

**CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE
IN DIVERSE MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS**

Gloria J. Miller
Austin Peay State University
millerg@apsu.edu

ABSTRACT

Mentoring has become more common in organizations as firms have discovered the benefits of this process, such as the retention and cultivation of employees who create the work and products of the organization. To meet the challenges associated with increasing diversity within organizations, researchers have focused on understanding diverse mentoring relationships (Athey, Avery, & Zemsky, 2000; Clutterbuck & Ragins, 2002; Hardy, 1998; Knouse, Hill, & Webb, 2005; Ragins, 1997). The demographic (e.g., ethnicity, gender, age) and situational (e.g., position, power) disparities between mentors and protégés often make it more difficult for diverse partners to develop quality relationships that are needed to realize the full benefits of mentoring.

The purpose of this study is to test antecedent (cultural intelligence) that may foster a higher level of perceived attitude homophily (or attitude similarity) among diverse mentoring partners as well as higher quality mentoring relationships. I contend that mentors and protégés who are culturally intelligent will be better mentoring partners. As a result of the enhanced cultural intelligence, they will have a higher perception of having the same attitudes as their partners, in turn corresponding to a higher quality relationship with their partners.

The regression results of this study, overall, indicated that two domains of CQ of mentors and one domain of CQ of protégés in diverse mentoring relationships are significantly positively related to the outcome of perceptions of attitude homophily with their partners or perceived relationship quality in regression analyses. Perceived attitude homophily has been found to be positively significantly related to relationship quality. Perceived attitude homophily was found to fully mediate the relationship of motivational CQ on relationship quality for mentors, and was found to partially mediate the relationship between one domain of CQ on relationship quality for each data set.

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, diversity in organizations has become reality (Ragins & Gonzalez, 2003). Diversity consists of differences at many levels, including age, gender, culture, sexual orientation, ability/disability, national origin, religion, and socioeconomic background, among others. Some negative effects of diverse workgroups include lower satisfaction and higher turnover (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992) as well as lower organizational commitment and employee perceptions of the reduced likelihood of promotion (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). Some of the benefits of organizational diversity, though, include the varied knowledge bases and perspectives these diverse employees bring (Phillips, Mannix, Neale, & Gruenfeld, 2004), greater creativity and innovation as well as improved decision-making (T. Cox, 1991), and positive impacts on organizations' bottom lines through positive changes in recruitment, retention, and more (SHRM, 2006).

To reduce the negative outcomes attributed to diversity and to enhance the positives, many organizations have implemented formal diverse mentoring programs (Ragins, 2007). Diverse mentoring relationships occur when the mentor and protégé differ in group membership (such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, etc.) associated with power differences in organizations (Ragins, 1995).

The majority of diverse mentoring relationships likely occur in formal mentoring programs rather than informal relationships. Indeed, it has been found that mentors, when given the choice, most often choose protégés who are viewed as being similar to themselves (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997). Cox and Nkomo (1990) found that people of color have a more challenging time gaining access to mentors.

According to the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model (Schneider, 1987), given personal choice, mentors and protégés would tend to enter into relationships with others similar to themselves. Therefore, informal mentoring relationships are less likely to be diverse relationships than formal mentoring relationships, although among formal programs, diverse relationships still are not common. Informal relationships often develop spontaneously, and therefore, visible similarities play a large part in the self-matching process. For these reasons, if minority individuals within organizations are to receive a mentor, informal mentoring may not provide a mentoring relationship for them.

Given the complexities associated with diverse mentoring pairs, it is important to consider what organizations can do to ensure that the mentoring experience is successful. This raises the research question: what is meant by a successful mentoring experience? Although the mentoring literature has articulated various benefits of diversity (Cox, 1991; Phillips et al., 2004; SHRM, 2006) and considered various mentoring behaviors enacted throughout the mentoring relationship (Allen, 2003; Allen & Eby, 2004; Thomas, 1990), researchers have not agreed on the criteria that represent successful outcomes. As an initial attempt to clarify the success criteria, I focus on two indicators that target success for the mentoring members: (1) the perception of attitude homophily, and (2) the quality of the relationship.

The purpose of this study is to understand how mentors and protégés in diverse mentoring relationships can get the most out of those relationships. One step in this understanding may be to find antecedents that help build positive mentoring relationships between diverse mentors and protégés. I look at cultural intelligence of the mentor and protégé in mentoring relationships as possible important antecedents. Then, using social information processing theory, I examined their impact on success criteria of attitude homophily and relationship quality.

DEFINITIONS

Mentoring and Participants

Mentoring is an important developmental resource for career and personal growth (Kram, 1985). Kram (1985), in a seminal work, defined mentoring as an intense interpersonal relationship where a more senior individual (the mentor) provides guidance and support to a more junior organizational member (the protégé). Kram added that both participants are working together in this relationship that has been mutually agreed upon.

The mentor is defined as an older, more experienced person that helps someone younger to find his/her way through the adult world and employment (Kram, 1985). A mentor might or might not be employed by the same organization as the protégé (Ragins, 1997). The protégé is the second person in the mentoring relationship, generally younger, less senior, less experienced and sometimes employed in lower job roles than the mentor.

Mentoring Programs

There are two main types of mentoring programs: informal and formal. Informal mentoring relationships, as the name suggests, develop by mutual identification, often spontaneously, where mentors choose protégés whom they see as younger versions of themselves, and protégés decide on mentors whom they view as role models (Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). Informal mentoring relationships, as such, do not necessarily occur between employees of an organization, but can develop between persons employed in different organizations or even different industries.

A formal mentoring program is an organized program managed by the organization, typically using a systematic selection and matching process (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). Eligibility for participation varies among organizations that use formal mentoring from allowing anyone in the organization to take on the role of mentor or protégé to using screening criteria such as job performance, nomination by other individuals, or job type (Eddy, Tannenbaum, Alliger, D'Abate, & Givens, 2001).

PAST STUDIES

The study of mentor and protégé characteristics' influence on the mentoring relationship has been studied and has expanded our knowledge of the development and processes of mentoring (Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003). These characteristics include personality characteristics (Fagenson, 1992; Singh, Ragins, & Tharenou, 2009) as well as demographics (Smith, Smith, & Markham, 2000; Viator, 2001) and history/experience (Allen, Poteet, Russell, & Dobbins, 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1991). A practical application of these studies is the possibility of identifying mentors or protégés within an organization that will perform exceptionally well within a mentoring relationship.

All said, studies of the antecedents to mentoring programs have been extremely diverse in their choice of personality characteristics, demographics, history of the mentor and protégé, and organization/job characteristics. The immediate outcomes of mentoring that have been studied consist of the different functions of mentoring received, including career, psychosocial, role modeling, and other (Aryee, Lo, & Kang, 1999; Blake-Beard, Bayne, Crosby, & Muller, 2011; Hartmann, Rutherford, Feinberg, & Anderson, 2014). After mentoring has occurred, there appears to be little if any consensus on what effects or outcomes of mentoring are important and should be measured. It is possible that researchers are still looking for a few areas where positive (or negative) impacts of the mentoring process come together.

Mentoring research has been covering many facets of diversity through many studies. Some of the facets of diversity within the mentoring dyad include: Age (Finkelstein, Allen, & Rhoton, 2003); gender (Blake-Beard et al., 2011; Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002; Smith et al., 2000); attitude (Ensher et al., 2002); actual and perceived demographic similarity (Lankau, Riordan, & Thomas, 2005); race (Lyons & Oppler, 2004; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005; Thomas, 1990); and nationality (Feldman, Folks, & Turnley, 1999).

A finding of this literature review is that many reviews do not include social antecedents that relate to diverse mentoring. This is an area that could benefit from continued empirical studies. This study attempts to add to this topic. Another finding of this literature review is that most benefits of mentoring are benefits to the protégés. Although some studies include benefits to mentors, this is not the norm.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

I propose that cultural intelligence (CQ) of the mentor/protégé will affect the perceived attitude homophily and quality of the relationship. These relationships are depicted in Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

The underlying theoretical rationale for the proposed model of diverse mentoring success stems from social information processing (SIP) theory.

In a seminal article, SIP is conceptualized as a broad and multifaceted theory made up of individuals' processing and actions when entering interpersonal situations where no immediately effective response is presented (D'Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971). The main component of SIP is the cognitive-behavioral process of generating potential solutions to the current social dilemma (D'Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971). Pfeffer summarized the SIP model as it relates to the work environment (1980). He stated that 1) an individual's social environment might provide cues as to which dimensions may be used to characterize his/her work environment, 2) the social environment might provide information on how the individual should weigh the various dimensions, 3) the social context provides cues concerning how others have evaluated the work environment on each of the selected dimensions, and 4) it is possible that the social context provides direct positive or negative evaluation of the work setting (Pfeffer, 1980).

Cultural Intelligence and Attitude Homophily

Scholars have begun to identify the important antecedents to effective diverse mentoring relationships, such as some mentor personality constructs, previous experience as a mentor or protégé, and perceived influence of the mentor, all on various DVs. Cultural intelligence (CQ) might be another important key in successful racially/ethnically diverse mentoring relationships. CQ is a different level of intelligence from that which is known as IQ, or rational and logic-based verbal and quantitative intelligence, and different also from emotional intelligence. CQ is defined by researchers as the seemingly natural ability to interpret an individual's unfamiliar and ambiguous gestures in just the way that person's compatriots and colleagues would, even to mirror them (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Another group of researchers added that CQ is a person's effectiveness in drawing upon a set of knowledge, skills, and personal attributes in order to work successfully with other people from different national cultural backgrounds at home or abroad (Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud, 2006).

CQ enables a person to be effective when engaging in intercultural interactions. It is related to emotional intelligence (EQ), but Earley and Mosakowski state that CQ picks up where EQ leaves off (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004) when interacting with individuals from other cultures. According to these researchers, a person with high EQ is able to grasp what makes us human and at the same time decipher what makes each of us different from one another. They further state that a person with high CQ can somehow tease out of a person's behavior those features that would be true of all people and all groups, those peculiar to this person, and those that are neither universal nor idiosyncratic (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004).

There are four domains of CQ that are commonly discussed: cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral. Metacognitive CQ includes the processes that individuals use to gain and understand cultural knowledge (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006). Cognitive CQ is overall knowledge and knowledge constructions about culture, including religious beliefs, economic systems, and languages (Ang et al., 2006). Motivational CQ includes the magnitude and direction of an individual's energy applied toward learning about and successfully functioning in cross-cultural situations (Ang et al., 2006). Behavioral CQ is the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when mingling with people from cultures other than one's home culture (Ang et al., 2006).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

CQ does not cause a person to ignore differences from others, nor does it cause that person to become consumed by those differences and examine those differences in every interaction with a diverse other. Rather, CQ assists the individual to acknowledge those differences and react to them when they have an impact on the task at hand. Literature exists regarding expatriates' experiences abroad and the importance of CQ in their adaptation to these new cultures. A commonality with diversity of other levels is that the culture, rules, norms and reward structure of organizations are developed by and for the majority group (Ragins, 2002). Ragins then compares this to the minority groups' feeling that they are a 'stranger in a strange land' where they don't understand the rules of the game or even that a game exists (2002). I compare the experience of diverse mentorship partners in organizations and the experience of expatriates in a foreign land as both diverse mentors and protégés (and expatriates) need to develop and maintain positive relationships with the mentoring partners (and host country nationals). It is possible that CQ facilitates interactions between diverse people in either situation.

CQ is especially relevant to diverse relationships (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004) and should assist mentors and protégés in relating successfully throughout their multicultural mentoring interactions. SIP theory suggests that past experiences influence current social interactions. Cultural intelligence is built upon past experiences, which can be used to smoothly interact with diverse others. A qualitative study of information technology offshore outsourcing projects found that higher levels of CQ led to the development of a negotiated culture, which is characterized, in part, by trust-based interpersonal relationships and shared understanding (Gregory, Prifling, & Beck, 2009). Attitude homophily is defined as one's perception of similarity to another in attitude (McCroskey, 1975). The ability of the mentor/protégé to interact effectively should remove or lessen perceptions of interpersonal conflict and, therefore, result in a higher level of perception of attitude homophily with the partner, as these interactions will be used to develop a more positive cognitive impression of the interactions which should translate into perceptions of similarity of attitudes. CQ will allow the mentor/protégé to more deeply connect to their partner using past experience, as SIP theorizes that these past experiences will impact current actions, in this case, interactions with diverse others.

Hypotheses 1a-d: a) The four domains of CQ of mentors, including (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral, will be positively related to the mentors' perceptions of attitude homophily in diverse mentoring relationships.

Hypotheses 2a-d: The four domains of CQ of protégés, including (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral, will be positively related to the protégés' perceptions of attitude homophily in diverse mentoring relationships.

Attitude Homophily and Relationship Quality

Research using the similarity-attraction paradigm has shown that similarity leads to frequent communication, desire to maintain affiliation, and high social integration (Lincoln & Miller, 1979). These results should lead to a mentoring partner to look upon the relationship in a more positive light. Traditional theoretical literature suggests that homophily tends to increase attraction (Berger & Clatterbuck, 1976; Daly, McCroskey, & Falcione, 1976; McCroskey, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006). Further, it has been posited that perceived dissimilarity can negatively impact interpersonal relationships (Ragins, 1997). A more general study found that participants in close relationships perceived greater attitude homophily (McCroskey et al., 2006). Another study found that perceived deep-level similarity (personality, interests, work values, outlook on organizational issues, problem-solving approach, and personal values) was significantly associated with partner liking of both mentors and protégés (Lankau et al., 2005). Yet another study found that perceived attitudinal similarity (as measured by eight items from three different sources) was significantly associated with protégés' satisfaction with their mentors (Ensher et al., 2002), although this was not studied on the part of mentors' satisfaction with their protégés. Finally, a significantly positive relationship was found between perceived similarity and mentorship quality in a study (Allen & Eby, 2003). Therefore, perception of attitude homophily with one's mentoring partner should help raise the quality of the relationship in these data sets.

Hypotheses 3a-b: a) The perceived attitude homophily of mentors will be positively related to the mentors' perceptions of relationship quality in diverse mentoring relationships; and b) The perceived attitude homophily of protégés will be positively related to the protégés' perceptions of relationship quality in diverse mentoring relationships.

Cultural Intelligence and Relationship Quality

As stated before, a person with high CQ can more easily tease out of a person's behavior those features that would be true of all people and all groups, those peculiar to this person, and those that are neither universal nor idiosyncratic (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Indeed, an important skill of CQ is knowing how to suspend judgment until enough information becomes available (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Those with higher CQ will be more satisfied with their interpersonal communications because of their cooperative behaviors (Ang et al., 2006). Individuals with higher CQ have more positive relationships with others in a multicultural setting (Earley & Ang, 2003). People with higher CQ will have paid attention to past experiences with diverse others and will have retained the information gathered. Therefore, a mentoring partner's CQ within a diverse mentoring relationship will result in that partner more accurately perceiving the characteristics of his/her diverse partner as an individual rather than simply as a member of an outgroup. This would lead to each mentoring partner to be more willing to see the mentoring relationship in a positive light. According to SIP, this individual attribute of CQ will be positively related to the mentoring participants' perception of relationship quality (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Earley & Ang stated that a high CQ person is able address relationship issues through an

adaptation of an extant cognitive frame or to create a new frame that might be appropriate for the new multicultural circumstance (2003). SIP comes into play as the person searches past similar situations when confronted with an ambiguous social interaction.

The four domains of CQ should all impact relationship quality in a diverse mentoring relationship. The metacognitive domain, or the information gathering, is vital as an individual accumulates information that may be accessed in future encounters with dissimilar others. The cognitive domain, or the actual knowledge of other groups, is necessary as individuals gain knowledge of other cultures through study and past experiences and the ability to acknowledge differences between themselves and others as well as the knowledge of when the differences matter. The motivational domain also will have an impact on relationship quality as an individual that does not want to interact with a dissimilar other will not develop a quality relationship with that person. The behavioral domain also will impact relationship quality as each partner will be judging the quality of the relationship through the behaviors of an individual throughout contacts. As stated before, a qualitative study found that higher CQ in offshore IT project members resulted in a negotiated culture, part of which is trust-based interpersonal relationships (Gregory et al., 2009). Individuals with higher CQ levels reported higher interpersonal trust toward culturally different others (Rockstuhl & Ng, 2008). Finally, IT engineers with higher CQ found more positive relationship perceptions than those with lower CQ (Tootoonchy, 2012).

Hypotheses 4a-d: The four domains of CQ of mentors, including (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral, will be positively related to the mentors' perceptions of relationship quality in diverse mentoring relationships.

Hypotheses 5a-d: The four domains of CQ of protégés, including (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral, will be positively related to the protégés' perceptions of relationship quality in diverse mentoring relationships.

Attitude Homophily's Mediation in CQ/Relationship Quality Association

As stated before, diverse mentoring relationships have a higher uncertainty than homogenous relationships (Ragins, 2002). This greater uncertainty associated with dealing with dissimilar others can be threatening (Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio, & Pilivian, 1995). Further, it has been speculated that perceived dissimilarity can negatively impact interpersonal relationships (Ragins, 1997). Prior research using the similarity-attraction paradigm has shown that similarity leads to frequent communication, desire to maintain affiliation, and high social integration (Lincoln & Miller, 1979). CQ should enable the mentors and protégés to look for and find deep-level similarity (or differences) rather than focus on the surface-level differences inherent in racial/ethnic diversity, and should enable them to more accurately remember past experiences that may relate to the current relationship. CQ should help mentors and protégés to pay attention to their partners as individuals, and correctly remember those past experiences, rather than a stereotype of the racial/ethnic group to which the partners identify. This should lessen the uncertainty within the relationship, which may be the process that attitude homophily shares in the perceptions of the relationship. Indeed, a study found that perceived attitude homophily had negative relationship with perception of uncertainty in relationships (Prisbell & Andersen, 1980). Therefore, CQ should result in perception of attitude homophily with one's mentoring partner, which in turn should help raise the quality of the relationship. Indeed, Allen and Eby (2003) found a significant relationship between perceived similarity (values, interests, and personality) and mentorship quality. This relationship may be the mediating relationship between mentors'/protégés' CQ and relationship quality.

Hypotheses 6a-d: Attitude homophily will mediate the relationship between all four domains of CQ of mentors, including (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral, and Relationship Quality

Hypotheses 7 a-d: Attitude homophily will mediate the relationship between all four domains of CQ of protégés, including (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral, and Relationship Quality.

METHODS

I used an established online survey site called StudyResponse to find participants that self-reported as being mentors or protégés in a racially/ethnically diverse mentoring relationship. No other screening criteria were used. These mentors and protégés are not matched data, in that they were not a mentor and protégé from the same mentoring dyad. I tested the model on both sets of data (mentors and protégés).

The mentor group was 51% male, with an average age of 43. They reported that their protégés were 56% male with an average age of 31. Mentors self-reported as 85% white/Caucasian; 7% black or African American; 3% American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native; 3% Asian; and 2% Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, with 89% reporting as non-Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. The majority (63%) were direct supervisors of their protégés.

The protégé group was 63% male, with an average age of 35. They reported that their mentors were 68% male with an average age of 46. Protégés self-reported as 55% white/Caucasian; 23% Asian; 11% black or African American; 7% American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native; and 4% Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, with 86% reporting as non-Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. The majority (65%) were reporting on a mentoring relationship where the mentor was their direct supervisor.

MEASURES

I used measures that have been developed and validated by researchers. All items are listed in the appendix. I collected demographics, CQ, attitude homophily, and relationship quality from mentors and protégés, as well as control variables.

Cultural Intelligence

I tested mentors'/protégés' levels of cultural intelligence, using the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) developed and validated by Ang and colleagues (Ang et al., 2007). This self-report scale is composed of 20 items that can be separated into the four components of cultural intelligence. These 20 items can also be totaled to obtain a person's overall measure of cultural intelligence. The four factors follow. A sample item for metacognitive cultural intelligence ($\alpha=.85$ for mentors; $\alpha=.90$ for protégés) is "I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds". A sample item for cognitive cultural intelligence ($\alpha=.87$ for mentors; $\alpha=.93$ for protégés) is "I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures". A sample item for motivational cultural intelligence ($\alpha=.86$ for mentors; $\alpha=.88$ for protégés) is "I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me". A sample item for behavioral cultural intelligence ($\alpha=.84$ for mentors; $\alpha=.88$ for protégés) is "I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it" (Ang et al., 2006). The item-to-total correlations for each of the four subscales (.30-.69) demonstrated strong relationships between items and their scales, supporting internal consistency (Ang et al., 2007). These authors assessed equivalence of the CQS in a U.S. sample compared to a Singapore sample; this assessment demonstrated the same four factor structure holds across the two countries. Items dropped for this study are discussed under the

analysis. This variable was assessed with a seven-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree.

Perceived Attitude Homophily

Perceived similarity is measured as homophily. I used the 15-item McCroskey et al. measurement tool for attitude homophily (2006). This measure tests the perceived similarity of the attitudes between two people. Internal reliability estimates range from .55 to .81 for individual items (McCroskey et al., 2006). The alpha reliability of this scale was .88 for mentors and .88 for the protégé sample. A sample item for attitude homophily is “My mentor/protégé thinks like me”. This variable was assessed with a seven-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree.

Relationship Quality

Measurement of relationship quality was measured using a portion of a measure derived by Allen and Eby (2003). The original measure was for relationship effectiveness and included relationship quality and learning from relationship. I used the five items that were to measure relationship quality. This measure was initiated for mentors, but I also used it for protégés, changing the word protégé to mentor. The alpha for the quality measure is .88 for mentors and .88 for protégés. A sample item for relationship quality is “I am very satisfied with the mentoring relationship my protégé/mentor and I developed”. This variable was assessed with a five-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree.

Controls

In addition to the above measures, I included questions to capture gender, race, ethnicity, age, prior experience as either a mentor and/or protégé in a mentoring relationship, educational level, length of time in the relationship, type of mentoring relationship (formal/informal), and the number of mentoring contacts within the past calendar year to use as control variables.

ANALYSES

Hypotheses 1a-d predicted that the CQ of mentors will be positively related to their perceptions of attitude homophily, controlling for participant’s gender, race, ethnicity, age, past protégé experience, past mentorship experience, relationship length, formal vs. informal relationship status, and total number of contacts in the previous year. All future findings will include the controls listed here.

As shown in Model 2 in Table 3, Hypothesis 1c was supported, that motivational CQ was found to be significant in the regression on attitude homophily. However, hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1d were not supported. Hypotheses 2a-d predicted that the CQ of protégés will be positively related to their perceptions of attitude homophily. As shown in Model 2 in Table 3, Hypothesis 2d was supported, that behavioral CQ was found to be significant in the regression on attitude homophily. However, Hypotheses 2a-c were not supported.

INSERT TABLES 2 AND 3 HERE

The third hypotheses predicted that the perceived attitude homophily of a) mentors and b) protégés will be positively related to their perceptions of relationship quality. As shown in Model 5 in Tables 2 and 3, both hypothesis (4a for mentors and 4b for protégés) were supported.

Hypotheses 4a-d predicted that the CQ of mentors will be positively related to their perceptions of relationship quality. As shown in Model 4 in Table 2, Hypotheses 5a and 5c were supported for metacognitive and motivational CQ, but Hypotheses 5b and 5d were not supported. Hypotheses 5a-d predicted that the CQ of protégés will be positively related to their perceptions of relationship quality. Hypothesis 5c for motivational CQ was supported, although the other three parts of this hypothesis were not supported as shown in Model 4 in Table 3.

Hypotheses 6a-d predicted that attitude homophily will mediate the relationship between mentors' four CQ domains and their perceptions of relationship quality. Attitude homophily did mediate the relationship between motivational CQ and relationship quality, per Hypothesis 6c. Motivational CQ was significant in the regression on relationship quality ($p=.0011$); after adding attitude homophily into the regression analysis, motivational CQ was no longer significant ($p=.0583$). Attitude homophily did partially mediate the relationship between metacognitive CQ and relationship quality, as posited in Hypothesis 6a. Although metacognitive CQ remained significant, the level of significance lowered slightly with the addition of attitude homophily into the regression ($p=.0003$ for Model 4; $p=.0008$ for Model 6). The other two hypotheses (6b and 6d) were not supported). Hypotheses 7a-d predicted that attitude homophily will mediate the relationship between protégés' four CQ domains and their perceptions of relationship quality. Attitude homophily did partially mediate the relationship between motivational CQ and relationship quality, as posited in Hypothesis 7c. Although motivational CQ remained significant, the level of significance lowered with the addition of attitude homophily into the regression ($p=.0064$ for Model 4; $p=.0257$ for Model 6). The other three hypotheses (7a, 7b, and 7d) were not supported.

The results of all hypotheses are included for reference. See Table 4.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As the workforce becomes more diverse throughout the world, diverse mentoring pairs will become more common, and the success of these mentoring pairs will become more important to overall success and competitive advantage. This study looked at mentors and protégés (unmatched) in ethnically and/or racially diverse mentoring relationships to investigate the importance of cultural intelligence to those relationships.

This study found that mentors' motivational CQ and mentors' metacognitive CQ was significantly related to their perceptions of attitude homophily in a racially/ethnically diverse mentoring relationship. High levels of CQ should enable a person to have read past experiences more accurately, which should lead to more appropriate actions in the current relationship, which he/she is also reading more accurately than one with lower CQ. This only proved to be true for one type of CQ in each group in racially/ethnically diverse mentoring relationships, possibly because race/ethnicity differences do not trigger cultural differences within these dyads.

Although three domains of CQ did not result in significant regression results on attitude homophily, three domains of mentors (all except for behavioral) were significantly correlated to attitude homophily, and all four domains were significantly correlated to attitude homophily in the protégé data set.

It is possible that some other individual characteristic could be playing an important role in these relationships that I did not include in my model. It is possible that self-esteem would enable a participant to relax and examine the new relationship in a clearer light, and that characteristic might be an

independent variable, or a moderator. Higher self-esteem may result in people's better identifying cues in the environment, which SIP states aids them as they encounter new relationships. In the same light, neuroticism/emotional stability, extroversion, and agreeableness may play a part in the beginning of relationships as new partners try to read cues in situations where no immediately effective response is clear (D'Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971).

When looking at CQ's impact on relationship quality, only metacognitive CQ was found to be significant in regression in the mentor data, and motivational CQ was found to be significant for the protégé data. However, the correlations do show significant and positive correlations between the four domains of CQ and relationship quality for both groups. These high correlations could become important when putting together a formal, diverse mentoring program.

The hypothesis that perceived attitude homophily would be positively related to relationship quality was supported for both the mentors and the protégés in this study. This relationship of attitude homophily and liking or relationship quality had been found in previous research (Berger & Clatterbuck, 1976; Daly et al., 1976; Ensher et al., 2002; Lincoln & Miller, 1979) and this study resulted in the same significant findings. The similarity-attraction paradigm indicates that perceived similarity should lead to a mentoring partner to look upon the relationship in a more positive light, and this was the case in this study. It had been suggested previously that perceived dissimilarity can negatively impact interpersonal relationships (Ragins, 1997), and a significant relationship was found between perceived similarity and mentorship quality (Allen & Eby, 2003). These earlier findings were confirmed in this mentoring study.

The mediation hypotheses were that the perceived attitude homophily of mentors and protégés will mediate the relationship between the mentors' or protégés' CQ and their perceptions of the relationship quality. Metacognitive CQ was found to be partially mediated by attitude homophily against relationship quality for mentors, and motivational CQ was found to be fully mediated for mentors, and partially mediated by attitude homophily for the protégé data set.

IMPLICATIONS

Implications for researchers can be found in this study. Cultural intelligence has been studied to a large degree using expatriates and with people from different countries. This study examined CQ of a largely US group and the diversity categories were racial and ethnic. This study does, through regression analyses, indicate the limited importance of studying CQ as people deal with racially and/or ethnically diverse others in mentoring relationships within their own home country, a situation that is happening more often in this globally connected world. Although there were positive, significant correlation relationships, the significant regression findings were limited to mentor metacognitive CQ, and both mentor and protégé motivational CQ on relationship quality.

This study also confirms previous studies that attitude homophily is significantly important when studying mentors' and protégés' perception of mentoring relationship quality when that mentoring relationship is diverse. This may be important as members in a diverse relationship might be looking for some areas of similarity, which has been found to be significantly associated with partner liking of both mentors and protégés (Lankau et al., 2005). Correctly recognizing more issues of attitude homophily will make the new relationship a bit more comfortable so that the mentor/protégé will see the benefits of the relationship earlier than those with lower levels of attitude homophily.

Implications for practitioners are also found from this study. Since people from underrepresented classes generally receive mentors who are racially/ethnically different from themselves, training CQ (particularly motivational and metacognitive) to both mentors and protégés may make the mentoring

relationship more beneficial to each of them and to the company or organization setting up the mentoring program. People can be trained in CQ. Another implication of this finding would be that those who are interested in becoming involved in a formal mentoring program might be screened for levels of CQ, particularly the domains that were found significant in this study. This screening might assist an organization to choose those people who would have a higher likelihood of a positive outcome, which would be those with high CQ. Testing and training employees, especially those likely to become involved in diverse mentoring, in CQ could make a positive impact in an organization that believes or has found that mentoring is important to its success.

Also, it may be beneficial for organizations that are setting up diverse mentoring relationships to encourage the mentoring pairs to discuss their attitudes and values in order to trigger a higher level of attitude homophily within the relationship. This higher level of attitude homophily might result in higher levels of relationship quality within those diverse pairs.

.....

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2003). Relationship effectiveness for mentors: Factors associated with learning and quality. *Journal of Management*, 29(4), 469-486. doi: 10.1016/s0149-2063_03_00021-7
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 70-89.
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., Russell, J. E. A., & Dobbins, G. H. (1997). A field study of factors related to supervisors' willingness to mentor others. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 1-22.
- Andersen, S. M., Klatzky, R. L., & Murray, J. (1990). Traits and social stereotypes: Efficiency differences in social information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(2), 192-201. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.59.2.192
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 100-123.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.-Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335.
- Aryee, S., Lo, S., & Kang, I.-L. (1999). Antecedents of early career stage mentoring among Chinese employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(5), 563.
- Athey, S., Avery, C., & Zemsky, P. (2000). Mentoring and diversity. *American Economic Review*, 90(4), 765-786.
- Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., & Phillips, M. G. (2008). Similarity on sports sidelines: How mentor-protégé sex similarity affects mentoring. *Sex Roles*, 58(1-2), 72-80.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Berger, C. R., & Clatterbuck, G. W. (1976). *Attitude similarity and attributional information as determinants of uncertainty reduction and interpersonal attraction*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Portland, OR.
- Blake-Beard, S. D., Bayne, M. L., Crosby, F. J., & Muller, C. B. (2011). Matching by race and gender in mentoring relationships: Keeping our eyes on the prize. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(3), 622-643. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01717.x
- Brown, B. P., Zablah, A. R., & Bellenger, D. N. (2008). The role of mentoring in promoting organizational commitment among black managers: An evaluation of the indirect effects of racial similarity and shared racial perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(7), 732-738.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(3), 619-636.
- Clatterbuck, D., & Ragins, B. R. (2002). *Mentoring and diversity: An international perspective*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2), 34-47.
- Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2), 34-47.
- Cox, T. J., & Nkomo, S. M. (1990). Invisible men and women: A status report on race as a variable in organization behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior (1986-1998)*, 11(6), 419.
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(1), 74-101.
- D'Zurilla, T. J., & Goldfried, M. R. (1971). Problem solving and behavior modification. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 78(1), 107-126. doi: 10.1037/h0031360
- Daly, J. A., McCroskey, J. C., & Falcione, R. L. (1976). *Homophily-heterophily and the prediction of supervisor satisfaction*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Portland, OR.

- Dodge, K. A. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perinutter (Ed.), *The Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 18, pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence : Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P. C., & Mosakowski, C. (2004). Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(10), 139.
- Eby, Lockwood, & Butts. (2006). Perceived support for mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(2), 267-291. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.003>
- Eddy, E., Tannenbaum, S., Alliger, G., D'Abate, C., & Givens, S. (2001). Mentoring in industry: The top 10 issues when building and supporting a mentoring program: Naval Air Warfare Training Systems Division.
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Marelich, W. D. (2002). Effects of perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity on protégés' support and satisfaction gained from their mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(7), 1407-1430.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1992). Mentoring: Who needs it? A comparison of proteges' and non-proteges' needs for power, achievement, affiliation, and autonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 48-60.
- Feldman, D. C., Folks, W. R., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Mentor-protége diversity and its impact on international internship experiences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(5), 597.
- Finkelstein, L. M., Allen, T. D., & Rhoton, L. A. (2003). An examination of the role of age in mentoring relationships. *Group & Organization Management*, 28(2), 249-281.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64.
- Gregory, R., Prifling, M., & Beck, R. (2009). The role of cultural intelligence for the emergence of negotiated culture in IT offshore outsourcing projects. *Information Technology & People*, 22(3), 223-241. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09593840910981428>
- Hamilton, D. L., Sherman, S. J., & Ruvolo, C. M. (1990). Stereotype-based expectancies: Effects on information processing and social behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(2), 35-60.
- Hamilton, D. L., Stroessner, S. J., & Driscoll, D. M. (1994). Social cognition and the study of stereotyping. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Social cognition: Impact on social psychology*. (pp. 291-321). San Diego, CA US: Academic Press.
- Hardy, L. C. (1998). Mentoring: A long-term approach to diversity. *HR Focus*, 75(7), S11.
- Hartmann, N. N., Rutherford, B. N., Feinberg, R., & Anderson, J. G. (2014). Antecedents of mentoring: Do multi-faceted job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 67(9), 2039-2044. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.006>
- Johnson, J. P., Lenartowicz, T., & Apud, S. (2006). Cross-cultural competence in international business: Toward a definition and a model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(4), 525.
- Knouse, S. B., Hill, V. D., & Webb, S. C. (2005). Surrogate sages: Mentoring alternatives for members of underrepresented groups of professionals. *Diversity Factor*, 13(2), 11-17.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Lankau, M. J., Riordan, C. M., & Thomas, C. H. (2005). The effects of similarity and liking in formal relationships between mentors and proteges *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 252-265.
- Lincoln, J. R., & Miller, J. (1979). Work and friendship ties in organizations: A comparative analysis of relational networks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 181-199.
- Lyons, B. D., & Oppler, E. S. (2004). The effects of structural attributes and demographic characteristics on protégé satisfaction in mentoring programs. *Journal of Career Development*, 30(3), 215-229.
- McCroskey, McCroskey, & Richmond. (2006). Analysis and improvement of the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily. *Communication Quarterly*, 54(1), 1-31.

- McCroskey, J. C. (1975). The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*(4), 323-332.
- McCroskey, L. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2006). Analysis and improvement of the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily. *Communication Quarterly V. 54 No. 1 (February 2006) P. 1-31, 54*(1), 1-31. doi: 10.1080/01463370500270322
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(2), 402-433.
- Nelis, D., Quoidbach, J., Mikolajczak, M., & Hansenne, M. (2009). Increasing emotional intelligence: (How) is it possible? *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*(1), 36-41. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.01.046>
- Ortiz-Walters, R., & Gilson, L. L. (2005). Mentoring in academia: An examination of the experiences of proteges of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 459-475.
- Pfeffer, J. (1980). A partial test of the social information processing model of job attitudes. *Human Relations, 3*, 457-476.
- Phillips, K. W., Mannix, E. A., Neale, M. A., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2004). Diverse groups and information sharing: The effects of congruent ties. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(4), 497-510.
- Prisbell, M., & Andersen, J. F. (1980). The importance of perceived homophily, level of uncertainty, feeling good, safety, and self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships. *Communication Quarterly, 28*(3), 22-33.
- Ragins, B. R. (1995). Diversity, power, and mentorship in organizations: A cultural, structural, and behavioral perspective. In M. M. Chemers, M. A. Costanzo, & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 91-132). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(2), 482.
- Ragins, B. R. (2002). Understanding diversified mentoring relationships: Definitions, challenges and strategies. In D. Clutterbuck & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Mentoring and Diversity, An International Perspective*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Ragins, B. R. (2007). Diversity and workplace mentoring relationships: A review and positive social capital approach. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspective Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(4), 939-951.
- Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1177-1194.
- Ragins, B. R., & Gonzalez, J. A. (2003). Understanding diversity in organizations: Getting a grip on a slippery construct. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (2nd ed., pp. 125-163). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rockstuhl, T., & Ng, K. Y. (2008). The effects of cultural intelligence on interpersonal trust in multicultural teams. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 206-220). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*(2), 224-253.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453.
- Schroeder, D. A., Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., & Piliavin, J. A. (1995). *The psychology of helping and altruism*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Sheldon, L. K., & Ellington, L. (2008). Application of a model of social information processing to nursing theory: How nurses respond to patients. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 64(4), 388-398. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04795.x
- SHRM. (2006). Outcomes of Diversity Initiatives. Retrieved November 11, 2007, 2007, from http://www.shrm.org/research/briefly_published/Workplace%20Diversity%20Series%20Part%20II%20Outcomes%20of%20Diversity%20Initiatives.asp
- Singh, R., Ragins, B. R., & Tharenou, P. (2009). Who gets a mentor? A longitudinal assessment of the rising star hypothesis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 11-17. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.09.009
- Smith, J. W., Smith, W. J., & Markham, S. E. (2000). Diversity issues in mentoring academic faculty. *Journal of Career Development*, 26(4), 251-262.
- Thomas. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(6), 479-492.
- Tootoonchy, M. (2012). *Conflict and communication among engineers*. (Master of Business (Research)), Queensland University of Technology, Queensland.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O Reilly, C. A., III. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(4), 549.
- Viator, R. E. (2001). An examination of African Americans' access to public accounting mentors: Perceived barriers and intentions to leave. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 26(6), 541.
- Walther, J. B. (2008). Social information processing theory. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithewaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives*. (pp. 391-404). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T., & Hezlett, S. A. (2003). Mentoring research: A review and dynamic process model. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 22, 39-124.
- Yzerbyt, V., & Carnaghi, A. (2008). Stereotype change in the social context. In Y. Kashima, K. Fiedler, & P. Freytag (Eds.), *Stereotype dynamics: Language-based approaches to the formation, maintenance, and transformation of stereotypes*. (pp. 29-57). Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

FIGURE 1: MODEL OF CQ ON MENTOR/PROTÉGÉ ATTITUDE HOMOPHILY AND RELATIONSHIP QUALITY IN DIVERSE MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS



TABLE 1: Cultural Intelligence Domains and their Relationship to Diverse Mentoring

Domain	Connection to Diverse Mentoring Relationship
Metacognitive	Mental processes used to acquire and understand knowledge of diverse partner, including control over individual through processes throughout contacts with mentor/protégé.
Cognitive	Knowledge that differences exist as well as the ability to decide the importance of these differences at any time throughout interactions.
Motivational	Incentive possessed by an individual to make an effort to successfully interact with a diverse other within a mentoring relationship.
Behavioral	Abilities to positively interact with a diverse other, manifested by both overt and obscure actions, chosen words, and body language.

TABLE 2: Results of Regression Analyses for Mentors

Predictor	Standardized Regression Coefficients*					
	Attitude Homophily		Relationship Quality			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Controls						
Mentor Gender	-.09	-.03	.16	-.02	.20*	.07
M. Race	.04	.06	-.03	-.01	-.05	.03
M. Ethnicity	.01	-.02	.08	.03	.09	.04
M. Age	-.01	-.03	.00	-.01	.01	.00
Past Protégé	-.12	.00	-.10	.01	-.04	.01
Past Mentor	.22	-.08	.28	.04	.19	.07
Education	.03	-.03	.02	-.09	-.04	-.08
Relationship Length	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Formal/ Informal	.22	.15	.30*	.22	.20	.17
Total Contacts	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Independent Variables						
CQ Met		.15		.24***		.19***
CQ Cog		.02		-.01		-.02
CQ Mot		.37***		.23*		.12
CQ Beh		-.09		-.06		-.03
Mediator						
Attitude Homophily					.42***	.30***
Overall R Squared	.05	.26	.14	.47	.48	.60
Adjusted R Squared	.04	.16	.06	.39	.42	.54
ΔR^2		.12	.02		.03	.15
Overall F	.53	2.57	1.68	6.27	8.59	9.84
df	10, 105	14, 101	10, 105	14, 101	11, 104	15, 100

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

TABLE 3: Results of Regression Analyses for Protégés

Predictor	Standardized Regression Coefficients*					
	Attitude Homophily		Relationship Quality			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Controls						
Mentor Gender	-.62**	-.54**	-.11	-.10	.16	.07
M. Race	.01	.02	.03	.05	.03	.04
M. Ethnicity	-.13	-.02	-.21	-.09	-.15	-.08
M. Age	.01	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.01	-.01
Past Protégé	-.17	.00	.15	.27	.22	.27*
Past Mentor	.17	.02	-.23	-.28*	-.30*	-.29*
Education	.30*	.20	.12	.03	-.01	-.03
Relationship Length	.00	.00	.00	.01*	.00	.00
Formal/ Informal	.86***	.69***	.31	.24	-.07	.03
Total Contacts	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Independent Variables						
CQ Met		-.20		.09		.15*
CQ Cog		.14		.06		.02
CQ Mot		.20		.21**		.15*
CQ Beh		.38**		.15		.03
Mediator						
Attitude Homophily					.44***	.31***
Overall R Squared	.22	.41	.13	.54	.47	.66
Adjusted R Squared	.13	.30	.03	.46	.40	.60
ΔR^2		.17		.43	.37	.57
Overall F	2.36	3.89	1.28	6.65	6.65	10.25
df	10, 84	14, 80	10, 84	14, 80	11, 83	15, 79

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

TABLE 4: Overall Results of Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Short Description	Result
1a	CQ on AH, Mentors	Not Supported
1b		Not Supported
1c		SUPPORTED
1d		Not Supported
2a	CQ on AH, Protégés	Not Supported
2b		Not Supported
2c		Not Supported
2d		SUPPORTED
3a	AH on RQ, Mentors and Protégés	SUPPORTED
3b		SUPPORTED
4a	CQ on RQ, Mentors	SUPPORTED
4b		Not Supported
4c		SUPPORTED
4d		Not Supported
5a	CQ on RQ, Protégés	Not Supported
5b		Not Supported
5c		SUPPORTED
5d		Not Supported
6a	AH mediating CQ on RQ, Mentors	PART.
6b		SUPPORTED
6c		Not Supported
6d		SUPPORTED Not Supported
7a	AH mediating CQ on RQ, Protégés	Not Supported
7b		Not Supported
7c		PART.
7d		SUPPORTED Not Supported

APPENDIX – Measures

Cultural Intelligence

Responses were on a seven-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree.

1. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.
2. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.
3. I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
4. I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.
5. I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.
6. I know the values and religious beliefs of other cultures.
7. I know the marriage systems of other cultures.
8. I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.
9. I know the rules (e.g., grammar) of other languages.
10. I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures.
11. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
12. I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.
13. I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
14. I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture.
15. I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.
16. I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.
17. I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
18. I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.
19. I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
20. I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.

Metacognitive = Items 1-4

Cognitive = Items 5-10

Motivational = Items 11-15

Behavioral = Items 16-20

Emotional Intelligence

Responses were on a five-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. R=Reverse Coded.

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others.
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them.
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try.
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me.
5. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people. (R)
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important.
7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities.
8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living.
9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.
10. I expect good things to happen.
11. I like to share my emotions with others.
12. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.
13. I arrange events others enjoy.
14. I seek out activities that make me happy.
15. I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others.
16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others.
17. When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me.
18. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing.
19. I know why my emotions change.
20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas.
21. I have control over my emotions.
22. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.
23. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on.
24. I compliment others when they have done something well.
25. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send.
26. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself.
27. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas.
28. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail. (R)
29. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them.
30. I help other people feel better when they are down.
31. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles.
32. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice.

Attitude Homophily

Responses were on a seven-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree. R=Reverse Coded.

My mentor/protégé:

1. thinks like me.
2. doesn't behave like me. (R)
3. is different from me. (R)
4. shares my values.
5. is like me.
6. treats people like I do.
7. doesn't think like me. (R)
8. is similar to me.
9. doesn't share my values. (R)
10. behaves like me.
11. is unlike me. (R)
12. doesn't treat people like I do. (R)
13. has thoughts and ideas that are similar to mine.
14. expresses attitudes different from mine. (R)
15. has a lot in common with me.

Relationship Quality

Responses were on a five-point Likert scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree.

1. The mentoring relationship between my mentor/protégé and me is very effective.
2. I am very satisfied with the mentoring relationship my mentor/protégé and I developed.
3. I was effectively utilized as a protégé/mentor by my mentor/protégé.
4. My mentor/protégé and I enjoy a high-quality relationship.
5. Both my mentor/protégé and I benefited from the mentoring relationship.