Understanding Leadership Development through Mentoring: An Examination of Mentoring in Public Service Internships

Jesus Valero

University of Utah
United States of America

Hee Soun Jang
Lisa A. Dicke

University of North Texas
United States of America

Abstract

This case study research provides answers to questions about public service leadership developed from an analysis of internship experiences in a Masters of Public Administration (MPA) program in Texas. It examines the mentoring component of internships in four functional areas of leadership development. In addition, we consider gender as an aspect of the pairings in mentor and mentee relations. Our study includes an analysis of 240 online surveys with students and alumni and a review of internship documents demonstrates that there are competencies to be achieved from mentoring. Our findings also show that gender diversity plays a role in leadership development. The study contributes to our understanding of mentoring outcomes and has instructional implications for promoting the effective use of internships in public service education whether in public or business administration.

Introduction

Internships are useful conduits for young or inexperienced workers to gain job skills, build networks and develop other career related competencies (Taylor, 1985, 1988; Cole, Kolke & Craddick, 1981; Feldmand & Weitz, 1990; Narayanan, Olk, & Fukami, 2010). The history and importance of internships in the public sector has not gone unnoticed by professional associations such as the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) or by national, state and local level governments—all of which promote them (McCormick & Brennan, 2001). The internship experience supports students and others in the development of their professional identities and competencies that affect their growth in their chosen profession.

Surprisingly, not much is published regarding the mentoring component of the internship experiences of students enrolled in programs of public administration. In 2009, Bozeman and Feeney noted an overall lack of academic attention regarding mentoring in the public sector resulting in a paucity of data that could be used to develop public management mentoring theory. In the same article, the authors proposed a three-tier model that focuses on three levels of analysis and explores the interactions among organization, individual, and public service outcomes (Bozeman and Feeney, 2009, p. 144). Although this three-tier model offers a research design unique to the public sector, a systematic research that examines outcome of mentoring in public sector is rare (Bozeman and Feeney, 2008).-This study examines mentoring outcomes using an individual level analysis and tests propositions about mentoring, gender pairing and the effects of public service internship on leadership development.

A review of literature informs that benefits resulting from an internship experience include: learning opportunities, the acquisition of job relevant skills, knowledge of work functions, and adaptability to professional and social norms. While there is agreement about practical benefits of internships, limited research explores the association between mentoring outcomes such as public service leadership development and how diversity in gender mentor/mentee pairings affect the development of leadership competencies. Our case study uses a literature review and analysis of internship documents and online survey of MPA alumni and MPA interns to answer the following research questions: 1) what leadership competencies are developed from mentoring in a public service internship? And 2) does diversity in gender mentor/mentee pairing matter in explaining difference in mentoring outcomes?

These research questions are guided by not only the lack of existing research on mentoring in the public management literature, but also by developments in practice, particularly professional associations. According to the Public Service Internship Guidelines of the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) the purpose of the public service internship is to provide a student with a "realistic exposure to an organizational-bureaucratic environment. This experience should develop the student's awareness of the internal dynamics of an organization and of the value and attitudes of public employees to both their clientele and their administrative-political superiors."[1] An internship offers students opportunities to engage in the internal operation of government offices and to build professional and ethical awareness. Benavides et al., (2012) conducted a review of NASPAA accredited programs and found interdependences among students, universities and hosting agencies. However, the learning gained from internships following the NASPAA guidelines has not been examined empirically. Our study fills gaps in research and practice by focusing on learning contents and mentoring patterns in the internship component of an MPA program that uses NASPAA guidelines.

A second focus of this research is to understand the development of leadership competencies and the impact of mentor and mentee diversity on these. Chopin et al. (2013) studied mentoring with business graduate students and found that high quality mentoring was a significant predictor of higher leadership capacity. Blass and Ferris (2007) found that mentees learn not only job-related skills and functions but political skills and contextual knowledge as well. These skills and knowledge contribute to greater adaptive capacity.

This study is organized as follows: mentoring as a developmental process is described followed by a discussion of our methods, survey instrument, and document reviews. We then present our findings and an analysis of these. Finally, the implications for programs offering internships and for public sector mentors are discussed followed by a conclusion.

Review of Literature

Internships offer an important learning opportunity for students and job seekers. Since the 1930s, internships have been used in federal agencies, and local governments have provided on-the-job training as a part of higher education (Benavides, Dicke & Holt, 2012). The Federal Internship Improvement Act signed by President Obama in 2011 highlighted the value of internships and urged hiring fulltime employees from the pool of federal interns. This Act also created a database maintained by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and it requires each federal agency to create a position to coordinate internship programs. In 1977, NASPAA formally recognized the value of internships by developing public service internship guidelines (NASPAA, 1977). The International City/County Management Association (ICMA) has developed internship resources including the Model Internship Guidelines (2012), an Internship Toolkit (2012), and the publication, Management Internships: Guidebook for Local Governments (2013). These resources are designed to help "local government managers and MPA programs to develop meaningful internship opportunities that benefit both the student and the local government." (2013. p. vii).

When the internship works well, interns apply what they have learned from the classroom, understand job functions, develop further technical skills, and enhance adaptability to the new professional environment (Narayanan, Olk, & Fukami, 2010; Gault, Redington, & Schlager, 2000).

---

[1] PUBLIC SERVICE INTERNSHIP GUIDELINE, Developed by the NASPAA Committee on Public Service Internships and Approved by the NASPAA Executive Council November 1977 At
http://www.naspaa.org/principals/resources/internship.asp (assessed on February 2015)

Studies of internships in business education indicate that students improve in problem solving, decision-making and social skills (Garavan & Murphy 2001; Chao, 1997). The learning from an internship helps students learn technical job skills, social adaptability, and soft "people skills" (Cook, Parker & Pettijohn, 2004; Matthews & Zimmerman, 1999; Freeman & Adam 1996). Garavan and Murphy (2001) report that socialization is a significant part of the internship experience and contributes to the gradual process of building new relationships. Through internship socialization, students learn the values of the organization, ideal job characteristics, and the roles of supervisors.

Our literature review shows a consensus about internships as an important component of leadership development in public administration education. In this research study, we focus on the socialization processes in internships by examining the mentoring relationship between student interns and supervisors in hosting agencies. Our interest is in understanding internships relative to leadership development. Research on mentoring in the business sector is widely available but few studies analyze mentoring in public sector organizations.

Mentoring

Workplace mentoring is associated with many positive organizational outcomes including higher retention and employee satisfaction (e.g., Forret & de Janasz, 2005; Payne & Huffman, 2005; Ragin, Miller, & Cotton, 2000). Researchers have conceptualized independent functions of mentoring which may affect mentee's outcomes (Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Ragins, 1999; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Two general functional areas have been examined in mentoring studies: career development functions, which prepare a mentee for job advancement, and, psychological functions, which enhance a mentee's professional and personal growth by building trust, intimacy and strengthening the bonding between a mentor and mentee. Career development mentoring includes activities such as: 1) coaching, 2) sponsorship, 3) protection, and 4) exposure (Kram, 1985; Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996). Psychological functions help mentees by offering; 1) acceptance and confirmation, 2) counseling, 3) friendship, and 4) role modeling (Kram 1985; Noe, 1988; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990).

There has been scholarly attention on how demographic diversity influences mentoring outcomes and mentees' satisfaction with the mentoring process (Kram, 1985; Moreland & Levine 1989; Ragins & Cotton 1991; Feldman, Folks, & Turnley, 1999). In terms of gender differences, studies have shown that demographic similarity helps those in the relationships feel more satisfied (Isen & Baron, 1991; Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszynski, 1991). Kram's (1985) seminal mentoring study indicated that cross-gender mentoring creates fears of accusations of improper relationships that can stymie the social support aspect of such relationships. Ragins and Scandura (1994; 1997), however, found no systematic differences between female mentors and male mentors in willingness to serve or ineffectiveness as mentors. In the context of public service internship, questions about cross gender mentoring remain yet may impact the development leadership competencies.

Public Sector Leadership Dimensions Achieved Through Mentoring

Leadership refers to the influences of an individual on others for achieving common goals and objectives (Northouse, 2010). This conceptualization of leadership highlights that leadership is a dynamic process by which an individual can build relationships to achieve collective benefits (Jaskyte, 2004; Trottier, Van Wart, & Wang, 2008). Many scholars have pointed to the importance of public sector leadership to manage and transform organizations (Behn, 1998; Packard, 2010; Van Wart, 2013). In the public sector, administrative leadership includes those persons in non-elected positions within public organizations such as appointed and career executives, middle managers, frontline supervisors and even those providing front-line services (Dicke 2004; Van Wart 2003). In this research, we investigate four leadership competencies associated with career development and psychological functions. These leadership competencies include normative, pragmatic, performance, and compassionate leadership.

In public services, normative leadership would refer to individuals that embody those values of public service including perceiving public service to be a calling, and maintaining a strong commitment to ethical standards and the precepts of founding legal documents (i.e., U.S. Constitution) (Van Wart, 2003; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Svara, 2014). Normative leadership recognizes the public sector as being distinct from other sectors and concerned with preserving institutional integrity (Terry, 1995). Normative leaders also value and pursue the input of citizens in an effort to be more responsive to their needs and interests (DeLeon & Denhart, 2000; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003). As an example, an individual mentor exhibiting normative leadership encourages a mentee to report unethical conduct, to seek citizen input on projects, and to pursue public service as a career choice.

Pragmatic leadership is defined as exhibiting behaviors that help to bridge the gaps between information or interactions in politics and administration. Here, mentors would help mentees in building a professional network and political acumen (Nalbandian, O'Neill, & Wilkes, 2013).

Pragmatic leaders are able to effectively manage their organization and are also able to engage in policy-making roles through the "identification, creation, and refinement of collective purposes" and "shaping people's preferences" (Cook, 1998). Thus, pragmatic leaders recognize that public institutions function within a political environment. At the same time, there is recognition that to navigate this political environment, individuals must be able to build social networks that will enable them to access social capital and other key resources to be successful in the public sector. For example, Leroux and her colleagues (2010) find that when public managers are involved in local government networks (e.g., regional association), interlocal service cooperation increases.

Performance leadership is concerned with having the administrative skills to function within a bureaucracy such as possessing knowledge of procedures, professional writing, and general work skills (Cohen, Eimicke, & Heikkila, 2013). Here, the leadership focus is on results-oriented public management to meet citizen needs and demands. An ever present need to perform in more efficient and effective ways drives a demand for public managers with solid administrative skills. Thus, performance leadership helps an individual to become an effective public manager.

Compassionate leadership refers to individuals that demonstrate emotional intelligence and individualized consideration (Berman & West, 2008; Northouse 2010). Leaders with emotional intelligence are able to recognize the emotions of their subordinates such as such as joy, fear, love and hate and likewise recognize them within themselves. Individualized consideration refers to instances where a leader is attentive to the emotions, needs and challenges of subordinates in the workplace. Compassionate leadership is an important competency because emotions often influence the work performances of employees within public organizations (Newman, Guy, & Mastracci, 2009).

In sum, we expect that students that have positive internship experiences will report higher levels of leadership development across these various competencies: normative, pragmatic, performance, and compassionate leadership. We contend that these leadership skills can be construed as mentoring outcomes, arising out of high levels of mentorship in the internship experience. Because there is little research on mentoring from a public management perspective, we are cautious of any predicted relationship between gender-pairing and leadership development. We anticipate, however, given the unique nature of the public sector context, gender-pairing will be correlated to perceptions of leadership development.

Data and Methodology

To answer our research questions, we rely on data compiled from a document review of all students taking part in an internship from fall 2006 to fall 2013. Department mailing lists and in-house internships files were used to identify potential participants and the information was matched against an alumni directory that is updated annually. In the absence of an email address in the internship file or alumni directory, the potential respondent's name and contact information was identified on the Internet using a search engine such as Google.

Our sample includes 204 students and alumni from one mid-sized masters of public administration program in Texas. An internship is required for all incoming students lacking substantial public sector experience (defined as at least one year of fulltime service in an organization in the public sector). Online surveys were sent to current students enrolled in a semester long and required internship class and to alumni who had completed their internship and coursework within a period of five years prior to 2014. Document reviews for students and alumni who enrolled in the internship class between fall 2006 to fall 2013 were retrieved from the files kept by the department and prepared by the internship coordinator. When students enter the course, a file is prepared and once the required coursework and 440 hours of paid internship is completed, the materials are transferred to the student's regular file. Each student's folder was reviewed and the following information was retained: details regarding internship agreement between student and host agency, contact information of internship supervisor, location of internship, duration of the appointment, and brief internship position description (i.e., tasks). The files include a weekly activity log describing duties performed, hours completed and the supervisor's signature.

The survey was prepared using Qualtrics, an online survey system that is made available through the university to graduate students and faculty. The survey includes two sections.

The first asks demographic information about the student intern such as his or her age, gender, and current employment status. The second part of the survey contains questions regarding the demographics of the mentor as well as how often the pair met, whether the mentoring was helpful, areas in which they received mentoring, and whether they were still in contact with their mentor. In addition, questions about the nature of the mentoring experience were investigated. Respondents were asked to rate their mentoring experiences as well as to identify specific areas in which they were mentored (e.g., work, professional, and personal). Questions regarding attitudes about mentoring and whether they were currently mentoring others were also asked.

Surveys were reviewed by two former students of the MPA program (who were active PhD students in the same department at the time of the study) to pilot the survey. After several small adjustments, 204 online surveys were sent via email in October 2013 to potential participants. An email to alert recipients that a survey would be coming was sent two days prior to sending the survey. This alert allowed us to update out-of-date or otherwise invalid emails. Bounce-back emails resulted in the elimination of two potential respondents from our sample, resulting in a final sample size of 202. Four follow-up reminders to encourage participation were sent weekly subsequent to the initial distribution of the survey. A total of 128 surveys were returned for a response rate of 63 percent. Of these, 11 were current MPA students and the rest of sample was alumni. The original sample of 202 sent out, included 50 current students (response rate of 90 percent), and 100 alumni (response rate of 50 percent).

Findings

The demographics of our survey respondents and the demographics of their mentors are shown in Table 1. More than half (57%) of the respondents were female; a gender distribution that was similar to that of mentors. Respondents ranged in age from 21 years to 42 years (average 25) with most, 73 percent, in their 20s during the time that they served as an intern. Somewhat surprisingly, 41 percent of the mentors were also in their 20s or 30s at the time the internship took place. Only 9 percent of respondents noted that their mentor was age 60 or above. Although not attributed to the internship experience, we found a majority (84%) of mentees were employed full time, and of the full time public sector employees, 53 percent reported having received a promotion in the preceding three years. In terms of internship sector location, 61% of internships were completed in public (governmental) agencies, 30% in nonprofit organizations and 9% in private sector organizations.

Table 1. Demographics of Mentors and Mentees

	Mentees	**Mentors**
Gender	M 43% F 57%	M 45% F 55%
Race	White 75%, Hispanic 9%, Black 11%, Asian 5% and Other 0.8%	White 84%, Hispanic 7%, Black 8%, Asian 0.8% and Other 2%
Age	Average 25 (Min 21-Max 42)	20-30s- 41%, 40-50s- 50% 60 or above- 9%
Employment	Fulltime employed 84%	
Internship sector		Public 61%, Nonprofit 30% And others 10%
Employment sector	Public 63%, Nonprofit 16%, Private 10% And others 11%	

The MPA program is located in Texas, a state that is almost 50 percent Hispanic (60 percent in the Dallas/Fort Worth region, the location of most of the internships), yet our survey respondents were almost 75 percent white (non-Hispanic). This corresponds to the composition of the program overall which does not match the region's demographics based on race/ethnicity. Likewise, workplace mentors (84 percent) were overwhelmingly white (non-Hispanic), followed by black/African-American (8 percent), Hispanic/Latin (7 percent), or other (2 percent).

Public Service Leadership Development

Our first research question asks: what leadership competencies are developed from mentoring in a public service internship? To answer this question, we relied on several survey questions used to measure whether the four leadership competencies (normative, pragmatic, programmatic, and compassionate) that could be developed from an internship were occurring. For example, students were provided a list of statements and asked to identify whether any of them applied as it related to their mentoring experience. Survey questions used to develop index are presented in Table 2 with index ratings from all mentors and ratings from mentees mentored by a female.

On normative leadership dimension, respondents were particularly asked whether: 1) mentor helped them see the value of public service, 2) mentor helped solidify or affirm choice of public service career, 3) mentor encouraged mentee to uphold the highest level of integrity, and 4) mentor helped mentee value citizen input from all parts of the community. Overwhelmingly, 71 percent answered to the affirmative in this set of questions (normative leadership). When separating the rating for female mentors only, mentees also overwhelmingly identify (though with less frequency) that their female mentor focused efforts in this area of leadership (66%).

With regard to pragmatic leadership, respondents were asked whether their mentor helped them work in a political environment and whether the mentor helped him or her expand their network of professional contacts. The average rating for all mentors was 54%, with a notable statistically significant different for female mentors (48%). This suggests that on average, mentees matched with a female mentor tend to rate their mentor lower when compared to the general pool of mentors in the area of pragmatic leadership.

Performance leadership was measured by asking respondents whether mentoring was received in the areas of work related skills and procedures, and whether mentor helped mentee learn skills related to professional writing (e.g., memos, policy reports, etc.). Our results indicate that internship mentoring is related to performance leadership, with no statistically significant difference between all mentors and female mentors. For instance, 76% of all respondents (regardless of mentor's gender) reported receiving mentoring focused on performance leadership and 75% of respondents with a female mentor reported receiving the same leadership development through mentoring.

Less frequently, mentoring on areas related to compassionate leadership such as being a compassionate manager and engaging in effective team-work was offered (33 percent). Like with performance and normative leadership, there was no statistically significant difference when comparing the rating for all mentors and those for just female mentors.

Overall, we found that in more than half of the cases, leadership competencies were achieved in normative, performance, and pragmatic leadership. The lowest rated leadership competency was the compassionate leadership dimension.

Table 2. Public Service Competency Index

Leadership Dimensions	Indicators	Index Average Ratings for All Mentors	Index Average Ratings for Female Mentors
Normative leadership	Value of public service, career choice as calling, value of integrity, value of citizen input	.71	.66
Pragmatic leadership	Professional network, political capacity	.54	.48*
Performance leadership	Work skills and procedures and professional writing	.76	.75
Compassionate leadership	Compassionate manager and teamwork	.33	.31

Gender-Pairings and Leadership Development

Table 3 reports the impact of gender pairing by measuring leadership ratings for four gender-based pairs: male mentee / male mentor (n=31), male mentee / female mentor (24), female mentee / male mentor (n=27), female mentee / female mentor (46). Comparing scores of overall leadership development (comprised of all four leadership competency scores) and leadership in the various competencies (normative, pragmatic, performance, and compassionate) across those gender pairings, we find that the male mentee and female mentor pair is the lowest rating across the four leadership competencies. In addition, with the exception of pragmatic leadership, results further indicate that the ratings for the male mentee / female mentor pairing were statistically significant. It is unclear why these differences appear, but these findings are worthy of further investigation. For males paired with female mentors, leadership development in the area of compassionate leadership was less likely to appear than when they were of the same gender. This does not mean that mentees' were more satisfied with their internship experiences when paired with a same gendered mentor, however. The leadership competencies developed in the internship experience suggest that gender plays a role.

Table 3. Gender Pairs and Leadership Dimensions

	Leadership Development	**Normative Leadership**	**Pragmatic Leadership**	**Performance Leadership**	**Compassionate Leadership**
Male mentee and Male mentor N=31	.85*	.79	.65*	.79	.39
Male mentee and Female mentor N=24	.63*	.55*	.42	.64*	.18***
Female mentee and Male mentor N=27	.79	.73	.58	.74	.36
Female mentee and Female mentor N=46	.74	.72	.51	.81	.30

Discussion

The first purpose of our case study was designed to assess whether leadership competencies were developed through mentoring in a public service internship experience. Specifically, we sought to understand whether leadership in the form of normative, pragmatic, performance, and compassionate leadership were outcomes of the mentoring relationship between students in an MPA program completing an internship and their internship supervisor and mentor. Our results indicate that indeed, students reported developing competency in these four areas—some with more frequency than other areas of leadership.

For example, out of the four leadership competencies, respondents report that developing compassionate leadership was less of a focus in their mentoring experience. This, however, does not mean that respondents or even their mentors value compassionate leadership less. Berman and West (2008) note that mentoring is a key strategy by which to develop people skills, which we argue is an important component of exhibiting compassionate leadership as a public manager and team member. A greater focus on building compassionate leadership through the mentoring process may result in higher levels of mentees acquiring these key skills.

Our results also indicate that there is a strong emphasis in developing normative and performance leadership—both top rated leadership dimensions. Mentors seem to focus significant attention to helping mentees see the value of public service and developing professional skills that will ultimately help them in their careers. Our findings here are consistent with renewed efforts in public administration scholarship that place citizens at the forefront of public policy and public management (DeLeon & Denhart, 2000; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003) as well as normative arguments about seeing public institutions as separate and distinct from the other sectors (Terry, 1995).

There is some evidence to suggest that in at least half of the cases in our sample, mentors are focusing efforts on building the pragmatic leadership of their mentees. Here, our focus was in understanding the extent to which mentoring results in mentees developing skills in areas such as building a professional network and strengthening their political capacity, and mentees report having mentoring in these areas. As Cook (1998) notes, having political capacity is symptomatic of individuals being able to balance the dual functions of managing a public organization and engaging in the policy making process. And our results suggest that mentors do see the value of this skill.

The second purpose of our study was to understand whether differences in mentoring outcomes varied according to gender-based pairs in mentor / mentee. With the exception of pragmatic leadership, the male mentee and female mentor pairing is associated with statistically significant lower scores in all dimensions of leadership. Thus, there is some evidence in this study to suggest that demographics, particularly the gender of the mentor seems to matter. This finding is a departure from previous studies that do not find a relationship between gender and mentoring outcomes (Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Ragins & Scandura, 1997). While our study did not seek to understand what affects differences in mentee perceptions about their mentor, previous research indicates that cross-gender mentoring may result in fear of accusations of improper relationships (Kram 1985). It is also possible that work place protocols such as keeping a distance between an employee and supervisor and/or the avoidance of favoritism may explain differences in gender-pairings.

Conclusion

This study has aimed to better understand the mentoring and leadership development that takes place in internships within an MPA program in Texas. Our interest was in understanding the outcomes of mentoring, with a specific focus on the leadership competencies that were developed by mentees. In addition, we sought to understand the dynamics that gender plays in explaining the development of leadership competencies. We find that mentoring indeed is a tool by which students of public administration can develop key leadership competencies such as normative, pragmatic, performance, and compassionate leadership. In general, it appears that mentors place a heavy emphasis on mentees developing skills within the dimension of normative and performance leadership—for example, seeing the value of public service and having working knowledge of the bureaucracy (e.g., organizational procedures). With much less frequency (33%), mentees report having developed compassionate leadership. Our study also highlights that gender indeed plays a role in the mentoring relationship, as male mentees tend to report that their female mentors focused significantly less attention to most areas of leadership development. The results of our research make contributions to both theory and practice.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings confirm theoretical arguments about the value of mentoring but within the context of the public sector. On average, a majority of mentees in our study report that they received help in developing at least three out of the four leadership competencies through their internship experience. In addition, our study sought to apply Bozeman and Feeney's (2009) three-tier model of public sector mentoring by exploring individual level analysis of mentoring and its interaction with public service outcomes—in our case, leadership skills. Our results provide evidence to support at least some dimensions of this mentoring model in one case of public administration internships.

From a practical standpoint, our findings suggest that leaders within public sector should consider the adoption of formal policies and programs to support the establishment or functioning of mentoring initiatives within their organizations. Mentoring is key to future public managers developing important leadership competencies such as understanding how to navigate the political environment and building professional networks—among others. In addition, in the development of these programs, public managers need to be aware of the potential implications of cross-gender pairing for leadership development.

Despite the meaningful contributions of this research, our study is faced with several limitations. First, the sample for our research is drawn from a single MPA program in one state. We do not know if the experiences of the participants in this study are similar to those of others in other parts of the country. Thus, future research should consider replicating these efforts in other contexts to generate comparative data and analysis. A second limitation is associated with recall. Among our survey respondents were alumni who had completed their internship 2 to 3 years prior to participating in the study. For most MPA students, however, the internship is their first foray into a profession that holds great interest to them. Thus, even with the passage of time, we believe that recall concerns are minimized due to the importance of the internship experience in their life plans.

Lastly, our research did not employ any predictive analysis to develop causal inferences. For example, we are not able to make conclusions about why differences in leadership development among mentees are reported when male mentees are paired with a female mentor. Future research should explore explanatory factors associated with variation in the content and effects of mentoring.

References

Baugh, S. G., Lankau, M. J. & Scandura, T. A. (1996). An Investigation of the Effects of Mentee Attitudes Toward the Working Setting. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 14, 503-522.

Behn, R. D. (1998). What Right Do Public Managers Have to Leader?. Public Administration Review, 58(3), 209-224.

Benavides, A. D., Dicke, L. A., & Maleckaite, V. (2012). Creating Public Sector Pedestals and Examining Falls From Grace. International Journal of Public Administration, 35(11), 749-759.

Berman, E. M., & West, J. P. (2008). Managing Emotional Intelligence in U.S. Cities: A Study of Social Skills among Public Managers. Public Administration Review, 68(4), 742-758.

Blass, F. R., & Ferris G. R. (2007). Leader reputation: The role of mentoring, political skill, contextual learning, and adaptation. Human Resource Management, 46(1), 5-19.

Bozeman, B. & Feeney, M. K. (2008). Public Management Mentoring: What Affects Outcomes?. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 19(2), 427-452.

Bozeman, B. & Feeney, M. K. (2009). Public Management Mentoring: A Three-Tier Model. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 29(2), 134-157.

Chao, G. R. (1997). Mentoring Phases and Outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 15, 15-28.

Cohen, S., Eimicke, W.B., & Heikkila, T. (2013). The Effective Public Manager: Achieving Success in Government Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, B. J. (1998). Politics, Political Leadership, and Public Management. Public Administration Review 58(3), 225-230.

Cook, S., Parker, R. S., & Pettijohn, C. E. (2004). The perceptions of interns: A longitudinal case study. Journal of Education for Business, 79, 179–185.

DeLeon, L., & Denhardt, R. B. (2000). The Political Theory of Reinvention. Public Administration Review, 60(2), 89-97.

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2003). The New Public Service: An Approach to Reform. International Review of Public Administration, 8(1), 3-10.

Dicke, L. A. (2004). Street-Level Leadership in the Public Sector: A Case Study of the Challenges. International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 7(2), 231-251.

Feldman, D. C., Folks, W. R., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Mentor-protege diversity and its impacton international internship experiences, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 597-611.

Feldman, D. C. and Weitz, B. A. (1990). `Summer interns: factors contributing to positive developmental experiences', Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, 267-284.

Forret, M., & de Janasz, S. (2005). Perceptions of an Organization's Culture for Work and Family: Do Mentors Make a Difference?. Career Development International, 10 (6/7), 478-492.

Garavan, T. N., & Murphy, C. (2001). The co-operative education process and organizational socialization: A qualitative study of student perceptions of its effectiveness. Education & Training, 43, 281–302.

Gault, J., Redington, J., & Schlager, T. (2000). Undergraduate business internships and career success: Are they related? Journal of Marketing Education, 22(1), 45–53.

Isen, A. M., & Baron, R. A. (1991). Positive affect as a factor in organizational behavior, In: Cummings, L. L., & Staw, B. M. (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (1-53), Greenwich: CT.

Jaskyte, K. (2004). Transformational Leadership, Organizational Culture, and Innovativeness in Nonprofit Organizations. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 15(2), 153-68.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the Mentor Relationship. Academy of Management Journal. 26. 608-625.

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

LeRoux, K., Brandenburger, P.W., Pandey, S.K. (2010). Interlocal Service Cooperation in U.S. Cities: A Social Network Explanation. Public Administration Review, 70(2), 268-278.

Matthews, C., & Zimmerman, B. B. (1999). Integrating service learning and technical Communication: Benefits and challenges. Technical Communication Quarterly, 8, 383–404.

McCormick K. M., & Brennan S. (2001). Mentoring the new professional in interdisciplinary early childhood education: The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 3, 131–144.

Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1989). Newcomers and oldtimers in small groups. In P. B. Paulus (Ed.), *Psychology of group influence,* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nalbandian, J., O'Neill, R., Wilkes, J. M., & Kaufman, A. (2013). Contemporary Challenges in Local Government: Evolving Roles and Responsibilities, Structures, and Processes. Public Administration Review, 73(4), 567-574.

Narayanan, V., Olk, P. & Fukami, C. (2010). Determinants of internship effectiveness: An exploratory model. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 9(1), 61–80.

Newman, M. A., Guy, M., & Mastracci, S. H. (2009). Beyond Cognition: Affective Leadership and Emotional Labor. Public Administration Review 69(1), 6-20.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An Investigation of the Determinants of Successful Assigned Mentoring Relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41, 457-479.

Noe, R. A., Greenberger, D. B., & Wang, S. (2002). Mentoring: What We Know and Where We Might Go. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 21, 129-173.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 5th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Packard, T. (2010). Staff Perceptions of Variables Affecting Performance in Human Service Organizations. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39(6), 971-990.

Payne, S. C., & Huffman, A. H. (2005). A Longitudinal Examination of the Influence of Mentoring on Organizational Commitment and Turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 48, 158-171.

Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. (1990). Perception of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, 321-339.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 939-951.

Ragins B. R. & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentoring Functions and Outcomes: A Comparison of Men and Women in Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84 (4), 529-550.

Ragins, B. R. (1999). Where Do We Go From There and How Do We Get There? Methodological Issues in Conducting Research on Diversity and Mentoring Relationships. In A. J. Murrell, F. J. Crosby, & R. J. Ely (eds.) Mentoring Dilemmas: Developmental Relationships within Multicultural Organizations. 227-247. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ragins, B.R., Miller, J. L., & Cotton, J. S. (2000). Managing Mentoring: The Effect of Type of Mentor, Quality Relationship, and Program Design on Work and Career Attitudes. Academy of Management Journal, 43(6), 1177-1194.

Ragins, B. R. and Kram, K. E. 2007. The Roots and Meaning of Mentoring. In Ragins, B. R. and Kram, K. E. (eds.) The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research and Practice. 3-15. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1994). Gender Differences in Expected Outcomes of Mentoring Relationships. The Academy of Management Journal, 37(4), 957-971.

Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1997). The way we were: and the termination of mentoring relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(6), 945-953.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszcynski, T. (1991). A terror management theory of social behavior: The psychological functions of self-esteem and cultural worldviews. In: Berkowitz, L. (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (93-159), Academic Press, New York.

Svara, J. H. (2014). Who Are the Keepers of the Code? Articulating and Upholding Ethical Standards in the Field of Public Administration. Public Administration Review, 74(5), 561-569.

Taylor, M. S. (1985). The roles of occupational knowledge and crystallization of vocational self-concept in students' school to work transition. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 539-550.

Taylor, M. S. (1988). Effects of college internships on individual participants. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 393-401.

Terry, D. J. (1995). The theory of planned behaviour: The effects of perceived behavioural control and self-efficacy. British Journal of Social Psychology, 34(2), 199-220.

Trottier, T., Wart, M. V., & Wang, Xiaohu. (2008). Examining the Nature and Significance of Leadership in Government Organizations. Public Administration Review, 319-33.

Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment. Public Administration Review, 63(2), 214-28.

Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment. Public Administration Review, 63(2), 214-228.

Van Wart, M. (2013). Lessons from Leadership Theory and the Contemporary Challenges of Leaders. Public Administration Review, 73(4), 553-565.