

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindor

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

---

1-25-2016

# Mentoring in Professional Sport: A Functional Analysis of the Most Prolific General Managers in the History of the National Hockey League

Stephen Ernest Kirzinger  
*University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Kirzinger, Stephen Ernest, "Mentoring in Professional Sport: A Functional Analysis of the Most Prolific General Managers in the History of the National Hockey League" (2016). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 5646.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/5646>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email ([scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca)) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Mentoring in Professional Sport: A Functional Analysis of the Most Prolific General  
Managers in the History of the National Hockey League

By

Stephen E. Kirzinger

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies  
through the Department of Kinesiology  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Human Kinetics  
at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2016

© 2016 Stephen E. Kirzinger

**Mentoring in Professional Sport: A Functional Analysis of the Most Prolific General Managers in the History of the National Hockey League**

by

**Stephen E. Kirzinger**

APPROVED BY:

---

Dr. Dave Bussiere  
Odette School of Business

---

Dr. Todd Loughead  
Kinesiology

---

Dr. Jess C. Dixon, Advisor  
Kinesiology

January 15, 2016

## DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine who the most prolific General Managers (GMs), as mentors, have been in the history of the National Hockey League, and then illuminate factors that have led to their success. Rick Dudley, Jack Ferreira, and Scotty Bowman were identified as the most prolific GM-mentors based on how many and how efficiently, members of their hockey operations staffs became GMs later in their respective careers. A qualitative analysis of published biographies, recorded interviews, newspaper articles, magazine articles, and books profiling these GM-mentors revealed that coaching and sponsorship were the mentoring functions most frequently provided to protégés. The results also demonstrated that, within the context of professional hockey, being connected to a high-reputation leader is important to an executive's career success. These findings provide insight regarding the factors that contribute to successful mentoring relationships among professional sport executives.

## DEDICATION

To my mentors - Mom, Dad, Jon, Grant, Matt, Desi, Roman, and Jess.

Thank you for the sponsorship, coaching, challenging assignments, role modeling,  
counseling, and friendship.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to recognize my beautiful and loyal wife, Chantelle, who has supported me and journeyed with me through the many highs and lows of moving across the continent in pursuit of higher education. The sacrifices that she made, which enabled me to pursue a Master's degree in sport management at the University of Windsor, are too many to name and too immense to express, but will never be forgotten. Undoubtedly, Chantelle has been my motivation to complete this program to the best of my ability.

Secondly, to my advisor and mentor, Dr. Jess Dixon. 'Thank you' does not suffice for the ways in which he has positively impacted my, Chantelle's, and our future family's lives. Jess encouraged me to challenge the boundaries that I had put on myself and as a result, achieve greatness. His selflessness and unmatched work ethic has impacted me in such a way that will propel me to better the lives of others, as he does on a daily basis. More than simply an academic advisor, Jess has been a mentor, personal advisor, advocate, bench boss, tour guide, and friend.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Dave Bussiere and Dr. Todd Loughead, for sharing their knowledge and experience to ensure this project will move mentoring research forward. Thank you to the great people in the Faculty of Human Kinetics and my colleagues for making my experience in Windsor one that Chantelle and I will never forget.

Finally, to my Dad, who taught me to 'wear my tie,' the rest of my immediate family, and a particular aunt who values education and lexia raisins, thank you for your significant impact on my educational pursuits.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY .....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
DEDICATION .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	ix
RESEARCH ARTICLE.....	1
Introduction .....	1
Literature Review .....	3
Methods.....	10
Results .....	13
Discussion .....	26
References .....	34
Tables .....	42
EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW .....	50
Leadership.....	50
Mentoring.....	61
A Brief History of the NHL .....	86
Hockey Operations Staffs of NHL Franchises .....	87
References .....	91
Appendices .....	104
Appendix A: Researcher Autobiography .....	104
VITA AUCTORIS .....	107

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Kram's (1985) Mentoring Functions and Definitions.....	42
Table 2 - Top Ten GM-mentors Sorted by Effectiveness.....	43
Table 3 - Top Ten GM-mentors Sorted by Standardized Efficiency.....	44
Table 4 - ANOVA Table for Five Clusters.....	45
Table 5 - Rick Dudley's Protégés.....	46
Table 6 - Jack Ferreira's Protégés.....	47
Table 7 - Scotty Bowman's Protégés.....	48
Table 8 - Functions Offered by Each GM-mentor.....	49

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Researcher Autobiography.....104

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### **Introduction**

Mentoring has become an extensive domain of inquiry for researchers and practitioners alike due to the array of benefits that a mentoring relationship can yield. A mentor, often a higher-ranking individual who has advanced knowledge and experience, can play a positive role in the development of another individual's career (Singh, Ragins, & Tharenou, 2009). Although scholars have generally agreed on what a mentor is, defining the mentoring relationship and the nuances that accompany such a relationship has been ongoing. A contributing factor to the elusiveness of understanding mentoring relationships in their entirety, is the reality that these interactions are highly dependent on a variety of contextual factors. Thus, clarification of different aspects of this dyadic relationship has proven to be an evolving journey.

As many researchers have demonstrated (e.g., Chao, 1997; Ghosh & Reio, 2013; Kram, 1983; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002), garnering an understanding of the factors that contribute to a successful mentoring relationship is important, as the benefits for the protégé, mentor, and organization can be substantial. Although sport management scholars have studied mentoring in a variety of contexts, researchers have generally ignored the potential of professional sport as a context to study management theories and concepts (Devine & Foster, 2006). Thus, a gap in the literature exists regarding the study of how mentoring impacts the career development of executives in professional sport. Some franchises have a multi-billion dollar net worth and thus, they need experienced managers in order to stay profitable and maintain a positive reputation (Badenhausen, 2014; Devine & Foster, 2006). One way of obtaining such individuals is through leader

development and specifically, the mentoring of more novice members of the organization. This research emphasizes the need for a deepened understanding of the factors that contribute to successful mentoring within professional sport organizations.

In the realm of professional sport, General Managers (GMs), in consultation with their teams' operations staffs, are primarily responsible for establishing policies and making decisions regarding player personnel (Farris, 2011; Gamson & Scotch, 1964; Wong & Deubert, 2010). Within this context, there is an opportunity for mentoring relationships to develop between GMs (mentors) and members of their hockey operations staffs (protégés). Dean Lombardi, GM of the National Hockey League's (NHL) Los Angeles Kings, stated that without the help of his two mentors, Lou Lamoriello and Bobby Clarke, he would likely not be an NHL GM today (Rosen, 2012). Lamoriello and Clarke have a combined 3,740 games (the equivalent of 45.6 regular seasons) of experience as NHL GMs. Although this statement acknowledges the impact mentoring can have on the career success of NHL executives, minimal research has been conducted to discover who the most prolific GMs, as mentors, have been in the history of the League and what factors contributed to their success.

The goals of this research study were to: 1) identify who the most prolific GMs are in terms of their ability to mentor future GMs; 2) provide insight regarding how mentoring has impacted the career development of NHL GMs; 3) illuminate the mentoring functions that have aided those protégés who later became NHL GMs; 4) contribute to literature that acknowledges the positive outcomes of mentoring as a form of leader development, and; 5) serve as a foundation for future research of mentoring in

professional sport and other areas of sport management. The following questions guided this research in trying to achieve the aforementioned goals:

1. In the history of the NHL, which GMs have been the most prolific mentors?
  - a) Which GMs have been the most effective mentors in terms of the total number of protégés who have gone on to become GMs later in their respective careers?
  - b) Which GMs have been the most efficient mentors in terms of the total number of protégés who have gone on to become GMs later in their respective careers, divided by the total number of years that the GM-mentor has been active in this role?
2. Which mentoring functions (i.e., career and psychosocial) did the most prolific NHL GM-mentors provide to their protégés?

## **Literature Review**

### **Leader and leadership development.**

*Leader development* is continually transforming as researchers attempt to understand the concept in a variety of contexts. Day (2001) explained leader development as having an orientation toward the growth of human capital and, thus, the development of individual capabilities such as self-awareness (e.g., emotional awareness, self-confidence), self-regulation (e.g., self-control, trustworthiness, adaptability), and self-motivation (e.g., commitment, initiative, optimism). Therefore, the focus of leader development is to develop intrapersonal capabilities through the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and abilities that are typically associated with formal leadership roles (Day, 2001). In contrast, *leadership development* places an emphasis on social capital and the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with the resources embedded within individuals' networks (Brass, 2001). These resources enhance the dynamics and interactions involved in creating organizational value (Day, 2001).

Six popular and promising leader and leadership development practices are 360-degree feedback, executive coaching, networking, job assignments, action learning, and mentoring (Day, 2001). It is through the implementation of these practices that individuals are provided with development opportunities. Although researchers have found merit in studying all of these practices (e.g., Kram & Isabella, 1985; Peterson, 1996; Popper, 2005; Waldman & Atwater, 1998), this project will evaluate the prevalence and benefits of mentoring in the realm of professional sport.

### **Mentoring.**

The concept of mentoring can be traced back to Homer's (1946) legendary poem, *The Odyssey*. Formally, research concerning mentoring began in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). Some authors (e.g., Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lenz, & Lima, 2004; Chandler, Kram, & Yip, 2011) have cited Levinson and colleagues' (1978) work on the career development of adult men as the first empirical research conducted in the realm of mentoring. These authors highlighted the relationship that develops with a mentor as one of the most important experiences in a person's life. Kram (1983) advanced this notion by stating that a young adult in the work world is likely to encounter "a variety of developmental tasks that are reflected in concerns about self, career, and family" (p. 608). She suggested that the role of a mentoring relationship is to significantly enhance early adulthood development by facilitating work on these tasks.

Kram's (1983) foundational work has been cited by numerous researchers as providing the theoretical basis for much of the contemporary research on the topic (e.g., Allen et al., 2004; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). Through her research, Kram (1983) identified four phases of mentoring relationships. The *initiation* phase, which lasts approximately six to twelve months, is the time period when the relationship between the

protégé and mentor commences. Following is the *cultivation* phase, which is described by Kram (1983) as a two to five year period in which the positive expectations that developed in the initiation phase are tested against reality. In the case of a successful mentorship, the protégé will eventually long for independence due to the development that she or he has experienced and the *separation* phase begins. Finally, Hunt and Michael (1983) refer to the *redefinition* phase as the lasting friendship phase. Due to a decrease in power distance between the mentor and protégé, the two individuals feel that they are able to talk about common problems and act as a support system for each other.

*Career* and *psychosocial* functions were also outlined by Kram (1983) as fundamental tenets of mentoring (see Table 1 for operational definitions of each function). In particular, Kram's career and psychosocial functions have been used as a guiding framework for numerous studies in a wide variety of research disciplines (e.g., Allen et al., 2004; Chandler et al., 2011; Chao, 1997; Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & DuBois, 2008; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Ragins et al., 2000).

Researchers agree that there are three parties who may benefit from a mentoring relationship: 1) the protégé (e.g., Allen et al., 2004; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Fagenson, 1989; Orpen, 1995; Scandura, 1992); 2) the mentor (e.g., Hunt & Michael, 1983, Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999), and; 3) the organization(s) to which the protégé and/or mentor belong (e.g., Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993; Scandura & Viator, 1994; Wilson & Elman, 1990). Despite clarifying the three parties that may benefit from the establishment of a mentoring relationship, Chao (1997) noted that very little empirical research examining the linkage between the phases, functions, and outcomes has been conducted. In her study, Chao (1997) compared measures of job satisfaction, career

outcomes, organizational socialization, and income measures over a five year period between protégés and non-protégés. This study confirmed Kram's (1983) four phases of a mentor relationship, career and psychosocial functions, as well as the measureable benefits accruing to protégés and mentors involved in mentoring relationships.

In addition to researchers' efforts to clarify the parties who may benefit from a mentoring relationship, previous literature has also highlighted three streams of mentoring, including youth mentoring, academic mentoring, and workplace mentoring. Eby et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis on these streams and confirmed that mentoring relationships produce a wide range of positive behavioural, attitudinal, relational, motivational, health-related, and career outcomes.

In response to the changing workplace environment of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, researchers introduced a variety of mentoring models. Higgins and Kram (2001) used social network theory as a method for better understanding mentoring. This model, also known as *constellation mentoring*, is when "a protégé has a network of concurrent mentoring relationships that develop him/her in different ways" (Kelly & Dixon, 2014, p. 508). Similarly, *composite mentoring* includes multiple relationships where the protégé selects her or his mentors to fill specific mentoring functions (Packard, 2003). For composite mentoring, the protégé is intentional about finding mentors to fill specific functions, whereas mentors in constellation mentoring are more organically obtained. Finally, for *strategic mentoring*, a group of strategically selected mentors provides functions to a group of protégés. In this model, mentors are deliberately selected to ensure that a variety of functions are provided to the protégés (Wasburn & Crispo, 2006).

Mentoring is a vast research topic due to the variety of contexts in which these relationships can occur. Although mentoring has been studied since the late 1970s, many questions remain to be answered regarding the impact it has on executives in professional sport. To date, minimal research has been conducted within the NHL to uncover the mentoring relationships that have occurred throughout the League's 98 year history.

### **A brief history of the NHL.**

The NHL was founded in 1917 with five teams located throughout Ontario and Quebec, including the Montreal Canadiens and Toronto Maple Leafs (National Hockey League, 2008). In 1926, the League expanded into the United States where the Boston Bruins, New York Rangers, Chicago Black Hawks, and Detroit Red Wings were granted franchises. Between 1917 and 1942, eight other Canadian and American teams sporadically joined the League, but eventually became defunct. From 1942 to 1967, the League consisted of the six aforementioned teams and was dubbed the 'Original Six Era.' Between the years of 1967 and 1979, the NHL expanded by adding fifteen new teams, and by the year 2000, the League included 30 teams from throughout Canada and the United States (National Hockey League, 2008).

Over the last forty years, a number of franchises have relocated to other cities within Canada or the United States due to financial and market-related concerns. These relocations show the volatility of certain markets and demonstrate the importance of proper management of these businesses. Further, some ownership and management groups continue to be challenged with maintaining the financial well-being of their organizations. This highlights the importance of leader development within organizations, as seamless transitions between leaders is vital to ensuring these firms' long-term financial stability.

### **Hockey operations in NHL franchises.**

In consultation with their teams' operations staffs, GMs of professional sports franchises are primarily responsible for making decisions regarding player personnel (Farris, 2011; Gamson & Scotch, 1964; Wong & Deubert, 2010). Similarly, Rowe, Cannella, Rankin, and Gorman (2005) stated that hiring a coach, personnel evaluation, conducting contract negotiations, managing player trades, drafting amateur players, operating training camps, and determining what players will make up the team roster are the tasks of a NHL GM. In an effort to provide clarity regarding the roles of professional sport GMs, Hatfield, Wrenn, and Bretting (1987) surveyed GMs from the major spectator sport leagues in North America. The results of their study showed that GMs perceived task areas related to labour relations and personnel evaluations as more important than all other task areas (i.e., marketing, administration, public relations).

In the NHL, each franchise has a hockey operations department, which, for some organizations, is overseen by the president of hockey operations. This position is relatively new, with only six franchises in the League having adopted this senior level executive position as of the 2015-2016 season. Nevertheless, GMs have led the hockey operations departments of NHL franchises since the League's inception. Other members working within a typical hockey operations department under the tutelage of the GM include one or two assistant GMs (AGMs), a director of hockey operations and/or director of hockey administration, a director of player development, a scouting director, and several others. The personnel structure of each franchise's hockey operations department varies, as do individuals' titles, depending on the perceived needs of the team and the GM's desired structure (King, 2008).

Similar to how hockey operations' personnel structures differ amongst franchises, so do the duties of GMs. The difference in explicit duties between GMs may be a result of the capabilities and resulting duties of the other members of each GM's hockey operations staffs. Within each franchise's department of hockey operations, different individuals possess unique capabilities that support the operations of the department.

Devine and Foster (2006) conducted an interview with Scott Howson in an effort to further understand the responsibilities of a NHL GM and his hockey operations staff. At the time of the interview, Howson was the AGM of the Edmonton Oilers. When asked about making player personnel decisions, Howson stated that Kevin Lowe, GM of the Oilers at the time, relied heavily on the input of the other members of the hockey operations staff. However, Howson pointed out that, as the GM, Lowe was the ultimate decision maker. Howson also stated that as a member of a hockey operations staff, it is critical to learn from more experienced NHL GMs because professional sports is a unique management context. This statement highlights the potential for leader development through mentoring relationships within the hockey operations staffs of NHL franchises.

As noted throughout this literature review, mentoring is a vast and complex area of research due, in part, to the variety of contexts in which mentoring relationships can exist. Further, the benefits that often accompany a mentoring relationship for the protégé, mentor, and/or organization make the concept of mentoring a fruitful domain of inquiry. Despite the many contexts in which mentoring has been studied in over the past number of decades, there remains a dearth of research on mentoring among professional sport executives. This study attempts to fill this void and shed light on the effects of NHL GMs' mentoring relationships with key members of their hockey operations staffs.

Specifically, this study intends to highlight who the most prolific GM-mentors in the history of the NHL have been, which functions they provided to their respective protégés, and what the perceived benefits of these relationships may be.

## **Methods**

This study utilized an explanatory sequential mixed methods research design (Creswell, 2014). The goal of the quantitative method was to determine who the most prolific NHL GMs have been in their roles as mentors since the inception of the NHL. For the purpose of this study, a GM (i.e., mentor) is considered to be successful when a member of his<sup>1</sup> hockey operations staff (i.e., protégé) becomes a NHL GM later in his career. Data for this phase of the study were obtained from NHL team media guides dating back to 1940, which were accessed from the Hockey Hall of Fame (HHoF) Resource Centre in Toronto, ON.

It should be noted that NHL franchises' hockey operations staffs have grown considerably over time. When the League was founded, hockey operations staffs were less formally structured and consisted of one or two individuals who were often also coaches and/or players on the team. As the NHL and its franchises evolved into sophisticated business entities, hockey operations staffs have expanded to include up to ten or more individuals. Key members of these operations staffs were selected as protégés, as they generally have the greatest levels of interaction with the GM and are seen as positions that prepare individuals to become GMs (Devine & Foster, 2006; King, 2008). Positions at the 'manager' or 'director' level were evaluated, including: AGMs, Special Assistants to the General Manager (SAGM), Directors of Hockey Operations

---

<sup>1</sup> To date, all NHL GMs have been male.

(DHO) and/or Directors of Hockey Administration (DHA), Directors of Player Personnel (DPP), Directors of Player Development (DPD), Directors of Pro Scouting (DPS), Directors of Amateur Scouting (DAS), and Directors of Hockey Administration (DHA).

Once the quantitative data were collected, determining a GM's success as a mentor was accomplished in two ways. First, effectiveness was measured by tallying the total number of protégés who have gone on to become GMs later in their respective careers. Second, efficiency was measured in terms of the total number of protégés who have gone on to become GMs later in their respective careers, divided by the total number of years that the GM-mentor has/had been active in this role.

After these two measures of success were calculated, a *K*-means cluster analysis was used to identify who the most prolific GM-mentors have been in the history of the NHL. A cluster analysis is used to group '*N*' observations into '*K*' clusters, where each observation belongs to a more similar cluster than those observations outside the cluster. This analysis clustered similarly prolific GM-mentors together, highlighting a significantly meaningful group of the most prolific GM-mentors. Efficiency scores were standardized to ensure the two measures of success were on the same scale, which allowed the *K*-means cluster analysis to allocate similar significance to both measures when identifying the most significantly meaningful group of GM-mentors.

Once the most prolific GM-mentors were identified through the *K*-means cluster analysis, the qualitative inquiry began. The purpose of the qualitative method was to uncover the factors that contributed to the various GMs' success as mentors. This was accomplished through document and audiovisual analyses (Creswell, 2014), using the following sources: published biographies, recorded interviews with the GMs, protégés,

and/or others in the GMs' hockey operations staffs, newspaper and/or magazine articles, and books. These sources, which were retrieved via the World Wide Web, the HHoF Resource Centre, and the University of Windsor's Leddy Library, provided the researcher with a variety of viewpoints and opinions regarding the factors that contributed to each GMs' success as a mentor. The names of each identified GM-mentor, along with the following words, were used as search terms: biography, mentor, protégé, and leader. Data derived within the formal mentor-protégé relationship context, as well as from relationships involving other members of hockey operations staffs, and while the GM-mentors were in positions other than GM were considered. Using these complementary data helped to illuminate the potential factors that have led to the GM-mentors' success.

Once these qualitative data were collected, an analysis procedure was followed in order to make sense out of them (Creswell, 2014). The first step in this analysis involved organizing and preparing the data for examination. After the materials that were identified in the collection process were organized accordingly, all of the data were read and/or observed in order to make notes about potential themes that aided in the formation of codes. Coding is the organizing of information by bracketing chunks of text or image data and labelling each of them with a word that represents a category (Creswell, 2014). For the purposes of this study, predetermined codes consisted of the five career and four psychosocial functions of mentoring that were outlined by Kram (1983). These functions were selected as codes because the general purpose of this study was to determine the factors that led to GMs' success as mentors. Aside from these predetermined codes, the researcher developed additional codes based on information that emerged in the coding

process (Creswell, 2014). Throughout the qualitative analysis, QSR Nvivo software was employed to organize, manage, code, and analyze the data (QSR International, 2015).

### **Trustworthiness, ethical considerations, and philosophical approach.**

The researcher completed the following steps to ensure the project's trustworthiness: 1) a peer audit of the quantitative data collection was conducted; 2) the measures of success were calculated multiple times to ensure their accuracy; 3) the researcher's interpretation of data was evaluated against his advisor's, and; 4) an autobiography has been included to account for any potential biases in the researcher's interpretation of the data (see Appendix A). Since qualitative research is interpretive, researchers are encouraged to identify their biases, values, and personal backgrounds (Creswell, 2014). Moreover, since this project had no human participants and the information being researched was publicly available and was not sensitive in nature, ethical clearance from the University of Windsor's Research Ethics Board was not required (Interagency Secretariat on Research Ethics, 2010).

Finally, as Creswell (2014) acknowledges, it is important for researchers to explain the philosophical approach that guided their study. Through an evaluation of the four different approaches identified by Creswell, a pragmatic approach was utilized for this study. Pragmatism allows researchers to draw from both quantitative and qualitative assumptions when engaging in research because they work to provide the best understanding of the research problem.

### **Results**

The results are presented in two sections. The first section presents descriptive statistics of the quantitative results, outlines the effectiveness and standardized efficiency

scores for the top ten GM-mentors, statistics from the *K*-means cluster analysis, and who the most prolific GM-mentors are in the history of the NHL. The second section provides a brief biography of each GM-mentor, information about the protégés of the most prolific GM-mentors, and a synopsis of the primary themes resulting from the qualitative research methodology.

### **Quantitative results.**

Based on data retrieved from team media guides, there have only been 187 people who have held the position of GM for a NHL franchise since the League's inception (through the 2014-2015 season). Assisting these GMs were 1540 potential protégés who held positions among clubs' hockey operations staffs at the manager or director level. The average tenure of the GMs was 9.041 years ( $SD = 6.820$ ) and the average number of protégés that worked within each GM's hockey operations staff was 6.900 ( $SD = 4.000$ ).

Once these quantitative data were organized, the two measures of success were calculated. Table 2 shows the effectiveness and standardized efficiency scores of the top ten GM-mentors (including ties), sorted by effectiveness. It is noteworthy that the three GM-mentors with the highest effectiveness scores have standardized efficiency scores that are fairly unique to one another. Cliff Fletcher, for example, had an effectiveness score of five, which was tied for the highest. However, his 28 years as general manager in the NHL, lowered his efficiency score considerably. Thus, his standardized efficiency score was relatively low compared to the other two equally effective GM-mentors.

Table 3 displays the effectiveness and standardized efficiency scores of the top ten GM-mentors (including ties), sorted by standardized efficiency. As Cliff Fletcher's longevity as a GM in the NHL had a negative impact on his standardized efficiency

score, Phil Esposito, Mel Bridgman, and Larry Gordon's standardized efficiency scores were relatively high due to their very short careers as NHL GMs. Of note, the only GMs included in *both* top ten tables are Jack Ferreira, Rick Dudley, and Randy Sexton. Scotty Bowman was tied for the highest effectiveness score, but narrowly missed being included in the top ten GM-mentors, when sorted by standardized efficiency.

The results of the *K*-means cluster analysis revealed that the most appropriate number of significantly different clusters was five ( $p < 0.001$ ,  $F = 437.456; 292.185$ ), with three GM-mentors included in the cluster of the most prolific GM-mentors (see Table 4). Compared to analyses involving two, three, four, or six clusters, the five cluster analysis yielded the largest *F*-statistics, while providing a manageable number ( $N = 3$ ) of prolific GM-mentors to examine in the qualitative portion of the study.

The three most prolific GM-mentors in the history of the NHL, as identified via the *K*-means cluster analysis, were Rick Dudley, Jack Ferreira, and Scotty Bowman. Each of these individuals has fairly balanced effectiveness and standardized efficiency scores. Attaining high scores for both measures of success was important, as the *K*-means cluster analysis deemed both factors to be statistically significant. Thus, if a particular GM-mentor had a low score on either of the measures, they were not identified as one the most prolific GM-mentors. Bowman had the most unbalanced scores of these prolific GM-mentors, with an effectiveness score of 5 and a standardized efficiency score of 2.273. Although some GM-mentors had higher standardized efficiency scores than Bowman, these individuals all had lower effectiveness scores.

### **Qualitative results.**

In sum, 89 unique sources of qualitative information about Rick Dudley, Jack Ferreira, and Scotty Bowman were identified, yielding over 200 data points that were subsequently coded and analyzed. Where possible, quotes from relationships between these GM-mentors and their protégés (as defined in this study) have been used as representative samples of the data that were retrieved. As necessary, quotes involving these GM-mentors and other members of their hockey operations staffs were also used to illuminate the kinds of mentoring functions that were likely provided to their protégés.

#### ***Rick Dudley.***

Dudley played in the NHL and World Hockey Association (WHA) with skill and tenacity, while compiling 451 points and 808 penalty minutes in 579 games from 1972 through 1981 with the Buffalo Sabres, Cincinnati Stingers, and Winnipeg Jets (hockeyDB, 2015a). Following his retirement as a player, Dudley purchased the East Coast Hockey League's (ECHL) Carolina franchise and assumed the dual roles of GM and Coach. Dudley also served as the ECHL President from 1983 to 1986, and has an extensive coaching resume, having coached four teams in the minor leagues, and three in the NHL (Hockey Hall of Fame, 2015).

Since returning to the NHL as the Head Coach of the Buffalo Sabres in 1989, Dudley has been a coach or executive with a NHL franchise nearly every year. He accepted his first NHL GM position with the Ottawa Senators in 1998. One season later, he left to become GM of the Tampa Bay Lightning, where he remained for three seasons. Shortly after being released by Tampa Bay in February of 2002, Dudley was hired as GM of the Florida Panthers, but was replaced two seasons later by Panthers' Head Coach,

Mike Keenan. Later that year, Dudley joined the Chicago Blackhawks and by 2006 was Dale Tallon's AGM (Willis, 2012). In 2010, Dudley became GM of the Atlanta Thrashers, but was terminated one year later when the team was relocated to Winnipeg by a new ownership group. Dudley was subsequently hired as DPP for the Toronto Maple Leafs from 2011 to 2012. On May 9, 2012, he joined the Montreal Canadiens as AGM, serving under Marc Bergevin. As AGM of the Chicago Blackhawks from 2006 to 2009, Dudley mentored Bergevin who was starting his executive career within the Blackhawks' organization. In 2015, Dudley was promoted to Senior VP, Hockey Operations (Montreal Canadiens, 2015).

As seen in Table 5, Dudley has mentored four successful protégés to date, with the average formal mentoring term with each protégé lasting 1.5 years. Specifically, Ray Shero and Jay Feaster were AGMs, while Marshall Johnston was DPP and Andre Savard was DS in Dudley's hockey operations staffs.

***Jack Ferreira.***

Ferreira began his career in hockey as a goaltender at Boston University, and then moved into the collegiate coaching ranks with Princeton University in 1969 and Brown University one year later. After two years at Brown University, he became the Head Scout and AGM of the New England Whalers of the WHA. Upon leaving the Whalers in 1977, he joined the NHL's Central Scouting Service for three years, then later became a scout for the Calgary Flames, and eventually DPD for the New York Rangers in 1986 (Los Angeles Kings, 2015). Ferreira's ascension through the NHL's executive ranks continued when he became GM of the Minnesota North Stars from 1988 to 1990 and then the expansion San Jose Sharks for three seasons. After a brief stint in Montreal as DPS,

Ferreira became GM of the expansion Anaheim Mighty Ducks in 1993 for five seasons. Following his tenure with Anaheim, he became DPP and AGM for the expansion Atlanta Thrashers (Los Angeles Kings, 2015). Due in part to his relationship with Los Angeles Kings' GM Dean Lombardi, Ferreira is currently SAGM for the franchise. Ferreira worked closely with Lombardi in Minnesota and San Jose, where Lombardi was a junior member of Ferreira's hockey operations staffs. Over 43 seasons in professional hockey as an executive, Ferreira has spent nine seasons as a GM and many more as a scout.

As seen in Table 6, Ferreira mentored five successful protégés, with the average formal mentoring term with each protégé lasting just over 2 years. Dean Lombardi and Pierre Gauthier were AGMs, while Chuck Grillo was DPP and DPS, Les Jackson was DAS, and Craig Button was DS in his hockey operations staffs.

***Scotty Bowman.***

Bowman began his coaching career as an 18 year old in Quebec and later became a coach for the Montreal Canadiens' farm team, the Montreal Junior Canadiens. In 1967, Bowman was hired by the expansion St. Louis Blues where he was the coach for four years and GM for three of those years. He returned to the Montreal Canadiens in 1971 for eight years as Head Coach, winning five Stanley Cups (Chicago Blackhawks, 2015). Bowman was then hired by the Buffalo Sabres where he served as Head coach for seven years and GM for nine. After a two year stint as Coach and DPP with the Pittsburgh Penguins from 1991 to 1993, which included a Stanley Cup championship, he spent the remainder of his coaching career with the Detroit Red Wings, capturing three more Stanley Cups and becoming the NHL's all-time winningest coach. From 1994 to 1997, Bowman was also the Wings' GM (hockeyDB, 2015b). Currently, Bowman is in his

eighth season with the Chicago Blackhawks as a senior advisor to his son, Stan, who is GM of the Blackhawks. With Chicago, the father-son duo have won three Stanley Cup championships, which increases Scotty's total to twelve.

As seen in Table 7, Bowman mentored five successful protégés, with the average formal mentoring term with each protégé lasting 2.4 years. Cliff Fletcher, Gerry Meehan, and Ken Holland were AGMs, while Jim Nill was DAS and Tim Murray was DS in his hockey operations staffs. Although not identified as a protégé in this study, Stan Bowman undoubtedly received a variety of informal mentoring functions from his father, which presumably benefitted him in building three Stanley Cup championship teams to date.

In sum, the most prolific GM-mentors were responsible for mentoring 14 future NHL GMs over the course of 28.5 years. Prior to becoming GMs themselves, and while working with the most prolific GM-mentors identified in this study, seven of these protégés served as AGM, three were DS, two were DAS, one was DPP, and another was DPS who was later promoted to DPP.

***Key themes.***

As noted in Table 8, the *coaching* function was the most prevalent among each of these prolific GM-mentors. Through their coaching, GM-mentors provided their protégés with knowledge and understanding about how to successfully operate within their roles as members of their hockey operations staffs. In many cases, GM-mentors offered coaching that protégés may not have received from other people in hockey. Because of the unique hockey-related experiences and skills that the GM-mentors had gained through their many years of involvement in the business, they were able to pass on strategies and tactics to their protégés that ultimately aided in their future career success. For instance,

John Torchetti, who was mentored by Dudley in various coaching positions in the ECHL, as well as with the Panthers' in 2002 and 2003, stated that:

On road trips, I would stay up talking with Rick about the game until like three, four, or five in the morning. We talked about everything, from working out to training and from the management side to the psychology of coaching. He'd have to finally tell me at about four thirty in the morning, 'Enough, Torch. Get to bed, because you have a game tomorrow.' (Burson & Hart, 2011, p. 139)

This quote demonstrates the effort that Dudley put forth in passing along his knowledge to his protégés regarding a variety of different aspects of hockey.

Another example of a GM-mentor providing coaching to one of his protégés was Ferreira while he was an advisor to Lombardi, GM of the Kings. When Lombardi began his executive career as AGM with the Minnesota North Stars from 1988 to 1990, Ferreira was GM. Nearly two decades later, Lombardi hired Ferreira to be his SAGM with the Kings. Lombardi expressed that, as SAGM, Ferreira would often recommend players to be called up from the Kings' minor league affiliate. Leading up to their Stanley Cup championship year in 2012, Lombardi claimed that Ferreira "was the guy who was banging on the table in October, saying, 'Get those (bleeping) guys out here. Get (Jordan) Nolan and (Dwight) King up here'" (Hammond, 2012, ¶ 39). Nolan and King ended up being pivotal members of the Kings' championship team approximately nine months later. This example of coaching demonstrated that Ferreira was able to pass along specific information to Lombardi regarding player personnel decisions, which ultimately aided Lombardi in building a championship team.

Perhaps the best example of a GM-mentor providing coaching to one of his protégés was Red Wings' Senior Advisor Bowman passing wisdom on to Head Coach Mike Babcock. Three years after Bowman relinquished his coaching position with the Wings in 2002, Mike Babcock took over as head coach. In the years that followed, Bowman and Babcock developed a mentoring relationship in which Bowman would offer daily coaching to Babcock about player personnel decisions and tactics for motivating players. Regarding their mentoring relationship, Babcock stated that having someone to discuss issues with, who has already been through what he was going through, was the greatest aspect of their relationship (Wolfe, 2010). The notion of GM-mentors passing on information to their protégés was highlighted throughout the qualitative findings.

*Sponsorship* was the second most common function provided by the GM-mentors. Sometimes GM-mentors nominated protégés for positions within their organizations or leveraged their networks to promote protégés for positions in other franchises. An example of sponsorship involving one of the GM-mentors identified in this study was Torchetti being a coach for three of the four NHL franchises that Dudley was the GM of. In fact, Dudley's sponsorship of Torchetti led to Dudley's eventual dismissal as Panthers' GM. After firing Head Coach Mike Keenan, Dudley took over as the interim Head Coach and promptly promoted Torchetti as his assistant. At the end of that season, Panthers' majority owner Alan Cohen wanted to hire free agent coach Jacques Martin. However, Dudley wanted to promote Torchetti instead. The disagreement ultimately led to Cohen firing Dudley in order to hire Martin (Cadmus, 2005; Hyde, 2003).

Ferreira also provided sponsorship when he took over as GM of the expansion San Jose Sharks in 1990. After giving Lombardi his first NHL executive job as AGM

with the Minnesota North Stars in 1988, Ferreira's first hire with the Sharks was once again his long time protégé Lombardi. These two individuals' mentoring relationship dates back to the mid-1970s where Ferreira coached Lombardi in a pick-up hockey league (Hammond, 2012). Since that time, Ferreira has been providing many mentoring functions to Lombardi, particularly sponsoring him for multiple career promotions and desirable lateral moves. In one instance, Ferreira leveraged his network to connect Lombardi with Lamoriello, who shared with Lombardi his blueprint for how to structure a NHL hockey operations staff (Rosen, 2012). In general, GM-mentors used their positions of power to directly impact the career success of their protégés.

Despite being found less frequently, challenging assignments and protection were also provided by the GM-mentors. *Challenging assignments* involves mentors assigning difficult tasks to protégés, enabling them to develop specific competencies (Kram, 1983). As one example, Ferreira furnished Lombardi with opportunities to develop his skills in negotiating player contracts. Ferreira stated that he "wanted him [Lombardi] to do all the contracts and be my assistant..." (Hammond, 2012, ¶ 21). This assignment, provided by Ferreira, was an opportunity for Lombardi to gain skills and experience regarding player contracts. Today, Lombardi is recognized as a leading expert in player contract negotiations. Like this example, GM-mentors provided their protégés with opportunities to specialize in competencies that were crucial to being successful as a NHL GM.

*Protection* involves insulating protégés from damaging interactions with key figures in the organization (Kram, 1983). Regarding the protection provided by the GM-mentors in this study, Hall of Famer and former Montreal Canadiens goaltender Ken Dryden (1990) described how Bowman attempted to shield members of his operations

staff from getting fired while GM of the St. Louis Blues. After a disappointing end to the season and an unpleasant trip home from Minnesota, Bowman met with the son of the principal owner of the team, Sid Salomon III. Salomon made it clear that he did not want Al Arbour as the head coach, Cliff Fletcher as Bowman's AGM, or Tommy Woodcock as the team's trainer the following season. After a fiery meeting between Bowman and Salomon, Bowman resigned because he did not agree with dismissing the other members of his staff. This type of protection was noted throughout the data, with multiple people claiming that GM-mentors lost their jobs in attempts to safeguard their protégés.

Although psychosocial functions were found less frequently than career functions, there were still several instances of GM-mentors providing protégés with counseling and friendship. *Counseling* enables protégés to explore personal concerns with their mentors, while *friendship* is classified as social interactions that result in mutual liking and informal exchanges between mentors and their protégés (Kram, 1983). In reference to the counseling function provided by Bowman, Wolfe (2010) stated that:

Mike Babcock and Scotty Bowman converse regularly. Sometimes they even talk about hockey. Often, though, their discussions have nothing to do with rink-related matters. "I know about his family and he knows about my family," said Babcock.... "You build a relationship over time." (¶ 1)

Before Bowman left Detroit to work with his son in Chicago, Babcock would call Bowman almost every day to gain his counsel on anything from hockey to family life.

Perhaps the most powerful example of a GM-mentor providing counseling to a protégé occurred in Dudley's mentorship with Clint Malarchuk, a former NHL goalie. Dudley and Malarchuk got to know each other while Malarchuk was a goalie coach for

the Panthers and Dudley was GM. The two men stayed closely connected while Malarchuk battled through several years of mental illness.

He [Malarchuk] told her [Joanie, Malarchuk's wife] to call Dudley if it ever seemed like he'd lost control. Dudley was the only one who knew how to talk him off the trigger. That's why, mid-season in 2007, Dudley shunned his duties as the assistant GM of the Chicago Blackhawks and made an emergency trip to Nevada...[where] Dudley and Joanie managed to get Malarchuk to a doctor's office in Reno. (Robson, 2012, ¶ 25)

All of the GM-mentors offered counseling to their protégés. Sometimes the counseling was about family and personal issues, while in Malarchuk's case, the counseling provided by Dudley could have proven the difference between life and death.

Friendship was also offered to the protégés of the GM-mentors identified in this study. For example, in 2010, Bowman cancelled plans to attend golf's British Open so he could help Babcock raise funds for the Children's Hospital Foundation of Saskatoon (Wolfe, 2010). Dudley and Malarchuk's relationship also incorporated friendship. In reference to the friendship between Dudley and Malarchuk, Robson (2012) wrote:

Once, as the Panthers' owner was speaking to Dudley in his office, Malarchuk did a striptease behind him. Dudley tried to keep a straight face as Malarchuk laid down on a desk in the room directly across the hall, tucking his unmentionables between his legs, posing like a centerfold. (¶ 20)

The friendship demonstrated between Dudley and Malarchuk in this quote would not have been possible if Dudley did not reciprocate the social interaction and enjoyable informal exchanges, which Kram outlines as characteristic of the friendship function.

Although there were relationships where friendship was evident, there were also many relationships where friendship was not found.

Aside from Kram's (1983) mentoring functions, emerging codes reflected Kram's phases of mentoring relationships. In particular, the *redefinition* phase was found in at least one mentoring relationship involving each of the GM-mentors. After years of separation from their GM-mentors, protégés often hired their former mentors once in positions to do so. Reasons cited by protégés for hiring their mentors were because they liked working with them and/or wanted to continue receiving their coaching and counseling. For instance, Ferreira described how Lombardi approached him in 2006, approximately thirty-five years after their relationship began, to serve as his Senior Advisor with the Los Angeles Kings. Lombardi had just accepted a five year contract to be the Kings GM and his first hire was his mentor, Ferreira (Hammond, 2012).

Another example of redefinition involving a GM-mentor was Dudley being hired as the AGM with the Montreal Canadiens in 2012. As the AGM in Chicago from 2006 to 2009, Dudley mentored Marc Bergevin through his first few years as a NHL executive while he was DPS. In May of 2012, Bergevin was hired as the Canadiens' GM and his first hire was Dudley. When asked why he left the Maple Leafs' front office to join the Canadiens, Dudley stated that it was the opportunity to work with Bergevin. Regarding the new structure of their relationship Bergevin stated, "I don't look at it as being Duds's boss... We're a team. I don't make any decisions without running it by him..." (Hickey, 2012, ¶ 27). It is clear that Bergevin values Dudley's ability as a hockey executive, hence his reason for hiring him to be a part of his hockey operations staff.

Another key theme that was found is the concept of ‘promotion by association.’ This concept provides a possible explanation for how Bowman was found to be one of the most prolific GM-mentors, despite his aristocratic management style. Rather than being successful as a consequence of receiving many of the mentoring functions outlined by Kram (1983), Bowman’s protégés appear to have been successful in being hired as GMs later in their careers due to their professional associations with him. Terry Crisp, who once coached with and was mentored by Bowman, summarized Bowman’s management style by stating that, “One man runs the ship and only one man can run it. Scotty ruled with an iron fist” (Jackson, 2004, p. 156). Nevertheless, Bowman has been one of the most respected people in hockey for decades, being inducted into the HHoF as a builder in 1991, achieving the most wins all-time as a NHL Coach, and winning twelve Stanley Cup championships as a Coach and/or member of hockey operations staffs.

## **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to identify who the most prolific GM-mentors have been in the history of the NHL and the factors that led to their success as mentors. The quantitative results of this study identified Rick Dudley, Jack Ferreira, and Scotty Bowman as the most prolific GM-mentors in the history of the League. Aside from the findings that illuminated possible explanations for the GM-mentors’ success, the qualitative results revealed that half of the successful protégés were once AGMs. According to Hatfield et al. (1987), AGMs assist GMs with the management of player personnel and apprentice under GMs, making them obvious choices to become future GMs. Also, six of the successful protégés held a director of scouting position. As

directors of scouting, protégés also had opportunities to hone their player evaluation skills, making them desirable candidates to become future GMs (Hatfield et al., 1987).

Kram's (1983) mentoring functions served as predetermined codes for highlighting the factors that led to the most prolific GM-mentors' success. From this standpoint, coaching and sponsorship were most prevalent within the relationships involving the prolific GM-mentors in this study. This finding supports that of Ragins and Cotton (1999) who found coaching to be one of the most common mentoring functions offered to protégés by their mentors across a variety of industries. Additionally, in a study of mentoring relationships among doctoral students and their academic advisors, Beres and Dixon (2014) found that "in comparison with the other career mentoring functions, mentors reported the greatest number of coaching examples" (p. 20). The findings of the current study and others (i.e., Beres & Dixon, 2014; Ragins & Cotton, 1999) suggest that protégés will likely have an advantage over non-protégés in navigating their respective work environments and advancing their careers due to the coaching they may receive.

Further, in the current study, instances of sponsorship were found when GM-mentors would actively recruit protégés to work within their hockey operations staffs, or promote their protégés' to other franchise owners and GMs in an attempt to advance their careers elsewhere. As Kalicin (2013) highlighted, mentors who act as sponsors ensure that their protégés are promoted when opportunities arise to advance their careers. Further, when these opportunities do arise, it is important to have mentors who are high-reputation leaders and are willing to advocate on their protégés' behalf (Kalicin, 2013). This type of sponsorship was offered by all three GM-mentors to their protégés. Thus, it

is beneficial to the career success of NHL executives to have GM-mentors who are willing to sponsor their career advancement.

The results of this study also support Hoffmann and Loughhead's (2014) idea that psychosocial functions may be lacking among mentorships in organizational contexts because there are legitimate power distances between GM-mentors and the individuals they provided mentoring functions to. In their study of athlete mentoring functions' associations with leadership behaviours and protégé satisfaction, these authors found that athletes primarily offered psychosocial functions to their teammates. Being that there is not a legitimate power distance between athletes within the same team, they are less likely to provide career functions to their protégés. Conversely, the authors suggest that when a mentor is a protégé's supervisor within an organizational context, as in the current study, she or he is more likely to provide career functions to her or his protégé.

An alternative explanation for the limited evidence of psychosocial functions in this study is provided by Ragins and Cotton (1999), who stated that psychosocial functions only become present once a deep emotional bond is formed between mentor and protégé. Further, the cultivation stage, which lasts two to five years, is where mentorships become most intimate and psychosocial functions become more evident (Kram, 1983). Being that many of the mentorships in this study occurred in a formal context for two or fewer years, they may not have worked far enough through the cultivation phase for psychosocial functions to be provided. A final explanation as to why psychosocial functions may not have been present in the mentoring relationships examined in this study is that individuals may not have been comfortable divulging personal information to the sources used for this investigation. Additional research is

needed to better understand why so few psychosocial functions were identified within this study.

Additional qualitative analysis revealed that Dudley and Ferreira were in the redefinition phase of their mentoring relationships with several of their protégés. Currently, both GM-mentors are working within hockey operations staffs led by GMs who they previously mentored. Kram (1983) suggested that, due to the feelings of indebtedness experienced by protégés toward their mentors, they are motivated to provide opportunities to their mentors similar to those that they received earlier in their careers. By providing Dudley and Ferreira with work environments where they are valued, Bergevin and Lombardi are demonstrating their gratitude for the positive impact that their mentors had on their career successes, respectively. The findings of the current study support previous research (e.g., Chao, 1997; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Roche, 1979), which suggests that protégés often attempt to reciprocate the kindness they received from their mentors earlier in their career by offering career or psychosocial functions in return. Further, the current findings suggest that the phases of mentoring may be present in mentoring relationships among professional sport executives, which could provide researchers with a greater understanding of hiring practices within NHL franchises.

One may speculate how, due to his management style, Bowman was successful as a GM-mentor, particularly if a mentor's success is dependent upon her or his ability to provide mentoring functions to protégés. Kilduff and Krackhardt (1994) suggested that being connected to prominent others can enhance an individual's reputation and thus, her or his job mobility and career success. Further, in his study of mentorships within National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) Division I basketball coaching

networks, Mott (2009) highlighted that being associated with highly respected individuals can often increase one's performance reputation. Mott suggested that within the context of executives and coaches in professional and intercollegiate sport, the functions of mentoring should be expanded to include associations with prominent individuals. Kilduff, Crossland, Tsai, and Bowers (2015) advanced Mott's findings, demonstrating that National Football League (NFL) head coaches also benefitted from having high-reputation ties when seeking promotions. Other sport management literature (e.g., Hums & Goldsbury, 2015; King, 2008) acknowledges that getting a job and being promoted in the sport industry is considerably impacted by who one knows. Thus, Bowman's protégés' career success may be less attributable to the functions he provided to them and more a function of their association with a high-reputation leader in the NHL.

Another finding of this study supports that mentoring relationships can have considerable positive impacts on the organizations in which they occur. In fact, half of the successful protégés identified in this study got their first NHL GM jobs within the franchises where their mentoring relationships occurred. For example, Jay Feaster, three year protégé of Rick Dudley, succeeded Dudley as the GM of the Tampa Bay Lightning. Being able to hire a new GM from within the organization benefits the franchise by reducing socialization and on-boarding costs (Chandler, Hall, & Kram, 2010; Rowe, 2012). Moreover, Rowe et al. (2005) demonstrated that the longer a NHL GM has to develop organization-specific skills before stepping into this role, the better his team's performance (i.e., win percentage) will be. As the benefits of hiring internally-sourced GMs are evident, franchise owners may want to implement formal mentorship programs for their executive staffs. Doing so may increase the number and variety of mentoring

functions that GM-mentors offer to their protégés, thereby allowing protégés to achieve greater career (i.e., promotion to GM) and organizational success (i.e., improve team win percentage).

## **Conclusion**

The results of this study demonstrate that the mentoring functions provided by the most prolific GM-mentors in NHL history were coaching and sponsorship. This finding sheds light onto what makes mentors successful within the context of professional sport executives. Also, half of the successful protégés were hired by the franchises where their mentoring relationships occurred, providing considerable benefits to these organizations. Finally, the findings of this study add to the literature that acknowledges the positive outcomes of mentoring as a form of leader development in professional environments, and among professional sport executives in particular.

As with all research, there were certain delimitations and limitations associated with this study. Being that the purpose was to determine who the most prolific GM-mentors have been in the history of the NHL, executives from the other major spectator sport leagues within North America were not included. Further, in order to ensure consistency within the data collection process, certain positions of hockey operations staffs were omitted as protégés. However, individuals in the selected positions generally have the greatest levels of interaction with the GM and are often seen as positions that prepare individuals to become GMs (Devine & Foster, 2006; King, 2008).

Also, since this study intended to highlight GM-mentors who were successful in preparing protégés to become GMs later in their respective careers, it was determined that the best measures of this were effectiveness and efficiency. However, defining success in

these ways may have prevented some otherwise well-respected GMs from being identified among the most prolific GM-mentors. Ken Holland, for example, has been the Detroit Red Wings' GM for eighteen years and Jim Nill was his AGM for thirteen of these years. Nill was a successful protégé of Holland (becoming GM of the Dallas Stars in 2013), but Nill's lengthy tenure as the Wings' AGM may have limited Holland's potential to mentor other successful protégés. Thus, future researchers could incorporate the length of each mentorship as a success variable when attempting to identify the most prolific GM-mentors. Additionally, other measures of success, such as win percentage and Stanley Cup championships won by each GM-mentors' protégés, could be integrated into future research. Defining success in these ways may provide insights into other aspects of mentoring among NHL executives, including psychosocial functions.

Further, the sources that were used for the qualitative method were selected because they provided comprehensive channels of secondary qualitative data collection. Although considerable qualitative information about the factors that led to the GM-mentors' success were found, it is recognized that there are certain limitations with using secondary data sources. For example, the prolific GM-mentors identified in this study may have regulated what they said in interviews with journalists and other authors, resulting in a response bias within these secondary sources. Despite this limitation, the researcher was able to obtain valuable insight about the factors that led to the most prolific GM-mentors from their protégés and others who worked with them throughout their careers. Future researchers could pursue interviews with the GM-mentors and/or protégés that were identified in this study. Despite the fact that professional sport executives can be a difficult population to gain access to, interviewing these individuals

would likely provide researchers with a deeper understanding of the role that mentoring plays in leader development among NHL executives.

Another limitation of this study is the assumption that individuals who worked within a GM-mentor's hockey operations staff were actively engaged in some kind of mentoring relationship with their GMs. Also, it is possible that GM-mentors had relationships that occurred outside of this context, but were not included when determining the most prolific GM-mentors. For example, Ferreira and Clarke were identified as Lombardi's formal mentors, however Lombardi has also credited Lamoriello as his mentor as well. Thus, due to the way that success is defined in this study, Lombardi was a successful protégé for Ferreira and Clarke, but not for Lamoriello.

Finally, media guide archives at the HHoF Resource Centre begin in 1940. Thus, information on the members of hockey operations staffs before that time was not obtained. Franchises that remained in the League from 1917 to 1940 had less than three GMs and were often players and/or coaches on the team, with minimal (if any) other members on their hockey operations staffs. Consequently, GM-mentors from this time frame would likely not have been considered as one of the most prolific GM-mentors due to how success is defined in this study.

## References

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lenz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 127-136.
- Badenhausen, K. (2014, July 16). The world's 50 most valuable sports teams. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhausen/2014/07/16/the-worlds-50-most-valuable-sports-teams-2014/>
- Beres, J., & Dixon, J. C. (2014). Exploring mentoring functions within the sport management academy: Perspectives of mentors and protégés. *Sport Management Education Journal, 8*, 14-26.
- Brass, D. J. (2001). Social capital and organizational leadership. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership* (pp. 132–152). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burson, R., & Hart, G. (2011). *Lone star skate: Improbable (but true) stories of Texas' hockey heroes*. Brisbane, Australia: Bridgeway Books.
- Cadmus, A. (2005, July 11). The sports page. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from <http://home.myfairpoint.net/acadmus/sports.html>
- Chandler, D. E., Hall, D. T., & Kram, K. E. (2010). A developmental network and relational savvy approach to talent development: A low-cost alternative. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(1), 48-56.
- Chandler, D. E., Kram, K. E., & Yip, J. (2011). An ecological systems perspective on mentoring at work: A review and future prospects. *The Academy of Management Annals, 5*(1), 519-570.

- Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 15-28.
- Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 619-636.
- Chicago Blackhawks. (2015). *Scotty Bowman*. Retrieved from <http://blackhawks.nhl.com/club/page.htm?id=47738>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Day, V. D. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Devine, K., & Foster, W. M. (2006). Off-the-ice action in the National Hockey League: An interview with Scott Howson of the Edmonton Oilers. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(3), 290-298.
- Dryden, K. (1990). *The game*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 254-267.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10(4), 309-320.
- Farris, J. (2011). *Behind the moves: NHL general managers tell how winners are built*. West Vancouver, BC: circanow.media.

- Gamson, W., & Scotch, N. (1964). Scapegoating in baseball. *American Journal of Sociology*, 70(1), 69-76.
- Ghosh, R., & Reio, T. G. (2013). Career benefits associated with mentoring for mentors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 106-116.
- Hammond, R. (January 6, 2012). The man behind the man with the plan. *Los Angeles Kings*. Retrieved from <http://kings.nhl.com/club/news.htm?id=633507>
- Hatfield, B. D., Wrenn, J. P., & Bretting, M. M. (1987). Comparison of job responsibilities of intercollegiate athletic directors and professional sport general managers. *Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 129-145.
- Hickey, P. (2012, September 11). For new Habs GM, a hockey homecoming. *The Montreal Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://www.montrealgazette.com/sports/habs+hockey+homecoming/7233427/story.html>
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26, 264-288.
- hockeyDB. (2015a). *Rick Dudley*. Retrieved from <http://www.hockeydb.com/ihdb/stats/pdisplay.php?pid=1461>
- hockeyDB. (2015b). *Scotty Bowman*. Retrieved from <http://www.hockeydb.com/ihdb/stats/pdisplay.php?pid=528>
- Hockey Hall of Fame. (2015). *Rick Clarence Dudley*. Retrieved from <http://www.legendsofhockey.net/LegendsOfHockey/jsp/SearchPlayer.jsp?player=12498>

- Hoffmann, M. D., & Loughhead, T. M. (2015). Investigating athlete mentoring functions and their association with leadership behaviours and protégé satisfaction. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 22, 1-18.
- Homer. (1946). *The odyssey*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Hums, M. A., & Goldsbury, V. R. (2011). Strategies for career success. In L. P. Masteralexis, C. A. Barr, & M. A. Hums (4th ed.), *Principles and Practice of Sport Management* (pp. 543-559). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *The Academy of Management Review*, 8(3), 475-485.
- Hyde, D. (2003, March 7). Under new structure, Keenan really has no shot. *SunSentinel*. Retrieved from [http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2003-03-07/sports/0303070315\\_1\\_mike-keenan-rick-dudley-assistants](http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2003-03-07/sports/0303070315_1_mike-keenan-rick-dudley-assistants)
- Interagency Secretariat on Research Ethics. (2010). *Tri-council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Retrieved from [http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS\\_2\\_FINAL\\_Web.pdf](http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf)
- Jackson, J. (2004). *Walking together forever: The Broad Street Bullies, then and now*. Champaign, IL: Sports Publishing LLC
- Kalicin, S. (2013, November). Developing successful career relationships: Leveraging mentoring, coaching, and sponsorship. *Amstat News*, 437, 28-29.

- Kelly, D. D., & Dixon, M. A. (2014). Successfully navigating life transitions among African American male student-athletes: A review and examination of constellation mentoring as a promising strategy. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28, 498-514.
- Kilduff, M., Crossland, C., Tsai, W., & Bowers, M. T. (2015). Magnification and correction of the acolyte effect: Initial benefits and ex post settling up in NFL coaching careers. *Academy of Management Journal*. doi: 10.5465/amj.2014.0239
- Kilduff, M., & Krackhardt, D. (1994). Bringing the individual back in: A structural analysis of the internal market for reputation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 87-108.
- King, B. (2008, July 14). Path to the corner office. *Street & Smith's SportsBusiness Journal*, 1-21.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 608-625.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, D., Klein, E., Levinson, M., & McKee, B. (1978). *Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Los Angeles Kings. (2015). *Jack Ferreira*. Retrieved from <http://kings.nhl.com/club/page.htm?id=41335>

- Montreal Canadiens. (2015). *Rick Dudley*. Retrieved from <http://canadiens.nhl.com/club/page.htm?id=86414>
- Mott, J. W. (2009). *The role of human and social capital in the perpetuation of leader development* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3359151)
- National Hockey League. (2008). *History*. Retrieved from <http://www.nhl.com/history/timeline.html>
- Orpen, C. (1995). The effects of mentoring on employees' career success. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(5), 667-668.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 170-183.
- Packard, B. W. (2003). Student training promotes mentoring awareness and action. *The Career Development Quarterly, 51*(4), 335-345.
- Peterson, D. B. (1996). Executive coaching at work: The art of one-on-one change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 78-86.
- Popper, M. (2005). Main principles and practices in leader development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*(1/2), 62-75.
- QSR International. (2015). *Products*. Retrieved from <http://www.qsrinternational.com/products.aspx>
- Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 6*, 1177-1194.

- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, L. J. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(4), 529-550.
- Robson, D. (2012, May 3). Clint Malarchuk, the survivor. *Sportsnet Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsnet.ca/magazine/clint-malarchuk-the-survivor-dan-robson/>
- Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(1), 14-20.
- Rosen, D. (2012, May 11). Kings GM Lombardi feels indebted to pair of mentors. *NHL.com*. Retrieved from <http://kings.nhl.com/club/news.htm?id=631405>
- Rowe, W. G. (2012). Debunking the “proven winner myth in the National Hockey League. *Ivey Business Journal Online, 1*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.uwindsor.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1039395815?accountid=14789>
- Rowe, W. G., Cannella, A. A., Rankin, D., & Gorman, D. (2005). Leader succession and organizational performance: Integrating the common-sense, ritual scapegoating, and vicious-circle succession theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 197-219.
- Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.
- Scandura, T. A., & Viator, R. E. (1994). Mentoring in public accounting firms: An analysis of mentor-protégé relationships, mentorship functions, and protégé turnover intentions. *Accounting, Organizations, and Society, 19*(8), 717-734.

- Singh, R., Ragins, B. R., & Tharenou, P. (2009). What matters most? The relative role of mentoring and career capital in career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75, 56-67.
- Waldman, D. A., & Atwater, L. E. (1998). Has 360-degree feedback gone amok? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 12(2), 86-94.
- Wasburn, M. H., & Crispo, A. W. (2006). Strategic collaboration: Developing a more effective mentoring model. *Review of Business*, 27(1), 18-25.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *QUEST*, 51, 24-38.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Mentoring in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 96-116.
- Willis, J. (2012, March 8). Leafs' executive Rick Dudley has run four NHL teams – Should he get a fifth? *Edmonton Journal*. Retrieved from <http://edmontonjournal.com/sports/hockey/nhl/cult-of-hockey/leafs-executive-rick-dudley-has-run-four-nhl-teams-should-he-get-a-fifth>
- Wilson, J. A., & Elman, N. S. (1990). Organizational benefits of mentoring. *The Executive*, 4(4), 88-94.
- Wolfe, C. (2010, June 8). Babcocks, Bowmans enjoy special bond. *The Star Phoenix*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.pe.ca/Sports/Football/2010-06-08/article1276484/Babcocks,-Bowmans-enjoy-special-bond/1>
- Wong, G. M., & Deubert, C. (2010). Major League Baseball general managers: An analysis of their responsibilities, qualifications, and characteristics. *Nine: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, 18(2), 74-121.

Tables

Table 1

*Kram's (1985) Mentoring Functions and Definitions*

Function	Definition
<b>Career Functions</b>	
Sponsorship	Involves actively nominating the protégé for promotions or desirable lateral moves.
Exposure and Visibility	Involves assigning responsibilities that allow the protégé to develop relationships with key figures in the organization.
Coaching	Enhances the protégé's knowledge and understanding of how to navigate effectively in the corporate world.
Protection	Involves shielding the protégé from damaging or untimely contact with key figures of the organization.
Challenging Assignments	Involves the assignment of challenging work which enables the protégé to develop specific competencies and experience a sense of accomplishment in a professional role.
<b>Psychosocial Functions</b>	
Role Modeling	The mentor's attitudes, values, and behaviour provide a desirable model for the protégé.
Acceptance and Confirmation	Enables the protégé to experiment with new behaviours due to the previous establishment of a basic trust which encourages the protégé to take risks.
Counseling	Enables the protégé to explore personal concerns with the mentor.
Friendship	Social interaction that results in mutual liking and enjoyable informal exchanges about work and outside work experiences.

Table 2

*Top Ten GM-mentors Sorted by Effectiveness*

General Manager	Effectiveness	Standardized Efficiency
Cliff Fletcher	5	0.895
Scotty Bowman	5	2.273
Jack Ferreira	5	3.125
Rick Dudley	4	2.857
Pierre Gauthier	4	1.818
Bryan Murray	4	0.952
Randy Sexton	3	3.750
Doug Armstrong	3	1.250
Pierre Lacroix	3	1.250
Pat Quinn	3	1.000
Brian Burke	3	0.938
Larry Pleau	3	0.938
Bob Gainey	3	0.882
Ken Holland	3	0.833
Bob Pulford	3	0.714
Bill Torrey	3	0.652
Harry Sinden	3	0.625

Table 3

*Top Ten GM-mentors Sorted by Standardized Efficiency*

General Manager	Effectiveness	Standardized Efficiency
Phil Esposito	2	5.000
Mel Bridgman	1	5.000
Larry Gordon	1	5.000
Randy Sexton	3	3.750
Alex Delvecchio	2	3.333
Marshall Johnston	2	3.333
Jacques Martin	2	3.333
Jack Ferreira	5	3.125
Rick Dudley	4	2.857
Ned Harkness	2	2.500
Ted Lindsay	2	2.500
Pierre Page	2	2.500
Nick Beverley	1	2.500
Gord Stellick	1	2.500

Table 4

*ANOVA Table for Five Clusters*

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>p</i>
Effectiveness	4	437.456	0.125	< 0.001
Standardized Efficiency	4	292.185	0.135	< 0.001

Table 5

*Rick Dudley's Protégés*

Protégé	Beginning of Term	End of Term	Term Length (years)	Position	Franchise
Ray Shero	1998	1999	1	AGM	Ottawa
Marshall Johnston	1998	1999	1	DPP	Ottawa
Andre Savard	1998	1999	1	DS	Ottawa
Jay Feaster	1999	2002	3	AGM	Tampa Bay

*Notes:* AGM = Assistant General Manager, DPP = Director of Player Personnel, DS = Director of Scouting.

Table 6

*Jack Ferreira's Protégés*

Protégé	Beginning of Term	End of Term	Term Length (years)	Position	Franchise
Dean Lombardi	1988	1990	2.5	AGM	Minnesota
Chuck Grillo	1988	1990	2.5	DPS	Minnesota
Les Jackson	1988	1990	2.5	DAS	Minnesota
Craig Button	1989	1990	1	DS	Minnesota
Dean Lombardi	1991	1992	1	AGM	San Jose
Chuck Grillo	1991	1992	1	DPP	San Jose
Pierre Gauthier	1993	1995	2	AGM	Anaheim

*Notes:* AGM = Assistant General Manager, DPS = Director of Pro Scouting, DAS = Director of Amateur Scouting, DS = Director of Scouting, DPP = Director of Player Personnel.

Table 7

*Scotty Bowman's Protégés*

Protégé	Beginning of Term	End of Term	Term Length (years)	Position	Franchise
Cliff Fletcher	1969	1971	2	AGM	St. Louis
Gerry Meehan	1983	1986	3	AGM	Buffalo
Ken Holland	1994	1997	3	AGM	Detroit
Jim Nill	1994	1995	1	DAS	Detroit
Tim Murray	1994	1995	1	DS	Detroit

*Notes:* AGM = Assistant General Manager, DAS = Director of Amateur Scouting, DS = Director of Scouting.

Table 8

*Functions Offered by Each GM-mentor*

	Rick Dudley	Jack Ferreira	Scotty Bowman	Total
<b>Career Functions</b>				
Coaching	9	8	19	36
Sponsorship	9	7	5	21
Challenging assignments	2	3	--	5
Exposure and visibility	--	--	--	0
Protection	--	--	1	1
<b>Psychosocial Functions</b>				
Counseling	5	3	2	10
Friendship	4	2	2	8
Role Modeling	--	--	--	0
Acceptance and confirmation	--	--	--	0

## EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Leadership**

Leadership research has increased dramatically in the past decade (Dinh et al., 2014) and, consequently, a plethora of theories have been formed in an attempt to understand the ever-evolving phenomenon. Hicks and Gullett (1998) wrote that the art of leadership “energizes the potential of people and gets brilliant results. Thus, existence of leadership is essential and unavoidable for organizations to remain successful” (p. 90). Nearly everyone has witnessed the effect, either positive or negative, that leadership can have on an individual, team, or organization. Despite this reality, leadership has been challenging to define due to the many dynamics associated with most leadership scenarios (Dinh et al., 2014).

Although defining leadership has been a struggle, researchers have forged ahead in their attempt to do so. For example, Barrow (1977) defined leadership as, “the behavioral process of influencing individuals and groups towards set goals” (p. 232). The importance of the term ‘influence’ to the definition of leadership seems to be of some consensus among researchers. In his study of paratroop companies, Popper (1996) found one company outperformed others in a training course due to their levels of identification and motivation, which he deemed to be a product of their leader’s influence. These results are reinforced by Kotter (1988) who defined leadership as a process of moving people in a particular direction through non-coercive means. Further empirical research supports the importance of emotional influence in the definition of leadership. In his investigation of nearly 200 large global companies, Goleman (1998) found that emotional

intelligence, which is a skill leaders possess when they are able to influence others, carries twice the weight of IQ in accounting for excellence in work performance.

From 2000-2012, there were 752 articles published in 10 top-tier psychology and management journals, demonstrating both the intrigue and impact leadership has on researchers (Dinh et al., 2014). Currently, there are eight established and six emerging thematic categories of leadership, which are comprised of 66 leadership theory domains. While some theories focus on behaviours and traits related to initiating structure and consideration (e.g., trait theories of leadership; Colbert, Judge, Choi, & Wang, 2012; Seltzer & Bass, 1990), other theories incorporate a broader view that sees leaders elevate the interests of their followers when they adopt the purpose and mission of the group. This process is sometimes called the ‘new leadership’ perspective (e.g., transformational leadership; Burns, 1978; Seltzer & Bass, 1990).

For as many leadership theories exist, the contexts in which they have been studied are even greater. Empirical studies regarding leadership theory have occurred in contexts such as general management (Seltzer & Bass, 1990), the telecommunications industry (Malik, 2013), the restaurant industry (Grant, Gino, & Hofmann, 2011; Liden, Wayne, Chenwei, & Meuser, 2014), corporate culture (Lorinkova, Pearsall, & Sims, 2013; Yiwen, Lepine, Buckman, & Feng, 2014), sales (Bass, 1997), and hospital administration (Top, Akdere, & Tarcan, 2015). Seemingly, for most contexts that exist in which an element of leadership could be detected, one or more empirical studies have been conducted.

Sport management, as a research context, is no exception to the study of leadership. Specifically, Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) used Bass’s (1985)

transformational/transactional leadership model to examine the leader behaviour of interuniversity athletic administrators. These authors found that perceived leader effectiveness, coaches' satisfaction with leadership, and extra effort were "positively and strongly associated with transformational leadership" (p. 292). Another study conducted in the university athletic administration context by Kent and Chelladurai (2001) established that the three dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., charismatic leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration; Bass, 1985) found in the behaviours of athletic directors were significantly correlated with leader-member exchange quality between second level managers (e.g., assistant, associate athletic directors) and their followers. These findings demonstrate the cascading effect of transformational leadership within an organization (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001).

Smith, Arthur, Hardy, Callow, and Williams (2013) investigated transformational leadership by studying a cross-sectional group of competitive university ultimate frisbee players. Specifically, this study attempted to determine the mechanisms that mediate the relationship between transformational leadership behaviours and follower outcomes. They found support for the argument that follower outcomes such as team and task cohesion in sport are positively affected by transformational leadership (Smith et al., 2013). The results of the aforementioned studies are consistent with Burns' (1978) vision that when follower interests are broadened and in line with the purpose and mission of the organization, team performance will be enhanced.

The study of transformational leadership has also led to the creation of a conceptual leadership model called the Collegiate Athletic Leadership Model (CALM; Sinclair, Harper, & Segrave, 2014). This model was created to provide clarity on the

transformational behaviours that foster positive outcomes at the team and individual level within National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I, II, and III schools. The authors state that future research should focus on the application of the model to NCAA teams and used in case studies, as well as in empirical investigations of the proposed model's underlying tenets (Sinclair et al., 2014).

Leadership has also been studied in the context of professional sport. Deutscher (2009) researched athlete-leadership by examining National Hockey League (NHL) player salaries in relation to their perceived leadership abilities. Through an analysis of the salaries of explicit team leaders (i.e., captains and alternate captains) between the 2003 and 2008 NHL seasons, Deutscher concluded that perceived leadership ability rewards NHL players with a wage premium between 21 and 35 percent. Similar to the perceived importance of athlete-leadership amongst researchers is that of coaching leadership. Bennie and O'Connor (2012) conducted a qualitative investigation regarding effective coaching leadership within male Australian professional sport teams. Semi-structured observations and interviews revealed that developing a personalised approach, delegating responsibilities, and making decisions assertively strengthens effective coach leadership. In an effort to discover the effects of NHL Head Coach (HC) turnover on team performance, Audas, Goddard, and Rowe (2006) found teams that changed their coach within-season performed worse than those that did not. The authors suggest that in order to have effective coaching leadership, the approach of the HC needs to be aligned with his support staff. Thus, the essential continuity between a HC and his support staff is compromised when a within-season change is made.

The effects of leadership on organizational culture change has also been researched in the context of professional sport. Frontiera (2010) conducted a case study of six owners or GMs of North American professional sports teams who had successfully brought their organizations through a major change in culture. Ultimately, Frontiera initiated a model for organizational culture change in professional sport that included five emergent themes (i.e., systems of a dysfunctional culture, my way, walk the talk, embedding new culture, and our way), with the moderating variable being leadership. The model can be used as a guide for leaders attempting to change culture within organizations, particularly in the realm of professional sport (Frontiera, 2010). Similar to Frontiera's efforts, Cruickshank, Collins, and Minten (2013) used a case study approach to examine the successful culture change programme at English Rugby Union's Leeds Carnegie. These researchers discovered that cultural change was facilitated effectively by subtly shaping the context in which staff and players made performance-impacting choices and by regulating the power balance amongst coaches and players.

### **Leader and leadership development.**

The concept of *leader development* is continually transforming as researchers attempt to understand the concept in a variety of contexts. According to Mott (2009), the significance of leader development through the study of mentoring is important to understand and crucial to study because of its implications to individual and organizational success. Day (2001) explained leader development as having an orientation toward the growth of human capital and, thus, the development of individual capabilities such as self-awareness (e.g., emotional awareness, self-confidence), self-regulation (e.g., self-control, trustworthiness, adaptability), and self-motivation(e.g.,

commitment, initiative, optimism). Therefore, the focus of leader development is to develop intrapersonal capabilities through the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and abilities that are typically associated with formal leadership roles (Day, 2001). According to Zand (1997), these capabilities contribute to enhancing personal power, trust, and knowledge, which are considered to be fundamental leadership traits. The acquisition of these capabilities enable people to act and think in new ways, which are the characteristics of development (Coleman, 1988).

As Day (2001) highlights, whereas leader development places an emphasis on human capital, *leadership development* places an emphasis on social capital. Specifically, leadership development focuses on the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with the resources embedded in the connections or relationships between individuals (Brass, 2001). These resources enhance the dynamics and interactions involved in creating organizational value (Day, 2001). This is an important distinction to note as it frames the purpose for using either leader or leadership development in order to make sure the proper concept is being utilized in research and literature.

Collectively, leader and leadership development practices are intended to improve performance management, facilitate corporate socialization, and/or enhance productivity (Day, 2001). Further, these practices are used to develop leaders and leadership in the context of ongoing work in an organization (Day, 2001). Galli and Muller-Stewens (2012) noted that the organizational impact of leader and leadership development is not fully understood. However, most research efforts search for the effects of leader development on an individual's human capital, rather than the impact of leadership development on an organization's social capital (Galli & Muller-Stewens, 2012). The

authors also state that it is difficult to fully define the organizational impact of leader and leadership practices because of the dynamic environments in which they exist (Galli & Muller-Stewens, 2012).

In their exploratory case study, Galli and Muller-Stewens (2012) examined how social capital can be developed through leadership development practices. Their study revealed that social capital develops through three stages of experiences (i.e., contact, assimilation, and identification) that differ in terms of intensity. This means that “leadership development practices differ in their potential contribution to the social capital stages and should therefore be designed accordingly” (Galli & Muller-Stewens, 2012, p. 176). Thus, when designing leadership development practices, leaders must be sensitive to the reality that development will occur at different rates as a relationship moves through the three stages. Six popular and promising practices of leader and leadership development that are currently being used by organizations include: 360-degree feedback, executive coaching, networking, job assignments, action learning, and mentoring (Day, 2001).

The leader development practice of ‘360-degree feedback’ has gained tremendous popularity within organizations as a method of enhancing management development, employee involvement, communication, and culture change (Waldman & Atwater, 1998). The practice of 360-degree feedback uses multiple ratings and anonymous feedback in the assessment of individuals’ performances, and often involves the solicitation of feedback from four sources: 1) downward from the target’s supervisor; 2) upward from subordinates; 3) laterally from peers or coworkers, and; 4) inwardly from the target him or herself (Carless, Mann, & Wearing, 1998; Waldman & Atwater, 1998).

London and Beatty (1993) stated that 360-degree feedback is most useful when the process includes receiving feedback from business partners, customers and/or suppliers, if applicable. These authors noted that the practice should be more appropriately called 270-degree feedback, as partners, customers, and/or suppliers are often not included in the process. According to London and Beatty, the perspectives of these stakeholders would aid significantly in accomplishing the ultimate goal of 360-degree feedback, which is to increase or regain a firm's competitive advantage through the development of its leaders (London & Beatty, 1993). Specifically, Waldman and Atwater (1998) state that the purpose of leader development, through 360-degree feedback, is accomplished when the feedback prompts behavioural change within the individual that is the target of the feedback. Further, when the target compares her or his evaluation with the other anonymous feedback, she or he may form a more realistic perspective of her or his strengths and weaknesses (Waldman & Atwater, 1998). An organizational benefit of 360-degree feedback is the potential for increased trust and communication, as upward feedback will create a more participatory organizational culture, which responds quickly to the needs of internal and external customers (Waldman & Atwater, 1998).

Peterson (1996) defines 'executive coaching' as "the process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective" (p. 78). Specifically, Day (2001) stated that executive coaching involves practical, goal-focused forms of behavioural change and one-on-one learning. The objectives of executive coaching are to improve individual performance and personal satisfaction, and as a result, enhance organizational effectiveness (Kilburg, 1996). As

Katz and Miller (1996) stated, executive coaching can also be used to work through organizational issues such as culture change.

In the realm of executive coaching, Peterson (1996) identified five coaching strategies that have emerged from research, including: 1) forge a partnership, which he describes as a process of building trust; 2) inspire commitment, through providing personally relevant insight, which will aid in achieving the pupil's goals; 3) grow skills, by building new competencies to ensure people know how to do what is required; 4) promote persistence, through building stamina and discipline to make sure individuals are implementing what they have learned, and; 5) shape the environment by building organizational support to remove barriers and reward learning. The result of these five elements being brought together is that the individual will be able to diagnose and resolve personnel and organizational level challenges as they arise (Peterson, 1996).

According to Day (2001), 'networking' is a way of breaking down barriers between functional areas within an organization, which will aid in fostering broader individual networks. Further, networking is about challenging an individual's basic assumptions through the exposure to others' thinking, which may ultimately lead to improved practices and performance (Day, 2001). In sum, the leader development practice of networking is about developing social capital for the purpose of building support (Day, 2001). As opposed to mentoring, networking allows individuals to forge relationships with peers, which are often accompanied by mutual obligation and a much longer duration. Research suggests that a peer relationship in a work setting can last 20-30 years (Kram & Isabella, 1985), whereas a mentoring relationship typically lasts three to six years (Kram, 1983; 1985).

During the past decade, the concept of developing one's personal network as an explanation for career mobility and leader development has caught the attention of researchers (Dobrow, Chandler, Murphy, & Kram, 2012). The concept of creating a network, which includes a constellation of several people from different life domains, is known as a developmental network (Dobrow et al., 2012; Higgins & Kram, 2001). Often, researchers highlight a 'mutuality perspective' when studying developmental networks, which evaluates opinions of all members of an individual's network when considering information in the decision-making process (Dobrow et al., 2012). Developmental networks are valuable for achieving career outcomes such as promotion and career advancement (Singh, Ragins, & Tharenou, 2009). Precisely, it is through the specific functions of mentoring, that developmental networks provide value to an individual. The functions of mentoring and the benefits that accompany them will be discussed in more detail in a subsequent section.

Among the most important teachers in the development of leaders is experience (Day, 2001). Through job experience, development refers to "how managers learn, undergo personal change, and acquire leadership capacity as a result of the roles, responsibilities, and tasks encountered in their jobs" (Day, 2001, p. 598). 'Job assignments' give individuals an opportunity to grow by providing challenges which force them to learn about building teams, enhance their strategic thinking, and gain persuasion and influence skills (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988). Further, Popper (2005) stated that all of the major theories on developmental processes place experience at the centre of the learning process, which demonstrates the importance of the role that challenging job assignments play in leader development. Bandura (1977) also

demonstrated that self-confidence and self-efficacy develop on the basis of experience. His findings were supported by Akin (1987) and Kotter (1988) who found that, in retrospect, managers credited practical experience as the most important mechanism in their leader development.

As Day (2001) highlights, some job assignments contribute more to one's development than others. For example, 'stretch' assignments that put managers in new situations with unfamiliar responsibilities may force them to build new relationships as well as new competencies (Day, 2001). Even negative experiences can promote learning and self-reflection, which are important steps in the greater process of leader development. The way in which individuals respond to failure can be crucial in fostering a learning environment (Day, 2001).

The concept of 'action learning' can be described as "a continuous process of learning and reflection, supported by colleagues, with a corresponding emphasis on getting things done" (Day, 2001, p. 601). A generative practice, action learning provides a challenging task and ample support for participants in a situation where they collectively construct social meanings and shared realities in an environment that is conducive to learning (Day, 2001). John Murphy, former corporate director of executive education at GTE Corp. in Stamford, CT, described the action learning process as somewhat opposite of the classroom-training model, where individuals receive training that they are eventually supposed to apply to a real work scenario. He stated that action learning is about placing individuals into a legitimate work scenario in which they are accountable for the project's success (Froiland, 1994). The scenario is usually on the edge of their current capabilities, meaning they would not likely attempt to accomplish

the task without the assumption that the scenario is part of the action learning project (Coyle, 2009). Then, in collaboration with the individual, the leader provides him or her with just-in-time learning, which aids in the leader development process and accomplishing the project goal (Froiland, 1994). Due to participants' awareness that they are involved in an action learning scenario, they are often more receptive to feedback and less self-conscious about making an error. The process of action learning, if executed properly, can increase self-efficacy, competency, and teamwork ability within an individual (Froiland, 1994).

### **Mentoring**

The concept of mentoring can be traced back to Homer's (1946) legendary poem, *The Odyssey*. When Odysseus left for the Trojan War, Telemachus, Odysseus' son, was entrusted into the care of Mentor, a wise older friend of Odysseus. During Odysseus' absence, Mentor provided guidance and advice to a younger, developing Telemachus (Homer, 1946), and thus, the concept of a mentoring relationship was established. Formally, research concerning mentoring began in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). Some authors (e.g., Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lenz, & Lima, 2004; Chandler, Kram, & Yip, 2011) have cited Levinson and colleagues' (1978) work on the career development of adult men as the first empirical research conducted in the realm of mentoring. These authors highlighted the relationship that develops with a mentor as one of the most important experiences in a person's life. Kram (1983) advanced this notion by stating that a young adult in the work world is likely to encounter "a variety of developmental tasks that are reflected in concerns about self, career, and family" (p. 608).

She suggested that the role of a mentoring relationship is to significantly enhance early adulthood development by facilitating work on these tasks.

Since Kram's foundational work in 1983, the concept of mentoring has been developed by analyzing a number of different aspects of the mentoring process. She has been cited by many researchers (e.g., Allen et al., 2004; Chandler et al., 2011; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000) as providing the theoretical basis for much of the contemporary research on the topic. Her in-depth analysis of 18 developmental relationships between younger and older managers yielded considerable insights into the mentoring phenomenon. Through her research, Kram (1983) identified four phases of mentoring relationships (i.e., initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition), and outlined career and psychosocial functions as the fundamental tenets of mentoring. In particular, Kram's career and psychosocial functions have been used as a guiding framework for numerous research studies (e.g., Allen et al., 2004; Chandler et al., 2011; Chao, 1997; Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & DuBois, 2008; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Ragins et al., 2000).

Definitions for mentoring abound, as some authors believe that mentoring is defined in part by the scope of the research investigation (Chao, 1997; Merriam, 1983). Although this may be the case, a variety of scholars (e.g., Kram, 1983, 1985; Singh et al., 2009; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002) have advanced definitions of mentoring that seem to be fairly agreed upon. Kram (1985) defined the mentoring relationship as one in which "an older, more experienced adult...helps the younger individual learn to navigate the adult world and the world of work" (p. 2). This definition is supported by Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) who stated that mentoring is "a process in which a more experienced person (i.e., the mentor) serves as a role model, provides guidance and support to a

developing novice (i.e., the protégé), and sponsors that individual's career progress" (p. 25). In their definition, Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) build on Kram's (1985) notion that a mentor helps the protégé navigate the world of work by stating that the mentor sponsors the protégé's career progress.

Kelly and Dixon (2014) further clarified the definition of mentoring when they stated that a mentoring relationship goes beyond role modeling, friendship, and a supervisory relationship. In fact, the authors state that mentoring seeks to enhance "the professional development of the protégé while indirectly (and sometimes directly) providing beneficial outcomes for the mentor as well" (p. 504). Despite this advancement in the definition of mentoring, the authors do not mention the potential organizational benefits that accrue as a result of a mentoring relationship within an organizational context. Organizational benefits may include increased employee motivation, job performance, and retention rates (Wilson & Elman, 1990).

### **Mentoring functions.**

In order to provide benefits for those involved in a mentoring relationship, certain functions must be present. Kram (1983) presented five career and four psychosocial functions of a mentoring relationship and suggested that the more functions a mentor provides the protégé with, the more the protégé will benefit from the relationship. Researchers (e.g., Chao, 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura & Viator, 1994) have used these functions as guiding principles for understanding how mentorship contributes to the development of protégés.

Kram (1983) outlined sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments as the main career functions that a mentor can provide to a

protégé (see Table 1 for operational definitions of each function). A mentor may provide all, most, or few of these functions, and the level at which a mentor is able to provide a protégé with these functions depends on the mentor's position and power within an organization (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). The greater purpose of leveraging career functions in the mentor relationship is to advance the protégé's career and improve the organization (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Despite the importance of the career functions of mentorship, some studies (e.g., Noe, 1988; Olian, Carroll, Giannantonio, & Feren, 1988) have found that the psychosocial functions of mentorship are more desirable to protégés.

Kram (1983) highlighted role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship as the psychosocial functions of mentorship (see Table 1 for operational definitions of each function). She stated that through these functions, a young manager receives support for developing the necessary confidence and effectiveness to become successful in a managerial role. The mentor's ability to provide the protégé with psychosocial functions is dependent on the quality of the interpersonal relationship and emotional bond between the mentor and protégé (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Compared to career functions, which provide the protégé with work-related opportunities for success, the psychosocial functions affect the protégé on a more personal level (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Chao (1997) described the psychosocial functions of a mentor relationship as activities that affect the protégé's development of self-image and competence. Practically, this may occur when the mentor provides the protégé with personal friendship and/or social acceptance (Scandura & Viator, 1994).

### **Formal versus informal mentoring.**

An important step in understanding mentoring is to determine whether the relationship is established as part of a formal program or out of mutual identification by the protégé and mentor to enter into an informal mentoring relationship (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Ragins et al., 2000). An informal mentorship is driven by the developmental needs of the protégé such as support, affirmation, and guidance (Ragins et al., 2000). The mutual identification by the protégé and mentor of the need to establish a mentoring relationship contributes significantly to the closeness and intimacy of an informal mentorship (Ragins et al., 2000). A higher level of closeness experienced by the mentor and protégé in an informal mentorship often leads to greater psychosocial and career benefits for the protégé and a greater sense of satisfaction and accomplishment for the mentor (Kram, 1983; Ragins et al., 2000).

In a formal mentoring relationship, a protégé is usually assigned to a mentor by a third party. This formal process does not necessarily allow for the development of mutual respect and identification to occur between the protégé and mentor (Ragins et al., 2000). For a mentoring relationship to yield significant benefits, often the mentor needs to determine that the protégé is worthy of the extra attention that the mentoring relationship requires (Chao et al., 1992). Although mutual respect may form after the establishment of a formal mentoring relationship, the mentor may be less intrinsically motivated to provide the psychosocial and career functions necessary to produce benefits for the protégé and/or organization if the mutual respect is absent (Ragins et al., 2000).

The benefits experienced as a result of an informal mentorship are often more significant than those experienced in formal mentoring relationships (Ragins et al., 2000).

Chao et al. (1992) examined 212 protégés that were involved in informal and 53 protégés who were involved in formal mentoring relationships and found that those involved in informal mentoring relationships reported more career-related support and higher salaries than those involved in formal mentoring relationships (Chao et al., 1992). Murphy and Kram (2010) found a similar result when they studied 254 mentorships with the purpose of determining whether non-work (most often informal) or work (which may be formal) related mentorships produced greater benefits. Their results indicated that non-work related mentoring relationships provided more overall support than work related mentoring relationships (Murphy & Kram, 2010). These authors also made the distinction that non-work related mentorships were more positively associated with the psychosocial functions of the mentor relationship, while work related mentorships were more positively associated with the career functions. Although studies, such as the two reviewed above, demonstrate that informal mentorships usually yield greater benefits, research has found that formal mentorships can produce positive outcomes as well (Chao et al., 1992; Murphy & Kram, 2010).

In an empirical study of a formal mentoring program in a Fortune 100 corporation, Seibert (1999) found that those individuals who had formal mentors reported significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than those who reported that they did not have a mentor. Other empirical investigations (e.g., Eby & Lockwood, 2005; Egan & Song, 2008) have yielded similar results to those of Seibert (1999), demonstrating that formal mentoring relationships, although perhaps not as fruitful as informal mentorships, can produce career and psychosocial benefits. Despite these potential benefits, formal mentoring relationships are also more likely to produce relational concerns than informal

relationships. Protégés have cited separation and neglect by their mentors as potential problems associated with formal mentoring relationships (Eby & Lockwood, 2005).

Although these issues have the potential to occur in informal mentoring relationships as well, the mutual identification process that is inherent to the initiation phase of the informal mentor relationship acts as a filter to prevent these issues from surfacing.

### **Phases of the mentor relationship.**

Although the length of mentoring relationships can vary, Kram (1983, 1985) indicated that the average length is approximately five years. Through these years, the relationship progresses through four predictable, yet not completely distinct phases, including: initiation; cultivation; separation, and; redefinition (Kram, 1983). These four phases have been agreed upon by many other scholars and have been used as a framework for many empirical mentoring studies (e.g., Chandler, Kram, & Yip, 2011; Chao, 1997; Seibert, 1999; Wang, Tomlinson, & Noe, 2010; Young & Parrewé, 2000). Kram (1983) also made a distinction between which mentoring functions (i.e., career and psychosocial) are most likely to emerge in each stage. She noted that career-related functions often develop in the initiation phase, while the psychosocial-related functions of the relationship develop in the later stages.

The 'initiation' phase is the time period when the relationship between the protégé and mentor commences. Kram (1983) stated that during this phase, a fantasy emerges where the mentor is respected and admired by the protégé for their competence as well as their ability to provide guidance and support. This phase lasts approximately six to twelve months and the relative positions of the two partners become evident in relation to their competency and/or experience level in a given context (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram,

1983). As Hunt and Michael (1983) highlight, during the initiation phase, the mentor will be clearly more skilled, powerful, and professionally recognized than the protégé. The protégé's potential for career success may or may not be significant, but either way their abilities are under developed (Hunt & Michael, 1983). Kram (1983) also noted that shortly after the relationship has been formed, the protégé begins to feel cared for, respected, and supported by someone who is admired by others in a particular industry or organization.

While the establishment of these feelings and beliefs within the protégé are witnessed by the mentor, the mentor begins a fantasy of her or his own as to what benefits the mentorship could afford her or him (Kram, 1983). In positive mentorships, the protégé is viewed by the mentor as someone who is coachable and enjoyable to work with. Specifically, the protégé can provide technical assistance and, perhaps more importantly to the mentor, “become an object for the transmission of the senior manager's (the mentor's) values and perspectives on the world” (Kram, 1983, p. 615). It is the mentor's recognition of these potential benefits that sets the relationship in motion and alerts the mentor of her or his importance to the protégé's development. Despite the expectations experienced by the mentor and protégé in the initiation stage, there remains a sense of uncertainty as to whether or not these expectations will be fulfilled (Kram, 1983).

Once the expectations that are experienced by the protégé and mentor are tested against reality, there are a number of resulting interactions that occur as a means to support these expectations. According to Kram (1983), initial interactions include working on common tasks and sometimes a direct reporting relationship will be formed.

Other interactions such as discussions about organizational or departmental performance and/or concerns produce increasingly positive expectations of the value of relating to each other. Usually, there is a balance of initiative from the mentor and protégé when seeking interaction, as the protégé seeks support and guidance from the mentor and the mentor attempts to provide development opportunities for the protégé (Kram, 1983).

If the initiation phase of the mentoring relationship is successful, in that the mentor and protégé wish to continue developing their partnership, the relationship enters the ‘cultivation’ phase (Chao et al. 1992). This second phase of mentorship, is described by Kram (1983) as a two to five year period where the positive expectations that developed in the initiation phase are continuously tested against reality. Due to the rigorous testing that the relationship faces, each individual discovers the real value of relating to the other, as opposed to measuring the value of the relationship by expectation and fantasy, as in the initiation phase (Kram, 1983).

As a result of the testing that mentoring relationships undergo during the cultivation phase, trust is built as the mentor witnesses the skill level of the protégé through the completion of given tasks (Hunt & Michael, 1983). It is through the building of trust that mentors provide their protégés with opportunities to prove themselves and demonstrate their skills (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Wang et al., 2010). Kram (1983) noted that the cultivation phase is where the career and psychosocial functions of the relationship are at their peak. Although this may be the case, as noted earlier, career functions usually emerge first, as the mentor provides the protégé with challenging work, sponsorship, and exposure. As trust continues to build through the development of the career functions, an interpersonal bond strengthens, and psychosocial functions (e.g.,

friendship, counseling, and modeling) of the relationship begin to develop (Kram, 1983). In cases where career and psychosocial functions are being cultivated, the growth of the protégé's confidence in her or his own abilities, due to the accomplishment of assigned tasks and taking on new opportunities, is also being strengthened (Kram, 1983). In some circumstances, the growth in competence may lead to benefits such as job promotions, increased job satisfaction, and wage increases for the protégé (Kram, 1983).

For the mentor, the overriding benefit of the cultivation phase is a feeling of empowerment (Kram, 1983). Empowerment occurs for the mentor when she or he realizes the influence she or he has in the organizational world, as a result of a protégé's success, due to her or his mentoring efforts (Kram, 1983). Other benefits during the cultivation stage for the mentor include the personal satisfaction of aiding in the development of the protégé's career, as well as transmitting her or his values and worldview through the protégé (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1983).

Due to the immense development of the protégé's career competency that will likely occur during the cultivation phase, the protégé develops a longing for independence, autonomy, and to be recognized separately for her or his work (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1983). The result of this longing for independence is a separation that lasts approximately six to twenty-four months (Kram, 1983). The 'separation' phase occurs not only due to the protégé's wish for independence, but also because the career and psychosocial functions that the mentor once provided and were valued by the protégé are no longer as attractive (Chao, 1997; Kram, 1983; Hunt & Michael, 1983). This change in the perceived value of the mentor's career and psychosocial offerings to the protégé force both partners to reassess their relationship (Kram, 1983). Other reasons for

separation include a dysfunctional relationship or a lack of interest to engage in the relationship by either the protégé or mentor (Hunt & Michael, 1983).

For protégés, the separation phase can be met with feelings of pride and joy to move on in their careers, or a lack of confidence as they can be tempted to revert back to their roles as protégés and rely on their mentors for additional guidance (Kram, 1983). Mentors may also experience a sense of pride and satisfaction, knowing they have played a major role in the career success of their protégés. Alternatively, mentors may fear the loss of the technical and psychosocial support they received from their protégés, and in some cases, block protégés' opportunities for promotion (Kram, 1983).

The final phase of the mentor relationship, as defined by Kram (1983), is called 'redefinition.' Hunt and Michael (1983) refer to this as the lasting friendship phase, as the relationship between the mentorship partners often resembles a peer relationship. Due to the decrease in power distance that was experienced throughout the previous three phases of the mentoring relationship, the two individuals feel that they are able to talk about common problems and act as a support system for each other (Kram, 1983). Both partners realize that they have invested years in fostering a positive relationship with each other, and staying connected in some regard provides psychosocial benefits to both individuals (Kram, 1983). Similarly, Chao (1997) describes the redefinition phase as a termination of the mentorship and evolution of the relationship to one of mutual support and informal contact.

Depending on the level of guidance and support provided by the mentor to the protégé during the cultivation stage, the protégé may feel a sense of indebtedness (Kram, 1983). Because of this sense of indebtedness, the protégé may be motivated to provide

support and guidance to the mentor in return for the support and guidance she or he received earlier in the relationship from her or his mentor. Further, the excitement of the initiation and cultivation stages are replaced with gratitude and realism about the considerable contributions the mentor has made in the protégé's life (Kram, 1983). The gratitude demonstrated by the protégé to the mentor is often reciprocated, as the mentor takes pride in witnessing the protégé's success and emulation of the mentor's values (Kram, 1983). When gratitude and admiration is reciprocated in this manner, often a friendship that may last a lifetime between the mentor and protégé will emerge (Roche, 1979).

### **Models of mentoring.**

Traditionally, mentoring has been conceptualized and researched as a dyadic relationship (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kelly & Dixon, 2014; Packard, 2003). However, as 21<sup>st</sup> century leaders and researchers feel the need to release and maximize intellectual capital and organizational knowledge as a method of sustaining competitive advantage through leader development within organizations, different mentoring models have been created (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Packard, 2003; Wasburn & Crispo, 2006). Specifically, there are three models that researchers (e.g., Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Kelly & Dixon, 2014; Packard, Walsh, & Seidenberg, 2007) have relied upon as frameworks for their work. These three models, which have been created in response to a call to diversify the context of mentoring relationships, are commonly referred to as composite mentoring (Packard, 2003), strategic collaborations (Wasburn & Crispo, 2006), and constellation networks (Higgins & Kram, 2001). Each of these mentoring models views mentoring with a multi-relational approach, as opposed to the traditional mentor-protégé dyad.

Kelly and Dixon (2014) have credited Packard (2003) with the initial conceptualization of 'composite mentoring.' Packard (2003) defines composite mentoring as "the strategic selection of a diverse set of mentors, [with] each mentor offering one aspect of the desired mentoring experience" (p. 337). Originally conceptualized as a framework to guide college women who were pursuing a career in science, the composite mentoring model has had limited empirical testing regarding its effectiveness (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). However, in their study of the mentoring relationships among 60 low-income, adolescent girls, who had college and career aspirations, Packard, Kim, Sicley, and Piontkowski (2009) found that the number of mentoring sources and different contexts from which mentoring relationships were derived, was positively associated with the number of mentoring functions provided to the girls. Based on their results, Packard et al. (2009) suggest that informal mentoring networks are effective in supporting adolescents in their career and educational pursuits when diversely composed.

The idea of composite mentoring is for protégés to actively seek different mentors to meet different needs (Packard, 2003). Accompanying this notion is a more active role for the protégé in the development process (Kelly & Dixon, 2014; Packard, 2003). In a composite mentoring model, protégés are encouraged to create and reflect on their own goals and guide their own development. The result of this approach is that protégés seek mentors that aid in their development process, rather than completely take it over (Packard, 2003).

Kelly and Dixon (2014) point out that there are three major assumptions with the composite mentoring model. First, the model assumes that individuals will consciously

select mentors who will meet desired needs. If a protégé consciously selects mentors to meet a particular need, then a second assumption of the model is that the protégé must also know what her or his needs are. A third assumption of the model is that once the area of need is identified, she or he will not only be able to identify a mentor that fits that need, but that the protégé can also get in contact with that mentor. Despite the dearth of research and resulting questions concerning the composite mentoring model, it has potential to provide additional understanding regarding how mentoring can benefit protégés (Kelly & Dixon, 2014).

Wasburn and Crispo (2006), who are credited as the developers of the ‘strategic collaboration’ approach (Kelly & Dixon, 2014), define the concept as the pairing of two experts or senior level organization members (i.e., mentors) with a group of junior members (i.e., protégés) who desire to further develop their careers. Similar to composite mentoring, strategic collaboration operates on the assumption that multiple mentors are better than one. Other assumptions that are unique to strategic collaboration as a model for mentoring is that the organization will devote resources to and support the program, and that senior members are willing to serve together as mentors (Kelly & Dixon, 2014).

Unlike the composite model for mentoring, which focuses primarily on the protégé’s success, strategic collaboration is implemented as a method to ultimately grow the capabilities of the organization by developing protégés (Wasburn & Crispo, 2006). The idea is that when an individual enters the organization, she or he becomes a protégé within a group of other protégés who are mentored by two senior members of the organization (Wasburn & Crispo, 2006). Through the implementation of the following four stages, protégés will be prepared to assume greater responsibility: 1) discover the

ideal processes for the group; 2) dream what the group can accomplish; 3) design the processes, and; 4) execute the plan (Wasburn & Crispo, 2006). As a result of the completion of these stages, protégés can develop capabilities that will not only contribute to her or his success, but also that of the organization.

Empirical studies conducted to test the effectiveness of the strategic collaboration model (e.g., Ncube & Wasburn, 2006; Wasburn, 2007) have yielded promising results (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). For example, through an investigative case study of J. R. Rooney Corporation, a worldwide engineering technology company, Ncube and Wasburn (2006) discovered that strategic collaboration enhanced ethical decision making within the organization. The authors attribute this to the fact that mentors and protégés were accountable to the group and the mentors aided in the protégés' development of ethical decision making practices. Furthermore, the mentors provided support such as sharing their knowledge and experiences, as well as offered different perspectives and insights regarding the situation to the protégés (Ncube & Wasburn, 2006).

Often referred to as multiple developmental networks, 'developmental constellations' are defined by Higgins and Thomas (2001) as "the set of relationships an individual has with people who take an active interest in and action to advance the individual's career by assisting with his or her personal and professional development" (p. 224). Originally conceptualized by Higgins and Kram (2001), this approach views mentoring as a cluster of different relationships. Unlike the composite mentoring and strategic collaboration models of mentoring, the mentoring relationships formed in a developmental constellation are not necessarily coordinated in a particular manner (Kelly & Dixon, 2014). This means that relationships are formed organically as a result of an

individual's social network and not purposefully constructed, as is the case with the other two models.

Higgins and Thomas (2001) conducted a longitudinal study of the careers of lawyers to determine the career effects of protégés' developmental relationships. Their investigation found that the quality of one's primary mentor affected career success and job satisfaction in the short-term greater than the quantity and quality of their entire developmental network. However, the authors discovered that it is the quantity and quality of one's entire developmental network that accounts for positive long-term career outcomes (e.g., retention and promotion; Higgins & Thomas, 2001). These results are supported by van Emmerik's (2004) study of approximately one thousand university faculty members. This research determined that the size of one's developmental network was positively associated with career and intrinsic job satisfaction (van Emmerik, 2004). These findings demonstrate that the natural composition of a large developmental network is effective in producing desirable career outcomes.

### **Benefits of mentoring.**

As noted throughout the literature review, mentoring relationships have the potential to yield many benefits for the protégé, mentor, and organization involved in the mentorship. Because the nature of a mentoring relationship is such that the mentor provides functions for the protégé's benefit, the majority of empirical research studies have sought to define the benefits that the protégé gains as a result of her or his relationship with a mentor. A meta-analysis conducted by Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lenz, and Lima (2004) reviewed existing empirical research regarding the career benefits experienced by protégés as a consequence of their mentoring relationships. These authors

separated the types of benefits that have been studied into subjective and objective career outcomes. The objective career outcomes that were most commonly researched for protégés were compensation, salary growth, and promotions. Alternatively, career satisfaction, expectations of advancement, career commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to stay with one's current organization were the most commonly investigated subjective career outcomes. The results of this meta-analysis are generally supportive of the claims made by researchers that mentoring yields positive benefits for protégés (Allen et al., 2004).

In one example, Fagenson (1989) administered a survey to over 500 high and low level managers that solicited information regarding individual's experiences as protégés in a mentoring relationship. She discovered that "mentored individuals reported having more satisfaction, career mobility/opportunity, recognition, and a higher promotion rate than non-mentored individuals" (p. 309). Chao et al. (1992) found a similar result when their study uncovered a significant correlation between career and psychosocial functions, and career outcomes such as job/career satisfaction, as well as compensation. These results have since been supported by the research findings of Scandura (1992), Orpen (1995), and others, demonstrating the immense benefits that protégés may experience as a consequence of being involved in a mentoring relationship.

The benefits experienced by a mentor are not as easily recognized and certainly less researched than the benefits that a protégé experiences from being involved in a mentoring relationship. However, according to some researchers (e.g., Chao et al., 1992; Kram, 1983) they certainly exist. Kram (1983) found that beginning in the cultivation phase, the mentor realizes substantial satisfaction in knowing that she or he positively

influenced the protégé's development. Other mentor benefits cited in Kram's (1983) study included technological and psychological support, empowerment due to the realization that she or he had the capacity to nurture and support a protégé to the extent that it enhanced an individual's career, as well as greater visibility within her or his organization as a result of her or his role in the protégé's success.

Ghosh and Reio (2013) conducted a meta-analysis of 18 empirical studies that investigated the benefits mentors experienced as a result of their involvement in a mentoring relationship. Similar to Kram's (1983) findings, the authors found that mentors were more satisfied with their jobs and committed to the organization than non-mentors. The authors also noted that the benefits experienced by mentors differed depending on the type of functions (i.e., career and/or psychosocial) they provided to their protégés. Their analysis also revealed that career functions provided by mentors were associated with better personal job performance and career success. When the mentors provided more psychosocial mentoring functions, they experienced benefits such as increased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career success (Ghosh & Reio, 2013). These research findings suggest that not only do mentors experience benefits from being involved in a mentoring relationship, but that the types of functions they provide to their protégés will dictate the benefits they may receive.

In comparison to the benefits that accrue to protégés and mentors, the benefits experienced by an organization where mentoring is present have been more scantily researched. Nevertheless, some researchers (e.g., Chandler, Hall, & Kram, 2010; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993; Wilson & Elman, 1990) have found significant organizational benefits to exist. For example, Wilson and Elman (1990) noted that the development of

human resources within the organization is perhaps the most obvious benefit at the organizational level. Mentoring can contribute to improved retention rates, employee motivation, and job performance, which ultimately strengthens an organization's capabilities through the development of employees (Wilson & Elman, 1990). Chandler et al. (2010) have since supported these claims by stating that organizational commitment and lower turnover benefits organizations by reducing on-boarding and socialization costs. These findings demonstrate the importance of mentorship at the organizational level and the need for continued research in this area.

These statements are supported by the work of Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) who studied the existence of mentorships between 316 newly graduated engineering and business majors with senior members of their respective organizations. The authors found that participants who reported having a mentor were more quickly sensitized to the importance of the organization's culture, politics, and history, compared to their non-mentored counterparts. Acclimating newcomers to the organization's culture, politics, and history benefits the organization through protégé's higher levels of work performance (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993).

#### **Protégé-mentor compatibility.**

Bozeman and Feeney (2008) stated that mentoring relationships either have optimal or suboptimal conditions for the transmission of benefits from the mentor to protégé or vice versa. By this, the authors mean that the 'fit' between the mentor's and protégé's preferences, incentives, and valuations within the relationship create the conditions for which the mentorship exists. To illustrate this point-of-view, Bozeman and Feeney (2008) created a 'Goodness of Fit' model for mentoring relationships. The model

implies that in order for a mentor and protégé to experience optimal benefits from their relationship, the fit of certain criteria must be in place in the initiation stage. The authors summarize the model by suggesting that mentoring will only produce maximal benefits for the mentor and protégé when the mentor is equipped with “the knowledge preferred by the protégé, has a value for transmitting that knowledge, and does so effectively to a protégé who has the capability to understand the knowledge transmitted and learning skills to fully expropriate the knowledge being transmitted” (p. 472). The criteria that affect the relational fit of a mentorship suggested by Bozeman and Feeney (2008) are work orientation (i.e., task-oriented, and socio-emotional), transmission preference of mentoring information (i.e., directed, by example, and indirect), processing preference of mentoring information (i.e., active, and absorptive), content preference (e.g., strategy, tasks, career advancement, visibility), and personal attributes (i.e., gender, race, extrovert/introvert, friendliness, and marital status).

Other researchers (e.g., Turban & Dougherty, 1994; Waters, 2004; Wilson & Elman, 1990) have acknowledged the importance of compatibility between mentor’s and protégé’s personalities when determining if a mentoring relationship will yield optimal benefits. In an empirical study of the mentoring relationships, personality characteristics, mentoring received, and the career success of 147 managers (i.e., protégés) in a variety of industries, Turban and Dougherty (1994) found that protégés who actively initiated mentoring relationships with mentors can influence the amount of mentoring they receive. Further, those protégés that received more functions from their mentors experienced more career attainment and perceived career success than those who received fewer functions. The results of this study suggest that personality characteristics

such as locus of control, self-monitoring, and emotional stability were related to protégés' abilities to initiate mentoring relationships and thus receive mentoring (Turban & Dougherty, 1994).

In a similar study, Waters (2004) sought to examine the protégé-mentor agreement regarding the provision of psychosocial support between 166 junior administrative staff at an Australian university and their matched mentors. The protégés and mentors completed a questionnaire which assessed three antecedents to the protégé-mentor agreement. The three antecedents assessed were: 1) structural and experiential aspects of the mentorship (e.g., frequency of meetings, and length of relationship); 2) protégé and mentor personality (e.g., agreeableness, and openness), and; 3) protégé and mentor workload. The findings of the study demonstrated that the three antecedents to the protégé-mentor agreement were positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment among protégés and mentors (Waters, 2004). These results support Bozeman and Feeney's (2008) 'Goodness of Fit' model, which suggests that a variety of compatibility factors affect whether or not a mentoring relationship will yield optimal or suboptimal benefits for both parties. If the mentor and protégé have a high level of compatibility, then it is suggested that the mentoring relationship will yield considerable benefits.

### **Contexts of mentoring research in sport management.**

Empirical studies of mentoring in the realm of sport management have occurred in a variety of contexts such as: sports coaching (e.g., Jones, Harris, & Miles, 2009; Narcotta, Peterson, & Johnson, 2009), student-athlete mentoring (e.g., Carter & Hart, 2010; Harrison, Comeaux, & Plecha, 2006; Hoffmann & Loughhead, 2015),

intercollegiate athletic administration (e.g., Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990), and sport management academia (e.g., Beres & Dixon, 2014; Ferris & Perrewé, 2014).

### *Sports coaching.*

Mentoring in sports coaching has been a popular topic among researchers in recent years and has been identified as a “good practice in relation to developing coaches’ knowledge and expertise” (Jones et al., 2009, p. 267). However, Jones et al., (2009) state that many of the claims made regarding the importance of sports coach mentoring are largely unfounded and the area of research “remains an ill-defined activity” (p. 280). In their review of the state of research regarding sports coach mentoring, Jones et al. (2009) examined models for sports coach mentoring, and provided suggestions for developing a theoretical underpinning for future research efforts in this context. The authors write that an effective mentoring program must be developed and consist of several elements such as formalizing the mentor relationships of coaches, focusing on the specific needs of the protégé coach, and more (Jones et al., 2009).

Despite Jones et al.’s (2009) allegations that the findings of sports coach mentoring are largely unfounded, some researchers have conducted empirical research regarding the benefits of mentoring relationships between a senior and junior sports coach. Narcotta et al. (2009) aimed to identify the mentoring functions reported by 172 NCAA Division I assistant coaches within a head coach-assistant coach dyad in the sport of women’s soccer. The results of the study showed that the psychosocial functions of acceptance and friendship, as well as the career functions of challenging assignments and sponsorship, ranked as the most prominent functions that existed within these mentoring relationships. Although these results demonstrate the existence of mentor functions

within these sports coaching mentorships, Narcotta et al. (2009) stated that future research should consider the mentoring effects on benefits such as job satisfaction and turnover rate with sports coaching.

Another empirical study on the effects of mentoring in sports coaching was conducted by Mott, Porschitz, Sherman, and Manz (2007). Their study analyzed the mentors of 318 recently active NCAA Division I basketball head coaches to determine whether the upward career mobility of these coaches was influenced by the size of their mentors' protégé networks. The results of their investigation showed that the aggregate size of mentors' protégé networks had the strongest relationship with individual protégés' career advancement. These findings highlight the important role certain mentoring functions (i.e., sponsorship, and exposure and visibility) have in providing protégé benefits such as career advancement within sports coaching.

#### ***Student-athlete mentoring.***

Research on student-athlete mentoring has been conducted to find the sources of mentoring relationships among athletes (Carter & Hart, 2010), investigate relationships between faculty members and athletes (Harrison et al., 2006), and examine peer-to-peer athlete relationships (Hoffmann & Loughhead, 2015). In their study of the sources of mentoring relationships for 38 female student-athletes from two NCAA Division I schools, Carter and Hart (2010) found that the highest percentage of participants relied on their parents for academic/career and psychosocial support, but depended on their coach for athletic support. These authors suggest that these relationships aided student-athletes' abilities to overcome roadblocks during their intercollegiate athletic careers. Thus, Carter and Hart (2010) assert that mentoring is a valuable resource for collegiate athletes.

Similar to the benefits experienced by student-athletes as a result of parent and coach mentor relationships, a faculty to student-athlete mentorship can enrich the lives of both individuals. Harrison et al. (2006) used approximately 216,000 American collegiate student responses to the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Student Information Form (SIF) to determine the factors associated with student-athlete GPA success in four-year undergraduate academic programs. Their results showed that interaction levels between student-athletes and faculty members showed positive impacts on academic achievement. In acknowledging the limitations to their study, the authors point out that it is difficult to determine if those seeking faculty mentorship achieved higher grades as a result of their interactions with faculty members or if those with higher grades simply sought out faculty mentorship (Harrison et al., 2006).

In their study of 272 self-identified interuniversity athlete protégés, Hoffmann and Loughhead (2015) found the transformational leadership behaviour of inspirational motivation was positively related to protégés' receipt of psychosocial mentoring functions. Moreover, the transformational leadership behaviour of intellectual stimulation and the transactional leadership behaviour of contingent reward were positively associated with the career functions of mentoring. Further, the authors found that psychosocial mentoring functions were positively related to protégé satisfaction. The authors state that "transformational and transactional leadership behaviours exhibited by athlete mentors relate to increased protégé receipt of mentoring functions" (Hoffmann & Loughhead, 2015, p. 12). These findings demonstrate the importance of an athlete mentor's leadership style in her or his ability to effectively deliver the functions that are desired by the protégé.

### ***Intercollegiate athletic administration.***

In her study of mentoring relationships among intercollegiate athletic administrators, Young (1990) administered a 68 item forced-choice questionnaire to 263 NCAA athletic administrators (i.e., Athletic Directors and Assistant Athletic Directors). Her results demonstrated that the existence of mentoring relationships assisted protégés in attaining career outcomes such as job satisfaction and increased salary. Further, 94 percent of participants advocated that all young professionals should establish mentoring relationships. Similarly, in their study of the mentoring relationships of 253 NCAA Assistant Athletic Directors, Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) found that mentored individuals were more satisfied with their work than non-mentored individuals. The results of these studies highlight the importance of mentoring relationships in the attainment of career benefits such as job satisfaction for more novice athletic administrators.

### ***Sport management academia.***

Despite researchers' acknowledgements that mentoring is an important topic in many fields, it has been scantily researched in the context of sport management academia (Pastore, 2003). As the topic of her Earle F. Zeigler lecture, Pastore (2003) challenged academics to view their relationships with graduate students as a mentorship and thus, serve as effective mentors. In response to Pastore's challenge, Beres and Dixon (2014) examined the mentoring relationships and functions that occur between doctoral dissertation advisors and their doctoral students. To accomplish this, they conducted 13 semi-structured interviews with doctoral dissertation advisors and former doctoral students. Their results demonstrated that the advisors generally provided all of the

mentoring functions outlined by Kram, which aided in the career advancement of the students.

Ferris and Perrewé (2014) also contributed to the literature regarding mentoring within sport management academia. The authors suggest that there is a lack of material published regarding how best to train, develop, and prepare doctoral students for career success in a university faculty position. In an effort to amend the limited literature on the topic, Ferris and Perrewé (2014) provided a discussion on the concept of apprenticeship, as well as socialization and mentoring, as these concepts apply to developing Ph.D. students. The authors state that using mentoring as a framework to train Ph.D. students will aid in their future career successes.

### **A Brief History of the NHL**

The NHL was founded in 1917 with five teams located throughout Ontario and Quebec, including the Montreal Canadiens and Toronto Maple Leafs (National Hockey League, 2008). In 1926, the League expanded into the United States where the Boston Bruins, New York Rangers, Chicago Black Hawks, and Detroit Red Wings were granted franchises. Between 1917 and 1942, eight other Canadian and American teams sporadically joined the League, but eventually became defunct. From 1942 to 1967, the League consisted of the six aforementioned teams and was dubbed the ‘Original Six Era.’ Between the years of 1967 and 1979, the NHL expanded by adding fifteen new teams, and by the year 2000, the League included 30 teams from throughout Canada and the United States (National Hockey League, 2008).

Over the last forty years, a number of franchises have relocated to other cities within Canada or the United States due to financial and market related concerns. For

example, the Winnipeg Jets relocated to Phoenix, Arizona in 1995, where the Arizona Coyotes franchise continues to operate today. However, due to Winnipeg's ability to demonstrate to the League that the market was able to support a franchise once again, the Winnipeg Jets returned to the city in time for the 2011-2012 season, via the relocation of the Atlanta Thrashers. These relocations show the volatility of certain markets and demonstrate the importance of proper management of these businesses. Further, some ownership and management groups continue to be challenged with maintaining the financial well-being and existence of their organizations. This highlights the importance of leader development within organizations, as seamless transitions between leaders is vital to ensuring these firms' long-term financial stability.

### **Hockey Operations Staffs of NHL Franchises**

In the realm of professional sport, GMs, in consultation with their teams' operations staffs, are primarily responsible for establishing policies and making decisions regarding player personnel (Farris, 2011; Gamson & Scotch, 1964; Wong & Deubert, 2010). Similarly, Rowe, Cannella, Rankin, and Gorman (2005) stated that hiring a coach, personnel evaluation, conducting contract negotiations, managing player trades, drafting amateur players, operating training camps, and determining what players will make up the team roster are the tasks of the organization's GM.

In an effort to provide clarity regarding the differences in roles between intercollegiate athletic directors (ADs) and professional sport GMs, Hatfield, Wrenn, and Bretting (1987) administered a three-part questionnaire to 58 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I athletic directors and 62 GMs from the major spectator sport leagues in the United States and Canada to assess the perceived importance of job-

related competencies or duties and provide recommendations for educational preparation to assume these positions (Hatfield et al., 1987). The results of their study showed that GMs perceived task areas related to labour relations and personnel evaluations as more important than did ADs, whereas ADs perceived all other task areas (i.e., marketing, financial management, administration, public relations) as more important than did GMs. These results shed light onto the main concerns of professional sport GMs in relation to their duties and the role they fill within professional sport organizations.

Specifically, in the NHL, each franchise has a hockey operations department, which, for some organizations, is overseen by the president of hockey operations. This position is relatively new, with approximately one third of franchises in the League having adopted this senior level executive position. Regardless of this position's existence within a franchise's hockey operations department, each NHL franchise has a GM and, apart from those franchises that have recently hired a president of hockey operations, the GM leads the department of hockey operations. From a historical standpoint, GMs have led the hockey operations departments of NHL franchises since the League's inception. Other members working within a typical hockey operations department under the tutelage of the GM include one or two assistant GMs (AGMs), a director of hockey operations and/or director of hockey administration, a director of player development, a scouting director, one or more executive assistants, and several others. The personnel structure of each franchise's hockey operations department varies slightly, as do individuals' titles, depending on the perceived needs of the team and the GM's desired structure.

Similar to how hockey operations' personnel structures differ from one franchise to the next, so do the duties of GMs. For example, Brad Treliving, GM of the Calgary Flames, is cited as being responsible for both player and staff personnel decisions, managing pro and amateur scouting staffs, determining player assignments with minor league affiliates, and other administrative duties (Calgary Flames, 2015). In contrast, the Detroit Red Wings describe the duties of GM Ken Holland as "overseeing all aspects of Detroit's hockey operations including matters relating to player personnel, development, contract negotiations, and player movement" (Detroit Red Wings, 2015, ¶ 6). The difference in explicit duties between these two GMs may be a result of the capabilities and resulting duties of the other members of each GM's corresponding hockey operations staffs. Within each franchise's department of hockey operations, different individuals possess unique capabilities that support the overall operations of the department.

Devine and Foster (2006) conducted an interview with Scott Howson in an effort to further understand the responsibilities of a NHL GM and his hockey operations staff. Howson is the current Senior Vice President of Hockey Operations for the Edmonton Oilers and former General Manager of the Columbus Blue Jackets. At the time of the interview, he was the AGM of the Edmonton Oilers and provided insight into the management of a NHL franchise. When asked about making player personnel decisions, Howson stated that Kevin Lowe, the former GM of the Oilers, relied heavily on the input of the other members of the hockey operations staff. However, Howson was quick to point out that, as the GM, Lowe was the ultimate decision maker. Howson also stated that as a member of a hockey operations staff, it is critical to learn from more experienced NHL GMs because professional sports is a unique management environment. This

acknowledgement highlights the potential for leader development through mentoring relationships within the hockey operations staffs of NHL franchises.

As witnessed throughout the extended literature review, mentoring is a vast and complex area of research, due in part to the variety of contexts in which mentoring relationships can exist. Further, the benefits that often accompany a mentoring relationship for the protégé, mentor, and/or organization make the concept of mentoring a fruitful domain of inquiry. Researchers, including Kram, have provided the conceptual foundation for other scholars to move mentoring research forward. Despite the many contexts in which mentoring has been studied in over the past several decades, there remains a dearth of research on mentoring among professional sport executives.

## References

- Akin, G. (1987). Varieties of managerial learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(2), 36-48.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lenz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 127-136.
- Audas, R., Goddard, J., & Rowe, W. G. (2006). Modelling employment durations of NHL Head Coaches: Turnover and post-succession performance. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 27, 293-306.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Barrow, J. (1977). The variables of leadership: A review and conceptual framework. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2, 231-251.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Personal selling and transactional/transformational leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 17(3), 19-28.
- Bennie, A., & O'Connor, D. (2012). Perceptions and strategies of effective coaching leadership: A qualitative investigation of professional coaches and players. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 10, 82-89.
- Beres, J., & Dixon, J. C. (2014). Exploring mentoring functions within the sport management academy: Perspectives of mentors and protégés. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 8, 14-26.

- Bozeman, B., & Feeney, M. K. (2008). Mentor matching: A “goodness of fit” model. *Administration & Society, 40*(5), 465-482.
- Brass, D. J. (2001). Social capital and organizational leadership. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership* (pp. 132–152). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Calgary Flames. (2015). *Hockey operations*. Retrieved from <http://flames.nhl.com/club/page.htm?id=40740>
- Carless, S. A., Mann, L., & Wearing, A. J. (1998). Leadership, managerial performance and 360-degree feedback. *Applied psychology: An International Review, 47*(4), 481-496.
- Carter, A. R., & Hart, A. (2010). Perspectives of mentoring: The black female student-athlete. *Sport Management Review, 13*, 382-394.
- Chandler, D. E., Hall, D. T., & Kram, K. E. (2010). A developmental network and relational savvy approach to talent development: A low-cost alternative. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(1), 48-56.
- Chandler, D. E., Kram, K. E., & Yip, J. (2011). An ecological systems perspective on mentoring at work: A review and future prospects. *The Academy of Management Annals, 5*(1), 519-570.
- Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 15-28.

- Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 619-636.
- Colbert, A. E., Judge, T. A., Choi, D., & Wang, G. (2012). Assessing the trait theory of leadership using self and observer ratings of personality: The mediating role of contributions to group success. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 670-685.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, S95–S120.
- Coyle, D. (2009). *The talent code*. New York: Bantam Dell.
- Cruickshank, A., Collins, D., & Minten, S. (2013). Culture change in a professional sports team: Shaping environmental contexts and regulating power. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 8*(2), 271-290.
- Day, V. D. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 581-613.
- Detroit Red Wings. (2015). *Hockey operations*. Retrieved from <http://flames.nhl.com/club/page.htm?id=40740>
- Deutscher, C. (2009). The payoff to leadership in teams. *Journal of Sports Economics, 10*(4), 429-438.
- Devine, K., & Foster, W. M. (2006). Off-the-ice action in the National Hockey League: An interview with Scott Howson of the Edmonton Oilers. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(3), 290-298.

- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 36-62.
- Dobrow, S. R., Chandler, D. E., Murphy, W. M., & Kram, K. E. (2012). A review of developmental networks: Incorporating a mutuality perspective. *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 210-242.
- Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 292-309.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 254-267.
- Eby, L. T., & Lockwood, A. (2005). Protégés' and mentors' reactions to participating in formal mentoring programs: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 441-458.
- Egan, T. M., & Song, Z. (2008). Are facilitated mentoring programs beneficial? A randomized experimental field study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 351-362.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10(4), 309-320.
- Farris, J. (2011). *Behind the moves: NHL general managers tell how winners are built*. West Vancouver, BC: circanow.media.

- Ferris, G. R., & Perrewe, P. L. (2014). Development of sport management scholars through sequential experiential mentoring: Apprenticeship concepts in the professional training and development of academics. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 8, 71-74.
- Froiland, P. (1994). Action learning: Taming real problems in real time. *Training*, 31(1), 27-34.
- Frontiera, J. (2010). Leadership and organizational culture transformation in professional sport. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1), 71-86.
- Galli, E. B., & Muller-Stewens, G. (2012). How to build social capital with leadership development: Lessons from an explorative case study of a multibusiness firm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 176-201.
- Gamson, W., & Scotch, N. (1964). Scapegoating in baseball. *American Journal of Sociology*, 70(1), 69-76.
- Ghosh, R., & Reio, T. G. (2013). Career benefits associated with mentoring for mentors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 106-116.
- Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93-102.
- Grant, A. M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 528-550.
- Harrison, C. K., Comeaux, E., & Plecha, M. (2006). Faculty and male football and basketball players on university campuses: An empirical investigation of the “intellectual” as mentor to the student athlete. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(2), 277-284.

- Hatfield, B. D., Wrenn, J. P., & Bretting, M. M. (1987). Comparison of job responsibilities of intercollegiate athletic directors and professional sport general managers. *Journal of Sport Management, 1*, 129-145.
- Hicks, H., & Gullett, R. (1998). *Organizational and management theories, elements and processes* (2nd ed.). Tehran: Douran Publication.
- Higgins, M. C., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Constellations and careers: Toward understanding the effects of multiple developmental relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 223-247.
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 26*, 264-288.
- Hoffmann, M. D., & Loughead, T. M. (2015). Investigating athlete mentoring functions and their association with leadership behaviours and protégé satisfaction. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 22*, 1-18.
- Homer. (1946). *The odyssey*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *The Academy of Management Review, 8*(3), 475-485.
- Jones, R. L., Harris, R., & Miles, A. (2009). Mentoring in sports coaching: A review of the literature. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 14*(3), 267-284.
- Katz, J. H., & Miller, F. A. (1996). Coaching leaders through culture change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 104-114.
- Kelly, D. D., & Dixon, M. A. (2014). Successfully navigating life transitions among African American male student-athletes: A review and examination of

- constellation mentoring as a promising strategy. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28, 498-514.
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001) Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15(2), 135-159.
- Kilburg, R. R. (1996). Toward a conceptual understanding and definition of executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48(2), 134-144.
- Kotter, P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 608-625.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Company.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, D., Klein, E., Levinson, M., & McKee, B. (1978). *Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Chenwei, L., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434-1452.
- London, M., & Beatty, R. W. (1993). 360-degree feedback as a competitive advantage. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 353-372.

- Lorinkova, N. M., Pearsall, M. J., & Sims, H. P. (2013). Examining the differential longitudinal performance of directive versus empowering leadership in teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(2), 573-596.
- Malik, S. H. (2013). Relationship between leader behaviors and employees' job satisfaction: A path-goal approach, *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 209-222.
- McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). *The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, (33)3, 161-173.
- Mott, J. W. (2009). *The role of human and social capital in the perpetuation of leader development* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3359151)
- Mott, J. W., Porschitz, E. T., Sherman, K. E., & Manz, C. C. (2007). How networks impact the search for a mentor: An examination of NCAA basketball coaches and their protégés. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 3-20.
- Murphy, W. M., & Kram, K. E. (2010). Understanding non-work relationships in developmental networks. *Career Development International*, 15(7), 637-663.
- Narcotta, E. M., Peterson, J. C., & Johnson, S. R. (2009). Mentor functions in NCAA women's soccer coaching dyads. *Team Performance Management*, 15(3/4), 100-116.

- National Hockey League. (2008). *History*. Retrieved from <http://www.nhl.com/history/timeline.html>
- Ncube, L. B., & Wasburn, M. H. (2006). Strategic collaboration for ethical leadership: A mentoring framework for business and organizational decision making. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *13*(1), 77-92.
- Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, *41*, 457-479.
- Olian, J. D., Carroll, S. J., Giannantonio, C. M., & Feren, D. B. (1988). What do protégés look for in a mentor? Results of three experimental studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *33*, 15-37.
- Orpen, C. (1995). The effects of mentoring on employees' career success. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *135*(5), 667-668.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *42*, 170-183.
- Packard, B. W. (2003). Student training promotes mentoring awareness and action. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *51*(4), 335-345.
- Packard, B. W., Kim, G. J., Sicley, M., & Piontkowski, S. (2009). Composition matters: Multi--context informal mentoring networks for low-income urban adolescent girls pursuing healthcare careers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *17*(2), 187-200.

- Packard, B. W., Walsh, L., & Seidenberg, S. (2004). Will that be one mentor or two? A cross-sectional study of women's mentoring during college. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 12*(1), 71-85.
- Pastore, D. (2003). A different lens to view mentoring in sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 17*, 1-12.
- Peterson, D. B. (1996). Executive coaching at work: The art of one-on-one change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 78-86.
- Popper, M. (1996). Leadership in military combat units and business organizations: A comparative psychological analysis. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11*(1), 15-23.
- Popper, M. (2005). Main principles and practices in leader development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*(1/2), 62-75.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor 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., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 6*, 1177-1194.
- Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(1), 14-20.
- Rowe, W. G., Cannella, A. A., Rankin, D., & Gorman, D. (2005). Leader succession and organizational performance: Integrating the common-sense, ritual scapegoating, and vicious-circle succession theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 197-219.

- Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.
- Scandura, T. A., & Viator, R. E. (1994). Mentoring in public accounting firms: An analysis of mentor-protégé relationships, mentorship functions, and protégé turnover intentions. *Accounting, Organizations, and Society, 19*(8), 717-734.
- Seibert, S. (1999). The effectiveness of facilitated mentoring: A longitudinal quasi-experiment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 483-502.
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management, 16*(4), 693-703.
- Sinclair, N., Harper, T., & Segrave, J. (2014). Building a collegiate athletic leadership model for NCAA teams: Context, leadership behaviors, and outcomes mediated by leader-member exchange theory. *The International Journal of Sport and Society, 4*, 33-46.
- Singh, R., Ragins, B. R., & Tharenou, P. (2009). What matters most? The relative role of mentoring and career capital in career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*, 56-67.
- Smith, M. J., Arthur, C. A., Hardy, J., Callow, N., & Williams, D. (2013). Transformational leadership and task cohesion in sport: The mediating role of intrateam communication. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*, 249-257.
- Top, M., Akdere, M., & Tarcan, M. (2015). Examining transformational leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust in Turkish hospitals: Public servants versus private sector employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*(9), 1259-1285.

- Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of protégé personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 688-702.
- van Emmerik, I. J. H. (2004). The more you can get the better: Mentoring constellations and intrinsic career success. *Career Development International*, 9(6), 578-594.
- Waldman, D. A., & Atwater, L. E. (1998). Has 360-degree feedback gone amok? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 12(2), 86-94.
- Wang, S., Tomlinson, E. C., & Noe, R. A. (2010). The role of mentor trust and protégé internal locus of control in formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 358-367.
- Wasburn, M. H. (2007). Mentoring women faculty: An instrumental case study of strategic collaboration. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15(1), 57-72.
- Wasburn, M. H., & Crispo, A. W. (2006). Strategic collaboration: Developing a more effective mentoring model. *Review of Business*, 27(1), 18-25.
- Waters, L. (2004). Protégé-mentor agreement about the provision of psychosocial support: The mentoring relationship, personality, and workload. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 519-532.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *QUEST*, 51, 24-38.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Mentoring in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 96-116.
- Wilson, J. A., & Elman, N. S. (1990). Organizational benefits of mentoring. *The Executive*, 4(4), 88-94.

- Wong, G. M., & Deubert, C. (2010). Major League Baseball general managers: An analysis of their responsibilities, qualifications, and characteristics. *Nine: A Journal of Baseball History and Culture*, 18(2), 74-121.
- Yiwen, Z., Lepine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Feng, W. (2014). It's not fair...or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor-job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(3), 675-697.
- Young, D. (1990). Mentoring and networking: Perceptions by athletic administrators. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 71-79.
- Young, A. M., & Parrewé, P. L. (2000). The exchange relationship between mentors and protégés: The development of a framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(2), 177-209.
- Zand, D. E. (1997). *The leadership triad: Knowledge, trust, and power*. New York: Oxford University.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Researcher Autobiography

As aptly pointed out by Creswell (2014), researchers can have a considerable influence on their own qualitative studies due to the interpretive nature of the data analysis process. Consequently, it is important that I acknowledge experiences that have shaped my biases, values, and personal background as they relate to mentoring, particularly in sport. These experiences include previous involvement with mentors, as well as my views on mentoring, previous research experience, and my motivations for pursuing this study.

I have been blessed to have four experiences with mentors, all of which I would be remiss not to mention at this juncture. Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, I have three older brothers and a father that have provided me with true examples of what mentoring relationships should be. Being the youngest in my family, I have been able to model the successful actions and decisions of my older brothers, as well as gain insight from their life experiences. Further, all of these individuals have provided me with a plethora of mentoring functions that I have benefitted from throughout my life.

Secondly, from a young age, I was involved in a variety of sports and have had almost exclusively positive experiences, particularly in the sport of hockey. Through my minor hockey years, there were three individuals that coached the hockey teams I played on. These coaches were my friends' fathers, as well as my dad. All of these men acted as mentors for me at a young age, as they aided in my development as a hockey player, as well as a leader. I was often a formal leader of my team, serving as team captain, and always led by example both on and off the ice.

Thirdly, Desi Zimmerman was my teacher from grades five to ten, my badminton coach, a family friend, fellow hockey coach, and co-worker. I have always admired Desi's work ethic and relentless striving to be the best that he can be in everything. Thus, whether knowingly or not, he has been a mentor to me for well over a decade and I have benefitted from a variety of functions that he has provided me with.

Finally, and perhaps most pertinent, is the mentoring relationship I have with my master's advisor, Dr. Jess Dixon. Jess has demonstrated to me what it means to be a professional, strive to be the best I can possibly be, and find a career that I will be passionate about and enjoy. The fact that I am pursuing the completion of this master's degree and, specifically, this thesis project is an example of the positive affects my mentorship with Dr. Dixon has had on my life. Jess has had a significant impact on my ability to strive to be the best that I can be by making decisions with an open mind and without fear of failure. My research background is limited, as I was not exposed and did not seek out opportunities to get involved in research during my undergraduate education. The thought of completing a thesis seemed terribly daunting and not something that I had the skill set for. It was not until my arrival at the University of Windsor that I gained an appreciation for the power of research and decided to pursue this project. Thus, the process of completing this thesis is a considerable learning experience for me and I am excited for the opportunity to gain the research skills and knowledge associated with doing so. In sum, these four positive mentoring experiences have instilled in me an optimistic perspective of what mentoring is and a desire to provide similar benefits to other individuals when the opportunities arise for me to be a mentor.

Finally, it is important for me to highlight my motivation for undertaking this project, in particular. As noted earlier, I have been blessed to have numerous mentors in my life that have aided in the development of my world view, values, and self-concept. Therefore, I have felt the positive effects mentoring can have on an individual and have a desire to learn more about what makes an effective mentor so myself, and others, can model the successes of previous mentors. Additionally, the positive impact my involvement in sport has had on my life has motivated me to pursue further education in sport management and contribute to the creation of new knowledge through this research project. Also, I am fascinated by the management of professional sports teams and hope to one day be employed in this sector of the sport industry. Consequently, I have a desire to learn more about the factors that make a great General Manager, particularly as it pertains to leader development through mentoring.

## VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: Stephen E. Kirzinger

PLACE OF BIRTH: Humboldt, SK

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1990

EDUCATION: Caronport High School, Caronport, SK, 2008  
Mount Royal University, BBA, Calgary, AB, 2013  
University of Windsor, M.H.K., Windsor, ON, 2016