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ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the relationship between mentoring program, personality and mentee outcomes. One hundred respondents from different faculties in one of the universities in East Malaysia were involved in this study. Pearson Correlation was employed to determine the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes, personality and mentee outcomes, mentoring program and psychological and emotional support. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. Multiple Regressions was used to assess whether personality act as a moderator between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. The findings indicated that personality moderates the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. The findings of this research are beneficial for mentoring program in universities in Malaysia, especially, in ensuring better mentoring outcomes. Implication of this research on organization and individuals was also discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Mentoring among students is one of the issues in higher education owing to its impact on both mentor and mentee. The purpose of this research is to analyze the relationship between mentoring program, personality, and mentee outcomes.
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challenges in lifestyles before he goes to the Trojan war (Edlind & Haensly, 1985; Merriam, 1993; Ismail, Alias, & Amir, 2012).

Mentoring is a relationship between less experienced individual in which that individual is nurtured and trained by a more experienced person (Cummings & Worley, 2009). Roberts (2000) defined mentoring as a formalized process whereby developmental relationship in which a more knowledgeable and experienced person actuates a supportive role to encouraging and learning within an inexperienced and less knowledgeable person so that he or she can help that persons’ career and development. In higher education, mentoring is used for various purposes. It includes improving students’ academic performance, improving school attendance, improving job performance, decreasing deviant behavior, and improving connectedness to social institutions (Campbell & Campbell, 2007; Guetzloe, 1997; Karcher 2005; Stoltz, 2005).

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Mentoring program is known as an intervention that attempts to improve mentee outcomes. Mentees establish a strong and clear conceptual foundation when effective mentoring programs are constructed (Anderson & Shannon, 1988). It includes inspiring the mentee, developing mentees’ commitment to the goals and values and providing mentees’ with invaluable information. It is also a structured relationship between individuals and focuses on developing the competencies and strengths of the mentee (Britner & Kraimer-Rickaby, 2009).

Mentoring program is conducted by different individuals in different situations to different mentees. Hence, personality of both mentor and mentee can be a very significant factor that affects the mentee outcomes. Personality can be defined as mentee’s nature and characteristics as a whole that determine how an individual behaves (Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003). With regard to mentor-mentee relationship, Wanberg et al. (2003) stated that the role of mentor and mentee personality characteristics in mentoring relationships and mentoring program should be a research priority. This is because personality leads to suggestion of a variety of practical strategies for helping mentor and mentee and how the constructs may play a role in mentoring. One of the commonly assessed personality types are the Big-Five personalities. The Big-Five personalities are five broad domains or dimensions which are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness that are used to describe human personality (John & Srivastava, 1999). For example, Big-Five personality can lead to improving the mentee outcomes and enhance mentee knowledge about how they might benefit from mentoring. Mentor and mentee personality characteristics influence the success of mentor-mentee relationships and give the benefit of the mentee outcomes.

The role of personality characteristics in mentoring program received little attention in the literature. According to Wanberg et al. (2003), mentoring research has not examined current model of personality and mentor and mentee personality and should become a priority in research on mentor and mentee. Similarly, Noe, Greenberger, and Wang (2002) assert that the literature is still scarce in difficulties of personality and mentoring program. Recent studies show that mentoring programs where the ability of mentors to appropriately implement programs may give a significant impact to mentee outcomes (Ismail et al., 2012; Santos & Reigadas, 2005). However, few studies have used mentoring program as a measure of mentee outcomes at the university level (Burger, 1992; McKenzie, Gow, & Schweitzer, 2004; Nguyen, Allen, & Fraccastoro, 2005; Svanum & Zody, 2001).
Many researchers think that mentoring programs are distinct, but it is strongly interrelated constructs. This is because mentoring programs may lead to increased mentee outcomes (Ismail, Abdullah, & Khian, 2011; Santos & Reigadas, 2005). Although, personality that acts as a potential variable can influence the effectiveness of mentoring program and may provide different perspectives for understanding; it will affect the mentee outcomes, especially academics, moral development, interpersonal skills, intrapersonal skills, and career search (Guetzloe, 1997).

Research on the impact of personality on the mentoring outcomes may be beneficial to investigate and also will be moderated by other personality characteristics (Garner, Byars, & Greenwood, 2003). It is believed that individual differences in specific personality characteristics will influence the efficiency of mentoring relationships and consequently impact on the mentee outcomes. According to Turban, Dougherty, and Lee (2002), a better understanding of how mentee and mentor personality characteristics influence mentoring program success in academics and mentee development is important. Although little is known about whether or how individual differences of mentor and mentee affect the quality of mentoring relationships, it seems likely that mentor and mentee characteristics may influence the benefits of mentoring relationship for both mentor and mentee. Therefore, limited research investigating on the role of personality and the various methods to understand the mentoring program, personality and their outcomes is the drive for this study.

**OBJECTIVES**

This study is conducted to examine the relationship between personality and mentee outcomes. Specifically, this study attempts to investigate the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes with regard to psychological and emotional support. Additionally, this study also analyzes the role of personality in the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework depicts in Figure 1 shows the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable in this study. The independent variable is the mentoring program whereas the dependent variable is mentee outcomes and personality acts as a moderator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td>Mentee Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Psychological and emotional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Personality moderates the relationships between mentoring program and mentee outcomes**
LITERATURE REVIEW

Mentoring

According to Ragins and Kram (2007), the concept of mentoring has been around since the time of Homer. Homer, the author of Odyssey, one of two Greek epic poem books, is cited as the original source for mentioning the concept of mentoring. Despite Homer’s notion on the concept of mentoring which is universally accepted, the meaning of mentoring was not universally recognized. Wanberg et al. (2003) defined mentoring as one-to-one relationship between a less experienced and a more experienced person, which prototypically intended to advance the personal and professional growth of the less experienced individual.

Mentoring can be categorized into formal mentoring and informal mentoring. Formal mentoring involves some kind of matching process strong-minded by third party and informal mentoring is relationship that develops between individuals without managerial interventions (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Galbraith and Cohen (1995) found that the informal mentoring relationships seem to be less understood from the formal mentoring. Conversely, Wanberg et al. (2003) pointed out that a majority of studies conducted on mentoring have focused completely on informal mentoring. This is because they should be powerfully motivated and concerned in the relationship when each partner enters the relationship willingly. In certain outcomes, the formal and informal mentoring has positive relationships, but does not provide the same level of positive outcomes for formal mentoring and informal mentoring. Even beyond this, the formal mentoring for possibility of variance is greater than in informal mentoring and can have negative consequences (Eby, MccManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000).

Bova and Phillips (1984) used the method of surveys and interviews to verify positive values that mentee learned from their mentors and how they learned them. They determined that mentee learns risk-taking behaviours, skills in their profession, communication skills, respect for people, ways to set high standards and how to tolerate and communicate with all kinds of people, how to be good listeners, leadership qualities and what it means to be a professional. Similarly, Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and Mckee (1978) suggest that mentoring is critically important in developing individuals.

Gold and Pepin (1987) have showed in their research that retired teacher enjoyed mentoring and contributed to less experienced beginner teacher, and at the same time gained friendship through the program. Freiberg, Zbikoski, and Gansser (1997) conducted research on formal mentoring in a large town school and the results show that mentoring program enhanced mentors’ own professional growth in terms of improving professionalism and greater empowerment to take more responsibilities. Lewis, Parsad, Carey, Bartfai, Farris, Smerdon, and Greene (1999) in their survey found that 19 percent of teachers surveyed had been mentored by another teacher in a formal mentoring relationship. Their survey also shows that as teachers advance through their career, they gain wisdom from experience and the likelihood to be mentee decreases. On the contrary, the chances to become mentor increases.

In conclusion, the result of formal mentorship programs has some positive benefits for both mentees and mentors. The mentees obviously acquire new skills and knowledge that allow them to cope with their different types of responsibilities through mentoring.

Personality

Felissa, Thomas, and Daniel (2000) perceive personality as preferences of people who have certain types of behaviour and
the usual patterns of behaviour exhibited by people in a diversity of conditions. In a nutshell, personality permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation (Fontana, 2000).

According to the definition provided by Schultz (1994), personality is distinguished motivation, reaction and intervening variable. Motivation focuses on the feeling the person creates on others. Conversely, a person can create a different imitation on diverse people at different times. Therefore, motivation implies that people may have several personalities.

Thus, personality can affect the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. Surveys, such as, that conducted by Turban and Lee (2007) have shown that personality is a factor that leads individuals to build informal mentoring relationship and also can be used to match mentee to mentors in formal relationship. Similarity in personality has a positive relationship to quality of mentoring and mentee work attitudes when formally assigned. According to Allen and Eby (2003), the quality of mentoring is theoretically defined as feelings of positive affect toward the mentoring relationship and often evaluated through mentee pleasure with mentoring. The quality of mentoring can include the mutual perceived benefits, strength of the relationship and approval with the relationship. Higher effectiveness will have higher quality and in turn produces more positive mentee outcomes (Kram, 1985).

Besides that, personality makes the most of a valid and generally relevant personality framework on a consistent basis. One helpful personality framework is the Big-Five Model (Felissa, Thomas, & Daniel, 2000). The Big-Five is the generally used term for the model of personality which explains the five basic factors of our personality. According to Digma (1990), Big-Five is a classification that parsimoniously and expansively illustrates the human personality area. The Big-Five includes extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism.

### Mentee Outcomes

Mentoring is increasingly viewed as a key factor contributing to success for many mentees’ outcomes that consist of academic subject knowledge support, degree of career support, existence of a role model, and psychological and emotional support. Among the benefits of psychosocial mentoring relationships, psychological and emotional support, role modeling, academic support, and possible career progression are prominent (Hansman, 1998).

Nora and Crisp (2007) have conducted a study of the first latent variable of psychological and emotional support. The psychological and emotional support includes a sense of listening, providing moral and emotional support, providing support, as well as, the concern of a kind relationship in which there is common understanding, and link between mentees and mentor, and problem recognition.

According to Ismail, Hasbullah and Abu Bakar (2005), recent learning in university mentoring programs emphasizes that the ability of mentors to correctly perform interpersonal communication and communication openness may give a significant impact on mentee outcomes, especially academic performances. Ismail et al. (2011) reckon academic performance as students’ perseverance rates, graduation rates, and cumulative grade-point average. The lack of support and limited access to high quality undergraduate preparation may in turn influence the academic progress (Davis, 2007).

### Mentoring Program and Personality

Research on relationship between mentoring program and personality is sparse. Only a few studies have examined mentee personality features related to mentee perceptions of mentoring received.
Generally, the studies indicate that mentors may provide more mentoring to mentees who are seen as more experienced (Mullen, 1998; Mullen & Noe, 1999). Bozionelos (2004) examined the role of the Big-Five characteristics in providing mentoring and receiving mentoring. The Big Five characteristics include openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness. Individuals’ intelligence of receiving mentoring was correlated positively with their extraversion and openness to knowledge and was correlated negatively with conscientiousness. Results show that self-reported mentoring provided was correlated positively with openness to experience and negatively with agreeableness. Consequently, individuals reported receiving more mentoring when they were more extraverted, open to knowledge, and low in conscientiousness; and individuals reported providing more mentoring when they were high in openness to experience and low in agreeableness.

Felissa et al. (2000) conducted a study that focused on the role of personality and work values in mentoring programs. They reported that mentees who are low on emotional stability, and agreeableness or both may have difficulties in mentoring relationships. So, individual should benefit from interference prior to entering the mentoring program. Moreover, mentees who are very low on conscientiousness and openness dimension may benefit from training in general management skills, before they seek mentoring relationship with higher level managers. It can be concluded that the personality types could help mentors to assess mentoring programs. This information is important for people who are more or less satisfied, or who have experienced more or less difficulty in their relationships. Future interference could be developed to avoid any problems.

Melissa, Samuel, Timothy, and Cavell (2011) have also conducted a study to examine the degree to which mentoring highly aggressive children was associated with changes in mentors’ attitudes, personality, and attachment tendency. They used a team of 102 college students who each mentored an aggressive, high-risk child across three academic semesters in their study. They found out that volunteers who mentored an aggressive child for three academic semesters were likely to experience significant declines in mentoring self-efficacy, as well as, ratings of their level of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness. Significant declines in mentors’ self-ratings did not rise to the level of serious harm, and changes were more obvious among mentors who viewed the relationship as less supportive than other mentors. In fact, mentors who viewed the relationship as supportive tended to experience increased levels of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness.

**Mentoring Program and Mentee Outcomes**

Several researchers had conducted studies on the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. Elisabeth (2008), for example, conducted a study to estimate how mentoring program may or may not have been helpful to graduates. She found that the mentoring relationships and learning contracts were most helpful to the respondents in the study. That is because, it had the most impact on the respondents’ current job satisfaction, and had a positive effect on the move of seminary learning to following ministerial occupations. She concluded that the effect of relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes is positive.

In addition, Jean, Cidhinia, De, lia, and Chami (2011) also conducted a study on the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. They implemented a mentoring program for Latino college freshmen to identify processes that account for the effects of the program. Graduate students from psychol-
ogy and counseling majors are compared to an equal sample number of unmentored student. The result shows that mentors are good at alleviating psychosocial risk factors. Thus, choosing at-risk students and using experienced peers as mentors can make the program effective. The result also shows that the mentees showed a decreased level in hopelessness and stress than non-mentee who were classified as being at risk for poor academic outcomes. The number of contact between mentee and mentor, and the quality of the relationship contributed to positive outcomes for mentees.

Sushmita and Jomon (2013) conducted a study to examine factors that significantly influence the mentoring outcomes within formal and supervisory mentoring relationships. They used the qualitative case study approach to do their study. The results of this study are presented in two categories which included path goal clarity and values goal clarity. The path goal clarity is defined in terms of how a mentee can achieve his career goals and build the mentee self-efficacy and motivation in achieving that goal. Then, the values goal clarity is defined in terms of the mentee’s current work life situations, the appropriateness of chosen career and life decisions and whether they satisfy ones needs. They found that mentoring have significant practical implications for the development and formal and supervisory mentoring programs. On the other hand, the result shows that the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes is positive and significant.

Ismail, Alias, and Amir (2012) found mixed result in their studies on the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes. The results were based on two important communication styles which were interpersonal communication and communication openness as key factors to the success of mentoring program. The result indicated that the communication openness did act as an important determinant of academic performance, but does not act as an important predictor of academic performance. These studies additionally proposed that the ability of mentors to suitably train mentees in interpersonal communication and communication openness in mentoring activities will persuade subsequent positive mentee outcomes. Thus, these positive outcomes may lead to achieving academic performance of higher learning institutions.

Personality and Mentee Outcomes

Nikos and Giorgos (2010) conducted a study to investigate relationship between personality and mentee outcomes. They explored the relationship of mentoring received with the Big-Five personality and general mental ability in the Anglo-Saxon organizational environment. Additionally, it included the relationship between dispositional traits, mentoring received, and career success in a causal path model. Using the method of analysis of data collected from 272 white-collar workers, they suggested that the white-collar workers have no logarithmic form of relationship between mentoring received and personality traits or general mental ability. The result showed that there is a relationship between the Big-Five traits of openness and agreeableness and the amount of mentoring in individuals reported they had received. The study also considered the relationships between dispositional traits and mentoring received within the wider context of career success by placing the three sets of variables within a causal path model. Despite the positive relationship of both openness and agreeableness with mentoring received, their overall contribution to extrinsic career success was negative.

Ismail et al. (2012) did a study...
to examine the relationship between men-
tors communication styles and academic
performance. They used a self-report ques-
tionnaires collected from undergraduate
students in a defence-based university in
Malaysia. Using multiple regression analy-
sis, they found that the interpersonal com-
munication was not significantly correlated
with academic performance, but the com-
munication openness was significantly
correlated with academic performance.
They concluded that the ability of men-
tors to implement interpersonal commu-
ication is not an important interpreter of
academic performance, but the ability of
mentors to practice communication open-
ness is a significant interpreter of academic
performance.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In this study, a correlational research was
used to investigate the relationship be-
tween mentoring program, personality, and
mentee outcomes. A set of questionnaire
was used as a method of data collection for
this study. All the data obtained were ana-
lyzed using Statistical Package for Social
Sciences (SPSS 19.0).

Participants

Population and sample were deter-
mined before the research was carried out.
The minimum sample size of this research
was determined by using a formula sug-
Participants were asked to identify a likely
cause for each of the hypothetical situa-
tions and answer the questions.

Instruments

All the questionnaires used in this study
were derived from factors previously de-
veloped and validated. The set of ques-
tionnaires used in this study consisted of
four (4) sections. Section A mainly covers
demographic information whereas section
B covers questions on mentoring program.
This section consists of two subscales that
are interpersonal communication which
was measured using three items and com-
munication openness which was measured
using three items that were adopted from
Ismail, Jui, and Abdullah (2009) under-
graduate mentoring program scale. All
items in the questionnaires used a 5-point
Likert-Type scale ranging from “strongly
disagree/dissatisfied” (1) to “strongly
agree/satisfied” (5). Alpha values for each
variable were greater than 0.70, signify-
ing that the variables met the acceptable
standard of reliability analysis (Nunally &
 Bernstein, 1994). Section C which mea-
sures mentee outcomes consists of four
subscales that are psychological and emo-
tional support, degree of career support,
academic subject knowledge support, and
existence of role model.

Psychological and emotional sup-
port was measured by eight items related
to encouraging the student to discuss
problems, providing emotional support,
talking openly about personal issues and
social issues. The degree of career sup-
port was measured by six items related
to examining degree options, encouraging
educational opportunities, guiding an
assessment of skill, and help mentee with
making decisions related with their degree
choice. Academic subject knowledge sup-
port was measured by five items related to
achievement of academic aspirations, en-
couraging discussion, and ongoing support
regarding coursework. Lastly, existence of
a role model was measured by six items
that involved looking up to university is-
sue and someone who they admire or who
sets a good example to accomplish their
academic goals.

Participants were asked to rate
how certain they felt about being able to
get support in various situations, such as,
“give me emotional support” or “discuss-
es the implications of my degree choice”.


Participants were asked to check the degree of the items by using a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following anchors from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). The value of coefficient alpha for psychological and emotional support indicating that it was highly reliable. Substantial reliability result also found for degree of career support (α=.90), academic subject knowledge support (α=.88), and existence of a role model (α=.85).

Section B gauges on types of personality as measured by Big Five Inventory (BFI) as developed by John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991). The 44-item of BFI was developed to represent the prototype 22 definitions developed through expert ratings. In the U.S. and Canadian samples, the alpha reliabilities of the BFI scales typically range from 0.75 to 0.90 and above average. The scales of the Big-Five Inventory established a good internal consistency, which was slightly less reliable than one would ideally like to see that are extraversion (α = .88), conscientiousness (α = .79), agreeableness (α = .82), emotional stability (α = .84), and openness to experience (α = .81) and convergent validity with corresponding scales of John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991) adjectives to assess the dimension of the Big-Five model.

According to John and Srivastava (1999), and McCrae and Costa (1987), the Big-Five is the most established and well-validated model of personality, consisting of extraversion, emotional stability, conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness to experience (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The Big-Five personality is found across cultures (Hofsted, Kiers, de Raad, Goldberg, & Ostendorf, 1997) which shows a strong predictive validity (Ozer & Benet-Martínez, 2006; Paunonen, 2003), hereditability (Bouchard, Lykken, Tellegen, & McGue, 1996), and interrater agreement (McCrae & Costa, 1987).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Demographic Characteristic of Respondents**

The demographic factors used included gender, age, CGPA, year of study and faculty. The results of the demographic factors are divided separately according to factors.

**Hypothesis Test**

In this study, Pearson Correlation and Multiple Regression were used to conduct the analysis. Pearson Correlation was used to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. Using interaction model suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986), Multiple Regression was used to explore whether personality has any interaction between mentoring program and mentees’ outcomes relationship.

Table 2 indicates the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes which was moderate, with a positive correlation at $r=0.66$. The moderate positive relationship between these two variables indicates that mentee outcomes increase if the mentoring programs are applied successfully. This finding is supported by the previous studies by Sushmita and Jomon (2013) who stated that mentoring program that examines factors had an influence on the mentee outcomes, which included the path goal and the values goal clarity. The mentee outcomes show that mentee can achieve his or her career goals and building the mentee self-efficacy, motivation and mentee current work life situations.

Table 2 also indicates the relationship between personality and mentee outcomes was weakly positive ($r=0.30$). The relationship indicates that personality has an impact on the mentees’ outcomes. This finding is supported by a previous study of Nikos and Giorgos (2010) which investi-
gated the relationship between personality and mentees’ outcomes.

Table 2 shows that the relationship between mentoring program and psychological and emotional support was moderately positive ($r=0.64$). The moderate positive relationship between two variables indicates that mentoring program affects the psychological and emotional support. This finding is supported by previous study of Nora and Crisp (2007). They found that mentoring program has positive impact on psychological and emotional aspect of mentees such as listening, ongoing support and encouragement. Additionally, their results also indicated that mentoring program assists to increase self-confidence of mentees.

Table 3 shows the results on the role of personality in the relationship between mentoring program and mentees’ outcomes. In this model, testing mentoring program were entered in model 1 and followed by personality in model 2 and interaction variables in model 3. An examination of multicollinearity shows that the tolerance value for the relationship between mentoring program and mentee outcomes was 0.95. While as the value for the relationship between the mentoring program, personality, and mentee outcomes was 0.34.

Model 2 shows that mentoring program was found to be a significant predictor for mentee outcomes ($\beta=0.306, p=0.039$). In terms of explanatory power, the inclusion of mentoring program practices in this step has explained 46 percent of the variance in the dependent variable.

As shown in model 3, the interaction term ($\beta=2.00, p=0.000$) is significant. In terms of the explanatory power, the in-
Conclusion of the personality in this step has explained 46 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, therefore personality does act as a moderator in the relationship between mentoring program and mentees’ outcomes. As a result, the relationship between mentoring program and personality had increased mentee outcomes among students in this university.

These findings further stressed the importance of personality in ensuring the successful running of mentoring program for the benefit of mentees. Since there was no known research related to the role of moderator in the relationship between mentoring program and mentees’ outcomes, the current findings cannot be linked to previous studies. However, the current results echoed earlier studies by Garner, Byars, Greenwood, and Garner (2003), and Campbell and Campbell (2007) on the importance of integrating personality in research on mentoring program in which they found the importance of personality in mentoring program. Similarly, Cuperman and Ickes (2009) found that the Big Five Inventory predicted behaviors in initial mentor-mentee conversations. Therefore, more studies are needed to further investigate the role of personality in the relationship between mentoring program and mentees’ outcomes.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study was carried out to determine the relationship between mentoring program, personality, and mentee outcomes in a university in East Malaysia. A profile of student was developed based on demographic characteristic including gender, age, CGPA, year of study, and faculty. The findings indicate that mentee outcomes increase, if the mentoring programs are applied successfully. The results also point out that personality has an impact on the mentees’ outcomes. It also shows that a well-planned and executed mentoring program provides better psychological

---

**Table 2: Pearson correlations between mentoring program and mentee outcomes, personality and mentee outcomes, mentoring program and psychological and emotional support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Mentoring Program</td>
<td>.66&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Mentoring Outcomes</td>
<td>.23&quot;</td>
<td>.30&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64&quot;</td>
<td>.93&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Psychological and Emotional Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Result for regression analysis with personality as moderator and mentee outcomes as dependent variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE Beta</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Level of Significant: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 Beta=Standardized Beta*
and emotional support to mentees. Finally, it supports the notion that personality moderates the relationship between mentoring program and mentees’ outcomes.

There are few limitations in conducting this study. Firstly, this study was performed in only one university; therefore the findings cannot be generalized to other populations. Secondly, this study examined only psychological and emotional support as mentees’ outcomes. Other important variables such as degree of career support, academic subject knowledge support, guiding an assessment of skill, achievement of academic aspirations, and encouraging educational opportunities were not considered. Thirdly, even though this study employed only Big Five Personality theory, other personality theories such as 16 Personality factor (16PF), Eysenck Personality Model were not investigated. Examining these different models of personality may have given different lights on the findings of this study.

There are some recommendation that can be made based on the findings of this study. The first recommendation is for organizations, as they will be able to gain a better understanding of the importance of personality on mentee outcomes. This study shows that it is important for an organization to have a personality screening and assessment before a mentor and a mentee are assigned to each other. Apart from that, this study can be used as a guideline to measure whether the organization has provided enough programs or development plans for the employees or students. Secondly, the findings of this study indicate the importance of mentoring program in helping mentee development. It is recommended that, universities should incorporate mentoring programme as part of thier student development programs. Finally, for individuals, this study is helping them to notice that personality is actually able to determine a better outcome when they participate in a mentoring program. This is because the study has indicated that personality was a strong predictor in ensuring better mentoring outcomes. Therefore, it is recommended that mentor should pay greater attention in understanding the personality of the students in the mentoring process so as to achieve better mentoring outcomes.
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