoring Program*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1995.

United States. Department of the Army. *Army Mentoring Handbook*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2005. Publication on-line; available from http://www.armyg1.army.mil/hr/mentorship/docs/Army%20Mentorship%20Handbook%202005.pdf; Internet; accessed 4 March 2011.

———. *Army Regulation 600-100 Army Leadership*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2007. Publication on-line; available from http://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/pdf/R600_100.PDF; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

———. *Field Manual 22-100 Army Leadership: Be, Know, Do*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1999. Publication on-line; available from http://www.fs.fed.us/fire/doctrine/genesis_and_evolution/source_materials/FM-22-100_army_leadership.pdf; Internet; accessed 4 March 2011.

———. *Field Manual 6-22 Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2006.

Walker, Robert W. *CFLI Technical Report 2006-01 The Professional Development Framework: Generating Effectiveness in Canadian Forces Leadership.* Ottawa: Canadian Defence Academy - Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2006.

Wong, Leonard, Stephen Gerras, Colonel William Kidd, Colonel Robert Pricone, and Colonel Richard Swengros. . *Strategic Leadership Competencies*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Strategic Studies Institute, United States Army War College, 2003. Report on-line; available from http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=382; Internet; accessed 11 February 2011.

Wright, Cheryl A. and Scott D. Wright. "The Role of Mentors in the Career Development of Young Professionals." *Family Relations* no. 26 (1987): 204-208. Journal on-line; available from http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?hid=119&sid=e99aa030-83aa-4b91-b2af-2916a0a7c40a%40sessionmgr110&vid=4; Internet; accessed 2 March 2011.