



Mentoring Functions to Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment

Mentoring Functions to Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment

DISTOR, John Mark S. ⁽¹⁾, NUÑEZ, Edsel ⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ 0009-0006-4887-5748, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines, jmdistor@pup.edu.ph

⁽²⁾ 0009-0000-1986-822X, Manila Tytana Colleges, Pasay City, Philippines, elnunezo127@gmail.com

The content expressed in this article is the sole responsibility of its authors.

ABSTRACT

Mentoring, one of the human relations intervention program, aims to harness employees skills for professional development. Focusing on the mentees' level of mentoring functions received from their mentors, level of occupational self-efficacy (OSE), and level of organizational commitment (OC), the study examined these among 50 mentees from a local BPO company using three standardized tests - Mentoring Functions Questionnaire (MFQ-9), Occupational Self-Efficacy Short Version, and Three Component Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. It was supplemented by a one-on-one interview with 10 respondents using an open-ended questionnaire. The study determined that the psychosocial support function though high ($\bar{x}=4.11$) may still be improved in terms of ensuring an accepting and confirming relationship as revealed during the interview. Meanwhile, career support ($\bar{x}=4.30$) and role modelling ($\bar{x}=4.30$) are at very high level. Very high level was found on OSE ($\bar{x}=4.47$) and OC ($\bar{x}=4.74$) with normative commitment ($\bar{x}=4.86$) as the dominant type. A correlation was established between psychosocial support and OSE ($p=0.048$) attributed to the importance of motivation, counseling, coaching, and friendship. No statistical significant correlation was established between mentoring functions and OC ($p=0.88$). Age may have been a factor as majority of the respondents are millennials who are known to have a stronger concept of task commitment instead. A proposed strategic response roadmap for learning and development plan focuses on enhancing the accepting and confirming aspect of psychosocial support through building a support system. This includes capacity building for mentors and establishing mentors and mentees' circle.

RESUMO

O Mentoring, um dos programas de intervenção nas relações humanas, visa potenciar as competências dos colaboradores para o desenvolvimento profissional. Concentrando-se no nível das funções de tutoria recebidas de seus mentores, nível de autoeficácia ocupacional (OSE) e nível de comprometimento organizacional (OC) dos pupilos, o estudo examinou-os entre 50 pupilos de uma empresa local de BPO usando três testes padronizados - Mentoring Functions Questionnaire (MFQ-9), Occupational Self-Efficacy Short Version e Three Component Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Foi complementado por uma entrevista individual com 10 respondentes usando um questionário aberto. O estudo determinou que a função de apoio psicossocial, embora alta ($\bar{x}=4,11$), ainda pode ser melhorada em termos de garantir uma relação de aceitação e confirmação conforme revelado durante a entrevista. Enquanto isso, o suporte de carreira ($\bar{x}=4,30$) e a modelagem de papéis ($\bar{x}=4,30$) estão em um nível muito alto. Nível muito alto foi encontrado em OSE ($\bar{x}=4,47$) e OC ($\bar{x}=4,74$) com comprometimento normativo ($\bar{x}=4,86$) como o tipo dominante. Foi estabelecida uma correlação entre apoio psicossocial e OSE ($p=0,048$) atribuída à importância da motivação, aconselhamento, coaching e amizade. Nenhuma correlação estatisticamente significativa foi estabelecida entre as funções de tutoria e CO ($p = 0,88$). A idade pode ter sido um fator, já que a maioria dos entrevistados é da geração do milênio, conhecida por ter um conceito mais forte de comprometimento com a tarefa. Um roteiro de resposta estratégica proposto para o plano de aprendizagem e desenvolvimento concentra-se em melhorar o aspecto de aceitação e confirmação do apoio psicossocial por meio da construção de um sistema de apoio. Isso inclui a capacitação de mentores e o estabelecimento de um círculo de mentores e pupilos.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article process:

Submitted: 11/05/2023

Approved: 26/06/2023

Published: 03/07/2023



Keywords:

Self-efficacy,
organizational commitment,
business process outsourcing,
mentoring

Introduction

Learning and development is often challenge by the changing learning style of employees. Time and time again, HR practitioners handling L&D face issues on applicability of training, its cost, return of investment, and direct application to one's work. However, traditional learning and development is already aging and may no longer function alone specially with the changing demographics of the workforce. It is therefore necessary for L&D to find other ways to ensure transfer of necessary skills, knowledge, and attitude to every employees with consideration to its financial cost. This leads to the emergence different techniques and strategies such as microlearning and mentoring wherein long hours of training room set-up is no longer necessary but more on-the-job training approach.

This study focuses on one of these approaches, mentoring, and takes a macro and micro lens to examine its connection to other human relations aspect. On a macro level it aims to identify the connection between mentoring and organizational commitment. On a micro level, it seeks to determine the connection of mentoring to occupational self-efficacy. The researcher's interest on these variables started from a personal experience of a mentoring program from a BPO company and personal observation on the growth of the mentees and their loyalty to the organization. Thus, the researchers' curiosity was triggered to identify if mentoring functions had to do with enhancing the mentees OSE and strengthening of their OC.

Reviewing the available literature to strengthen this study, a meta-analysis of Bouquillon (2004) on mentoring among various organizations and corporations, cited a survey stating that 33% to 66% of employees in various industries and occupations are more involved in mentoring relationship at work. In 2012, a survey conducted by Bridgeford among Fortune 500 companies, cited by Hurst and Eby (2012), found out that 71% of these companies has mentoring program for their employees. In the Philippines however, study on mentoring in industrial setting is still limited. Perhaps, this can be attributed to the practice being held within the company's premises only. The researcher reached out to various companies from different industries such as hotel and hospitality, airlines, financial institutions, information technology, and real estate to name a few, to identify if mentoring is in place. Majority of these companies expressed that their mentoring program is still on its birthing stage thus refused to participate while others does not have any. These are probable reasons why literature and studies on mentoring is still under developed.

To add to the data on the practice of mentoring in the country, a simple Google search of mentoring in the Philippines will result to mentoring in education, entrepreneurship and the Philippine Society of Training and Development (PSTD), a non-government and non-profit organization of human resources development practitioners. PSTD had one exploratory study

on mentoring but it was limited to member companies of the organization only. To be exact, seven (7) were placed in a study which includes a multinational financial investment company, two from banking industry, one higher education institution, one business processing outsourcing company, a power generation company and a petroleum company. One from the banking industry, the Banko Sentral ng Pilipinas, made the result of their evaluation public, reflecting that the program was approved in December 23, 2010 and was fully implemented in February 2014 with 19 mentors and 11 mentees only. Come 2016, they reported having 40 mentors and 124 mentees. As of writing, in a communication with them stated that the organization is re-evaluating its program. Other than this, no further statistics can support how far the practice of mentoring has been in the country. The limitedness of local study on mentoring is another reason why this topic becomes more interesting to the researcher.

Going by the definition of the variables involved in the study, Renton (2009) explained that mentoring in the industrial lens is a tool to develop one's skills and knowledge for personal and professional development that leads to attainment of various organizational outcomes such as increase in career satisfaction, promotion, positive job attitude, reduced turnover intentions, and organizational commitment. The definition reveals the micro and macro scope of mentoring, to which the researcher draws investigation of OSE and OC. Occupational self-efficacy being a specific domain of Albert Bandura's self-efficacy theory that plays a great role in making choices, amount of effort to exert, strength to persevere in the midst of challenges, and the level of anxiety or confidence in performing a task. Self-efficacy's application to work setting, is therefore referred as occupational self-efficacy which Rigotti, Schyns, and Mohr (2008) defined as the capability of a person's feeling on his or her ability to successfully perform tasks, thus affecting behavior.

On the other hand, organizational commitment (OC) according to Allen and Meyer, as quoted by Curado (2016), is a psychological state that bounds the individual to the organization leading the individual to perform in a way that is beneficial to the organization. Barton (2016) in her article at LinkedIn.com stated that OC is the employee's feeling towards the organization to which the employee identifies him/herself to the organization and enmeshed him or her in the organization. Bryson and White (2008) further explained that OC is a productive asset because it directs individuals to give extra effort. These literature support the importance of organizational commitment in the work setting as it can be viewed as related to the kind of performance an employee can provide.

The literatures and studies presented above showed commonality among mentoring, OSE and OC - development in a personal and organizational level. As mentioned previously, in this study on mentoring functions, the researcher aims to explore the correlation of mentoring on a personal level in terms of occupational self-efficacy as perceived by the mentees, and on organizational level in terms of organizational commitment as perceived by

the mentees as well. Grounding from the local literature gathered, one of the industries presented by PTSD was from the BPO industry, the researcher will explore mentoring in the same industry through a multi-national organization operating across the Philippines and considered as one of the leading BPOs in the country.

This company was selected as a representative of the booming sector in the country. Natividad (2014) stated that BPO sector is a lucrative enterprise that has proven to be the largest and fastest growing industry in the country. With the increase in labor demand in the BPO industry, it also faces the challenge of retaining talents. According to Joson (2012), in a report by the Business Processing Association of the Philippines (BPAP), the industry increased by 60% for its back-office operations from 2004 to 2007 while attrition rate is at 30% to 40% base range as reported by many BPO providers. It was also reported that there is a large gap in the supply of mid-level managers and senior level executives since there has not been enough time to nurture managers from within the industry. Thus, various intervention programs have been implemented such as mentoring.

Same challenges are faced by the BPO industry where this study was conducted. With the growing demand for talent supply and keeping talents for future roles have been a constant concern. Thus, mentoring practice has been placed with the hope of continuously developing talents in an out of the traditional way of learning and development and the same time keeping the attrition rate low.

From such, the researcherS aims to identify the level of these variables, explore the correlation of mentoring to the other two variables. Furthermore, it is the researcher's hope to contribute on filling in the gap in available literature of mentoring in the Philippines' industrial setting. Though this paper cannot address the lack of statistics on the practice, this paper hopes to bring mentoring to the spot light of human resources developmental tool and to the research community.

Literature Review

The history of mentoring goes a long way and was used in various terms such as apprenticeship after the industrial revolution. Kahle-Piasecki (2011) cited the study of Grollman & Rauner that stated apprenticeship is known in European countries as a form of job training. The basic concept of apprenticeship is to transfer knowledge. Knowledge was transferred from an older and wiser adult to another inexperienced person. This is called the apprenticeship model. Synonymous to the senior-junior framework that can be observed from historical accounts of mentoring.

According to Dominguez (2012) apprenticeship played a significant role during the Middle Ages in enforcing social order, control and loyalty. Apprenticeship became a tunnel of

transmitting knowledge, competence, and expertise. Knowledge is transferred through lessons, stories, and by actions.

Renton (2009) explained that over the past two decades, mentoring expanded and created impact on early education, professional development in business management, and health care.

All the early accounts of mentoring according to Garvey et.al. (2017), revolves on the central purpose of mentoring - assisting the learner (mentee) to integrate in the society as a fully functioning individual.

Scholarly studies on mentoring points to the early works of Kram who pioneered the notion of mentoring dated 1985. Kram as cited by various studies defined mentoring as "a relationship between a young adult and an older one wherein the experienced adult helps the younger individual to learn and to navigate in the adult world and the world of work" (Faraz Naim and Lenka, 2017; Klinge, 2015).

Various studies explore the advantages of formal mentoring and informal mentoring. Formal mentoring is characterized as a structured form wherein mentors and mentees are identified and matched, and the expectations from both parties are enumerated (Hurst and Ebby, 2012). Guidelines such as the frequency of meeting, topics to be discussed, goal setting, training sessions for both the mentors and mentees, and the duration of the relationship were set (Kim, 2010). The structure offered by formal mentoring provides support to the mentor-mentee relationship that further gives focus, visibility, and commitment (Heykoop, 2019).

On the other hand, informal mentoring is unstructured, spontaneously being developed, and unplanned relationship between a mentor and mentee is created along the process. This happens on a natural basis based on mutual attraction and trust, and that no specific rules were set (Kim, 2010). Heykoop (2019) further explained that informal mentoring generally receives no support from the organization, resulting to individuals looking for their own mentor and defining the purpose of the relationship on their own.

Studies on these two types of mentoring majorly reported positive outcome on formal mentoring. Bouquillon (2004) reported that formal mentoring is perceived effective by mentees in providing career development, psychosocial support and role modeling versus informal mentoring. Meta-analysis of Payne and Huffman (2005) revealed that mentees in a formal mentoring reported higher level of organizational commitment. It was perceived that in such set-up, the organization communicated concern to their well-being and career development that enhances their perception of organizational support.

On the contrary, in a meta-analysis of Heykoop (2019), it was found out that mentees who selected their own mentors experienced higher rates of career advancement than those who were paired in a formal program. But when the mentor and mentees in a formal program

were allowed to be part of the matching process, greater satisfaction and perceived quality of mentoring is reported higher.

Nevertheless, contradicting results of formal and informal mentoring all suggests that mentoring in general brings positive outcomes such as lower turnover rate, improved job performance, career commitment, organization commitment, organizational self-esteem, job satisfaction and socialization into organizational roles (Kim, 2010).

Occupational Self-Efficacy and Mentoring in the Workplace

In a study conducted by Fülleman, Jenny, Brauchli, and Bauer (2015), expectations derived from self-efficacy also determines the effort to be given by an individual as well as how long the effort can last when adversities and challenges are experience.

These definitions given on self-efficacy becomes the foundation of having a domain specific self-efficacy referring to work conditions.

Researchers Chiesa, Toderi, Dordoni, Henkens, Fiabane, and Setti (2016) cited Lent that self-efficacy construct is dynamic in nature that it holds self beliefs that are connected to a particular domain and activities. Therefore, self-efficacy can be further elaborated through different levels of specificity. Holding such interpretation, the construct can be expounded on a domain-specific attribute applying the basic concept of "belief in one's ability to perform a domain-specific attribute to achieve the goal/s of a given domain.

Park and Jung (2015) believed that using self-efficacy in a specific domain would require specification of the domain or the task of interest. For example, the domain can be school or career related, thus named as academic self-efficacy or career self-efficacy respectively. In this study, the domain specific pertains to the occupation, or job, or work. Thus occupational self-efficacy, or job self-efficacy, or work self-efficacy are the identified specification in this study.

Fülleman et. al. (2015) supported that OSE is a medium of specificity that is specific to the occupational context. It narrows down the measure of self-efficacy to task specific thus allows comparisons of different works, professions, and work sectors.

To further explain the use of self-efficacy in an occupational domain, Fülleman et. al. (2015) provided an explanation of how self-efficacy applies to work domain. As stated earlier, there are four main sources of information in the SCT's self-efficacy construct namely mastery of experience, social modeling, social persuasion, and physical and emotional states. In application to work setting, own experience of successfully completing a given assignment can increase occupational self-efficacy. In terms of social modeling, if someone of similar capacity, a colleague for example, successfully mastered a challenging assignment, they serve as social models. Social comparison of one's ability to the given social model, can lead to a conclusion that same result can be gained. For social persuasion, positive reinforcement from a person of

authority such as a supervisor can increase one's belief to fulfil a challenging tasks. Finally, when an individual draws information from their own positive emotional and physical well-being, that he / she believes that he / she has the ability to accomplish a challenging task such as big projects, increases one's efficacy. To Schyns (2005), these four sources in the occupational context are important factors in preparing employees for occupational change. Findings from the study indicated that employee's self-efficacy affects adaptation to organizational changes.

Organizational Commitment and Mentoring in the Workplace

Plethora of researches were conducted about mentoring and organizational commitment. In a meta-analysis of Allen and Eby (2004) on their study of mentoring, researchers found out that individuals who are mentored are less likely to leave the organization. The same findings was found out by Lapointe and Vandenberghe (2017) on their study of mentoring on various businesses.

In Heykoop's (2019) study on mentoring on industries under the Fortune 100 companies, it was found out that mentees with supervisory mentoring and those with intrinsic motives to pursue mentoring all reported having high level of organizational commitment. It was further found out that the impact of mentoring to increasing organizational commitment also reflects among employees who had mentoring experience in the past. Meaning, mentees who are part of the organization's mentoring program and even those who are not part of the program and had experience of mentoring from previous organizations, both showed high level of organizational commitment.

Similarly, Woo's (2016) exploratory study on mentoring and organizational commitment among Korean firms including financial services, information services and manufacturing, revealed that mentoring programs were recognized as a method to increase organizational commitment. It was further reported that the sub-functions of mentoring positively correlates with the employee's level of organizational commitment. Thus, enhanced organizational commitment reduced the turnover intentions of employees.

Moreover, researchers were also interested in knowing what type of organizational commitment is highly related to mentoring. Meaning, researchers were interested to know what kind of commitment organizational commitment developed among the mentees. To recall, there are three types of organizational commitment identified: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment.

Majority of the researches conducted on various industries revealed strong relationship of mentoring and affective commitment. Faraz Naim and Usha (2017), for example mentioned that mentoring as a developmental intervention enhances the competencies of employees that leads to having sense of emotional bonding, a characteristic of affective commitment. They

further suggested that enhancing affective commitment can be achieved by integrating mentoring in the talent management strategy as it revitalizes the branding of organization that cares for the development of employees, thus further attracts and retains employees, specifically the millennials. Such strong linkage of mentoring and affective commitment and retention promotes the culture of continuous learning, knowledge sharing and evokes positive employee attitude. They further explained that when an organization demonstrates care and concern for their employees through offering of avenues for development, it satisfies higher orders of self-esteem and self-actualization, that in return reciprocate to organizational commitment.

Three variables were reviewed in this study - mentoring, occupational self-efficacy, and organizational commitment. These variables were explored through its conceptual meaning, its industrial application or usage, its relation to various human resources variables and the inter-relation of mentoring to OSE and OC.

The studies revealed that mentoring is one of the most researched topics in Western culture given its popularity of usage. Literature revealed that mentoring was used since the time of Homer and can be seen on the mythological works like *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. There have been reported practices of mentoring in the workplace prior to industrial revolution but such practice was informal in nature. Mentoring (also referred as apprenticeship) in its contextual definition refers to the relationship between a mentor and a mentee (also referred as protégé/apprentice) that aims to transfer knowledge from a senior to a more junior individual. Such relationship provides support such as career, psychosocial, and role modeling and is directed towards the advancement and development of the mentee. In contrast to coaching that focuses on skills development, mentoring goes beyond skills and creates a more personal relation that can last for a long period of time or even a lifetime. To the words of some researchers, it is considered as one's personal board of trustees.

Studies on mentoring revealed similarities and differences in terms of its relationship with various demographic profiles across industries. On the other hand, mentoring and occupational self-efficacy's relationship are still limited. Few studies have been conducted for the two variables.

On the other hand, occupational self-efficacy's literature is considered limited as the term is a domain-specific of the general construct of Bandura's self-efficacy, the central theme of the Social Cognitive Theory. The construct believes that an individual's behavior is affected by his or her self-efficacy belief that is a product of any or combination of the four sources namely mastery of experience, social modeling, social persuasion, and emotional and physical state. Derived from such, occupational self-efficacy (also referred as job self-efficacy or work self-efficacy) adopted the concept in the context of work setting. This gave birth to the domain-specific attribute of OSE. Occupational self-efficacy then, as literature and studies defined refers to an employee's belief in one's ability and competence in order to perform a given task

or an occupation itself. The studies conducted on OSE revealed its relatedness to various career or work related attributes such as career choice, hiring, job performance, learning, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship, motivation, and work engagement. It was also found out that mentoring greatly influence OSE in such a way that mentoring becomes an avenue to experience mastery, modeling and social persuasion. Different studies revealed that role modelling strongly develops occupational self-efficacy while other studies revealed that it is psychosocial that helps enhances occupational self-efficacy. But nevertheless, the wide array of OSE's correlation makes it a significant predictor of human resources facets that can be beneficial to the practice.

Lastly, organizational commitment is one of the widely researched topic in industrial and organizational psychology as well as in human resource development. Such interest given to organizational commitment can be attributed to its imperative role in ensuring a balance workforce. In fact, same as OSE, organizational commitment has been found to be correlated to job performance, turnover intention, job satisfaction, training, engagement, etc. Organizational commitment as defined, refers to the psychological relationship between the employee and employer. It is the attachment created between the two, affected by various factors.

Researches conducted on mentoring and its effect on organizational commitment on various industries revealed different results. There were studies that found significant positive correlation between mentoring and its functions to affective commitment while some found that not all mentoring functions correlates to affective commitment. Some studies claimed that emotional bond formed during mentoring creates the kind of organizational commitment in an employee. On the other hand, normative commitment and continuance commitment relationship to mentoring revealed that it varies on industries. Financial institution, sales services and IT industries reported having a relationship between normative commitment and mentoring. While in the military, continuance commitment showed relationship with mentoring. These findings suggest that mentoring develops different types of organizational commitment depending on the industry. It also shows that there are other factors that affects the development of organizational commitment vis-a-vis mentoring and its functions. In the case of this research, mentoring functions, occupational self-efficacy and organizational commitment were explored in the business processing and outsourcing industry.

The practice of mentoring in the workplace was found to have personal benefits to the individual and organizational benefits to the company. In this research, it will try to identify whether mentoring functions will show correlation on the occupational self-efficacy of the mentee (personal benefit) and on the perceived organizational commitment of the mentees (organizational benefit). This study is an attempt to fill in the gap in literature and studies of mentoring vis-a-vis the level of occupational self-efficacy of the mentees, and the

organizational commitment and its types. Qualitatively, this study used a semi-structured interview with the respondents to support the findings of the quantitative method. The narrative of the respondents will provide a better understanding of the practice and its effect on their occupational self-efficacy and organizational commitment.

Materials and methods

In this study on the relationship of mentoring functions to occupational self-efficacy (OSE) and organizational commitment (OC), a mixed method analysis will be utilized. Mixed method is deemed appropriate to provide more depth to the study. Quantitatively, this study utilized a descriptive correlational method to describe the relationship between the variables (mentoring functions and OSE and mentoring functions and OC)

Participants are employees of a business processing and outsourcing (BPO) industry who have experienced mentoring in their industry as mentees. Based on the data given by the Director for Training and Performance Improvement who handles the mentoring program, there were 50 employees who have completed the apprenticeship program. Due to the small number of the population, the entire population of mentees were identified as the respondent of this study.

To support the data from the survey, an interview was conducted among a sample of the respondents identified through purposive sampling. Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) explained that purposive sampling involves researcher's intentional selection of participants. It was further explained that some of the key results during the quantitative phase such as statistically significant, statistically non-significant, key significant predictors variables that differentiate groups, outliers or extreme cases, distinguish demographic characteristics, or simply individuals that volunteer to participate in the interviews, can be used as identifier for the interview. One of these conditions was considered after showing statistical significant correlation to mentoring functions - gender.

In summary, majority of the respondents ages 26 to 40 years old (78%), mostly female (60%), holds an analysts and trainers position (76%), and has a tenure of 5 to 10 years (66%).

Research Instrument

Three (3) standardized tests was utilized in this study namely Mentoring Functions Questionnaire (MFQ-9), Occupational Self-Efficacy Short Version, and Three Component Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. These standardized tests were merged in one form preserving each tool in one section. To be exact, in Section I - Mentoring Functions Questionnaire; Section II - Occupational Self-Efficacy Short Version and; Section III - Three Component Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.

Results and Discussions

Table 1.
Overall Level of Mentoring Functions

	Mean	Adjectival Description	Interpretation
<i>Mentoring Functions</i>			
Career Support Function	4.30	Strongly Agree	Very High
Psychosocial Support Function	4.11	Agree	High
Role Modelling Function	4.30	Strongly Agree	Very High
MENTORING FUNCTIONS	4.24	Strongly Agree	Very High

Source: Own authorship.

Table 1 shows the level of mentoring functions as perceived by the respondents. Career support function and role modelling function were both perceived very high with a mean weighted average of 4.30. Meanwhile, psychosocial support function was perceived as high with a mean weighted average of 4.11. Overall, the level of mentoring based on its functions that the respondents received from their mentors is very high with a mean weighted average of 4.24.

In general, the overall level of mentoring functions were perceived by the respondents as very high. This denotes that the respondents strongly agree that career support function and role modelling function were given to them by their mentors.

Furthermore, respondents agree that psychosocial support function was given to but not as high as the other two functions.

The findings presented above can be supported by the following previously conducted studies and the findings from the interview conducted among selected respondents.

First, in the study of Weng et. al. (2010), role modelling function was reported to have the highest mean average in comparison to career support and psychosocial support. It was found out that the role modelling function was perceived higher than the other functions due to the technical knowledge and abilities of the mentors that were observed by the mentees, thus leading to imitation of such positive behavior. The same can be observed in the results of this study, wherein role modelling function is one of the top mentoring functions perceived to be very high among the respondents.

In relation to this, the interview data also revealed that their mentors provided them with various skills enhancement necessary for them to perform their duties. In fact, 6 of the 10 interviewees specifically mentioned how their mentors taught them of various skills that they were able to apply to others as well such as side by side observation of how tasks are performed and mimicking the trust given by opening up as well.

Similarly, career support function tallied the highest mean average as well. This can be supported by the interviewee data wherein all of the interviewees were able to express how their mentors were able to help them in their career in terms of skills enhancement, values formation, giving them challenging tasks, and guidance.

Lastly, in terms of psychosocial support, three (3) of the interviewees expressed uncertainty as to the level of psychosocial support that they received. As defined early on, trust is fundamental in the psychosocial support function. Individual personalities (being reserved and shy) and personal work attitude (keeping work and personal life separated) are the factors that led to partial trust given to their mentors.

Table 2.
Perceived level of occupational self-efficacy

Statement	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. I can remain calm when facing difficulties in my job because I can rely on my abilities.	4.56	Very High
2. When I am confronted with a problem in my job, I can usually find several solutions.	4.50	Very High
3. Whatever comes my way in my job, I can usually handle it.	4.48	Very High
4. My past experiences in my job have prepared me well for my occupational future.	4.56	Very High
5. I meet the goals that I set for myself in my job.	4.36	Very High
6. I feel prepared for most of the demands in my job.	4.38	Very High
Overall Mean	4.47	Very High

Legend: Very High (4.20-5.00), High (3.40-4.19), Neutral (2.60-3.39), Low (1.80-2.59), Very Low (1.00-1.79)

Source: Own authorship.

Table 3 displays the perceived level of occupational self-efficacy of the mentees. Measured using six (6) statements pertaining to the respondents' perceived self-efficacy at work, it can be noticed that respondents perceived that the general level of occupational self-efficacy to be very high across all items with a mean average of 4.47.

These findings and the interview results are synonymous to the theoretical framework of Alfred Bandura, Self-Efficacy Theory positing self-efficacy as an enhancer of human

accomplishment and personal well-being in such a way that when a difficult task is given, a person approaches it as a challenge to be mastered instead of a threat.

To further expound these findings, there are three themes in the statements namely general self-efficacy statements on optimism (statements 1-3), goal-oriented statements (statements 4 & 5) and, heuristic competence statement (statement 6). Dissecting such it can be noticed that goal-oriented statement (I meet the goals that I set for myself in my job) and a general self-efficacy statement on being optimistic when faced with challenges in the context of occupational setting (I can remain calm when facing difficulties in my job because I can rely on my abilities.), both tallied the highest mean average score of 4.56. On the other hand, tallying the lowest mean average score at 4.36, goal-oriented statement "I meet the goals that I set for myself in my job", nevertheless is still interpreted as very high. Therefore, all goal-oriented statements (Statements 4 and 5) denote that respondents have very high level of confidence in terms of attaining their goal. Same goes with the level of optimism when faced with challenging tasks in the workplace as expressed in statements 1 - 3. All three statements are part of the top 3 highest mean average scores. Lastly, statement 6 tallied second to the lowest mean average score at 4.38 denotes a very high level of heuristic competence or one's belief on the effectiveness of his/her ability when facing different situations.

This can be supported by the data from the interview. The interview revealed that majority of the interviewees has a definite goal upon entering the mentoring program such as personal growth (7 mentions), promotion (4 mentions) and financial related (1 mention). Prior to entering the mentoring program, some have questioned their abilities to perform for higher roles, the challenges of taking in new roles, making adjustments, and the type of personality needed for the new role vs their perceived personality.

It can be said that the high level of confidence in attaining the goals they set for themselves, sprung from their ability to achieved it in spite of the challenges they faced along the journey. Take note that all 10 interviewees were able to achieved the goals they've set prior to entering the mentoring program. All 10 interviewees shared their challenges during the program and how they were able to surpassed it, thus could have increased their level of occupational self-efficacy.

Furthermore, findings above support Fülleman et. al. (2015) that occupational self-efficacy, a domain specific to work setting, can be increased through own experience of successfully completing a certain goal (agency). Data from the survey and the interview revealed how the mentees experiences, specifically that of from the mentoring program helped in enhancing their occupational self-efficacy.

Table 3.
Overall Perceived Level of Organizational Commitment

Types of Organizational Commitment	Mean	Adjectival Description	Interpretation
Normative Commitment	4.86	Slightly Agree	High
Affective Commitment	4.80	Slightly Agree	High
Continuance Commitment	4.56	Slightly Agree	High
Organizational Commitment	4.74	Slightly Agree	High

Legend: Very High (6.16-7.00), Moderately High (5.30-6.15), High (4.44-5.29), Neutral (3.58-4.43), Low (2.72-3.57), Moderately Low (1.86-2.71), Very Low (1.00-1.85). Source: Own authorship.

Table 4 displays the overall perceived level of organizational commitment by the respondents. Normative commitment tallied the highest with a mean average of 4.86, closely followed by affective commitment at 4.80 mean average, and lastly continuance commitment at 4.56 mean average. All the three types of organizational commitment were perceived to be high.

It can be derived that the level of organizational commitment of the respondents regardless of its type are above the midpoint scale and qualitatively, they are equal. But according to Meyer and Allen (2004), in theory, the optimal profile should be one in which affective commitment scores are high (above the scale midpoint) and the continuance commitment scores should be considerably lower (below the scale midpoint). In the case of the respondents, all three types of organizational commitment are above the scale midpoint with normative commitment on top and continuance commitment in the bottom. Having a high normative commitment denotes that respondents felt obligated to the organization. While having a high continuance commitment denotes that employees may feel "trapped" in the organization. Such elevated score of continuance commitment can contribute to low rate of turnover, these employees will do little beyond what is expected from them.

Zabala (2015) findings affirm the same overall high level of OC in a BPO industry ($\bar{x} = 4.71$). Normative commitment ($\bar{x} = 4.88$) was found to be the dominant as well followed by affective commitment ($\bar{x} = 4.87$) and continuance commitment ($\bar{x} = 4.38$). It was reported that the organization's commitment to enhance the quality of life of its employees through offering various benefits that promotes work-life balance make the employees committed to the organization.

On the other hand, the interview revealed an interesting findings wherein combination of several organizational commitment types such as having an affective-continuance commitment, normative-affective commitment, and normative-continuance commitment. In fact, two of the interviewees shared how the company helped them when the typhoon struck their site and they were relocated to Manila with full assistance. Interviewees felt that such act deserves their loyalty to the organization. This could have been part of the reasons why normative commitment tallied the highest among the respondents. The organizational culture of commitment to one another could have possibly instigate such commitment. The interconnectedness of the three types of organizational commitment could have led to the high level of all three types.

Table 4.

Correlation of Perceived Level of Mentoring Functions and Perceived Level of Occupational Self-Efficacy

Mentoring Functions vs OSE	Computed Pearson-R	Computed p-value	Decision	Remarks
Career Support vs OSE	0.2539	0.0752	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Psychosocial Support vs OSE	0.2820	0.0475	Reject Ho	Significant
Role Modeling vs OSE	0.0479	0.7411	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Note: If p-value is less than the level of significance which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis otherwise accept. Source: Own authorship.

Table 4 represents the correlation table of the perceived level of mentoring functions namely career support, psychosocial support and role modeling to the perceived level of occupational self-efficacy. The table shows that mentoring functions namely career support ($p = 0.075$) and role modeling ($p = 0.741$) has no statistical significant relationship to occupational self-efficacy. Both of their computed p-values are greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus failed to establish relationship.

Meanwhile, the correlation of psychosocial support function of mentoring ($p = 0.048$) and occupational self-efficacy is less than 0.05 level of significance, thus statistical significant relationship was established between psychosocial support function and occupational self-efficacy.

In general, mentoring functions and occupational self-efficacy has a computed p-value of 0.1404 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it can be derived that

there is no statistical significant relationship between the level of mentoring based on its functions and OSE, thus the null hypothesis is retained. The correlation of the mentoring functions and OSE also showed positive negligible correlation.

From these findings, it can be said that mentoring functions at some point may have affected the occupational self-efficacy of an individual on certain criteria and conditions. In this case, psychosocial support of mentoring has statistical significant relation to the occupational self-efficacy of the respondents. This can attributed to the perceived importance of motivation, counseling, coaching, and friendship (as mentioned during the interview) in enhancing one's occupational self-efficacy.

Furthermore, in the context of this study, there are several factors that could have contributed why the two variables did not correlates. First, self-efficacy does not rely only on what the mentoring program can provide alone. Possibilities of other organizational interventions aimed toward increasing self-efficacy such as recognition program and performance management, may have affected the data. Additionally, tenure may have played its role as well, as the demographic profile (see Table 1) revealed that 66% of the respondents has a tenure period of 5 years to 10 years.

Second, the research was conducted among employees who have gone through the mentoring program. They are "graduates" of the program already. The timeline as to how long since the last time they were under mentoring program could be a factor as answering the survey would require a recall of experience. The period of time that they were out of the mentoring program opens greater possibilities of experiencing other factors that help increase their occupational self-efficacy.

The result above partially supports the findings of Kanten (2017) wherein career support ($p = 0.89$), and role modeling ($p = 0.090$) have no statistical significant relation to self-efficacy. On the other hand, the same study found no statistical significant relation to self-efficacy and psychosocial support ($p = -.028$) in contrast to the findings from this study. Kanteen (2017) suggests that other variables could have affected career-related consequences.

Conversely, Klaijnsen et. al. (2017) study found out that satisfaction of psychological needs, including psychosocial needs has strong effect on one's occupational self-efficacy ($p = 0.506$) thus allowing to develop innovative behavior. Satisfaction on meeting such psychosocial needs sustains the feeling of confidence in facing challenges and changes or unforeseen situations that may occur in their jobs. The same was claimed by Ragins and Kram (2007) stating that psychosocial mentoring function leads to enhance protégés self-esteem, self-efficacy and personal growth.

Table 5

Overall Correlation of Perceived Level of Mentoring and Perceived Level of Organizational Commitment and Its Types

Mentoring Functions vs	Computed Pearson-R	Computed p-value	Decision	Remarks
Affective Commitment	0.0644	0.6567	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Continuance Commitment	0.0162	0.9111	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Normative Commitment	-0.0447	0.7577	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Note: If p-value is less than the level of significance which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis otherwise accept. Source: Own authorship.

The table above, Table 5, displays the correlation of mentoring functions to organizational commitment (OC) and its attributes namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative. Mentoring functions correlation to organizational commitment has a computed p-value of 0.8812 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, thus the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the perceived level of mentoring functions to employees' perceived level organizational commitment is retained.

More so, mentoring functions versus the types of organizational commitment namely affective commitment ($p = 0.6567$), continuance commitment ($p = 0.9111$) and normative commitment ($p = 0.7577$) found no statistical significant correlation as well. A negative correlation was found also between mentoring and normative commitment.

From these findings and previous studies conducted on these variables, it can be assumed that the nature of mentoring in terms of its formality or informality may have affected the result of this study. It must be taken in to consideration that related studies were conducted on industries with a structured mentoring program and which mentoring program is highly valued in contrast to the Philippines' mentoring situation wherein mentoring is still yet to flourish. As mentioned previously, studies on mentoring in the industrial setting of the country is still limited wherein mentoring search in Google would generate results on mentoring in education and entrepreneurship. Second, the number of respondents ($n = 50$) could have affected the results of this study. Third, the presence of reversed-keyed questions as explained

in Table 11, might have affected the results. Lastly, the inter-connectedness of the level of organizational commitment as discussed in Table 10, wherein it was found out that there are respondents who shared having multiple dominant types of organizational commitment could have affected the data's correlation. In fact all three organizational commitment types were scored above the mid-point. Thus, it could have created a blur line to the connection of mentoring functions to any of the organizational commitment types.

Furthermore, findings of this study in terms of mentoring functions correlation to organizational commitment is in contrast to several studies conducted. Heykoop's (2009) study indicated that mentoring increased the organizational commitment of the employees who had mentoring experience within the organization and from their previous organizations. Faraz Naim and Usha (2017) on the other hand, further reported that of the attributes of organizational commitment, affective commitment in the form of having sense of emotional bonding, was greatly enhanced among the mentees who are part of a mentoring program. Meanwhile, Hartmann et. al (2012) found out that aside from affective commitment, normative commitment shown positive relation to mentoring as well. Lastly, Payne and Huffman (2019) found out that continuance commitment is also enhanced through mentoring as the mentees considers leaving the organization as a loss of investment.

In comparison to the above studies, as mentioned above, this study was conducted on an organization whose mentoring program is not as structured as those that were used in the abovementioned studies.

Table 6

Correlation of Career Support Mentoring Function and the Types of Organizational Commitment

Career Support Function	Computed Pearson-R	Computed p-value	Decision	Remarks
Affective Commitment	0.0392	0.7868	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Continuance Commitment	0.0480	0.7406	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Normative Commitment	-0.1133	0.4332	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Organizational Commitment	-0.0091	0.9497	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Note: If p-value is less than the level of significance which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis otherwise accept. Source: Own authorship.

Table 6 shows the correlation of career support mentoring function to organizational commitment and its three types namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and

normative commitment. Career support showed no statistical significant correlation to organizational commitment ($p = 0.9497$), to affective commitment ($p = 0.7868$), to continuance commitment ($p = 0.7406$), and to normative commitment ($p=0.4332$). Negative relationship was found on normative commitment and career support as well as with the overall organizational commitment. All the computed values are greater than 0.05 significant value. It can be derived that career support mentoring function has no statistical significant correlation to organizational commitment and its types.

Reviewing these findings and the available literature, there are several factors that may have affected the correlation of these variables such as age. It must be noted that majority of the respondents are millenials. According to the 14th Annual Global CEO Survey report of PwC (PricewaterhouseCoopers) (2011), though millenials are career driven, organizational commitment is not a strong value among them. However, millenials are more committed to task and growth. Therefore, though career movement was seen among them as discussed on Table 6, it may not directly affect their organizational commitment. It is worth noting too, that the level of organizational commitment on Table 10 showed that all organizational commitment types are above the mid-point thus, resulting to multiple dominant types.

Reviewing available literature, in the study of Çetin et. al. (2013), mentoring's career support function was found to have statistical significant correlation to affective commitment ($p = 0.003$) and normative commitment ($p = 0.002$) which is in contrast to the findings in this study. According to the authors, other variables such as age and gender, shadow the impact of these variables on one another. Meaning to say, inclusion of the aforementioned demographic variables could affect the correlation of career support to the three types of organizational commitment.

On the other hand, when career support was measured against continuance commitment, no statistical significant correlation was found to continuance commitment ($p=0.953$), as similar to the result of this study. When age ($p = 0.002$) was placed in the model, it rendered a negative significant correlation. In addition, an exploratory study of Sow et.al. (2016) identified that career support function relates more strongly to career outcomes such as job attainment versus organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment. Needless to say, it can be said that career support function of mentoring may create greater impact when other variables are involved.

Table 7

Correlation of Psychosocial Support Mentoring Function and the Types of Organizational Commitment

Psychosocial Support Function	Computed Pearson-R	Computed p-value	Decision	Remarks
--------------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	----------------

Affective Commitment	0.0469	0.7463	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Continuance Commitment	-0.1215	0.4005	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Normative Commitment	-0.0086	0.9525	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Organizational Commitment	-0.0352	0.8083	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Note: If p-value is less than the level of significance which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis otherwise accept. Source: Own authorship.

In terms of the correlation of mentoring's psychosocial function to organizational commitment and its three types namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment, Table 7 shows that there is no statistical significant correlation between these variables. No statistical significant correlation was found between psychosocial support and affective commitment ($p = 0.7463$); continuance commitment ($p = 0.4005$); and normative commitment ($p = 0.9525$). It can be noticed as well that only affective commitment showed positive correlation to psychosocial support.

It can be assumed from the data, that psychosocial support and affective commitment has a possibility for correlation should a greater number of respondents who have been involved. More so, by the nature of psychosocial support function, emotional in nature, it may not have fully attach to a cost-based type of commitment (continuance) and an obligation-based type of commitment (normative). These findings can be supported by the following studies.

First, study of Craig et. al. (2012), found that psychosocial support and affective commitment shows significant relationship, thus psychosocial support provided predictive value for affective commitment. Furthermore, Craig (2012) stated that psychosocial support has greater impact to affective commitment due to its emotional nature versus other mentoring functions and other types of commitment. In this study, it can be noticed that psychosocial support function of mentoring has positive correlation to only one type of organizational commitment - affective commitment. Though the correlation showed negligible relation, the number of respondents involved ($n=50$) could have increased the correlation.

On the other hand, Çetin et.al. (2013) found out that psychosocial support does not have statistical significant effect on affective commitment and continuance commitment which supports the findings in this study. It was further postulated that when other variables such as age and gender were included in the model, the effect of psychosocial support to affective

commitment and continuance becomes significant. It was concluded that these factors shadowed each other's effect.

Meanwhile, a study of Weng et.al. (2010) found out that psychosocial support does not have significant correlation to organizational commitment as similar to this study. It was found out that other mentoring functions namely, career support and role modeling are related to organizational commitment. These two functions were found to be influential to the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Table 8

Correlation of Role Modelling Mentoring Function and the Types of Organizational Commitment

Role Modelling Function	Computed Pearson-R	Computed p-value	Decision	Remarks
Affective Commitment	0.0876	0.5450	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Continuance Commitment	0.1081	0.4550	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Normative Commitment	0.0009	0.9949	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Organizational Commitment	0.0984	0.4966	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Note: If p-value is less than the level of significance which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis otherwise accept. Source: Own authorship.

Table 18 presents the correlation of role modelling mentoring function to organizational commitment and its three types - affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. The table shows that all the variables, affective commitment ($p = 0.5450$), continuance commitment ($p = 0.4550$), and normative commitment ($p = 0.9949$) have no statistical significant correlation to role modeling function of mentoring. All these variables meanwhile, showed positive relationship.

The findings revealed that role modelling showed no correlation to any type of organizational commitment. This can be due to the fact that the respondents' organizational commitment are all above the scale mid-point thus creating multiple dominant organizational type. Such can possibly lead to perplexity in identifying what really drives their commitment thus would further lead blurring line of connection to mentoring functions. Interestingly, comparing all the correlation tables of mentoring and organizational commitment (Table 16, 17, and 18) it can be noticed that role modelling function showed consistent positive

relationship to organizational commitment and its types, however negligible in relation due to possibility of smaller number of respondents (n=50).

In the study of Çetin et.al. (2013) one of the consistent finding was the significant correlation of role modelling on affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. It was further proposed that role modelling function of mentoring has more significant correlation to organizational commitment in general. Such findings were in contrast to the findings of this study wherein no statistically significant relationship was established between role modelling function of mentoring and organizational commitment and its types.

Nevertheless, this supports Weng et. al. (2010) findings that role modelling function provided by the mentors has positively influence organizational commitment. It was further explained that when mentors exhibit positive values such as high level of professionalism and attitude, it win the mentees' confidence and respect and was viewed as benchmark that further helps the mentees in adapting to the workplace, enhancing job satisfaction and improving their sense of organizational commitment.

Conclusion

1. Mentees experienced a very high level of career support and role modelling from their mentors through receiving challenging tasks, career guidance, skills enhancement, and values formation, and shadow coaching and observation that leads to professional growth and enhancement of their confidence to perform and deliver. Meanwhile, high level of psychosocial support was due to the individual

personality differences and varying work attitude that may have impact the acceptance and confirming nature of mentoring relationship.

2. Very high level of perceived occupational self-efficacy is a product of mentees ability to surpass challenges to attain their pre-mentoring goals such as personal growth, promotion, and to be financially able.
3. Mentees showed high level of organizational commitment (OC) with normative commitment (NC) as the dominant type, followed by affective commitment (AC), and continuance commitment (CC).
 - 3.1. High level of AC is emotion-based which is a product of the bond created among colleagues. However, the presence of reversed-keyed items, pose a challenge in terms of consistency of responses.
 - 3.2. High level of CC denotes that low turnover is expected however employees may feel trapped in the organization and they will do little beyond what is expected. Among the factors being considered are financial cost and availability of organization/jobs that would match their preferences.
 - 3.3. The dominant high level of NC is an obligation-based commitment developed by the company's effort to make them feel valued such as extending help during a calamity.
4. Occupational self-efficacy showed significant relation to the mentees' perceived level of psychosocial support received from their mentors which can be attributed to the perceived importance of motivation, counseling, coaching, and friendship. However, no significant relationship of mentoring functions to OSE can be attributed to the effect of other organizational intervention programs and the characteristic of the respondents (graduates of the apprenticeship program) who might have experienced other intervention program.
5. The mentees perceived level of mentoring functions showed no statistical correlation to any types of organizational commitment. Related studies revealed that millenials, which majority of the respondents are part of, are task committed rather than organizationally committed, thus age demography may have been a factor.
 - 5.1. Career support could have relate more strongly to career outcomes such as job attainment versus organizational outcomes like OC. Thus, career

support function may create greater impact when other variables such as demographics are involved.

- 5.2. Psychosocial support showed no significant correlation to the three types of organizational commitment. However, only affective commitment showed positive relationship due to the same emotional nature of the two.
- 5.3. Role modelling function showed no statistical correlation to all the types of OC but role modelling is the only mentoring function that showed consistent positive relationship to organizational commitment and its types. However, multiple dominant OC types may have lead to perplexity in identifying what really drives the respondents' commitment and the small number of respondents may have been a factor too.

REFERENCES

- Adkins, A., (2015). Majority of U.S. Employees Not Engaged Despite Gains in 2014. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/181289/majority-employees-not-engaged-despite-gains-2014.aspx>
- Allen, T. D., (2007). Mentoring Relationships From the Perspective of the Mentor. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255591043>. Retrieved September 8, 2019.
- Allen, T. D., and Eby, L. T. (2004). Factors Related to Mentor Reports of Mentoring Functions Provided: Gender and Relational Characteristics. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 50, Nos. 1/2, January 2004
- Allen, T. D., Lentz, E. and, Day, R. (2006). Career Success Outcomes Associated With Mentoring Others: A Comparison of Mentors and Nonmentors. *Journal of Career Development* 2006 32: 272. DOI: 10.1177/0894845305282942
- Babin, B. J. and Sarstedt, M. (2019). *The Great Facilitator. Reflections on the Contributions of Joseph F. Hair, Jr. to Marketing and Business Research*. Springer Nature Switzerland
- Bainbridge, H. T. J., & Lee, I. (2014). Mixed methods in HRM research. In K. Sanders, J. A. Cugin & H. T. J. Bainbridge (Eds.), *Research Methods for Human Resource Management* (pp. 15-33). Third Avenue, NY: Routledge.
- Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (2016). *Creating a Mentoring and Coaching Culture: The BSP Experience*. Retrieved from http://pstd.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/pstd_uncon_2_elvira_ditching-lorico.pdf. Retrieved October 8, 2019.
- Baruch, Y. (2004). Transforming Careers: From Linear to Multidirectional Career Paths, Organizational and Individual Perspectives. *Career Development International* Vol. 9, No. 1, 2004. DOI: 10.1108/13620430410518147
- Brashear-Alejandro, T., Barksdale, H., Bellenger, D., Norton, B., James, S., James, C. (2019). Mentoring characteristics and functions: mentoring's influence on salespeople. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 34 Issue: 2, pp.303-316, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-09-2017-0223>

- Boslaugh, S. (2013). *Statistics in a Nutshell, Second Edition. A Desktop Quick Reference*. O'Reilly Media Inc., pp. 173 - 191
- Bouquillon, E. A. (2004). *Antecedents Associated with Mentor Functions Received and Career Outcomes Reported by Protégés and Non-mentored Employees*. Thesis in Workforce Education and Development, The Pennsylvania State University Graduate School, College of Education
- Bryson, A. & White, M. (2008). *Organizational Commitment: Do Workplace Practices Matter?*.
- Benton, B. (2014). *The challenge of working for Americans: Perspectives of an international workforce*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Birgit S. (2004). *The Influence of Occupational Self-Efficacy on the Relationship of Leadership Behavior and Preparedness for Occupational Change*, *Journal of Career Development*, Vol. 30, No. 4, Summer 2004.
- Blaess, D., Bloom, L. K., Hollywood, K., & Santin, C. (2017). *Strategies, Stages, and Opportunities for Maximizing Mentoring Relationships*. *Chronicle of Mentoring and Coaching*, October 2017, Special Issue 10, pp.275-281.
- Carrell, W. S., (2018). *Examining the Mediating Influence of Occupational Self-efficacy and Perceived Organizational Support on the Relationship Between Perceived Managerial Coaching Behaviors and Employee Engagement Among Higher Education Enrolment Management Professionals*, *Human Resource Development Theses and Disertation*, Paper 28
- Carter, J. W., and Yousseff-Morgan, C. M. (2019). *The positive psychology of mentoring: A longitudinal analysis of psychological capital development and performance in a formal mentoring program*. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. 2019;1–23. DOI: 10.1002/hrdq.21348
- Castro, S. L., Scandura, T. A. PhD., and Williams, E. A. (2013) "Validity of Scandura and Ragins' (1993) Multidimensional Mentoring Measure: An Evaluation and Refinement" (2004). *Management Faculty Articles and Papers*. 7. http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/management_articles/7
- Catalyst (2018), *Quick Take: Generations-Demographic Trends in Population and Workforce*, August 20, 2018. Retrieved from www.catalyst.org/research/generations-demographic-trends-in-population-and-workforce/. Accessed October 6, 2019.
- Çetin, A. T., Kizil, C., Zengin, H. İ. (2013). *Impact of Mentoring on Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Accounting-Finance Academicians Employed in Turkey*. *Emerging Markets Journal* , 3 (2), 1-34.
- Chandler, D. & Kram, K. (2007). "Mentoring and Developmental Networks in the New Career Context". *Handbook of Career Studies*, pp. 241-267. SAGE Publications, Inc. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412976107.n13>
- Chao, G. T. (2008). *Mentoring and Organizational Socialization: Networks for Work Adjustment*. In Ragins, Belle Rose & Kram, Kathy E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*, pp. 179-196. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412976619.n7>
- Chiu, Chia-Nan., & Chen, Huei-Huang. (2016). *The study of knowledge management capability and organizational effectiveness in Taiwanese public utility: the mediator role of organizational commitment*. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1).commitment
- Cho, Y. (2018). *The Relationship among Mentoring, Self-efficacy and Work Engagement*. *Korean Journal of Business Administration* Vol.31 No. 12, pp. 2301 ~ 2322, p. 22.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Wesson, M. J. (2015). *Organizational Behavior, Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*, 4th Edition, McGrawHill Education.

- Cooke, K. J., DO, Patt, D. A., MD, MPH, MBA, and Prabhu, R. S., MD, MS (2017). *The Road of Mentorship*. 2017 ASCO Educational Book.
Downloaded from ascopubs.org by 91.204.14.241 on September 7, 2019 from 091.204.014.241
- Christopher A. Craig, M. W. (2012). *The Impact of Career Mentoring and Psychosocial Mentoring on Affective Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement, and Turnover Intention*. *Administration and Society*, 45, 949-973.
- Craig, C. A., Allen, M. W., Reid, M. F., Riemenschneider, C. K. and Armstrong, D. J. (2013). *The Impact of Career Mentoring and Psychosocial Mentoring on Affective Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement, and Turnover Intention*. *Administration & Society* 2013 45: 949 originally published online 5 July 2012. DOI: 10.1177/009539971245188
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach*, Third Edition. Sage Publication.
- Creswell, J. W. and Plano Clark, Vicki L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publication.
- Curado, C. (2017). *Human Resource Management Contribution to Innovation in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: A Mixed Methods Approach*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd. DOI: 10.1111/caim.12251
- Dadiz, R. and Guillet, R. M. D, PhD (2015). *Mentors, Protégés, and the Mentoring Relationship*. *NeoReviews* Vol.16 No.2 February 2015. Retrieved from <http://neoreviews.aappublications.org>. Retrieved on September 8, 2019.
- David, M. and Sutton, C. D. (2004). *Social Research, The Basics*. Sage Publication.
- Dominguez, N. (2013). "Mentoring Unfolded: The Evolution of an Emerging Discipline."
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/oils_etds/6
- Dou, D. D. G. and Valcke, M. (2016), *The relationships between school autonomy gap, principal leadership, teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment*, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 1–19, Sage Publication
- Dougherty, T. W. & Dreher, G. F. (2008). *Mentoring and Career Outcomes: Conceptual and Methodological Issues in an Emerging Literature*. In Ragins, Belle Rose & Kram, Kathy E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*, pp. 51-94. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412976619.n3>
- Elias, S. M., Barney, C. E., Bishop, J. W. (2013), *The treatment of self-efficacy among psychology and management scholar*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 2013, 43, pp. 811–822
- Faraz, N. M. (2018). *Tap the Experienced to Care for the Inexperienced: Millennial Employees' Retention Challenge? Mentoring is the Solution*. In M. Coetzee et al. (eds.), *Psychology of Retention*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98920-4_18
- Faraz N. M. and Lenka, U. (2017). *How Does Mentoring Contribute to Gen Y Employees' Intention to Stay? An Indian Perspective*. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 2017, Vol. 13(2), 314–335. DOI:10.5964/ejop.v13i2.1304
- Feist, J. and Feist, G. J. (2008), *Theories of Personality 7th Edition*, What is self-efficacy? p. 488-492
- Fletcher, S. (2000). *Mentoring in Schools, A Handbook of Good Practice*.
- Fülleman, D., Jenny, G. J., Brauchli, R., Bauer, G. F., (2015). *The key role of shared participation in changing occupational self-efficacy through stress management courses*. *The British Psychology Society. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (2015), 88, 490–510

- Fowler, J. L., Gudmundsson, A. J., and O’Gorman, J. G. (2007). The relationship between mentee-mentor gender combination and the provision of distinct mentoring functions. *Women in Management Review* Vol. 22 No. 8, 2007 pp. 666-681. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. DOI 10.1108/09649420710836335
- Growth Reimagined: Prospects in emerging markets drive CEO confidence. (2011). 14th Annual Global CEO Survey, PricewaterhouseCoopers.
- Hall, D. T. & Chandler, D. E. (2008). Career Cycles and Mentoring. In Ragins, Belle Rose & Kram, Kathy E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*, pp. 471-498. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412976619.n19>
- Hartmann, N. N., Rutherford, B. N., Hamwi, G. A. and, Friend, S. B. (2012). The Effects of Mentoring on Salesperson Commitment. *Journal of Business Research* 2012. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.03.001
- Heykoop, C. (2019). The Perception Gap: The Promise of Mentorship and the Impact on Promotion and Organizational Commitment. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.21230.25920
- Hirschi, A. & Jaensch, V. K. (2015). Narcissism and career success: Occupational self efficacy and career engagement as mediators. *Personality and Individual Differences* 77 (2015) 205-208
- Hollywood, K. G., Ph.D., Blaess, D. A., Ph.D., Santin, C., Ed.D., and Bloom, L., D. C., FIACN (2016). Holistic mentoring and coaching to sustain organizational change and innovation. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership* Vol. 2, No. 1, May 2016, pp. 32 – 4. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17062/CJIL.v2i1.34>
- Hurst, C. S. and Eby, L. T. (2012). Mentoring in Organizations: Mentor or Tormentor?. N.P. Reilly et al. (eds.), *Work and Quality of Life: Ethical Practices in Organizations*, International Handbooks of Quality-of-Life, DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4_5
- Illies, M. Y. and Reiter-Palmon, R. (2018). The Effect of Value Similarity on Mentoring Relationships and Outcomes. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* 2018, 16 (1), DOI: 10.24384/000468
- Jyoti, J. and Sharma, P. (2015). Exploring the Role of Mentoring Structure and Culture between Mentoring Functions and Job Satisfaction: A Study on Indian Call Centre Employees. Sage Publications. DOI: 10.1177/097226291561088
- Kanten, S. P. K. (2017). The Effects of Mentoring Functions on Career Adaptabilities and Career Self-Efficacy. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* , 2 (7), 259-272.
- Klaeijnsen, A., Vermeulen, M. & Martens, R. (2017). Teachers’ Innovative Behaviour: The Importance of Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction, Intrinsic Motivation, and Occupational Self-Efficacy, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, DOI: 10.1080/00313831.2017.1306803
- Kahle-Piasecki, L. (2011). *Mentoring: What Organizations Need to Know to Improve Performance in the 21st Century Workplace*. The University of Toledo.
- Kim, S. (2010). *Mentor Characteristics And Protégé/Mentor Perceptions Of Mentoring Functions And Quality In Korean Companies*. Dissertation Graduate College of the University of Illinois. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46090576>. Retrieved on September 8, 2019
- Kontoghiorghes, C. (2015). Linking high performance organizational culture and talent management: satisfaction/motivation and organizational commitment as mediators, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*
- Kraiger, K., Finkelstein, L. M. and, Varghese, L. S. (2018). Enacting Effective Mentoring Behaviors: Development and Initial Investigation of the Cuboid of Mentoring. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9551-z>

- Kram, E. K. and Higgins, M. C., (2008), A New Approach to Mentoring, Wall Street Journal, www.wsj.com,. Retrieved April 20, 2019
- Kozák, A. and Krajcsák, Z. (2018). Retaining the rookie - role clarification through mentorship. *Human Systems Management* 37 (2018) 95-103. DOI 10.3233/HSM-17108
- Kumar, P. and Kuma, S. (2018). Mentoring in Start-up Company with Millennial Recruits. In Kumar, Payal (Ed.) *Exploring Dynamic Mentoring Models in India*, p.49. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-56405-0_2
- Lammers, J. C., Atouba, Y. L., and Carlson, E. J. (2013). Which Identities Matter? A Mixed-Method Study of Group Organizational, and Professional Identities and Their Relationship to Burnout. *Management Communication Quarterly* 2013 27:503 originally published online 22 August 2013. DOI: 10.1177/089331891349882
- Lapointe, É., and Vandenberghe, C. (2016). Supervisory mentoring and employee affective commitment and turnover: The critical role of contextual factors, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (2016), doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.10.004
- Leck, J., Mossop, C. (2017). Mentoring Women in Canada's Financial Sector. In Clutterbuck, David A., Kochan, Frances K., Lunsford, Laura, Dominguez, Nora and Haddock-Millar, Julie (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Mentoring*, pp 93-98. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/>
- McKeena, E. (2006). *Business Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 4th Edition. Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Hove and New York.
- McKeen, C. & Bujaki, M. (2008). Gender and Mentoring: Issues, Effects, and Opportunities. In Ragins, Belle Rose & Kram, Kathy E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*, pp. 197-222. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412976619.n8>
- Miroshnik, V. (2013). *Organizational Culture and Commitment, Transmission in Multinationals*, Palgrave Macmillan
- Natividad, N. (2015, July 2). A history of the BPO industry in numbers. Retrieved February 12, 2020, from Rappler.com: <https://www.rappler.com/brandrap/stories/98207-bpo-philippines-timeline>
- Nkomo, M. W., Aigbavboa, C. and, Didibhuku T. W. (2018). Influences of Mentoring Functions on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Graduate Employees. In T. Andre (ed.), *Advances in Human Factors in Training, Education, and Learning Sciences, Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, p. 596. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-60018-5_20
- Ngo, Mai-Anh T. (2016), *Leadership Development Networks of Professionals of Color: Contemporary Conceptions of Mentoring Relationships*. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from https://www.sandiego.edu/events/detail.php?_focus=54897
- Pan, W., Sun, Li-Yun., and Hau S. C. I. (2011). "The Impact of Supervisory Mentoring on Personal Learning and Career Outcomes: The Dual Moderating Effect of Self-Efficacy." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 78 (2): 264–273.
- Park, In-jo, Jung, Heajung, (2015). Relationships among future time perspective, career and organizational commitment, occupational self-efficacy, and turnover intention. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 2015, 43(9), 1547-1562. Society for Personality Research
- Park, Y. (2015), *Investigation of Mentoring Experiences Among NCAA Division I Core Level Administrators*. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>
- Payne, S. C., and Huffman, A. H. (2005). A Longitudinal Examination of the Influence of Mentoring on Organizational Commitment and Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal* 2005, Vol. 48,

- No. 1, 158–168. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276053861>. Retrieved on September 8, 2019.
- Peretomode, V. F. and Ikoya, P. (2019). Mentorship: A Strategic Technique for Achieving Excellence, Manpower Development and Nation Building?. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 10, No. 2, March 2019. DOI: 10.2478/mjss-2019-0019
- Pethe, S. and Chaudhar, S. (2000). Role Efficacy Dimensions as Correlates of Occupational Self Efficacy and Learned Helplessness, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 507-518.
- Philippine Society for Training and Development (2016). *Mentoring Guidebook*. Published by Philippines Australia Human Resource and Organizational Development Facility (PAHRODF).
- Ragins, B.R. & Kram, K.E. (2007). "The Roots and the Meaning of Mentoring". Inside *Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice*. B.R. Eds. Ragins & K.E. Kram. U.S.A: Sage Publications, 1-17.
- Renton, J. (2009). *Coaching and Mentoring*
- Rhodes, J. (2015). Top 25 mentoring relationships in History, *The Chronicle of Evidence-Based Mentoring*, www.evidencebasedmentoring.org, Retrieved April 20, 2019
- Richa, C., Santosh, R., and Mukesh, K. B. (2012), Relationships between occupational self efficacy, human resource development climate, and work engagement, *Team Performance Management* Vol. 18, No. 778, pp. 370-383
- Rita, C., Stefano, T., Paola, D., Kene, H., Elena, M. F., Ilaria, S. (2016). "Older workers: stereotypes and occupational self-efficacy", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 31 Iss 7 pp.
- Rok, W. H. (2016). Exploratory Study Examining the Joint Impacts of Mentoring and Managerial Coaching on Organizational Commitment. *Sustainability* 2017, 9, 181. DOI: :10.3390/su9020181
- Sakakibara, K. (2018). Is mentoring a beneficial resource for career development issues among working people? : Examining the difference by the gender of mentor and mentee.
- Spitzmüller, C., Neumann, E., Spitzmüller, M., Rubino, C., Keeton, K. E., Sutton, M. T., and M. D. (2008). Assessing the Influence of Psychosocial and Career Mentoring on Organizational Attractiveness. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* Volume 16 Number 4 December 2008
- Sow, M., Anthony, P., and Berete, M. (2016). Normative Organizational Commitment and its Effects on Employee Retention. *Business and Economic Research*, 6 (1), 137-147.
- Teman, N. R., Jung, S. and Minter, R. M. (2019). *Mentors and Mentoring*. Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19179-5_11
- Ukeni, I. G. and Reynolds, K. (2017). Mentoring and Retention of Millennials in United Kingdom: Experiences and Perceptions. *British Academy of Management 2017 Conference Proceedings*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322910098>. Retrieved on September 8, 2019.
- Weir, K. (2016). Angels vs. Demons: How psychological researchers are unearthing the roots of human morality. *Monitor of Psychology* , 47 (8), 42.
- Weng, Rhay-Hung, Huang, Ching-Yuan, Tsai, Wen-Chen, Chang, Li-Yu, Lin, Syr-En, Lee, Mei-Ying (2010). Exploring the impact of mentoring functions on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of new staff nurses. *BMC Health Services Research*, (10: 240) DOI 10.1186/1472-6963-10-240

- Yang, C., Guo, N., Wang, Y. and Li, C. (2017). The Effects of Mentoring on Hotel Staff Turnover; Organizational and Occupational Embeddedness as Mediators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. DOI: 10.1108/IJCHM-07-2017-0398
- Zabala, Jay-ar A. (2015). Work Motivation and Organizational Commitment of Ingram Micro Philippines Catalog Specialist and their Relationships to Work Quality Performance. Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Graduate School.
- ZhouJiang, X.H., Zhongmin, W. (2017). Career adaptability and plateau: The moderating effects of tenure and job self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (accepted manuscript).