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The fact that girls and women suffer a loss of self-esteem disproportionate to boys and men is without argument. There are an increasing number of books, magazine articles, and resource kits being made available to begin to comprehensively address the issue with young girls. However, less effort is being directed toward the older adolescent, the college-age woman.

The problem with which this study was concerned was that of determining the impact of a mentoring program on the self-esteem of college-age women. The Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory (MSEI) was administered as a pre- and posttest, to 40 sophomore women, 20 of whom were in a control group and 20 who participated in the structured mentoring program. Using the MSEI, it was possible to gain statistically significant data which indicated that the self-esteem of the women could be positively impacted as a result of the mentoring experience. In addition to the instrument, the participants kept journals about their mentoring experience. Therefore, this research was able to report both qualitative and quantitative findings.

The findings regarding the control group were not statistically significant for any of the 11 characteristics on the inventory. The findings from the mentored group however, were determined to be statistically significant for 5 characteristics: global self-esteem,
competence, lovability, body appearance, and identity integration. From the statistical findings, as well as, from the journal entries it appeared that mentoring is a valuable experience.

Also it was determined that there was a pattern to a positive mentoring experience. The women felt that their mentors were individuals in whom they could place their trust, the women felt the mentors could be helpful to them because of the wisdom that comes from life experience.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In December 1993, Marianne Williamson, author of A Woman’s Worth and A Return to Love, spoke at an Estee Lauder luncheon, where she made the following observation:

I think that women have been hiding out for a very long time. Not only have we been consigned a place where our deepest feelings and passions were not considered relevant, but I think that in many ways we have conspired with those attitudes, helped to create them by not recognizing the importance of our deepest feelings and our most authentic selves. Basically our attitude towards cosmetics and clothes is, “Give me a place to hide, Be the mask”. (as cited in DiMona, 1994, p.2)

One might muse that, historically, cosmetics have become a metaphor. While, on the one hand, women have used make-up to “accentuate the positive,” they have also used make-up in an effort to comply with societal teachings that they will never be pretty enough, young enough, smart enough, or competent enough. Even with plenty of make-up, all the right clothes, or a facelift or two, women often express the wish to be someone other than who they are.
The women's movement brought about many changes, not only for women, but for men as well. In Texas, for example, nearly 60% of all women work outside the home. Women are an essential resource for economic growth and prosperity. Despite career gains in recent years, cases of gender discrimination persist, as does the disparity between the salaries of men and women. In addition, in the majority of homes, women are still expected to carry the major responsibility for cooking, cleaning, and caring for the children. Women are still subjected to verbal abuse in the music they hear, the movies they see, and the jokes that are circulated at cocktail parties and office coffee breaks.

Therefore, it should not have been startling news when, in 1990, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) conducted a nationwide poll on girls and self-esteem that determined a decline in girls' self-esteem versus that of boys. Sixty percent of all girls were happy about themselves in elementary school, but only 37% felt that way in middle school. By the time they reached high school, only 29% of girls liked themselves. In comparison, for boys, the decrease from elementary to high school was a drop from 67% to 46%.

How is it that these numbers become so disparaging for women? By the third grade, only 37% of the girls have used a microscope, compared to 51% of the boys. A study of science classes found that, when assistance was needed in carrying out a demonstration, 79% of the time boys were selected to help. Recent research shows that although 8, 9, and 10-year-old girls speak out with frankness and self-assurance, by age 12 or 13, they begin to pepper their language with self-effacing phrases such as "I don't know" or "This is dumb, but . . ." Researchers conclude that by age 12 most girls find they have to
obscure their true opinions, keep quiet, and be nice if they are to preserve peace in their relationships, fit in, and be liked. During these same years, from 8 to 13, girls' self-esteem plummets (AAUW, 1991).

In Failing in Fairness: How America's Schools Treat Girls, Sadker and Sadker (1994) wrote, "Girls begin school looking like the favored sex. They outperform boys on almost every measure" (p. 71). Girls arrive at college with more impressive high school transcripts as well as leadership experiences, yet they continue to see themselves less positively than the facts reflect that they should.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study concerned the impact of a structured mentoring program on the self-esteem of college-age women at Texas Christian University (TCU) in Fort Worth, Texas.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine whether a structured mentoring program with community women would have an impact on the self-esteem of college-age women.

Research Questions

The following research questions were generated to meet the purpose of this study:

1. Was there a general value in the mentoring experience as reflected by the pre- and posttest scores?
2. Was the value of the mentoring experience reflected in specific areas?

3. Was there a pattern that represented a positive mentoring experience as perceived by the participants?

4. Was there a pattern that represented a negative mentoring experience as perceived by the participants?

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study lies in its potential. First, the possibility exists to determine whether a mentoring experience might contribute to an improvement in the self-esteem of women between the ages of 18 and 23 who are attending college. Second, if the mentoring experience reflected an improvement in self-esteem, were there specific identifiable factors that were the greatest contributors to the improvement? Evidence supports the argument that the self-esteem of the average woman is lower than that of her male counterparts, despite the presence of a number of factors that would suggest otherwise, such as higher GPA and greater campus involvement in leadership positions. In other words, for most young women, performance and perception of self are not congruent.

Self-esteem issues are major contributors to circumstances of domestic violence, including but not restricted to physical and mental battering and sexual assault. Lack of self-esteem is an economic problem when women do not apply for jobs for which they are qualified because they do not perceive of themselves as qualified. Lack of self-esteem can allow a woman to tolerate sexual harassment or general abuse in the work
environment. Nearly 46% of the total U.S. labor force is made up of women, according to unpublished Bureau of Labor Statistics (Aburdene & Naisbitt, 1992). Women are an essential resource for economic growth and prosperity, yet often they are not treated as such; consequently, they do not feel essential.

The self-esteem of girls and women is now being discussed in ever-widening circles, and recent literature offers suggestions to parents and teachers that are designed to diminish the disempowering and destructive elements of gender inequality embedded in the fabric of socialization in our culture. Perhaps the mentoring process can begin to illuminate specific interactions that can contribute to developing a healthy self-esteem in participating young women. To create a base from which future discussions as well as research can start was a goal of this study. More important, however, was a desire to describe processes by which women can begin to respect and find dignity for themselves.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined as they relate to this study:

**Self-esteem**: "extent to which one perceives oneself as . . . close to being the person one wants to be and/or as . . . distant from being the . . . person one does not want to be, with respect to person-qualities one positively and negatively values" (Block & Robins, 1993, p. 911). Self-concept is a related term that refers to the conscious appraisal of the self (Kalsner, 1992). For the purpose of this study, the two terms may be used interchangeably to refer to how one perceives oneself."
Mentoring: a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task (Kram, 1985, p. 2).

Mentee: the student who is guided by a community woman.

Mentor: the community woman who guides the college student.

Delimitations

This study was limited to Anglo, sophomore women enrolled for the 1996 Spring and Fall semesters at Texas Christian University (TCU), a private, medium-sized (5,000-10,000 students), 4-year, church-related (Disciples of Christ) institution in the Southwest. The traditional-aged sophomore (19-20 years old) classification was the only one studied in order to control for psychosocial developmental differences in classifications. In this particular study, only Anglo women were included because of the numerous cultural variables that would have had to be addressed if the study had been open to include multiple ethnicities.

Although this information was gathered at only one institution, the population is similar enough to the national norm as reflected in the 1996 American Council on Education (ACE) annual survey of freshmen that information gained should be relevant and of interest to educators in other similar and dissimilar institutions.
Basic Assumption

The following assumption is related to this study:

The admission policies at the institution studied remained relatively unchanged from 1990-1995, and the university enrolled comparable students during those 5 years. Therefore, to look at one class of women would have significance to classes that preceded and followed the matriculating class of Fall 1995.

Summary

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to the study of the impact of a mentoring program on the self-esteem of college-age women. Chapter 2 will provide a review of the literature. Chapter 3 will explain the research design and methodology used in the study. Chapter 4 will provide an analysis of the data. Chapter 5 will discuss the findings, state conclusions, and cite implications for the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 2 will provide a review of the current literature. The first subject area will be self-esteem, followed by mentoring.

Self-Esteem

Research on women's self-esteem can be divided into two general categories. The first pertains to differences in self-esteem between the sexes. Studies of this type attempt to describe variations in the self-concept of the genders and also to take into account the ages at which these differences materialize. In addition, there have been studies on the sources of self-esteem and the causes of gender differences. The second area of research involves the consequences and the behavioral implications of low self-esteem.

From the numerous studies on self-esteem as it relates to gender differences, the overall conclusion drawn is that women have significantly lower self-esteem than men. Although both men and women tend to decrease in self-esteem with age, the changes in women are likely to be more dramatic and have longer lasting effects (Brutsaert, 1990).

For decades the differences between girls and boys have been the observational interest of classroom teachers, scout leaders, and community organization sponsors. When asked about the differences, most adults, remarking from their own experience,
would give what has become the classic cliche, “You know--boys will be boys. Girls are just the more, quiet, civilized type. They are little ladies.” Interestingly, although boys were considered eager, aggressive, and sometimes rude in group settings, these behaviors were considered positive attributes when displayed by boys. In the rare instance in which a girl demonstrated such behavior, she quickly would be called to task for such inappropriate, “disruptive” behavior (Orenstein, 1994, p. 16).

Beginning in the early to mid-1960s, numerous studies on self-esteem began to emerge. Coopersmith (1967) and Rosenberg (1965) identified involvement as the single most important parental attitude affecting the development of self-esteem in children. It was Rosenberg (1965) who determined the interaction between gender and self-esteem. More recent studies have supported his initial findings. In 1979, Epstein found that, when asked to report on experiences related to self-esteem, female subjects “reported more experiences involving acceptance and rejection, particularly acceptance, than males, and males reported slightly more experiences involving success and failure than the females” (p. 62). Brutsaert (1990) reported on his study with similar results. He interviewed 162 boys and 196 girls at different periods during secondary school to find the causes of higher self-esteem. The findings indicate that in early adolescence the self-esteem of girls is tied directly to emotional support—more specifically, to parental support. On the other hand, boys do not appear to be susceptible to emotional support as a factor in determining their self-esteem, rather, the variance in their self-esteem scores is strongly dependent upon their sense of power to control events. The higher boys’ sense of mastery over an environment, the higher their self-esteem score. Brutsaert further
argued that, over time, in a highly rigorous curriculum, the girls switched to using
mastery as their measure of self-worth. Interestingly, the rigorous curriculum had no
significance for the boys, with sense of mastery being the only variable of significance.

In another study about female worth and male efficacy, Diedrick (1988) studied men
and women ranging in age from 18 to 58. Unlike Brutsaert (1990), Diedrick did not find
that, with time, women base self-esteem on efficacy. Rather, defining worth as a moral
dimension of esteem related to kindness and goodness, Diedrick found worth to be the
basis of self-esteem for women. In contrast, she argued that men’s basis for self-esteem
seemed to be efficacy, the perceived accomplishments of the individual. Diedrick
explained:

It has been suggested that females’ reliance on others for self-esteem evolves from
socialization processes and from certain innate qualities (Bardwick, 1971). As
Bardwick pointed out, females are rewarded for socially-oriented behaviors, but
males for achievement-oriented behaviors. Girls are raised to be more helpful,
cooperative, and nuturant than are boys and in all societies, females are the
caregivers, which leads to the raising of females to respond in ways consistent
with such caregiving (Chodorow, 1974). Gilligan (1982) suggested that females
identify with their primary caregiver, typically female, and that they thus
maintain a connectness with others, rather than developing a separateness as do
males. Such identification and connectedness may lead to females’ reliance on
their relationships with others to maintain self-esteem. (p.6)
O'Brien and Epstein (1983) extended the work into the area of testing and measuring with the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory, and they found differences in responses based on gender to be significant enough to require separate norms. The consensus is that gender is capable of influencing self-esteem to some degree and that this influence is in a reasonably predictable direction. In general, women seem to gravitate toward the worthiness component of self-esteem (being valued in terms of acceptance or rejection), and men tend to be pulled by the competence dimension (success or failure) to a relatively greater degree (Mruk, 1995).

In the studies that report a gender difference in self-esteem, there is conflicting evidence about the age at which this difference materializes. Block (1991) measured self-esteem in boys and girls at ages 11, 14, 18, and 23 and found that the sexes differ in self-esteem over time. The most significant change occurred between ages 14 and 18. Findings from the Illinois Valedictorian Project show a slightly higher age range (Arnold, 1991). A study of 81 top high school students indicated that women tended to lower their estimate of their own intelligence in relation to their peers. Usually this change occurred between graduation from high school and the sophomore year of college. Whitt (1993) studied only college-age students, but also found that 1st-year students entered college with low self-esteem, which continued to decline during the college years.

Others have shown the divergence of the sexes' self-esteem at a much earlier age. The perhaps most well known of the studies, the Association of University Women (AAUW) (1991), found that levels of self-esteem began to lower for girls between elementary school and middle school. At ages 8 and 9 girls are confident, assertive, and
feel authoritative about themselves. By the time they emerge from adolescence, they reflect a poor self-image, constrained views of their futures and their place in society, and much less confidence about themselves and their abilities.

Using the statement “I am happy the way I am” as a core measure of self-esteem, 60% of elementary school girls and 67% of the boys responded yes. Over the next 8 years, the self-esteem of girls fell 31%, with only 29% of the high school girls saying they were happy with themselves. At the same time, 46% of the boys responded affirmatively (AAUW, 1991).

In every area evaluated, the statistics point to the disparity between the self-esteem of boys and girls. As they mature—and girls’ self-esteem declines at a faster rate than their male counterparts—so, too, do their perceptions of their abilities. In the AAUW (1991) study, while almost half of the boys felt they were “pretty good at a lot of things,” fewer than one third of the girls said that the statement was true. Boys were more willing to speak out in class, questioning the teacher when they felt he/she was in error. Boys tended to view the physical changes that occur during adolescence as a positive thing; they were getting bigger and stronger. Girls, on the other hand, believed that their changes led in a negative direction, reinforcing the declining self-esteem and gender stereotypes.

No academic subjects demonstrate the differences in boys’ and girls’ self-esteem more than math and science. Scholars hold conflicting views:

[It is unclear] whether innate differences exist in cognitive abilities, and boys simply have a higher aptitude for math; whether tests are biased against females;
whether parents develop the mathematical and scientific abilities of sons more than daughters by the kinds of toys they purchase and the more independent experiences they allow, whether girls see mathematics and science as male-dominated fields at which they are not good, fields they do not enjoy and where they do not belong. Whatever the origins of gender differences in mathematics and sciences achievement, children's experiences in schools typically amplify the differences that already exist. (Kleinfeld & Yerian, 1995, pp. 50-51)

In *Reviving Ophelia*, Mary Pipher (1994) suggested that “girls have trouble with math because math requires exactly the qualities that many junior-high girls lack--confidence, trust in one's own judgment and the ability to tolerate frustration without becoming overwhelmed. Anxiety interferes with problem-solving in math” (p. 63). She continued, “When boys have trouble with a math problem, they think the problem is difficult. When girls have trouble, they assume they are stupid” (p. 63).

A study of engineering students found the same results (Felder, 1994). Although the pre-engineering academic credentials of women entering college often exceeded those of men, the women did not score any higher in technical classes than men. In addition, the women in the study entered the engineering curriculum with greater anxiety and lower confidence in their preparation than did the men.

The women were more likely than the men to attribute poor performance to their own lack of ability and the men were more likely than the women to attribute success to their ability and the women more likely to attribute it to outside help. (Felder, 1994, p.4)
The decline in women's self-esteem during the college years has been attributed, in part, to the campus climates that women students encounter. Similar to the elementary experience, in the college classroom men are called on more often than women, and men's comments are treated more seriously than those of women. More studies substantiate these earlier findings. According to Whitt (1993), “In many classrooms, women are overshadowed. Even the brightest women often remain silent. . . . Not only do men talk more, but what they say often carries more weight” (p. 10).

Sandler, Silverberg, and Hall (1996) reported that, during college, women’s self-esteem continues to decline due to a great deal to a hostile, “chilly,” and nonsupportive environment. The nonsupportive environment can manifest itself in a variety of ways. Women experience isolation and lack of support by having faculty who expect less from them than their male counterparts or who exclude women from class participation by simply not calling on them, by interrupting, or by using male-gendered language when addressing the class. Other faculty have been reported to treat women and men differently when their behavior or achievement are the same. Women have reported being called on to speak “on behalf of ALL women” as well as having been defined and valued by their sexuality.

All the negative attention is bad enough, but perhaps it is not as harmful as no attention. Women have reported receiving less attention and intellectual encouragement than men. It is as subtle as faculty members having more eye contact with male students or as blatant as their calling on male students more and giving them more detailed
instructions for a task. "To do nothing" can have as negative an effect, or worse, as active degradation.

Women have fared no better socially than they have in the classroom. In their study of college student cultures, Holland and Eisenhart (1990) found an emphasis on and valuing of romantic relationships between men and women over other types of male-female or female-female relationships. Within these cultures, men's prestige was determined by their academic, athletic, and other achievements, as well as their attractiveness to women, whereas women's self-worth and prestige were determined by their relationships with men. The researchers also have found that the gender relationships present in the peer cultures were maintained in the classroom. The women students described not being taken seriously as students as the most detrimental to their learning (Whitt, 1993).

The general perceptions about self-esteem have translated into a similar picture regarding boys' and girls' future career aspirations. Boys were much more likely to believe they could accomplish the impossible, whereas girls' aspirations were rated far lower than their abilities would support (AAUW, 1991).

Although studies may not be definitive about the exact age at which self-esteem begins to decline, there is much agreement that the influences emanate from many sources. Parents contribute through expectations. Even before birth, active babies are believed to be boys, and more passive fetuses are believed to be female. Parents perceive newborn girls to be smaller, more delicate, less active, and weaker than they perceive sons to be. (Rubin, Provenzano, & Luria, 1974). In the home, parents encourage gender-
role-appropriate activities by providing children with sex-typed toys and clothing.

Studies reveal that girls are given dolls, doll houses, and miniature household appliances. Boys are provided with building blocks, sports equipment, models of vehicles and animals. Parents also behave differently toward their daughters and sons. As they grow, girls are assisted or "rescued" more than boys (Matlin, 1993; Newsom & Newsom, 1968).

However influential the parents may be concerning girls' self-esteem, many believe that the schools are the major culprit. For young women, feelings about academic performance correlate strongly with relationships with teachers, who are important role models for young women. Nearly three out of four elementary school girls and over half of high school girls want to be teachers. Pipher (1994) noted the following:

If teachers are serving as role models for young girls what are they learning from them? Schools have always treated girls and boys differently: Boys are twice as likely to be seen as role models, five times as likely to receive attention and twelve times as likely to speak up in class. In textbooks, one seventh of all illustrations of children are of girls. Teachers choose more classroom activities that appeal to boys than girls. Girls are exposed to almost three times as many boy-centered stories as girl-centered stories. Boys tend to be portrayed as clever, brave, creative, and resourceful, while girls are depicted as kind, dependent, and docile. Girls read six times as many biographies of males as of females. Boys are called on more often, are asked more abstract, open-ended, and complex questions.

Boys are more likely to be praised for academics and intellectual work, while girls
are more likely to be praised for their clothing, behaving properly, and obeying rules. (p. 62)

According to Parelius and Parelius (1978), while women dominate the teaching field at the preschool and elementary levels, more than 80% of the elementary school principals are men.

Although the overall structure of self-esteem is similar for girls and boys, small differences provide important insights. For young boys, the sense of confidence in their ability to do things correlates more strongly with general self-esteem than with other aspects of academic confidence. As they find people believing that males can do things, boys have higher self-esteem throughout adolescence. The research shows that young women find people, including their teachers, believing that females cannot do the things that they believe they can. The result is girls' lower self-esteem.

Pipher (1994) used the example of Ophelia in Hamlet, to make her point:

The story of Ophelia, from Shakespeare's Hamlet, shows the destructive forces that affect young women. As a girl, Ophelia is happy and free, but with adolescence she loses herself. When she falls in love with Hamlet, she lives only for his approval. She has no inner direction; rather she struggles to meet the demands of Hamlet and her father. Her value is determined utterly by their approval. Ophelia is torn apart by her efforts to please. When Hamlet spurns her because she is an obedient daughter, she goes mad with grief. Dressed in elegant clothes that weigh her down, she drowns in a stream filled with flowers. (p.21)
Barrie Thorne (1993) wrote of a 1990s version of Hamlet, in Gender Play: Boys and Girls in School:

But for many girls, appearance and relationships with boys begin to take primacy over other activities. In middle school or junior high the status of girls with other girls begins to be shaped by their popularity with boys; same-gender relations among boys are less affected by relationships with the other gender. In short, the social position of girls increasingly derives from their romantic relationships with boys, but not vice versa. (p. 155)

Brown and Gilligan (1992) reported similar findings in their longitudinal study at the Laurel School, in Cleveland, Ohio, where one would expect to find society’s “advantaged.” Eighty percent were from the middle and upper class, 14% were of color, and 20% were on scholarship. The authors wrote, “Yet we found that this developmental progress goes hand in hand with evidence of a loss of voice, a struggle to authorize or take seriously their own experience” (p.6).

Several other possible explanations for the differences in self-esteem of girls and boys have been offered in the literature. One interpretation involves sex-role stereotypes and the socialization of girls. Block and Robins (1993) pointed out that the range of experiences available to young boys is often much broader than that given to girls. This phenomenon may promote a diversity of experience for males. In addition, females are socialized to be more communal, and this ability to relate to others is a foundation for self-esteem in women. Smalley and Stake (1992) concurred. Their study produced
findings that pointed to traditionally feminine traits as a foundation for higher self-esteem.

An additional proposed explanation for gender differences is the prevalence of sexism in society. Through a study of Colorado high school students, Martinez and Dukes (1991) showed that both race and gender have a negative impact on a student’s self-esteem. Therefore, they proposed that the racism and sexism of society play a role in lowering the self-esteem of minorities and women. Further stressing the impact of sexism in society, Thorne (1993) supported the theory that adolescent girls often place themselves in paradoxical situations. Striving to express their independence from their parents, they become sexually active, risking disease and unwanted pregnancy. This circumstance ultimately binds them more tightly to their subordination as women.

As if low self-esteem in girls and women were not an issue deserving of a response on its own merit, it can also produce consequences of a dramatically tragic nature. Women of low self-esteem are frequently victims of domestic violence, which is a woman’s number-one health risk, according to the office of the Surgeon General (Aburdene & Naisbitt, 1992). A woman experiences domestic violence every 13 seconds. More than half of all the 911 calls are for violence against women. In a 1992 report, the Journal of the American Medical Association (Aburdene & Naisbitt, 1992) stated that more than 4 million U.S. women are severely assaulted each year. Every day, 3 women are beaten to death. According to the latest Justice Department figures, a woman is raped every minute (Aburdene & Naisbitt, 1992).
Mentoring

There are numerous interventions that could be perceived as positive. One such intervention is role modeling, or mentoring, concerning which Whitt (1993) quoted several faculty whom she interviewed as part of her study: "Insure that women students get connected with women faculty and women administrators. [Provide] a system for women students to see what their lives can be like and to not feel as foreign as they might" (p. 33).

Other faculty members noted:

"There’s got to be a more deep-seated worry about having women in intellectual and administrative authority. People find it really hard to see a woman in a position of power. That to me is the real stumbling block and, until that can change, I think anything else is only mildly interventionary."

"You’ve got to get women in the classroom and women in administration and women at the top. If something’s going to change, someone’s got to orchestrate it." (Whitt, 1993, p.33)

Whitt (1993) summarized several studies on role models:

The importance of role models for women’s development in a variety of areas, including achievement in mathematics and science (Boli, Allen and Payne, 1985); healthy identity formation (Komarovsky, 1985); pursuit of nontraditional fields of study, such as science and mathematics (Maples, 1992); as well as leadership (Astin and Leland, 1991; Keohane, 1984), is well documented. The necessity of women role models and mentors for women in coeducational institutions implies
that there must be sufficient numbers of women faculty and administrators “to go
around.” (p. 33)

Shandley (1989) recounted the history of the term mentor:
The term, mentor, has its root in Homer’s Greek epic poem, “The Odyssey.” In
this myth, Odysseus, a great royal warrior, had been off fighting the Trojan War
and entrusted the care of his son, Telemachus, to his friend and advisor, Mentor.
Mentor was charged with advising and serving as a guardian to the entire royal
household. As the story unfolds, Mentor accompanies and guides Telemachus on
a journey in search of his father and, ultimately, of a new and fuller identity of his
own. Since that time, the word, mentor, has become synonymous with wise
teacher, guide, philosopher, and friend. (p. 60)

Throughout history there is documentation of individuals who have been influenced
by mentors. For novelist Thomas Wolfe, an important mentor was his high school
English teacher, with her “abiding love for the brightness of spirit in a boy or girl”
(Mahoney, 1983, p. 2). Shandley (1989) wrote of others, such as Thomas Edison and
Babe Ruth, who had mentors:

Western Union executive Marshall Lefferts encouraged the young Edison to
pursue his strengths, brought him into the company, and set him up in his first
laboratory. When Babe Ruth was a seven year old in Baltimore, his parents ran a
waterfront salon and had little time for their son. Ruth found a mentor in a
Catholic school teacher who was so influential that he was later cited as the
individual who provided the "Babe" with the encouragement needed for him to persist in baseball. (pp. 59-60)

It should not be surprising that the three examples cited are men. For centuries, the predominant population to have been mentored has been men. In this country, they have been Anglo men. However, since the mid- to late 1970s, mentoring has become more common for women and minorities. Although the majority of the studies on mentoring have centered on career development within business, mentoring has become an increasingly popular form of intervention with youth, particularly disadvantaged youth. Philips and Hendry (1996) also believe that studies support that mentoring can be helpful to young people in general as they make the transition into adulthood. Mentors have been used effectively to affect the academic success of students (Jacobi, 1991). Mentors have even been used for leadership development (Shandley, 1989). Although no studies could be found using mentoring as an intervention for self-esteem development in either men or women, there are issues of concern and insights to be gleaned from most studies.

It is a concern to many that there is not a definitive definition of mentoring. From three disciplines—business, education, and psychology—Jacobi (1991) listed 15 different definitions. In many studies, the age of the mentor is not specified. In some studies, the mentor is a peer; in others, the mentor may be 7 to 10 years older than the mentee. Other factors of mentoring for which there are no criteria concern the duration of the mentoring experience. In some studies, the mentor and the mentee have met on only one occasion. In others, the duration is from several weeks up to 10 years. A related issue concerns the level of intimacy and intensity of the mentoring relationship. Some have described
mentoring at the highest point of the helping relationship. Others have described mentoring experiences along a continuum based on the depth of the relationship. In referring to these differences, they use such words as peer pals, guides, sponsors, and mentors. Still others have described mentoring by the role or function of the mentor. The literature is divided on the significance of the similarity of gender and ethnicity in the mentoring relationship. One final difference cited in the literature is the value of self-selection and free choice versus assigned mentors (Jacobi, 1991).

There are numerous insights to be gained from the literature as well. Even with all the debate among researchers, there is some agreement. Mentoring encompasses a total of 15 functions. Although every mentoring experience will not contain all 15, those functions all fall into one of three areas: emotional and psychological support, direct assistance with career and professional development, and role modeling. Other common components supported by the literature include the following: Mentoring is a helping relationship, and helping relationships are usually focused on achievement; mentoring is a reciprocal relationship, with each individual deriving some benefit; mentoring is personal; and mentors show greater experience, influence, and achievement within a particular organization or environment (Jacobi, 1991).

Some interesting observations can be found in the literature. Although studies show that it is women and minority men and women who can most benefit from the mentoring experience, it is much more difficult to find appropriate gender and ethnic matches for them. In fact, many women and minority individuals choose Anglo men as mentors, believing that they better understand the system, that they are better respected within the
system, and that their own status will be increased by being mentored by an Anglo man (Jacobi, 1991). It is also interesting to note, in light of the previous findings, that male mentoring relationships are typically task and activity oriented, whereas female mentoring relationships were shown to be relationally oriented (Keyton & Kalbfleisch, 1993). Finally, according to Shandley (1989), many studies found that mentoring was not equally available to women.

Summary

Chapter 2 provided a review of the current literature related to women, girls, and their self-esteem. From the literature, it is clear that girls and women suffer a loss of self-esteem disproportionate to boys and men. Also included in this chapter was a review of the literature related to mentoring.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In April of the 1996 spring semester, 20 mentees from TCU were paired with 20 mentors from the Fort Worth community. Each mentee was administered the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory as a pretest. Each mentee/mentor pair received an orientation to the mentor/mentee process and signed a contract of minimal expectations of the relationship. Each mentee was issued a journal in which to log each contact, whether by telephone, note, or in person; a brief summary of the contact; the length of time of the contact; feelings about the interaction; and any other pertinent comments which she felt were appropriate concerning the contact. At the conclusion of 26 weeks of contact, the journals were collected, and a posttest, again the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory, was administered to the mentees. The pre- and posttest were scored and studied for any differences in self-esteem. In addition, because of their journal entries suggested a significant mentoring experience, 6 participants were interviewed to further establish the complexities of the issues surrounding mentoring and self-esteem.

Concurrently, 20 sophomore women were administered the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory and received no intervention. At the conclusion of the 26 weeks, these
women repeated the inventory. This group of women students served as the control group.

Methodology

Recruiting Mentors

In Hand in Hand: Mentoring Young Women, Faddis (1988) discussed the characteristics of mentors:

Personal characteristics that would be beneficial include self-awareness, and self-confidence with regard to both work and interactions with others; high standards and expectations of oneself and one’s colleagues; enthusiasm and a sense of humor; and clear and effective communication skills, including the ability to express a point, defend a position, and confront “hard” issues without becoming overly aggressive or judgmental. . . . Above all, mentors must believe in the potential of the young or the inexperienced or the disadvantaged to make positive contributions. (p. 3)

With these parameters in mind, the selection of mentors began. Only Anglo women were included in this study because of the complexity that multiple ethnicity and male gendered mentors would introduce into the study. Mentors were recruited from a variety of sources. Three women were members of the American Association of University Women (AAUW), 4 were from Leadership Fort Worth; and the remaining 11 were from referrals and contacts within the university community. The women ranged in age from 33 to 60, with the average age being 41. Seventeen were married, 2 were divorced, and 1
had never married. Fifteen had children, 5 did not. Of the women, 14 were working outside the home on a full-time basis, 1 was working as a full-time volunteer, 2 were working part-time, and 3 were not working outside the home. The women’s careers included three psychologists, three bankers, two self-employed consultants, a high school math teacher, a university fund-raiser, an owner/president of a fabric company, a social worker, a physical therapist, and three nonprofit administrators. Nineteen of the women had earned a minimum of an undergraduate degree; 2 had their doctorates; and 2 had a dissertation in progress.

**Recruiting Mentees**

A letter was sent to 100 randomly selected Anglo women of sophomore classification, asking if they would like to participate in a mentoring relationship. Only Anglo women were included in this study because of the complexity that multiple ethnicity would introduce to the study. The first 40 to respond became the participants in the study. Only 40 participants were chosen because there was an attempt to select a population large enough to study, yet small enough to provide 20 of the participants with mentors.

Both the sample group and the control group had 20 subjects participating in the pretest. At the conclusion of the study, there were 14 subjects in the sample group and 16 in the control group. The decrease in subjects from the beginning to the end of the study was attributed to several things. From the sample group, 1 student did not return to the university in the fall of 1996. Five other students made a commitment to participate, attended the training, and took the pretest. When they did not contact their mentors,
numerous attempts were made to contact them. Although registered for the 1997 fall semester, they would not return telephone calls or respond to letters. In the control group, 4 of the 20 did not return to take the posttest.

Training Mentors and Mentees

An informational meeting was held for mentors and mentees. At the meeting for mentees, specific responsibilities were discussed. These responsibilities included the following:

1. Mentees would make the initial contact with their mentor.

2. After each contact, mentees would record reflections/thoughts/ideas in their journals about the topics they discussed with their mentors.

3. Mentees and mentors would meet a minimum of 8 contact hours over the period of 26 weeks, from April 18, 1996, to October 25, 1996.

Training also included a discussion of additional expectations: progress reports from the mentees at designated times during the 26 weeks and participation in an interview about the experience, if requested to do so.

The mentees were administered a pretest, the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory (MSEI). Following the 26-week mentoring experience, a posttest, the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory, was administered to the mentees as well as to all members of the control group.

Following the completion of the mentoring experience and the posttest, it was determined that some individuals would be interviewed. Several individuals who
appeared to have had a significant experience, whether positive or negative, were chosen.

Following the interviews, the information and insights gained were used to substantiate,
demonstrate, or clarify a point.

**Instrument**

The Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory (MSEI) was used in identifying
variables where there was an impact. The four-page instrument contains two parts. Part
1 contains 61 items on which respondents use a 5-point scale to indicate how accurately
the item describes them. Part 2 reports on how frequently the respondents experience
each of the 55 items. The instrument measures global self-esteem and eight components:
competence, lovability, likability, personal power, self-control, moral self-approval, body
appearance, and body function. The defensive self-enhancement scale differentiates
between a truly high and defensively high self-esteem. The MSEI was normed on 785
college students. All scales except the defensive self-enhancement demonstrated internal
consistency reliability coefficients of .80 or higher.

After years of study and use of self-esteem instruments, Mruk (1995) made the
following assessment about the MSEI:

The MSEI’s strengths are quite remarkable, given the difficulties of testing in this
area. First, it is grounded in a major theory of self-esteem, meaning that it has a
high degree of construct validity. Second, the content validity of the test is
improved because 8 of the 11 scales concern factors related to the competence and
worthiness dimensions of self-esteem. Third, there are some provisions for the
global versus situational and defensiveness issues. In fact, it appears to be the only major instrument that provides norms for these important self-esteem factors.

Fourth, the test includes a scale which attempts to assess defensiveness. Finally, the usefulness of the MSEI is supported by research using it in clinical settings, as well as with normal populations. These features make it a stronger instrument than the others in theory as well as in practice.

(p. 84)

Statistical Treatment

An independent one-tailed t-test was used to analyze the difference between the sample group mean scores and the control group mean scores on the posttest for the 11 subscales. A dependent t-test was used to analyze the difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the control group and the mentor group. Significance was determined at an alpha level of 0.05. Both the sample group and the control group had 20 subjects participating in the pretest scores. At the conclusion of the study, there were 14 subjects in the sample group and 16 in the control group.

The following null hypotheses were developed for the purpose of analysis:

1. There will be no significant difference between the pretest and the posttest in the sample group.

2. There will be no significant difference between the pretest and the posttest in the control group.
3. There will be no significant difference for the 11 subscale mean scores between the pretest and posttest scores for the sample group.

4. There will be no significant difference for the 11 subscale mean scores between the pretest and posttest scores for the control group.

The means of the pretest scores were also compared. The purpose of the comparison was to determine whether the sample group and the control group have similar characteristics.

The data are presented in chapter 4 through the use of tables and narratives to reflect the content of the research questions and to fulfill the purpose of the study. Characteristics are presented individually better to aid the reader in understanding the significance of the mentoring experience.

Summary

Chapter 3 discussed the research design and the methodology used in this study.

Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the data.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter contains an analysis of data collected from the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory (MSEI), data from journals completed by mentees, and data collected from interviews with mentors and mentees. The data were collected from the MSEI on two separate occasions for each person participating in the study—once in the spring of 1996 as a pretest and once in the fall of 1996 as a posttest. Data were collected from the mentees' journals, and interviews of the mentors and mentees were conducted in the fall of 1996 and spring of 1997. Both the mentored and the control group began with 20 participants. At the conclusion of the study there were 14 in the mentored group and 16 in the control group. The data are presented in order of the research questions.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not a structured mentoring program with community women would have an impact on the self-esteem of college-age women. Through a pre- and posttest, it was possible to establish whether the women actually felt better about themselves in any of the designated areas as a result of the mentoring experience. The MSEI was developed to provide a multidimensional measure of self-esteem. Therefore, it focuses on "relatively broad domains. This insures that each of the components has important implications for the overall self-esteem of most individuals" (O'Brien, 1988, p.7).
Four research questions were investigated to meet the purpose of this study.

1. Was there an overall value in the mentoring experience as reflected by the pre- and posttest scores?

2. Was the value of the mentoring experience reflected in specific areas?

3. Was there a pattern that represented a positive mentoring experience as perceived by the participants?

4. Was there a pattern that represented a negative mentoring experience as perceived by the participants?

The data in this chapter are presented in the order of the research questions. The first two questions use the MSEI, with comments from the journals and the interviews to be used as supportive data. The third and fourth questions are dependent on the journals and interviews because they are based on the participants' perceptions.

Global Self-Esteem

The first variable to be discussed is Global Self-Esteem (GSE), which is defined as “pleased with self, feels significant as a person, self-confident, pleased with past, expects future. . . . The global self-esteem (GSE) scale directly measures the subject’s overall feelings about herself by asking about generalized feelings of positive self-worth and inadequacy” (O'Brien & Epstein, 1988, pp. 6-7). Data related to research question 1, which questions the overall value of the mentoring experience, is gained from the score on the global self-esteem (GSE) characteristic and writings from the journals of the
participants. Results from the inventory data on global self-esteem (GSE) are reflected in Table 1.

Table 1

Global Self-Esteem (GSE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>35.43(5.72)</td>
<td>39.07(5.01)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>35.75(7.45)</td>
<td>37.88(4.80)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p=<0.01.

Analysis of the data in Table 1 indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the pre- and posttest for participants in the mentored group for global self-esteem (GSE). The significance was determined at p=<0.01. It appears from their writings that there was an overall value in the experience. There was frequent use of the word realize. It was used in such a way as to say, “I already knew these things in my unconscious, but the thoughts have been moved to my conscious and confirmed.” This confirmation, by someone “with an experienced outlook,” as one young woman described her mentor, served to awaken or heighten their sense of global self-esteem, even if they did not know the term. Some examples of these realizations include:

“I realize [emphasis mine throughout] the necessity of flexibility and patience.”

“It was beneficial to talk to Laurie because she helped to remind me that a degree in a certain area is not a binding contract to a vocation.”

“Meeting with Sally reminded me how things are always changing . . . .”
“It also occurred to me that I am the first woman in my family who will finish college. I wonder why I never thought of this before today.”

“I never realized how strongly I feel about my beliefs.”

“I realized how important it is to give back to the community after you are successful and established. It really completes your purpose in life.”

Analysis of the data provided in Table 1 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

Specific Characteristics of Self-Esteem

Research question 2 addressed the value reflected in specific areas. Data related to this subject are presented in Tables 2 through 11. Analytical data are presented for each of the four classifications groups: control pre- and posttest and mentored pre- and posttest. The analysis identifies differences between conditions (time between pre- and posttest) within the same group for each of the self-esteem characteristics. A discussion follows each table to explain its meaning.

The characteristic of competence (CMP) is defined as “competent, feels capable of mastering new tasks, learns quickly and does well at most things, feels talented, feels effective and capable” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). The data related to competence (CMP) are presented in Table 2.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>40.43(6.25)</td>
<td>42.79(3.89)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.038**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>39.81(6.04)</td>
<td>40.38(5.00)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p=<0.05

Analysis of the data in Table 2 indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the pre- and posttests for participants in the mentored group for the competence(CMP) characteristic. The significance was determined to be at p=<0.05.

Journal entries that support this position include the following:

"I have the chance to become whomever I want to become."

"The other thing was that I eventually want to get a Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education, but I also want to have children."

"I was always taught that I could do whatever I wanted to do. The only stipulation was that I always do the very best I can. . . . I was very encouraged by my teachers in high school as well."

Mary said that I seemed aggressive because I knew what I wanted with my life. She sounded surprised! I thought it was odd for her to use the term "aggressive," most people use that term when they mean pushy or bossy. I've thought of myself as determined, but not aggressive. I'll have to think about that one. Most of my friends know what they want out of life and I just assumed everyone does.
I like Dianne's views... And I like to share things with her that I have learned and which she has learned. I like the way she can keep her mind open and still feel secure when exposing herself to new things. I try to be this way!

The "feeling capable to master" whatever comes along is reflected in these examples.

Analysis of the data provided in Table 2 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic of lovability (LVE) is defined as "worthy of love, feels cared for by loved ones, accepted as a person, and count on support from loved ones, able to express and receive feelings of love, involved in satisfying intimate relationships" (O'Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). Results from the inventory data on lovability (LVE) are reflected in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lovability (LVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<=0.05

Analysis of the data in Table 3 indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the pre- and posttests for participants in the mentored group for the
lovability (LVE) characteristic. The significance was determined at $p=<0.05$. Examples of journal entries include the following:

"It's interesting that both of us have guys that go off and we just continue with our studies. I guess it's not a problem for us because we're both very secure in the relationship that we have."

"I feel gorgeous, unbelievably loveable . . ."

"Everyone is loveable in God's eyes."

Analysis of the data provided in Table 3 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic likability (LKE) is defined as "likable, popular, accepted by peers and included in their plans, enjoyable, companion, gets along well with others, popular in dating situations, expects to be liked, makes a good first impression" (O'Brien & Epstein, 1988, p.7). Results from the inventory data on likability (LKE) are reflected in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likability (LKE)</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>37.50(5.23)</td>
<td>38.36(5.03)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>35.88(6.09)</td>
<td>37.31(4.63)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the data provided in Table 4 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the mentored group between the pre- and the posttest. Although there was an increase in the posttest scores over the pretest, it was too small to infer any significance. The journal entries related to this characteristic include:

"I know I am likeable."

"I look at relationships more clearly now. I know I will find someone that is more accepting."

"I’m not rushing into anything. I like to be with my girl friends. It’s fun."

"It’s interesting that both of us have guys that go off and we just continue with our studies. I guess it’s not a problem for us because we’re both very secure in the relationships that we have."

Analysis of the data provided in Table 4 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic personal power (PWR) is defined as “powerful, successfully seeks positions of leadership, good at influencing others’ opinions and behaviors, assertive, has a strong impact on others” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). The data related to personal power (PWR) are reflected in Table 5.
Analysis of the data in Table 5 indicated that no statistically significant differences occurred within the mentored group between the pre- and posttest. The increase in the posttest score was so small it would be irresponsible to infer any importance to it. Although there were no comments related specifically to power, there was one that could be perceived as related. The young woman wrote, "I’m so glad the mentoring was personal and not career-based. That would have been such a turn-off. There’s so much more to life than careers."

Analysis of the data provided in Table 5 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic self control (SFC) is defined as "self-disciplined, persevering, good at setting and achieving goals, not easily distracted, in control of emotions, exercises restraint in eating, drinking, and/or the use of drugs" (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). Results from the inventory data on self-control(SFC) are reflected in Table 6.
Analysis of the data provided in Table 6 indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the pre- and the posttest for the participants in the mentored group on the self-control (SFC) characteristic. Although the increase from the pretest score to the posttest score is greater than for other characteristics for which there was no statistical significance, it is still too small to make any inference. The comments related to this characteristic include:

"I don’t think I will have trouble succeeding in life."

"I eventually want to get a Ph.D. in Music Education, but I also want to have children."

"I was always taught that I could do whatever I wanted to do."

Analysis of the data provided in Table 6 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic moral self-approval (MOR) is defined as "pleased with moral values and behavior, has clearly defined moral standards and acts in a way that is
consistent with moral values, sets a positive moral example for others” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). The results of the inventory data on moral self-approval (MOR) are reflected in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>42.50(7.52)</td>
<td>43.21(5.45)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>42.56(3.90)</td>
<td>43.69(3.82)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data provided in Table 7 indicated also that no statistically significant differences occurred within the mentored group between the pre- and the posttest. Although there was an increase in the posttest score from the pretest, it was too small to infer any significance. While there were no direct statements regarding moral self-approval, there were comments which could be related.

“My faith is very important to me. I am being “discipled” by a woman in my church.”

“I want to be at home when my children get home from school. It not the same when they have to wait until you get home to tell you about their day.”

Analysis of the data provided in Table 7 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.
The characteristic body appearance (BAP) is defined as “physically attractive, pleased with appearance, feels that others are attracted because of appearance, feels sexually attractive, takes care to enhance physical appearance” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6).

Results from the inventory data on body appearance (BAP) are reflected in Table 8.

Table 8

Body Appearance (BAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>30.21(8.75)</td>
<td>33.57(7.97)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>30.56(8.09)</td>
<td>32.81(6.39)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\alpha = 0.05$

Analysis of the data in Table 8 indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the pre- and the posttest for the participants in the mentored group on the body appearance (BAP) characteristic. Significance was determined at $\alpha = 0.05$.

There was only one journal entry that included any reference to body appearance. Only 1 participant wrote anything specifically related to appearance. “I feel gorgeous...” With such a minimal reference about appearance, no insight can be derived from the entry.

Analysis of the data provided in Table 8 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic body functioning (BFN) is defined as “well-coordinated, agile, in good physical condition, comfortable with body, enjoys physical activities such as...”
dancing or sports, feels healthy and feels a sense of vitality and vigor in body functioning” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p.6). Results from the inventory data on body functioning (BFN) are reflected in Table 9.

Table 9

Body Functioning (BFN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>32.36(10.31)</td>
<td>33.57(9.33)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27.69(9.58)</td>
<td>28.44(7.69)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data in Table 9 for body functioning (BFN) indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the pre- and the posttests for participants in the mentored group. Although there is an increase in the posttest score from the pretest, it is too small an increase from which to infer any importance. There were no journal entries which addressed this characteristic.

Analysis of the data provided in Table 9 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic identity integration (IDN) is defined as a “clear sense of identity, knows who she is, knows what she wants out of life, well defined long-term goals, inner
sense of cohesion and integration of different aspects of self-concept” (O'Brien & Epstein, 1988, p.6).

A well-functioning self-concept is associated with a tendency to seek out and assimilate new experiences, thereby allowing the self-concept to continually grow and expand. . . . The identity integration scale measures an individual’s view of her efficiency in assimilating new information and in organizing and directing life experience. This scale is similar to the global self-esteem scale in that its focus is on the overall functioning, or adequacy, of the self-concept. (p. 7)

Results from the inventory data on identity integration (IND) are reflected in Table 10.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Integration (IND)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p=<0.05

Analysis of the data in Table 10 indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the pre- and the posttest for participants in the mentored group for the identity integration (IND) characteristic. The significance was determined at p=<0.05. The following are examples from the students that support the identity integration scale:
She encouraged me to go as far as I could. She thinks I can work for the Federal Government, an Embassy, maybe. It would be so awesome. I felt like we were having a "To thine own self, be true!" kind of conversation.

"I don't think I will have trouble succeeding in life."

Often times, I think that life will be "easier" when I get out of school. However, I know now that it just progresses to a different level--with new aspects and a different environment. It is not as if we come to a certain point in life where things "peak"-- just as the saying goes, "success is a journey, not a destination."

So it is with life.

Analysis of the data provided in Table 10 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

The characteristic defensive self-enhancement (DEF) is defined as "defensive, overly inflated view of self-worth, claims to possess highly unlikely positive qualities, denies ubiquitous human weaknesses" (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). Results from the inventory data on defensive self-enhancement (DEF) are reflected in Table 11.
Table 11

Defensive Self-Enhancement (DEF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>46.63(9.56)</td>
<td>48.63(6.95)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>52.64(5.84)</td>
<td>53.14(5.42)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data provided in Table 11 indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the pre- and the posttest for the participants in the mentored group for the defensive self-enhancement (DEF) characteristic. Although there was some increase in the scores between the pre- and the posttest, it was not great enough to infer any significance. There were no entries that directly or indirectly addressed the subject of defensive self-enhancement.

Analysis of the data in Table 11 revealed that no statistically significant differences occurred within the control group between the pre- and the posttest. This analysis supports the expectation suggested in the hypothesis that the control group would reflect no statistically significant changes because they were not in the mentoring process.

Positive Patterns of Experiences

In response to the third research question, which examines whether there was a pattern that represented a positive mentoring experience, it was necessary to refer to the journals. There were perhaps three patterns worth highlighting. The first pattern was the
participant’s sense that the mentor was someone in whom she could confide. Journal entries which supported this pattern include the following:

“I felt like I could tell Maggie anything.”

“We talked about my college life, my boyfriend, her children, my self-esteem, and religion.”

“Peggy is really nice and easy to talk to.”

“Even though some things in my life aren’t very pleasant to me, I can still talk to Laura about them.”

“I felt so comfortable talking about everything and anything with Mary Jane.”

“It seems like I’ve known her for years, but I guess that’s because she knows how to make me feel like I can be myself no matter what.”

“I enjoy spending time with her and didn’t mind sharing things I normally wouldn’t share with anyone.”

“I like the fact that we talk about Beverly and not just about me.”

“Mary seemed interested in what I was doing and what my plans in life were.”

The second pattern is how these young women perceived themselves to be like or felt that in some way they could relate to their mentor. Entries which supported this pattern include the following:

“It’s interesting that both of us . . .”

“I would be a nervous wreck. Mary never stops amazing me.”

“I realized we had a lot in common.”
"I think I’m like that too. She’s taught me about the kind of person I want to strive to be every day of my life."

"Talking with Linda helped me get a “new” perspective on things."

"I try to be this way!"

"It’s really weird how I have a smile on my face from the moment I arrive to see Mary Jane until I leave. She’s a wonderful lady."

"I think I’m like that too."

The third pattern detected in the journal entries was the mentees’ perception that they could benefit from the wisdom of their mentors. Examples which supported this pattern include the following:

"She’s always giving me great tips and advice."

"It’s a good time to sort some thoughts about things going on in my life and to get input and comments from an entirely different perspective, from a much more mature perspective than my peers can offer."

"She has a lot to give and share."

There was a strong sense of “relatedness” throughout the journal writings. Without regard for the specific profile of their mentor, the college-age women expressed a perceived “closeness” with their mentors to the point of sharing in confidences. They felt that they had things in common, but yet that they could learn and grow from their mentor’s life experience and wisdom.
Negative Patterns of Experience

Finally, the fourth research question raised the issue of a pattern that might represent a negative mentoring experience. There was no formal documentation of such patterns. One could conclude from having read a number of journals and talked with several mentees and mentors that some relationships were closer than others. If there was a pattern to be seen in these relationships, one might speculate that when there was a lack of similar life values the bond in the relationships was not as close as when life values were more similar.

Summary

There were four research questions. Question 1 was stated in the following way: “Was there a general value in the experience as reflected by the pre- and posttest scores?” The findings demonstrated that a statistically significant difference did not occur for the control group, which was expected because they were not participating in the mentoring process. The findings further demonstrated that a statistically significant difference did occur between the pre- (x=35.43) and the posttest (x=39.07) scores on the global self-esteem characteristic for the mentored group (t=-5.26, df=13, p<.01). The journal entries provided substantive support to the findings.

Question 2 asked “Was the value of the mentoring experience reflected in specific areas?” The pre- and posttests of each group suggested that, while there was no change in the scores of any characteristics for the control group, the mentored group did reflect scores of statistically significant difference in four areas, in addition to global self-esteem.
The four areas were competency, lovability, body appearance, and identity integration. Each is addressed individually below.

The findings for the competency characteristic demonstrated that a statistically significant difference did occur between the pre- ($\bar{x}=40.43$) and the posttest ($\bar{x}=42.79$) scores for the mentored group ($t= -1.923$, $df=13$, $p<0.05$). There were numerous journal entries to support the statistical findings.

The findings for the lovability characteristic demonstrated that a statistically significant difference did occur between the pre- ($\bar{x}=38.78$) and the posttest ($\bar{x}=41.71$) scores for the mentored group ($t= -2.08$, $df=13$, $p<0.05$). There were several journal notations to support the statistical findings.

The findings for the body appearance characteristic demonstrated that a statistically significant difference did occur between the pre- ($\bar{x}=30.21$) and the posttest ($\bar{x}=33.57$) scores for the mentored group ($t= -2.08$, $df=13$, $p<0.05$). There was only one specific reference made to body appearance; therefore, journals were of minimal use as supportive data to the statistical findings.

The findings for the identity integration characteristic demonstrated that a statistically significant difference did occur between the pre- ($\bar{x}=36.57$) and the posttest ($\bar{x}=39.64$) scores for the mentored group ($t= -2.41$, $df=13$, $p<0.05$). There were a number of insightful journal entries which could be used to substantiate the statistical findings.

The remaining characteristics—likability, self-control, personal power, moral self-approval, body functioning, and defensive self-enhancement—were all determined to be statistically insignificant. Although in every case there was an increase in the score from
the pretest to the posttest, it was still too small to be approaching statistical significance.

The statistical information is provided on each characteristic.

The findings for the likability characteristic demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- (x=37.50) and the posttest (x=38.36) scores for the mentored group (t=-0.88, df=13, p=<0.20) A few journal entries addressed the issues associated with likability.

The findings for the self-control characteristic demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- (x=38.07) and the posttest (x=40.29) scores for the mentored group (t=-1.68, df=13, p=<0.06). Several journal entries addressed the issues related to self-control.

The findings for the personal power characteristic demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- (x=40.50) and the posttest (x=40.57) scores for the mentored group (t=-0.07, df=13, p=<0.47). There were no direct statements in the journals about personal power, but one could infer a relationship from the statements presented.

The findings for the moral self-approval characteristic demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- (x=42.50) and the posttest (x=43.21) scores for the mentored group (t=- 0.57, df=13, p=< 0.29). No direct statements addressed the subject of moral self-approval, but there were comments that could be related.

The findings for the body functioning characteristic demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- (x=32.36) and the posttest (x=33.57)
scores for the mentored group ($t = -1.12$, $df = 13$, $p = <0.47$). No journal entries addressed the body functioning characteristic.

The findings for the defensive self-enhancement characteristic demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference between the pre- ($\bar{x} = 52.64$) and the posttest ($\bar{x} = 53.14$) scores for the mentored group ($t = -0.1.78$, $df = 13$, $p = <0.38$). No journal entries addressed the defensive self-enhancement characteristic.

Question 3 was worded the following way: "Was there a pattern that represented a positive mentoring experience as perceived by the participant?" Support of these patterns was found in the journals and could be classified under three headings: The mentors were women whom the participants felt they could trust and take into their confidence; the mentors were women with whom the participants felt they could relate or had something in common; and finally, the mentors were perceived as having wisdom that could be helpful to the participants.

Research question 4 was worded in this way: "Was there a pattern that represented a negative mentoring experience as perceived by the participants?" While there was no formal documentation that would directly point to a pattern that represented a negative mentoring experience, one could infer after reading many journals and talking with a number of mentees and mentors that those individuals for whom the experience was not as rich as some had perceived life experiences and values that differed from their mentors. While all the women reported a very positive experience, it seemed that those for whom the experience was most meaningful had the life values similar to their mentors.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not a structured mentoring program with community women would have an impact on the self-esteem of college-age women. In order to fulfill this purpose, 40 Anglo, sophomore-classified women at Texas Christian University were randomly selected to participate in the study. All 40 were administered the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory (MSEI) (Appendix G) as a pretest. The women were divided into two groups, with 20 in each. One served as a control group and received no intervention. The 20 members of the other group were individually paired with a mentor from the Fort Worth community. The contractual period of the relationship was for a minimum of 8 hours of contact over a 26-week period. At the conclusion of the 26 weeks, all remaining participants from both the control and the experimental groups were again administered the MSEI as a posttest.

The MSEI inventoried on a total of 11 characteristics. As expected, there were no significant differences in the scores of the control group from the pretest to the posttest. However, the scores reflected statistically significant differences on 5 characteristics for the women in the mentored group. The 5 characteristics that suggested a statistically significant difference were global self-esteem (GSE), identity integration (IDN), competence (CMP), lovability (LVE), and body appearance (BAP). Significance was
determined at $p<0.05$, except for global self-esteem where it was determined at $p<0.01$. Journal entries substantiated the quantitative findings in each of the 5 areas.

It was determined that there was a pattern that represented a positive mentoring experience as perceived by the participants. Support for the patterns was found in the journals and could be classified under three headings: The mentors were women whom the participants felt they could trust and take into their confidence; the mentors were women with whom the participants felt they could relate or had something in common; and finally, the mentors were perceived as having wisdom that could be helpful to the participants.

Determining a negative pattern was more difficult because there was no documentation that formally stated the concern. From reading journals and interviewing participants and mentors, it was determined that those women who felt they had more similar life experience and value systems formed a tighter bond and felt the experience to be more positive than those who felt a greater difference between them.

Discussion of Findings

A surprisingly large number of studies exist on the subject of girls, women, and low self-esteem. Most surprising is that, prior to the last 3 to 5 years, the literature contained studies determining that girls and women do, in fact, have lower self-esteem than boys and men, however, there was little or no discussion about solutions. More recently, the literature has begun to offer guides to avoid and or correct the downward spiral. It is
remarkable, however, that virtually nothing exists on the effects of personal mentoring on self-esteem.

Most literature on mentoring is career based. The purpose is for a senior staff member to teach a junior employee “the ropes” within a particular corporate environment. Historically, most mentees were Anglo men, as were the mentors. In recent years, formal programs have grown out of human resources to provide mentoring to all levels, genders, and ethnicities of employees. Although the mentee is now frequently an ethnic minority or a woman, Anglo men are still often the preferred mentor. Many believe that Anglo men know the system best and would bring higher status to the junior staff member than would a female or ethnic minority mentor.

Much of the remaining literature on mentoring is based in programs for teens in low socioeconomic communities. Community leaders or other students are placed with the adolescents to encourage them to create goals and to work toward them. The emphasis is often on high school graduation and staying out of gangs and away from drugs. A smattering of literature addresses mentoring college students, but the focus is predominately on academic success.

It was the researcher’s 20-year personal experience with college-age women and men that led to this study. In those 20 years, of the students enrolled at the institution as freshmen, an overwhelming number of women had extremely high grade point averages (GPA), Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores, and impressive leadership resumes. Both women and men students were administered the American Council on Education (ACE) freshmen survey. The survey scores reflecting their perceptions of themselves did not
match the information in their academic and cocurricular transcripts. As personal and working relationships were formed, the paradoxical personalities continued. The women were frequently receiving the highest grades in their classes. They were formally or informally responsible for major organizations and cocurricular programs. Yet, when they felt comfortable enough to share their feelings, some of the brightest and most capable women revealed feelings of fear, insecurity, and a low sense of worth.

The results of this study contribute information on the value of personal mentoring for these and other college-age women. The results suggested both quantitatively and qualitatively that mentoring can make a difference in some characteristics of the self-esteem of college-age women.

Global Self-esteem

The first research question in the study centered on determining the value of the mentoring experience as reflected by the pre- and posttest scores. Although there was no statistically significant difference in the pre- and posttest scores of the control group, there was a statistically significant difference in the characteristic of global self-esteem for the participants who were mentored. Significance was determined at $p<0.01$. The statistic was supported by the entries in the participants’ journals. One mentee’s journal entry included the following:

“Having a mentor helped me to know what I do and do not want in my family life and to make smart decisions.”
Another participant wrote of her experience:

Having a mentor helped me gain insight into myself, learn how to be successful and happy in life. She gave me advice on my career, family, life, etc, and we shared common interest. I believe younger women can learn a lot from a successful, established woman who has already traveled down the same road.

Another young woman recorded these thoughts: “I think it benefits me to be able to talk seriously to somebody older. I rarely get this opportunity at college. It helped me focus on some personal goals for me, as a woman.”

One student summed up the sentiments of other mentees:

I definitely am going to model my character after my mentor. Not that she’s perfect—she’s just so together and she knows what’s important in life. I think I’m like that too. She’s taught me about the kind of person I want to strive to be every day of my life.

The students interviewed were asked the question, “Having had a personal mentor as opposed to one closely related to your career, do you think you would have preferred a career mentor or a personal one?” They all responded that they wanted the personal mentor. One student even remarked that a business mentor would turn her away. “Other parts of my life are important.” She particularly expressed a desire to have had more time with her mentor.

The journal entries indicate that the women in this study were particularly pleased that their mentors were at least 8-15 years older. They seemed to appreciate the experiences the women had had and the wisdom that came from their experiences. Therefore, it is interesting to note the research in this area. Jacobi (1991) found some research to support
mentors being 8-15 years older than their mentor. Yet, in other studies, the use of peer mentors seemed to discount the significance of age.

Mentors and mentees were required to visit a minimum of 8 hours within a 26-week period of time. Although 8 is not a large number and most mentees expressed a desire for the relationship to continue, none saw each other more than the required 8 hours during the designated time. Jacobi (1991) documented research regarding the significance of the length of time for mentoring. Interestingly, the duration of time is as wide as the age difference. Some researchers described a “typical mentoring relationship as lasting 2-10 years, while others suggest that a mentoring relationship can be as brief as a single encounter” (Jacobi, 1991, p.511). Still, according to Jacobi, some higher education literature referred to an academic year as a good length of time for the relationship to last.

Clearly, a related issue is “the level of intimacy or intensity characterizing the mentoring relationship” (Jacobi, 1991, p.511). Again, there are no rules. Some researchers referred to mentoring as the “highest end on a continuum of helping relationships” (Jacobi, 1991, p.511). Still others were more likely to describe different relationships along a continuum. Regardless, it is clear that there must be a “degree of mutuality” about the relationship (p. 511). Each should be comfortable with where the relationship is and where it is going. In this study, all indications were that the relationships were appropriate, comfortable, and mutual.

As if the value of global self-esteem were not apparent in and of itself, Frederick and Grow (1996) found disturbing data regarding eating disorders and self-esteem. In their study, they found a link between the two, observing that “women with clinically
diagnosed bulimia scored significantly lower than control groups on global measures of self-esteem” (p.218). Health risks as threatening as eating disorders are clear reasons to be concerned about the self-esteem of an individual or a designated population, specifically college-age women.

Specific Characteristics

The second research question was in regard to the value of the mentoring experience as it was reflected in specific areas. Of the 11 characteristics inventoried with the MSEI, there were no statistically significant differences in the pre- and posttest scores of the control group. Because there was no intervention with this group, there was no expectation that there would be a statistically significant difference.

Although there were six characteristics in which there was no change in the pre- and posttest of the mentored group, there were four, in addition to global self-esteem, for which a statistically significant difference was reflected. Significance was determined at $p=<0.05$.

In examining the definitions of the characteristics and the journal entries, it was easy to see a relationship between two of the characteristics: global self-esteem and identity integration. In the discussion of the instrument, O'Brien and Epstein (1988) observed the following about these characteristics:

Global self-esteem is conceptualized as a summary of feelings of worthiness... The global self-esteem scale directly measures the subjects overall feelings about herself.
[Identity integration] concerns the organization of self-experience and the efficiency with which these experiences can be integrated into the self-concept. A well functioning self-concept is associated with a tendency to seek out and assimilate new experiences, thereby allowing the self-concept to continually grow and expand. This scale is similar to the global self-esteem scale in that its focus is on the overall functioning, or adequacy, of the self-concept. (p. 7)

Further, in light of the above remarks, it is no surprise that competence is one of the five characteristics for which a significant difference was determined. By definition, competence means “competent, feels capable of mastering new tasks, learns quickly and does well at most things.” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 7) Obviously, to be competent is “to continually grow and expand” (p. 7).

The women’s journal entries reflected an overlap of these three characteristics: global self-esteem, identity integration, and competence.

“She encouraged me to go as far as I could!”

“I don’t think I will have trouble succeeding in life.”

“I’ve always thought of myself as determined, . . . Most of my friends know what they want out of life and I just assumed everyone does.”

In these and other writings, it appears that the women are pleased with who they are (GSE), know what they want out of life (IDN), and feel competent and capable to go after it (CMP).
The fourth characteristic for which significance was determined was that of lovability. Little insight is gained into why lovability was determined to be significant. Only 1 student wrote of it at all, and she included no explanation.

The fifth and final characteristic for which significance was determined was body appearance. Again, there was such a minimal reference to body appearance that one must only suppose the importance. It is, however, sometimes assumed that when people feel good about themselves they do, in fact, look better. They carry their heads higher and their backs erect; they smile, and their eyes are brighter. In these small ways they are able to change the way they look, and, in fact, change their own perception of their body appearance.

It is of interest, however, to note that “as a rule” college-age women historically rate themselves very low in body appearance as compared to their peers. It would be interesting to examine why these women scored a statistically significant difference in body appearance, whereas, in contrast, they did not score a significant difference in body function.

Body function is the first of the characteristics for which no significance was found. A high score in body functioning reflects an enjoyment of physical activity. With the large number of people in general, and students in particular, who are involved in physical fitness/activity, it would seem that body functioning would have reflected a significant difference. As was discussed earlier, surprisingly, body appearance did reflect a significance. The difference is unexplainable.
The second of those characteristics for which significance was not determined was likability. Because a high score reflected popularity with peers and in dating situations, it may be that the experience with a mentor did not touch on the issue in such a way as to impact its importance.

It is difficult to determine the reason for the lack of significant difference in self-control and moral self-approval. Nothing in the journals or interviews indicated that there was ever a discussion about topics related to either. One could wonder if issues having to do with moral values, self-discipline, and behavior were considered too personal to discuss.

As noted earlier, the mentees expressed excitement that the mentoring experience was a personal one rather than a career-based one. Therefore, it is easy to think that no statistically significant difference was determined for personal power, because power is associated with a work environment as opposed to a personal one. High scores in personal power would identify with words such as “powerful, successfully seeks positions of leadership” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p. 6). These phrases are clearly associated with work, not personal, relational interactions.

The one score for which a statistically significant difference would have been perceived as negative is the characteristic defensive self-enhancement. Words associated with defensive self-enhancement are “defensive, overly inflated view of self” (O’Brien & Epstein, 1988, p.6). To have scored a statistically significant difference would have been unfortunate, because it would have implied that having been mentored, the women are now uncomfortable with who they are.
The third research question addressed whether or not there was a pattern that represented a positive mentoring experience, as perceived by the mentees. The pattern was more implied than stated. The only variable on which the mentors and mentees were matched was that they did not share a similar academic/career background. Other than not being paired with individuals with whom they shared similar career areas, the potential relationships were open to expression and opportunity. Some pairs bonded immediately. Others took longer to feel close, but were equally attached at the end. Still others fulfilled the time requirement, but never felt emotionally attached to each other. However, in almost every case, the experience was evaluated by the mentees as wonderful. Comments included:

“It seems like I’ve known her for years, but I guess that’s because she knows how to make me feel like I can be myself no matter what.”

“I enjoy spending time with her and didn’t mind sharing things I normally wouldn’t share with anyone.”

“Mary seemed interested in what I was doing and what my plans in life were.”

“When I used to try to talk to my Mom I always felt like I had to talk so fast because she was so busy that she would stop listening. I never felt like I had to talk fast with Lynn.”

It was no surprise that the mentees expressed that mentors caused them to feel as if someone cared, someone listened, someone understood. Because these mentors were assigned, it is important to note that the literature addresses the issue of assigned mentors versus personally selected ones.
Researchers also disagree about the efficacy of formal mentoring, or programs in which mentors are assigned to students or employees as opposed to those instances in which the mentor relationship is an outcome of mutual attraction and free choice. On the one hand, the proliferation of formal or assigned-mentoring programs in both business and educational settings attests to a widespread belief in their effectiveness. On the other hand, at least some researchers and practitioners are skeptical. (Jacobi, 1991, p. 512)

Although the question remains in the research community, the response from the mentees in this study would further substantiate the position that formal mentoring programs, where mentors are assigned, can be successful.

The fourth research question addressed whether there was a pattern that represented a negative mentoring experience as perceived by the participants. No formal or informal documentation of a pattern was found. One might infer a pattern by what was not said. In reading numerous journals and talking with mentees and mentors, one could conclude that a richer experience was felt by those students who had life experience and values similar to their mentors.

Conclusions

The problem of this study concerned the self-esteem of college-age women at Texas Christian University (TCU) in Fort Worth, Texas and the impact of a structured mentoring program on their self-esteem. Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions seem warranted.
1. It seems that mentoring is a useful experience for college-age women.

2. Mentoring seems to have a positive impact on global self-esteem and some specific self-esteem characteristics, namely: competence, lovability, body appearance, and identity integration.

3. Even though mentoring does not have an impact on some specific self-esteem characteristics it still seems to be perceived as a positive experience.

4. Mentoring seems to be a positive experience with very little risk of being a negative experience.

Implications

Further Research

While a positive mentoring experience is clearly a coveted opportunity for any individual given the privilege to participate, the real concern in this study was on increasing the self-esteem of college-age women. This study and others indicate that mentoring is an intervention with potential impact. However, other research is encouraged.

1. With regard to mentoring, a longitudinal study with periodic testing needs to be conducted to determine whether statistically the impact on the self-esteem gained from the mentoring process will be sustained.

2. To help clarify the research literature, a study of assigned mentors versus personally selected mentors could help determine whether one mode is truly more effective than the other.
3. A study to determine the effects of mixed gender and ethnicity among mentees and mentors would be an addition to the literature.

4. More study should be undertaken to address the issue of what length of time is the most effective for a mentoring relationship.

5. For a more thorough collection of data, exclusively qualitative studies with college-age populations should exclude or limit the use of journals and use interviews only.

6. Other interventions should be studied to determine which are the most effective and long-lasting in their effect on the participants’ increase in self-esteem. Examples include the comparing of a mentoring experience with a self-esteem class, psychotherapy, reading of self-help books on the subject of self-esteem, and mastering a skill.

Practice

Every Student Affairs program should have the opportunity to be mentored as part of its educational and development mission and program. These relationships can be assigned or self-selected. They may be for a semester or an academic year. They may contract to extend the relationship beyond the prescribed time. There should be a choice of personal versus professional mentoring. The parameters are not as important as the opportunity to participate.

If this structure is used as a foundation for any mentoring program, it has the potential to be successful. Every individual who participates is not going to have the ideal
experience, but it will be worthwhile for most. It is human nature to respond when someone offers a hand, saying, “I care.” It is a powerful message.
APPENDIX A

MENTEE LETTER AND RESPONSE FORM
Dear : 

I would like to ask your help in an important study that could make a difference in the lives of future women students at TCU. In addition to being the director of new student orientation and the women’s resource center at TCU, I am also a doctoral student in the department of Higher Education at the University of North Texas. I plan to use the information I gather from the dissertation study to direct me in setting up similar programs for women students in the future.

I would like to ask you to participate in a study assessing the value of a mentor. From the women who respond affirmatively to my invitation, two groups will be formed. One group will take a 30 minute inventory in late March that will assess how those individuals see themselves, and will take it again in October. The other group will also take the inventory but will be paired with a professional woman from the Fort Worth community at times between the two assessments. I hope you will want to participate.

Attached you will find two documents. The first is a copy of a “Participant Consent Form” from which you can see that the study has been approved by the Committees for Safeguards Human Research at both TCU and UNT. In addition, it assures you that you may withdraw from the study at any time, should you so desire.

The second document is an information form requesting you to identify when you could come to an orientation session. If you are interested in participating but you have questions, please feel free to call me at 921-7855. If you have no questions and know that you want to participate, please return the form to me no later than March 15, 1996.

Thank you for considering this opportunity to make a difference for future women students at TCU.

Sincerely,

Kay Higgins
STUDENT RESPONSE FORM

NAME__________________________________________

MAILING ADDRESS_______________________________________

_____________________________________________________

TCU RESIDENCE_____________________________________

PHONE______________________________________________

HOME MAILING ADDRESS_________________________________

_____________________________________________________

HOME PHONE ( )_______________________________________

MAJOR OR AREA OF ACADEMIC INTEREST___________________________________

Please check the appropriate response:

_____ I would be happy to participate in this study.

_____ I am not interested in participating in this study.

If you will be able to participate in this study, please check the appropriate response:

I will be able to attend the orientation session for participants on the following date:
(select one)

_____ March 26  5:00 - 6:30 PM

_____ March 27  2:00 - 3:30 PM

_____ March 28  4:00 - 5:30 PM

_____ I am not available to attend any of the three dates, please call me about other options.

Please return this form by Friday, March 15 to:
Kay Higgins
P O Box 32917
Fort Worth, TX 76129
FAX: 921-7285
APPENDIX B

MENTOR LETTER
Dear : 

As you may know I have been a doctoral student at the University of North Texas for ten years. I am now beginning the dissertation stage of my studies. I have long been interested in the self-esteem issues of girls, adolescence, and women. Now as the director of TCU's Women's Resource Center, I afforded the opportunity to seriously study the issue.

Perhaps you are aware of a number of published self-esteem studies, the most well-known being the study conducted by the American Association of University Women (AAUW). In that study, published in 1991, they looked at 3000 boys and girls between the ages of nine and fifteen. They found that while 69% of the boys and 60% of the girls in elementary grades agree with the statement, "I like who I am", both numbers had dropped by the time these student reached high school. The boys had dropped to 46% and the girls to an alarming low of 29%.

These same girls, at eighteen head off to college, as a rule, with a higher GPA, a higher SAT score, and more leadership experience in high school than their male counterparts. However, their self-esteem remains low, or if they do increase, they remain lower than those of their male classmates.

With that gloomy information in mind, I am asking you to assist me in a very important study. I would like for you to be a Mentor to a TCU woman student. This year, the program is a pilot which will provide the basis of my dissertation study, "The Impact of a Community-Based Mentoring Program on the Self-Esteem of College-Age Women". However, in addition to providing the basis for the dissertation study, I hope this study will provide the information we need to establish positive mentor/mentee relationships for any TCU woman who would like to participate in such a program.

In order to participate in this study, I will need a few commitments from you.

1. Attend a one and one-half hour orientation session on one of the following dates:

   March 26, 1996      5:00 - 6:30 PM
   March 27, 1996      2:00 - 3:30 PM
   March 28, 1996      4:00 - 5:30 PM

2. Agree to a minimum of eight (8) hours of contact [personal visits, phone, (notes, letters, e-mail may be necessary for some students during the summer months)] with your student between April 1, 1996 and October 25, 1996.
3. Willing to participate in a follow-up evaluation (either conversational or written) of your mentor/mentee experience, if requested.

This study is very exciting to me because of all the possibilities it may open for future college-age women. Your commitment to this project would be appreciated more than you could know. I know, should you choose to participate, that by the time the study concludes that our students will be deeply indebted for the time and energy you will have invested to make this experience possible.

If you have questions, please feel free to call me: 921-7855 (work) 346-4556 (home). If you do not have questions, please complete and return the attached form by Friday, March 15, 1996. Thank you in advance for making a difference in the life of a future woman leader in our community.

Sincerely,

Kay Higgins, Director
New Student Orientation/
Women's Resource Center
Mentor/Mentee Expectations

1. Relationship of mentor and mentee will span a total of 27 weeks, beginning April 18, 1996 and ending October 25, 1996.

2. A minimum total of 8 contact hours (more is encouraged) should be accrued within the 27 week period. These hours may be obtained through personal visits, phone, letters, notes, and e-mail. The contacts may be as short as 15 minutes or as long as two or three hours. The entire 8 hours should not be scheduled at one time.

3. Mentees and mentors will attend a two hour training workshop.

4. Mentee will make the initial contact with her mentor.

5. Mentees will record reflections/thoughts/ideas about the topics discussed in their journals after each contact.

6. At designated points throughout the 27 weeks each mentee will contact the program coordinator for a progress update.

7. The last week in August, the mentees will attend a progress/assessment meeting lasting approximately one hour.

We agree to the expectations as stated in the points above. Should we have any questions or find difficulty meeting the expectations, we will contact the study investigator as soon as possible.

Mentor

Mentee

Date: __________________________
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ____________________________, agree to participate in a study regarding the impact of a mentoring program on the self-esteem of college-age women. Information gained from this study will be used by the TCU Women's Resource Center to provide a valuable mentoring experience for college-age women desiring to participate in such a program in the future.

As a participant, I understand that my involvement in this mentoring program will necessitate that I complete both a pre- and a posttest of the Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory. In addition, it may necessitate that I participate in a mentoring relationship with a woman from the Fort Worth community from April 1, 1996 to October 25, 1996. If I am a participant in the mentoring program, I know that I will keep a journal of my thoughts and reflections regarding the mentoring experience. I have been informed that any information obtained in this study will be recorded with a code number that will allow the investigator to determine my identity. At the conclusion of this study, the key that relates my name with my assigned code number will be destroyed. Under this condition, I agree that any information obtained from this research may be used in any way thought best for education or publication.

I understand that there is no personal risk or discomfort directly involved with this research and that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in this study at any time. A decision to withdraw from this study will not affect the service available to me or my participation in any program at TCU or specifically the Women's Resource Center.

If I have any questions or problems that arise in connection with my participation in this study, I should contact Kay Higgins, the program director, at 921-7855.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas and TCU's Committee On Safeguards in Human Research for the protection of human subjects.

Participant Name_______________________________________________________

Participant Signature___________________________________________________

Date_______________________________________________________________

(Sign and return one copy, keep the other for your records.)
APPENDIX E

MENTORING PROGRAM JOURNAL
TCU MENTORING PROGRAM

STUDENT MENTEE JOURNAL

by

FOR A STUDY

CONDUCTED BY

KAY HIGGINS

APRIL - OCTOBER 1996
Dear Student:

First let me thank you again for participating in this study. I hope that this time with a professional community woman will be beneficial to you as a person. You have an exciting opportunity ahead. Done correctly, it will be somewhat time-consuming, but hopefully worth every minute of your time.

Your mentor has a list of suggested topics/questions for the two our you to discuss. These are not required topics. Feel free to bring your own list of topics for your visits. Please take the time following each contact with your mentor to write thoughts, reflections, ideas which you have in thinking about the conversation you had, the relationship you have, etc. Please do not write in detail the content of your conversation, rather your reflections about your conversation. If it is necessary to include part of the content to record feelings, feel free to do so. But the important writing will be your reflections, feelings, and ideas.

Some journals are very specific and list questions for the person to answer. There will be a few questions to answer, but the majority of the journal pages are blank waiting for your mark on them. If you think better in front of a computer (or your handwriting is unbearable to read), you may type out the journal entries, and attach them to the booklet on the appropriate page.

Please put some important dates on your calendar:

- April 18, 1996 - beginning of week #1
- May 6, 1996 - date by which to make first progress report
- May 28, 1996 - date by which to make second progress report
- July 29, 1996 - date by which to make third progress report
- August 27, 1996 (5:00PM) - reporting meeting
- October 25, 1996 - last day of official study
- week of October 28 - post-tests scheduled/turn in journals

If at any time, you have questions, please do not hesitate to call me. 921-7855 (work) 346-4556 (home).

You are embarking on an exciting opportunity. Thank you for participating and remember: Enjoy!

Sincerely,

Kay Higgins, Director
TCU Women’s Resource Center
HOW OFTEN SHOULD I WRITE?

The best thing to do is to get in the habit of writing in your journal on a regular basis. Easier said than done, below are some helpful ideas:

1. You should write something after each visit with you mentor. You will probably have some thoughts or reactions. They may be good or bad ones. In either case, write them down.

2. You may continue to think about topics the two of you discussed as the days go by and perhaps experience something different or have a classroom discussion that impacts you differently because of the conversation. Record these thoughts, reactions, etc.

3. You and your mentor may disagree on some subjects. Write down your ideas and feelings, even if they are in phrases instead of complete sentences.

4. Carry your Journal with you all the time so that it is always handy. “Ah-ha” experiences don’t always happen at the time and location we deem most convenient. You want to be able to write when the idea comes to you. Before long, the journal will be full and you will be asking for more pages.

This experience (both the relationship and the journal) should be fun. Don’t forget to enjoy it!
WHAT IS A MENTOR?

A mentor is a wise and trusted counselor or teacher, tutor, coach, a wise advisor.

WHAT DOES A MENTOR DO?

A mentor is a mature, experienced person who helps you take steps toward being all that you can be.

A mentor will share knowledge and exchange ideas with you. By sharing her experiences and successes (and maybe her failures) with you, a mentor will serve as a role model as you prepare yourself for life, love, and work.

HOW CAN A MENTOR HELP YOU?

A mentor can show you how your interests, your beliefs, the abilities you have, and those you wish to learn work together to help you make critical decisions about all the complex areas of life.

A mentor is an experienced friend to whom you can turn with questions and problems related to school, work, or life, in general.

adapted from “Hand in Hand: Mentoring Young Women: Student Career Journal
WHAT IS MENTORING TO ME?

You are about to spend some time with a woman who has volunteered to be a role model (mentor) for you. Start thinking about what that idea means to you by completing the following sentences.

I volunteer to participate in this program because:

I think my mentor volunteered to spend time with me because:

Having a mentor should help me in the following ways:
MY REFLECTIONS

Visit #______ by phone, written(note/e-mail), in person (please circle)

length of time in contact _____

location of contact (if in person)__________________________________________

My reflections/feelings/ideas about the things we discussed and our time together:
FINAL LOG

NUMBER OF CONTACT BY PHONE

NUMBER OF WRITTEN CONTACTS

NUMBER OF CONTACTS IN PERSON

TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACTS
APPENDIX F

MENTOR/MENTEE TRAINING WORKSHOP OUTLINE
MENTOR/MENTEE TRAINING WORKSHOP OUTLINE

Convene Mentors

With Mentors Only:
1. Welcome, Introductions, Discussion of Mentors' Role -- (30 minutes)

Welcome Mentees

With Mentors/Mentees:
2. “Getting to Know You” -- Icebreaker exercise (30 minutes)

3. Introduction to the Study -- (20 minutes)

4. Questions for clarification -- (20 minutes)

5. Signing of Mentor/Mentee Expectations -- (5 minutes)

Dismiss Mentors

With Mentees Only:
6. Discussion of journal and how to use it -- (30 minutes)

7. Mentees take the Self-Esteem Inventory -- (30 minutes)

Convene Control Group

8. Administer Self-Esteem Inventory to Control Group -- (30 minutes)
APPENDIX G

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY INSTRUMENT
Item Booklet

Instructions

Begin by completing the information on the rating sheet. Enter your name, age, sex, and date. Read the following directions carefully before you begin.

This booklet is divided into two sections which contain statements about how people see themselves. Please indicate how accurately each of the following statements describes you. Mark all of your responses on the rating sheet provided. DO NOT ERASE! If you need to change a response, make an "X" through the incorrect response and then fill in the correct circle.

Work as quickly as you can without making careless errors. It is best to rely on first impressions in answering each item. Fill in only one circle for each statement, and be sure to respond to all of the statements. Please note that the items are numbered in columns.
Section 1

Use the following scale for your responses to Section 1:

Fill in 0 if the statement is **completely false**.
Fill in © if the statement is **mainly false**.
Fill in © if the statement is **partly true and partly false**.
Fill in 0 if the statement is **mainly true**.
Fill in 0 if the statement is **completely true**.

For example, if you believe that a statement is mainly true in describing you, fill in the © circle for that statement on your rating sheet.

Example

1. © 2 3 © ©

© Completely false © Mainly false © Partly true and partly false © Mainly true © Completely true

1. I often fail to live up to my moral standards.
2. I nearly always feel that I am physically attractive.
3. I occasionally have doubts about whether I will succeed in life.
4. I have trouble letting others know how much I care for and love them.
5. No matter what the pressure, no one could ever force me to hurt another human being.
6. I am very well-liked and popular.
7. On occasion, I have tried to find a way to avoid unpleasant responsibilities.
8. I occasionally worry that in the future I may have a problem with controlling my eating or drinking habits.
9. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don’t really know what I want.
10. I am not easily intimidated by others.
11. I am usually able to demonstrate my competence when I am being evaluated.
12. I don’t have much of an idea about what my life will be like in 5 years.
13. I nearly always feel that I am physically fit and healthy.
14. I usually do the decent and moral thing, no matter what the temptation to do otherwise.
15. There are times when I doubt my sexual attractiveness.
16. I sometimes have a poor opinion of myself.
17. There are times when I have doubts about my capacity for maintaining a close love relationship.
18. The thought of shoplifting has never crossed my mind.
19. I sometimes feel disappointed or rejected because my friends haven’t included me in their plans.
20. There have been times when I have felt like getting even with somebody for something they had done to me.
21. I feel that I don’t have enough self-discipline.
22. In general, I know who I am and where I am headed in my life.
23. I am usually a lot more comfortable being a follower than a leader.
24. Most people who know me consider me to be a highly talented and competent person.
25. I often feel that I lack direction in my life—i.e., that I have no long-range goals or plans.
26. I nearly always feel that I am better physically coordinated than most people (of my own age and sex).
27. I almost always have a clear conscience concerning my sexual behavior.
28. There have been times when I felt ashamed of my physical appearance.
29. I put myself down too much.
30. In times of uncertainty and self-doubt, I have always been able to turn to my family for encouragement and support.
31. I have never felt that I was punished unfairly.
32. My friends almost always make sure to include me in their plans.
33. There have been times when I intensely disliked someone.
34. I am sometimes concerned over my lack of self-control.
35. Once I have considered an important decision thoroughly, I have little difficulty making a final decision.
36. I have no problem with asserting myself.
37. There are no areas in which I have truly outstanding ability.
38. Sometimes it’s hard for me to believe that the different aspects of my personality can be part of the same person.
39. Most of the people I know are in better physical condition than I am.
40. I often feel guilty about my sexual behavior.
41. I usually feel that I am better looking than most people.
42. All in all, I would evaluate myself as a relatively successful person at this stage in my life.
43. There have been times when I have felt rejected by my family.
44. It hardly ever matters to me whether I win or lose in a game.
45. On occasion I have avoided dating situations because I feared rejection.
46. There have been times when I have lied in order to get out of something.
47. I often give in to temptation and put off work on difficult tasks.
48. I seldom experience much conflict between the different sides of my personality.
49. I feel that I have a lot of potential as a leader.
50. I am usually able to learn new things very quickly.
51. I often feel torn in different directions and unable to decide which way to go.
52. I occasionally have had the feeling that I have "gone astray," and that I am leading a sinful or immoral life.
53. I have occasionally felt that others were repelled or "put off" by my physical appearance.
54. I nearly always have a highly positive opinion of myself.
55. I occasionally feel that no one really loves me and accepts me for the person I am.
56. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
57. People nearly always enjoy spending time with me.
58. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
59. I have difficulty maintaining my self-control when I am under pressure.
60. I have often acted in ways that went against my moral values.
61. I am usually very pleased and satisfied with the way I look.

Section 2

In Section 2, you are to describe how often you experience the thoughts and feelings described in each item. Use the following scale for your responses to Part 2:

- Fill in © if you almost never experience them.
- Fill in © if you seldom or rarely experience them.
- Fill in © if you sometimes experience them.
- Fill in © if you experience them fairly often.
- Fill in © if you experience them very often.

For example, if you seldom or rarely experience the thoughts and feelings described, fill in the © circle for that statement on your rating sheet.

Example

52. How often do you expect to perform well in situations that require a lot of ability?
53. How often do you lose when you get into arguments or disagreements with others?
54. Do you ever "stretch the truth" and say things that aren't completely true?
55. How often do you feel confident that you have (or someday will have) a lasting love relationship?
56. When you are meeting a person for the first time, do you ever think that the person might not like you?
57. How often do you feel proud of the way that you stay with a task until you complete it?
58. How often do you feel dissatisfied with yourself?
59. How often do you feel that others are attracted to you because of the way you look?
60. How often do you feel a sense of vitality and pleasure over the way your body functions in physical activities?
61. How often do you feel uncertain of your moral values?
62. How often do you feel self-conscious or awkward while you are engaged in physical activities?
63. How often do you feel very certain about what you want out of life?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74. How often do you have trouble learning difficult new tasks?</td>
<td>@ Almost never @ Seldom or rarely @ Sometimes @ Fairly often @ Very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. When you are involved in group discussions, how often do you feel that your ideas have a strong influence on others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Do you ever gossip?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. How often do members of your family have difficulty expressing their love for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. How often do you feel certain that people you meet will like you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. How often are you pleased with yourself because of the amount of self discipline and willpower that you have?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. How often do you feel that you are a very important and significant person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. How often do you wish that you were more physically attractive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. How often does your body perform exceptionally well in physical activities, such as dancing or sports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. How often do you (by your behavior) set a good moral example for others younger than yourself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. How often do you feel clumsy when you are involved in physical activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. How often do you feel conflicted or uncertain about your career plans?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. How often do you feel that you can do well at almost anything you try?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. How often are you able to be assertive and forceful in situations where others are trying to take advantage of you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Have you ever felt irritated when someone asked you for a favor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. How often do you feel able to openly express warm and loving feelings toward others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Does it ever seem to you that some people dislike you intensely, that they “can’t stand” you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. How often do you feel that you are more successful than most people at controlling your eating and drinking behavior?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. How often do you feel really good about yourself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. How often are you complimented on your physical appearance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. How often do you feel in top physical condition?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. How often are you pleased with your sense of moral values?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. How often does your body feel “out of sorts” or sluggish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Have you ever felt that you lack the intelligence needed to succeed in certain types of interesting work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Do you enjoy it when you are in a position of leadership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Have you ever felt jealous of the good fortune of others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Have you ever felt alone and unloved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. When you go out with someone for the first time, how often do you feel that you are well liked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. How often are you able to exercise more self-control than most of the people you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. How often do you feel highly satisfied with the future you see for yourself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. How often do you feel unattractive when you see yourself naked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. How often do you enjoy having others watch you while you are engaged in physical activities such as dancing or sports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. How often do you feel highly satisfied with the way you live up to your moral values?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. How often do you feel that you are not as intelligent as you would like to be?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. How often do you feel uneasy when you are in a position of leadership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. How often is it hard for you to admit it when you have made a mistake?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. How often do people whom you love go out of their way to let you know how much they care for you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. How often do you feel that you are one of the most popular and likeable members of your social group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. How often are you able to resist temptations and distractions in order to complete tasks you are working on?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. How often do you feel lacking in self-confidence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. How often do you approach new tasks with a lot of confidence in your ability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. How often do you have a strong influence on the attitudes and opinions of others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. How often do you gladly accept criticism when it is deserved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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