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The present study sought to investigate the role of mentoring relationships in predicting career resilience. The study adopted a cross-sectional survey based research design using a sample of 205 managers from public and private sector organizations in North India. Mentoring relationships were measured under the 2 broad categories of career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring in alignment with previous studies. The findings showed that psychosocial mentoring acts as a significant predictor of career resilience; however, career mentoring was not found to have any significant influence on career resilience. Given research thus reiterated the significant contribution of mentoring in influencing career outcomes such as career resilience. Theoretical and future implications of research were also discussed.
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The unprecedented volatility of today’s global environment has forced organizations to strategize and devise unique career development interventions for training their workforce to enhance their diverse capabilities. In this context, effectiveness of workplace mentoring has long been recognized as vital for an organization (Billett, 2003). Traditionally, mentoring has been defined as a relationship between an older more experienced person (mentor) who helps and enables career development of a younger less experienced person (protégé) who may or may not be employed in the same organization or same chain of command or profession as that of the protégé (Levinson et al., 1978; Kram, 1985; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Ragins, 1999;
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Mentoring as a useful professional intervention for executive development has been confused with coaching among management practitioners. In this context, Megginson and Clutterbuck (2005) conceptualized the difference between both forms of developmental relationships. According to them, while coaching relates primarily to “performance improvement for learning specific skills” and is aimed at the accomplishment of intermediate or subgoals in line with the suggestion of the coach; mentoring relates primarily to the “identification and nurturing of potential for the whole person” based on the mentor–protégé long-term relationship where the mentor’s role is pivotal for providing useful insights for enhancing the protégé’s self-awareness (Megginson & Clutterbuck, 2005). This differentiation to some extent is resolved using the research of Grant (2004), who emphasized the close relation of coaching with mentoring whereby a coach with or without a domain specific expertise facilitates the entire result-oriented process to enhance the work performance of the protégé. In this research, it was further highlighted how various aspects of coaching can inform and enhance the mentoring process. Thus, taking into account converging viewpoints of both the concepts, our study adopted conceptualization in alignment with earlier studies that consider coaching as one of the significant forms of mentoring (Noe, 1988; Aryee & Chay, 1994).

There are many career benefits associated with the mentoring process. Research studies in the past depicted the usefulness of mentoring programs for enhancing a protégé’s competencies (Aryee & Chay, 1994) and personal learning (Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Simultaneously, organizations have also realized that irrespective of the situation in the global economy, learning that is facilitated via the process of mentoring not only trains employees to do their job effectively but also shapes their career path in the right direction. Furthermore, workplace mentoring also facilitates employee counseling to strengthen employees for overcoming challenges related to professional and personal development. In this way, workplace mentoring has an important role for enhancing the resilience of employees. In addition, creating a resilient workforce has become one of the toughest challenges for organizations in the present decade owing to prevalence of uncertainty and other competitive pressures across the globe. As a result, employees often find it difficult to persevere in their chosen career line. Thus, for stability under such ambiguous circumstances, the guidance and support of an experienced senior person who can function as a protector and a role model instills a sense of confidence among employees and helps them effectively deal with the obstacles. According to Lidenberger (2008), mentors enable protégés to see the wider realm of opportunities and give their valuable advice for career advancement to strengthen the fabric of resilience.
Keeping this foregoing discussion in mind, the present study explored the linkage of mentoring with career resilience using survey data collected from managers working in public and private sector organizations in North India. Through an empirical examination of the mentoring–career-resilience relationship, we contribute to the existing body of research on mentoring relationships and career outcomes. Although there is a plethora of research in the academic writings of careers and vocational psychology about career resilience, very few studies have been conducted in the Western countries on mentoring and career resilience. Hence, by testing the mentoring-career resilience relationship in the Indian context, our study also provides an opportunity for scholars and academicians to conduct replication studies from the cross-cultural perspective.

For an empirical examination of the linkage of mentoring with career resilience in the Indian context, we conceptualized mentoring based on the traditional model of one-to-one relationship (mentoring dyads) rather than a constellation of mentoring relationships (developmental networks; Ghosh & Haynes, 2008). Our conceptualization can be derived from India’s higher standing on the cultural dimensions of collectivism and power distance (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 1997).

Unlike Western countries (United States, Australia, and Spain; Hofstede, 2007), where people are individualistic, Indian people are more collectivist and followers of family traditions. They prefer to remain in harmony with the social environment (Christie et al., 2003). Another major difference between Western countries (e.g., United States) and the non-Western countries (e.g., India) is the professional ideologies of the nations. In the West, an ideal superior’s behavior is conceived as being professional and impersonal for the fulfillment of self-economic interest of the subordinate and there is no expectation of whether or not the superior is nurturing or assertive (Kakar, 1977). On the other hand, in the non-Western countries like India, due to higher ranking on the dimension of power distance (Hofstede, 1980) and the dominance of parental authority patterns in Indian organizations (Kakar, 1971), there is greater employee dependency on the nurturing supervisor for enhancing work performance and satisfaction. Similarly, Kakar, Kakar, Kets-deVries, and Vrignaud (2002) also identified in their study that Indian subordinates need a benevolent guide who is not only in strict in getting tasks accomplished but also takes an active interest in the subordinate’s well-being (Banerjee, 2009). This available evidence along with the prevalent culture of “family tradition” in India indicates the control and power being vested in the hands of a supervisor who is also responsible for the welfare of subordinates in this “one-on-one superior–subordinate relationship” (Varma, Srinivas, & Stroh, 2005). Thus, employees from high-power-distance cultures (e.g., India, Venezuela, and Philippines) consider bypassing of their bosses as insubordination (Adler, 1997; Kirkman & Shapiro, 1997). As a result, employer-
employee relationships in India are driven by the fulfillment of mutual
two-way expectations with respect to one another. Employers facilitate
protection to employees who also reciprocate the same with their loyalty and
dedication toward them through the accomplishment of organizational tasks.
Indian employees tend to identify themselves with the vision of the employer
and the organization (Shao & Webber, 2006) and have an orientation to serve
and stay in the organization with a long-term perspective. This further
clarifies the crucial necessity of mentors in the Indian context for guiding and
shaping the employee behavior.

Aside from contextual evidence that shapes the relation of mentoring
with career resilience, the social cognitive theory and adult development
theory also provide an explanatory base for understanding the mentoring
phenomenon. Social cognitive theory puts a major emphasis on the effective
use of modeling for inculcating work-related interpersonal skills in the
development of managers (Ghosh & Haynes, 2008). According to the social
cognitive theory, people learn by observing others. Thus, following this
approach can help managers serving as mentors to model desired corporate
behavior in developing protégés and enabling them to learn correct behaviors
(Ghosh & Haynes, 2008). Similarly, the adult development theory (Levinson
et al., 1978) also indicates the significant role of workplace mentoring for the
adult development of executives by stimulating the identity and intellectual
development of the protégé.

THEORETICAL OVERVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Mentoring

In the present scenario, organizations primarily use mentoring as a tool
for talent development, retention and attraction (Robinson, 2007). Mentoring
is a “deliberate pairing of a more skilled or experienced person with a lesser
skilled or experienced one, with the agreed upon goal of having the lesser
skilled person grow and develop specific competencies” (Murray, 1991, p.
xi). Workplace mentoring relationships yield great benefits such as higher
levels of compensation, promotions, career advancement, enhanced career
mobility, and career satisfaction (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Ragins, 1997).
Aside from this, mentoring contributes to the overall competence develop-
ment of employees by offering challenging work assignments and coaching
for skill upgradation (Kram & Isabella, 1985).

Numerous studies in the mentoring literature have categorized mentoring
roles assumed by senior experienced professionals under the two major
functions of psychosocial mentoring and career related mentoring (Kram,
Psychosocial mentoring includes those functions that enhance the inner competence of the protégé through unconditional acceptance and providing timely feedback to the protégé. While psychosocial mentoring support provided by a mentor carries more of affective component, career-oriented mentoring covers functions such as sponsorship, challenging assignments, protection, exposure, and visibility (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Noe, 1988). Apart from these two broad categories of mentoring functions, another study by Scandura (1992) used survey data from public accounting firms and demonstrated the existence of a third category of mentoring function called role-modeling. This function is illustrative of such a behavior in which a protégé identifies with a mentor with great referent power, the ones who hold high standards and are well-trusted and respected in the organizations (Scandura & Viator, 1994).

Career Resilience

According to Bryant (1995), whenever a change occurs in a person’s life, the individual traits and skills (e.g., time management) interact with both environmental and situational factors to produce a behavior that leads to the successful adaptation toward change, called resilience. Richardson (2002, p. 313) stated that resilience is “the motivational force within everyone that drives them to pursue wisdom, self-actualization, and altruism and to be in harmony with the spiritual source of strength.” Paul and Garg (2014, p. 72) defined resilience as “a unique ability to endure and recover fully from the extreme conditions, setbacks, trauma and other adversity.” Career resilience is thus an ability to adapt to changes even when situations are disruptive (London, 1997, p. 34). People who are high on career resilience show a high level of persistence in the face of adversities (Carson & Bedeian, 1994).

Expected Relationships and Development of Hypotheses

Career resilience defines the extent to which people resist career barriers or disruptions that affect their work, self-confidence, need for achievement, willingness, risk-taking ability, and acting independently and cooperatively (London & Mone, 1987). In this context, facilitation of mentoring support to protégés can play a significant role in building employees’ self-confidence through feedback and positive reinforcement. This will also contribute toward creating an environment conducive to risk taking that reduces the fear of failure.
Current research takes into account Kram’s (1985) conceptualization for understanding mentoring relationships under the two broad categories of psychosocial mentoring support and career mentoring support. We argue that in the Indian context, psychosocial mentoring, which characterizes a mentor adopting various roles such as a role model for the protégé, unconditional acceptance, and confirmation, counseling and friendship functions (Kram & Isabella, 1985) will influence the career resilience of Indian managers. This can be ascribed to the unique characteristics offered by the Indian culture, as it is a traditional hierarchical society where mentors assume the benevolent role of a parental figure who feel obligated to protect the junior employees and always keep themselves involved in both their work and nonwork lives (Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). Thus, in dealing with affective reactions in the workplace, socioemotional support of the mentor inculcates confidence in the protégé to effectively overcome difficulties. Besides this, India is higher on Hofstede’s cultural dimension of collectivism; therefore, facilitation of mentoring functions such as friendship and admiration of the senior members ushers the spirit of apnapan (belongingness), jaan-pehchaan (familiarity), and sambandh (who you know; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Ramaswami & Dreher, 2010) in the mentor–protégé relationship. This kind of psychosocial mentoring support is perceived by a protégé as a kind gesture that stimulates them to share their problems and concerns with the mentor without any hesitation. This further enhances the mutual liking of mentor and protégé and makes mentoring as a social exchange process more enjoyable. We thus, hypothesize that

**Hypothesis 1:** Psychosocial mentoring will be strongly related to career resilience among Indian managers.

Similarly, we also expect career mentoring support to act as a significant predictor of career resilience among Indian managers. In a study by Gentry et al. (2008) from samples of 33 countries across the globe, India ranked 12th on performance orientation. This study also emphasized that in cultures like India, value-performance orientation—and, to a greater extent, mentoring—is viewed positively. In addition, Indian organizations are also quite particular in employee training and development (Budhwar, 2003; Pio, 2007). Further, career mentoring has been a popular practice in India in the form of traditional guru–shishya relationship where the sole focus of the guru (mentor) is to guide the shishya (protégé) in his journey of self-discovery and transformation (Neki, 1973; Raina, 2002). Career-mentoring stimulates a protégé’s career advancement through the provision of challenging assignments, sponsoring for management development programs, guidance for achieving specific performance strategies, coaching, and enhancing protégé’s greater visibility among senior members for building contacts (Dreher &
Dougherty, 1997). Thus, given the nature of the progress-oriented functions of career mentoring support, it is quite reasonable to assume its significant role in enhancing the confidence of the protégés to effectively face every kind of situation. Henceforth, we hypothesize that

**Hypothesis 2**: Career mentoring will be strongly related to career resilience among Indian managers.

**METHOD**

**Procedure and Sample**

Data were collected through questionnaires from 205 managers in five public and private sector organizations in North India. The survey method was utilized and participants were contacted by making personal visits as well as via e-mail. The questionnaire was prefaced with a cover letter that explained the purpose and objectives of the study, participants were also assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. Participants in the present study consisted of employees from both managerial as well as technical backgrounds with 54.1% from the private sector and 45.9% from public sector organizations. The education profile of the respondents indicated that about 3.9% were diploma holders, 41% were graduates, 50.7% as postgraduates, and 4.4% constituted higher than postgraduates. About 42.4% respondents occupied the age group between 26 and 30 years. In terms of the hierarchical level, 22.1% reported to be at junior-level positions, 64.2% reported to be in middle-level positions, and 13.7% reported to be in senior-level positions.

**Instruments**

*Psychosocial Mentoring and Career Mentoring*

A 21-itemed scale given by (Noe, 1988) was used to assess the mentoring functions among Indian managers and the items were subjected to modification in accordance to the organizational context. Responses were taken on a five point format ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Of these 21 items, 14 items measured psychosocial mentoring and 7 items measured career mentoring; the score of the same was computed by the summation of the individual items and then the average was calculated. Sample items included, “I try to imitate the work behavior of my mentor” and
“My mentor assigned responsibilities that increased my contact with those who may judge my potential for future advancement.” The reliability of the scale in the present study was well established, with Cronbach’s alpha for psychosocial mentoring and career mentoring reported as 0.92 and 0.91, respectively.

### Career Resilience

Career resilience was assessed by adapting four items of career resilience from the Career Commitment Measure (Carson & Bedeian, 1994), which is a multidimensional construct of three main dimensions—career identity, career resilience, and career planning. This construct defines career commitment as the motivation to work in a chosen vocation based on Hall’s (1971) definition and London’s (1983, 1985) career motivation theory. To accomplish the study objective, the study defined career resilience as “the extent to which employee shows willingness to persist during the times of adversities and fluctuations . . .” (Carson & Bedeian, 1994).

Sample items included, “The discomforts associated with my line of work/career field sometimes seem too great.” Responses of the participants were recorded on a 5-point format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha reliability was reported as 0.75.

### Control Variables

Four variables were included as control variables: age, gender, organization sector (public/private), and hierarchical level. Position and organizational control measures were established because they are structural variables in nature and may influence career resilience and extent of mentoring functions as perceived by employees. The control variables were coded as follows: age (in years): 21–25 coded as 1, 26–30 coded as 2, 31–35 coded as 3, 36–40 coded as 4, 41–45 coded as 5, and above 45 coded as 6; gender: male coded as 1, and female coded as 2; organization sector: private coded as 1 and public coded as 2; and hierarchical level: junior level coded as 1, middle level coded as 2, and senior level coded as 3.

### Analysis

A multiple hierarchical regression analysis was utilized to measure the impact of mentoring relationships on career resilience. Hence, the dependent
variable of career resilience was regressed on control variables and then on the other two categories of mentoring relationships in alignment with the methodology adopted in the previous studies (Whitely & Coetsier, 1993 & Mullen, 1998). The purpose of using this methodology was to determine if psychosocial mentoring and career mentoring made a unique and significant contribution in the dependent variable after recognizing the contribution of the control variables (Whitely & Coetsier, 1993). Thus, following this strategy of analysis, the control variables were entered in the first step, followed by the variables of theoretical interest, psychosocial mentoring and career mentoring, in the second step.

RESULTS

Table 1 represents the mean, standard deviation and intercorrelations among the variables. The existing differential correlations among the two categories of mentoring relationships and career resilience can be seen in Table 1. For example, psychosocial mentoring was moderately correlated with career resilience, $r = 0.228, p < .01$, and career mentoring showed weak correlation with career resilience, $r = 0.145, p < .05$. Furthermore, the correlation between psychosocial mentoring and career mentoring, $r = 0.700, p < .01$, is also noteworthy. This indicated that career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring are strongly linked with each other. For instance, facilitating coaching to the protégé via career mentoring may also require the emotional support of the mentors. Yet, vice versa, it can also be seen where the sole provision of emotional support via the psychosocial mentoring may not be perceived by the protégé as very useful from the perspective of fulfilling intrinsic growth needs (e.g., attractive career advancement opportunities). However, this can be more carefully studied through the adoption of a longitudinal study research design that is outside the scope of the present study.

Table 2 shows the results of the multiple hierarchical regression analysis. The salient finding of the present study is that only psychosocial mentoring ($\beta =$

| Table 1. Mean, Standard Deviations, and Zero-Order Correlations Among the Existing Variables |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                | 1      | 2      | 3      |
| Psychosocial mentoring          | [0.92] |        |        |
| Career mentoring                | .700*  | [0.91] |        |
| Career resilience               | .228** | .145   | [0.75] |
| Means                           | 3.75   | 3.6    | 3.6    |
| Standard deviations             | 0.82   | 0.89   | 0.89   |

Note. $N = 205$; reliability of the scales are represented in brackets along the diagonal. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. 
0.243, \( p < .05 \) was found as the most significant predictor of career resilience among Indian managers. This provided support for Hypothesis 1. Unexpectedly, career mentoring was not found to have any significant relationship with career resilience. Hence, Hypothesis 2 was not accepted. Notably, the overall model consisting of both career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring accounted for 7.5% variation in the dependent variable of career resilience.

**DISCUSSION**

Given the plethora of research dealing with the linkage of mentoring and career resilience, the present study aimed to examine this relationship in the Indian context. In order to accomplish this objective, we sought to include two categories of mentoring relationships as demonstrated in past studies, namely career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring.

Hypothesis 1 stated that psychosocial mentoring support would be strongly related to career resilience among Indian managers. As hypothesized, the results provided support to Hypothesis 1, indicating the prominent role of psychosocial mentoring on career resilience of Indian managers. This finding shows that the psychic development of the Indian managers is characterized by excessive dependence on the supervisors for their socioemotional development. Employees carry a firm belief in the decisions of senior authorities that not only guide them but also take a personal interest in their well-being and overall career growth and advancement (Yadav & Katiyar, 2012).

Hypothesis 2 stated that career mentoring would be strongly related to career resilience among Indian managers. Contrary to the proposed hypothesis, career mentoring was not found as a significant predictor of career resilience among

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Career Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization sector</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical level</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial mentoring</td>
<td>0.243*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career mentoring</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 205 \); beta values represent standardized coefficients.

\* \( p < .05 \). \** \( p < .01 \).
Indian managers. This reflects that career mentoring support is perceived less frequently among Indian managers. Reasonably, this may be due to the fact that career mentoring requires a lot of time, effort, dedication, and commitment from the side of mentor (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Bozionelos et al., 2011) and could cause a hindrance for the mentor in uncovering and tapping the hidden potential of the protégé. Another reason is that the administration of career mentoring functions is possible only in a well-formalized organizational setting. Despite mentorship programs that are under the formal scheme of the organizations, they are often limited to entry level employees to aid their socialization process (Wilson & Elman, 1990).

**Implications for Organizations and Managers**

The previous discussion guides us to conclude that a provision for psychosocial mentoring support is of paramount importance for enhancing the career resilience of Indian managers. Therefore, this study recommends that organizations should focus more on administering psychosocial mentoring to the employees than career mentoring. Although, career mentoring also serves to shield the employees from powerful forces within the organization (Bryant, 1995), yet the extent to which career mentoring truly benefits both employees and organizations is dependent on several factors such as the desired level of compatibility between mentor and protégés and suitable formal arrangements to support allocation of mentors to protégés (McManus & Russell, 1997; Kram, 1983). According to Clutterbuck (1994), mentoring relationships that arise in an informal way rather than being a part of a formal organizational scheme is more likely to favor confident and assertive people to succeed with fewer conflict issues pertaining to authority and influence (Friedman & Phillips, 2002). This also calls for a major imperative to prepare organization policies for the development of psychosocial mentoring functions. Further, a clear line of thought must be followed by organizational decision-makers for channelizing the practice of psychosocial mentoring. This could be done by conducting sessions for the senior and junior organizational members to help them understand the benefits of engaging in a mentoring relationship as a doorway to complete transformation and developing learning capabilities. Also, a trusting relationship guided with an appropriate emotional involvement forms the core elements of psychosocial mentoring, organizations should also train potential mentors to be trusting, friendly, polite and patient, available when needed, ready to give sincere advice, and nonjudgmental (Friedman & Phillips, 2002; Bramley et al., 2012).
Theoretical Implications

Given the adversities and fluctuations prevalent in the labor market, it is highly crucial for organizations to sustain their competitive workforce by enhancing employee career resilience. This may require skill development to make employees learn and devise innovative approaches for solving problems. Hence, considering the significance of the career resiliency paradigm in the present scenario, deploying the career resilience theory in the selection-assessment frameworks and counseling practices from the perspective of career development practitioners will give fruitful results (Rickwood, 2011). Furthermore, the tested model of the current study may also guide the development of processes and systems for effectively managing employee’s career resilience in organizations. This may be strategized through the adoption of various interventions such as motivating the workforce, building connections, and creating an environment for helping employees explore greater career opportunities.

Besides this, both the theory and findings of the study can be utilized for the development of new models of career resilience. For instance, our study viewed career resilience as a state of an individual’s persistence to stay motivated during adverse times. One may view career resilience as a dynamic process with affective, cognitive and behavioral components as the key drivers (Lew, 2001). Overall, there is scope to model the work on career resilience within the domain of industrial-occupational psychology by researching possible correlates, antecedents, and consequences of career resilience.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations are associated with the current research. The first concern arises from the utilization of cross-sectional survey based research design comprising of self-reported measures. This design raises the possibility of common method variance (CMV) resulting in inflated correlations (Crampton & Wagner, 1994). Specifically, researchers should follow appropriate strategies to avoid the possibility of CMV during the research design phase. One of the popular remedies is collecting data at two different times. Another promising remedy is deploying Harman’s Test using statistical techniques such as the partial correlation procedure and latent factor method. While the partial correlation method partials out the first unrotated factor from the rest of the exploratory factor analysis and then determines the theoretical relationships between the variables of interest, the latent factor method allows items to load on their respective theoretical constructs as well as on the latent CMV factor, which is followed by examining theoretical constructs with or without the common factor (Chang, Van Witteloostuijn, & Eden, 2010). In addition, because the understanding of men-
toring dynamics from the focal point of a mentor is equally important from the theoretical and practical perspectives (Allen, 2007), future research studies should seek to explore perceived mentoring and career resilience relationship from the perspective of mentors.

The second concern is the usage of cross-sectional survey that limits the scope for making inferences about causal relationships between the variables. One may argue that employees who are higher on career resilience show a greater tendency to be mentored. This interpretation can only be established by using longitudinal and experimental research designs.

The third concern is related to the generalizability of the findings of the study because the sample included Indian employees from both private and public sector organizations. Future studies are recommended to make a sector-wise analysis on the different types of mentoring relationships. Specifically, researchers may focus on exploring globalized mentoring functions of career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring as a fruitful avenue for future research investigation.

Another issue is the lack of differentiation in terms of formal mentoring and informal mentoring in the current study. Hence, the findings of this research cannot be generalized in the context of a specific formal business setting. Also, one has to be cautious while considering the replication of career benefits of formal mentoring in case of informal mentoring support (Meggison, 2000). Such issues can be resolved by testing interrelationships among the variables in the varied contexts, as mentoring is a context-specific phenomenon.

Future research studies may explore additional variables that have not been given substantial attention in the mentoring and careers literature. For instance, earlier studies have highlighted the important role of psychosocial mentoring support in clarifying the protégé’s sense of competence and identity (Noe, 1988; Olian et al., 1988; Scandura & Viator, 1994), yet few studies have analyzed the possible mechanisms governing this relationship. Further investigation on this should be conducted to understand the possible effects of intervening variables. In this regard, additional work may also be conducted to see how perceived mentoring support impact career resilience through investigating the moderating role of individual differences such as creative self-efficacy, core-self-evaluation, locus of control, and proactivity.
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