Factors impacting the perceived organizational support of IT employees
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ABSTRACT

Organizations today face shortages of IT personnel. We investigated workplace factors in one state government in hope of identifying factors that influence perceived organizational support (POS) within an IT work environment. A combination of job characteristics (challenging job and perceived workload), job stressors (work exhaustion, role conflict, and role ambiguity), and the organization’s discretionary actions (pay-for-performance and mentoring opportunities) were measured and hierarchical regression was used to determine the relationships. Four control variables were also included (age, gender, organizational tenure, and professional versus administrator status). Role ambiguity, role conflict, work exhaustion, career mentoring, and pay-for-performance together explained 62% of the variance in the IT employees’ POS. Career mentoring and role ambiguity explained most of the variance.

© 2008 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Recently IS enrollments in US universities have dropped significantly [13] causing a severe shortage of new graduates in the workforce. This is negatively impacting IT departments: as the workforce shrinks, stress on the IS employees increases while managers worry about retaining personnel with valuable domain knowledge and critical to the organization. According to a news report [19], almost 87% of state governments lack the IT personnel they need.

While the IS community has investigated ways to boost retention by increasing organizational commitment and job satisfaction (e.g., [15]), few have studied perceived organizational support (POS) [1], which is the level of support from their organization, as perceived by employees, in return for their effort to help the organization reach its goals. In the general management literature, the link between POS and either voluntary turnover or retention is well documented. It has also been linked to increased job attendance, objective measures of in-role job performance, increased likelihood of helping coworkers, more constructive suggestions for improving the organization’s operation, etc. Additional information regarding the theoretical roots of the POS concept and several of the other concepts (e.g., autonomy, task variety, role ambiguity, role conflict, pay, demographics) was discussed in Rhoades and Eisenberger’s [21] 2002 meta-analysis of over 70 POS studies.

We decided to study retention of public sector IT employees in one state government in the south-central USA. The purpose of the study was to identify factors that influence POS within an IT work environment. In our study, job factors believed to be especially important were considered: characteristics (challenging job and perceived workload), stressors (work exhaustion, role conflict, and role ambiguity), and the organization’s discretionary actions (pay-for-performance and mentoring opportunities) [7].

2. Background and hypothesis development

2.1. Perceived organizational support

POS is the employees’ view of how much the organization values their contribution and cares about them. Employees see their employment as a reciprocal exchange relationship that reflects relative dependence and extends beyond a formal contract.
Employees need to determine whether, and to what extent, an organization will recognize and reward their effort, support their socio-emotional needs, and help them on request. According to organizational support theory, in return for a high level of support, employees work harder to help their organization reach its goals [2], providing loyalty and effort in return for material and social rewards.

We considered the potential antecedents of POS to be job characteristics, stressors, and rewards.

2.2. Job characteristics

Building on social exchange theory research, scholars argue that POS is influenced substantially by management’s actions that employees perceive as being voluntary rather than mandated by external entities or environmental conditions; the four job characteristics normally considered are: challenging work, autonomy, task variety, and perceived workload.

2.2.1. Job challenge

Challenge reflects an individual’s desire to be stimulated by the job; it can be quantified as the degree that the job requires a variety of skills. IT employees have a high need for challenging work. The opportunity for challenging work is intrinsically satisfying. POS should therefore be associated with an IT work environment that provides employees with job-related challenges. Thus:

**H1.** There will be a positive relationship between IT employees’ perceived level of job-related challenge and their level of POS.

2.2.2. Autonomy

The extent to which individuals can schedule work, determine what actions are required, and decide how best to execute their actions is important for their satisfaction with the job. The more perceived autonomy, the more responsible the individual will feel for the outcomes. Perceived autonomy has been positively linked to increased motivation, satisfaction, and work effectiveness of IS professionals [10]. Yamaguchi [25] found a strong positive relationship between autonomy and POS in a Japanese environment. This leads to our second hypothesis:

**H2.** There will be a positive relationship between IT employees’ perceived level of job-related autonomy and their level of POS.

2.2.3. Task variety

A high variety of unexpected or new events in the work process means that there is uncertainty about future tasks, and that many of them are non-routine or cannot be precisely defined in advance. IT employees generally are happy if given moderate levels of task variety and moderate task variety has been seen as an antecedent to POS. The third hypothesis was therefore:

**H3.** There will be a positive relationship between IT employees’ perceived level of job-related task variety and their level of POS.

2.2.4. Perceived workload

Two discretionary ways managers seek to keep down labor costs is to increase employees’ workload and ask them to work extra hours. IT employees are often asked to take on heavy workloads and tight deadlines, leading to long hours, late nights, after-hour meetings, on-call duty, and a continual state of ‘fire-fighting’ or crisis situations. The state of Missouri conducted an IT environmental scan including input from 23 agencies and found increased workload resulted in dissatisfaction and demotivation [17]. Therefore, we expected high perceived workload to have a strongly negative relationship with POS. The fourth hypothesis was:

**H4.** There will be a negative relationship between IT employees’ perceived workload and their level of POS.

2.3. Stressors

Job-related stressors result from discretionary decisions that management makes on structuring IT jobs. If employees attribute job-related stressors to conditions an organization can control then these stressors should reduce POS. Given the “24 h per day, seven days a week” schedule of many IT employees, constant deadlines, and staffing pressures are likely to result in a strong negative relationship between work exhaustion and POS. We expected to find similar negative relationships. In addition, due to IT workers having to meet the needs of multiple customers (some with conflicting goals), the relationships between role conflict and POS could be stronger than in other disciplines.

2.3.1. Work exhaustion

Depletion of emotional and mental resources in meeting job demands is widespread among software developers. IT workers suffering from work exhaustion have greater turnover intention. POS has been negatively associated with work exhaustion and other psychosomatic symptoms [11]. Thus the fifth hypothesis was:

**H5.** There will be a negative relationship between IT employees’ perceived level of work exhaustion and their level of POS.

2.3.2. Role ambiguity

Role ambiguity occurs when the instructions given to a person is uncertain, unclear, or inadequate. The IT work environment has the potential for high role ambiguity [20] and person-job fit theory has been used to explain the relationship between IT developers’ perceived role stress and job satisfaction/organizational commitment [14].

Findings about the role of ambiguity in the POS relationship have been mixed, with a significant negative correlation between POS and role ambiguity reported. Some researchers reported a causal relationship in which role ambiguity was an antecedent of POS or identified POS as a moderator between role ambiguity and intent to remain with an organization [23]. Thus, the sixth hypothesis was:

**H6.** There will be a negative relationship between IT employees’ perceived level of role ambiguity and their level of POS.

2.3.3. Role conflict

The perception of incompatible or incongruent demands placed on an incumbent occurs because of the need to meet the requirements of multiple customers, frequent use of project teams, and rapidly changing technologies or processes and often results in high role conflict (see [9]). There is a significant negative correlation between POS and role conflict, but there may be a causal relationship between role conflict and POS or POS may moderate the effect of role conflict on voluntary turnover intention. Thus the seventh hypothesis was:
H7. There will be a negative relationship between IT employees' perceived level of role conflict and their level of POS.

2.4. Organizational actions

Management can partially address employee support needs by providing pay-for-performance or mentoring. These issues are important for managers seeking to attract or retain IT employees in a tightening labor market.

2.4.1. Pay-for-performance

State governments interested in retaining IS employees often focus on the need to improve pay scales. The Michigan state government initiated a project to review how the private sector and other public organizations compensated and classified the delivery of IT services so that they could offer a competitive plan to attract new employees and retain their existing ones [6]. Thus, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H8. There will be a positive relationship between IT employees' satisfaction regarding the pay they receive for the work they do and their level of POS.

2.4.2. Mentoring

POS is positively influenced by developmental experiences that allow employees to expand their skills. Mentoring is an activity that organizations sometimes use to reduce turnover. It may be split into two dimensions: career and psychosocial. The first includes functions such as coaching, sponsorship, and protection, while the second includes acceptance, role modeling, counseling, and friendship. Mentors can provide social support and this appears to reduce leaving intention [12]. Given the importance of developmental opportunities to an employee's POS, two hypotheses were made:

H9. There will be a positive relationship between IT employees' level of perceived career mentoring and their level of POS.

H10. There will be a positive relationship between IT employees' level of perceived psychosocial mentoring and their level of POS.

See Fig. 1 for a graphical representation of the proposed model and our 10 hypotheses.

3. Method

3.1. Context

Data were collected from state government IT employees in a south-central state of the USA where the CIO allowed us to conduct our study. Thus, ours was a convenience sample. This state had one of the highest voluntary turnover rates of state government employees in the nation, and its pay for IT employees was in the lower 25% of all other states. An investigation of the statewide newspaper between October 2002, and November 2003, showed that employees in its IT department were experiencing transformational organizational change (the newspaper is not cited to ensure the anonymity of the state in which data were collected). These changes were corporate-wide and usually involved major shifts in business strategy, system and structure reorganization, and power shifts.

The governor had mandated a reorganization and consolidation of over 50 departments into less than twelve. The reorganization led to downsizing and layoffs across all departments including IT. Simultaneously, the governor initiated an overhaul of the state's computer system, altered agency processes, and hired a new CIO (a timeline is shown in Fig. 2).

As a result, the IT employees experienced daily changes and high uncertainty with respect to both workload and work assignments. They were held accountable for providing IT services to clients using a new technology that was not fully integrated into the state system. The restructuring meant that fewer employees were available to provide support for the new system, and many (including supervisors) were still learning about the impacts of the system on their work environment.
3.2. Participants

The state’s CIO identified the appropriate sampling frame and sent out an e-mail to all 297 of the state IT employees giving them the URL for the survey website and encouraging them to complete the survey. A reminder e-mail went out two weeks later. The on-line survey had been measured as taking approximately 20 min to complete; it consisted of 145 questions. In order to maintain anonymity, personal identification data were not collected.

We received 109 useable responses out of the 297 possible for a 37% response rate. Just over half (53%) of the respondents were male. Most were married (69%) and 91% were White. The respondents ranged in age from 22 to 72 (M = 46, SD = 9.2) and they had worked for the state from 1 to 35 years (M = 12, SD = 9.7). 46% held an associate’s degree or less while 49% had a bachelor’s degree or higher; 5% did not respond to this question. Only 33% had an IT-related degree. 28% were systems analysts, 17% were IS managers, 15% were project leaders, 12% were application programmers, 9% were software engineers, 4% were systems programmers, and 5% did not give an answer. Most (91%) identified themselves as professional staff but 7% said they were administrators.

3.3. Measures

All survey items were selected from previously validated scales and psychometric properties of the scales were assessed in terms of item loading and item consistency, all of which were greater than 0.70 and therefore considered acceptable. See Appendix A for the questions, reliabilities, and sources of the scales. Responses were recorded using one of two 7-point Likert-type scales (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; or 1 = not important, 7 = important) or a 7-point frequency-of-occurrence scale (1 = not at all, 7 = to a large extent).

3.4. Statistics

Even though all the scales used were conceptually distinct and had been validated previously, we wanted to ensure they were statistically distinct in our data. Initially, two confirmatory factor analyses were run using principal component analysis with Varimax rotation (results of the factor analysis are available from the first author). The first factor analysis included the items associated with job challenge, autonomy, task variety, perceived workload, work exhaustion, role ambiguity, and role conflict. However, because the task variety and autonomy items cross-
loaded on other dimensions, those scales were dropped from subsequent analyses. The first factor analysis was re-run after removing task variety and autonomy. A five-factor solution emerged; this explained 64.6% of the variance and showed that the five remaining concepts were empirically as well as conceptually distinct. The eigenvalue for factor one (work exhaustion) was 16.1%, for factor two (role conflict) it was 15.3%, for factor 3 (role ambiguity) it was 13.4%, for factor 4 (job challenge) it was 12.5%, and for factor 5 (perceived workload) it was 8.2%. The second factor analysis combined the items for career and psychosocial mentoring. A two-factor solution emerged explaining 77.6% of the variance and affirmed a difference between the two mentoring dimensions. The eigenvalue for Factor 1 (psychosocial mentoring) was 62.0% and for Factor 2 (career mentoring) it was 15.6%. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for the variables.

4. Results

Hierarchical regression was used, inputting the control variables in step 1, the job characteristic variables in step 2, the stressor variables in step 3, and the positive discretionary action variables in step 4. Such a regression analysis allowed us to specify the order in which independent variables entered the model. Although the order used in our study was not specified in any particular theory, logical considerations were used. We wanted to determine how employees' POS could be influenced separately by job characteristics, stressors, and positive discretionary actions taken by management.

The four control variables were investigated and they were found to explain 5% (Adj. $R^2 = 0.05$) of the variance in POS. However, only status was significant. A t-test indicated that administrators ($M = 5.2, SD = 1.0$) reported significantly higher levels of POS than professional staff ($M = 3.8, SD = 1.4$) ($t(105) = -2.75, p < 0.01$). When testing the hypotheses, separate regressions by status were attempted but the analysis for the administrators was not possible due to the small number ($n = 8$). As a result, the regression analysis was based only on professional staff responses, with a final sample of 95.

Of the ten hypotheses, two (H2 and H3) were not testable due to problems with the factor loadings of autonomy and task variety. Of the remaining eight hypotheses, five were significant (H5–H9) and three were not (see Table 2 and Fig. 3). The five significant variables were role ambiguity ($\beta = 0.25, p < 0.01$), career mentoring ($\beta = 0.34, p < 0.001$), role conflict ($\beta = -0.22, p < 0.01$), work exhaustion ($\beta = -0.20, p < 0.05$), and pay-for-performance ($\beta = 0.18, p < 0.05$). Together, these variables explained 62% (Adj. $R^2$) of the variability in POS; with career mentoring and role

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational tenure</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work challenge</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived workload</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work exhaustion</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-2.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-2.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-for-performance</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial mentoring</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career mentoring</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.79*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adj. $R^2 = -0.02$ for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = 0.30$ for step 2 ($p < 0.000$); $\Delta R^2 = 0.24$ for step 3 ($p < 0.000$); $\Delta R^2 = 0.12$ for step 4 ($p < .000$). Final Adj. $R^2 = 0.62$ ($F(13, 87) = 15.35, p < 0.000$).

* Standardized beta coefficients in regression equation at step 3.

** $p < 0.01$.

* $p < 0.05$.

Fig. 3. POS model results (ns = nonsignificant, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).
ambiguity having the strongest positive influence (higher scores were associated with lower role ambiguity). Job challenge, perceived workload, and psychosocial mentoring were not significant.

5. Discussion and conclusion

In our study, multiple potential antecedents of the POS of public sector IT employees were investigated. In the hierarchical regression, we found that the need for challenging work and a manageable workload together explained 30% of the variance in POS, suggesting that these were important considerations when seeking to create a supportive environment for IT employees. However, the IT employees in our sample worked in an organization undergoing transformational change; this is known to stress employees. Therefore, we added three stressors: work exhaustion, role ambiguity, and role conflict. Together they were found to explain an additional 24% of the variance in POS and ultimately overshadowed the importance of the job-characteristics. Finally, career mentoring emerged as especially important for the POS of IT employees, explaining an additional 12% of the variance. Thus, role ambiguity, role conflict, work exhaustion, pay-for-performance, and career mentoring explained 62% of the variance in the IT professional staff employees’ POS.

In a comparison of our results with the average weighted correlations corrected for attenuation in the meta-analysis, role ambiguity and role conflict had a stronger relationship to POS. We had expected that psychosocial mentoring would be more important than career mentoring to POS. However, career mentoring was most closely associated with POS in our study; perhaps mentor protection was especially important to protégés during times of change. Also, IT employees and their employers recognized that constant skill improvement was critical. Although an enhanced skill set made IT employees more marketable, it also showed that the organization valued employees enough to invest resources in them.

5.1. Contributions and study limitations

We studied the influence of workplace factors on the retention of valued IT employees. Similar to other studies focusing on turnover (e.g., [24]), multiple potential antecedents to POS including job characteristics, stressors, and organizational actions were part of our model. We established the importance of work exhaustion and career mentoring as antecedents of POS for public sector IT personnel and confirmed the influence of role ambiguity, role conflict, and pay. Our findings suggested that in governmental organizations, the importance of providing challenging work was less important than helping employees adjust to the stress they were facing due to role ambiguity, role conflict, work exhaustion, etc. Strong mentoring relationships helped employees deal with stress as well as prepared them for a new career.

However, our study had some limitations. Data were collected from a convenience sample within only one state IT department; this limits the generalizability of our findings. Assumptions of linearity and normality were tested and there were no violations but the data proved insufficient for the use of SEM techniques. Although valid and reliable scales were used, the factor analysis led us to drop the task variety and job autonomy scales from our analysis. Finally, the causal relationships could not be identified.
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Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cares about my opinions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shows very little concern for me. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, management would fail to notice. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Help is available from management when I have a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Job challenge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a great deal of challenge in my job.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On my job, I seldom get a chance to use my special skills and abilities. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be successful on my job requires all my skill and ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My job is very challenging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Task variety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is a great deal of variety in my job.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I get to do a number of different things on my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My job requires that I do the same things over and over. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have a great deal of freedom in how I do my job.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My current pay reflects my actual contributions to the job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel I am not paid fairly for the job I do. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my current overall pay level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay-for-performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcea</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Perceived workload</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel that the number of requests, problems, or complaints I deal with is more than I expected. I feel that the amount of work I do interferes with how well it is done. The scale for the next 2 questions is: 1 = daily; 2 = almost every day; 3 = about once a week; 4 = 2 or 3 times a month; 5 = about once a month; 6 = a few times a year; 7 = once a year or less:</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work exhaustion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work. I feel used up at the end of the work day. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job. I feel burned out from my work. Working all day is really a strain for me.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel certain about how much authority I have. Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job. I know that I have divided my time properly. I know what my responsibilities are. I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have to do things in my job that should be done differently. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it. I have to &quot;buck&quot; a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment. I frequently work with two or more groups that operate quite differently. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it. I work on unnecessary things.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychosocial mentoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>To what extent have you had a mentor at work who... Conveys feelings of respect for you as an individual? Conveys empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her? Encourages you to talk openly about anxiety and fears that might detract from your work? Shares personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems? Discusses your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts? Has shared the history of his/her career with you? Provides suggestions concerning problems you have encountered at work? Displays attitudes and values similar to your own?</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career mentoring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>To what extent have you had a mentor at work who... Has given or recommended you for challenging assignments? Presents opportunities to learn new skills? Given or recommended you for assignments that required personal contact with supervisors in different parts of the company? Given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with higher level managers? Given or recommended you for assignments that helped you meet new colleagues? Helped you finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete? Reduced unnecessary risks that could have threatened your opportunities for promotion? Given or recommended you for assignments or tasks that have prepared you for higher positions?</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple scales come from the same source.
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