

Talent Development Mentorship and Employee Performance: Moderating Effect of Organizational Culture

Barnaba Cheruiyot Kosgei

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Abstract: Mentorship is a semi-structured approach where a person or group of people share their knowledge, skills and experience to assist others to progress in their own lives and careers. It is more impacting than giving advice, or explaining experience. It motivates and empowers others so as to identify their own strength and achieve target and goals. Mentorship enables the mentee to tap into the best of a mentor as a source of energy to foster intrapersonal and interpersonal understanding. The purpose of this study was to determine the moderating influence of organisation culture on relationship between talent development mentorship practice and employee performance. A cross-sectional survey design was used in this study. From each institution, the respondents were all the employees. Questionnaires were used to collect data. Mentorship practices were identified as the independent variable, while employee performance was the dependent variables. While organizational culture was the moderating variable. Data will be analyzed using SPSS. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to arrive at conclusions on the relationships between study variables. Regression analysis was used to test the set hypotheses and construct the models of interest. The study found a significant relationship between talent development mentorship and the performance of the employees. It was also found that organizational culture does moderate the relationship between talent development mentorship and the performance. The results of the study will contribute to better management of firms through mentorship practices. The study recommends that talent development mentorship practice be considered as part of the organizations strategy to improve on the performance of the employees.

Keywords: Talent Development Mentorship, Employee performance, Organizational Culture.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study:

In a traditional sense, mentorship involves a process that brings together the inexperienced and experienced individuals in an attempt to enable the former to gain knowledge, self-confidence, skills as the other benefits from the later as they transit through the process (Colky and Young ,2006). Allen (2007) says mentorship is a system of semi-structured guidance where one person or a group of people share their knowledge, skills and experience to assist others to progress in their own lives and careers. Over time, the definition of mentorship has evolved, with some theorists suggesting that mentorship must be voluntary relationship of equality, openness, and trust between the mentor and mentee (Coppola *et al*, 2010). Mentorship further involves motivating and empowering the other person to identify their own issues and goals, and helping them to find ways of resolving or reaching them. It is not by doing it for them, or expecting them to 'do it the way I did it', but by understanding and respecting different ways of working (Bozionelos, 2006).

A mentor is a person who commands a certain degree of respect, either by virtue of holding a higher-level position, or because of age, expertise or experience doing the job (Noe *et al*, 2002). It also refers to someone who takes a special interest in a person, and in teaching that person skills and attitudes to help that person succeed. Garten(2007) states that a

shift has occurred that mentorship is now viewed as a knowledge management technique that supports the creation of knowledge or innovation. Mathewman *et al* (2012) established that mentorship has a large number of outcomes for the mentor, the protégé and the organization. Protégé outcomes include career advancement, success and satisfaction whilst mentors can benefit from increased promotion rates, rejuvenation and the acquisition of useful information. Furthermore, organizational outcomes include increased employee motivation, better job performance and increased competitive advantage. Clutterbuck *et al* (2012) found out that mentorship has the net effect of enhancing the competence of mentee; provide psychological support, motivation and job satisfaction which enhances performance not only for the employee but the organization as a whole which may translate into a competitive advantage position to the organization.

Olsen *et al* (1999) established that in knowledge economy, where the business environment is characterized by turbulence and complexity, knowledge is the main source of creating both innovation and sustainable competitive advantage. It is therefore necessary to appreciate the link between mentorship and knowledge identification, creation, transfer and application of knowledge in order to enhance employee competence and capability through acquisition of relevant skills, knowledge and decision making strategies. Rousseau (2008) emphasizes that instructional and transfer strategies are ways in which new concepts and skills are communicated and transferred from a seasoned individual to a less experienced person to reach a specific goal. For instance, with the 4p model developed by Toyota Company to ensure its continuous success, Meier *et al* (2005) states that Toyota leaders have learned through mentorship and experience that when they follow the right process they get the right results. Toyota Company also disclosed that when someone in the Toyota company learns an important lesson, he/she is expected to share it with others facing similar problems so that the company can learn from such sharing. Coppola *et al* (2010) explains that mature and experienced organizations will see mentorship as another method to help the entity achieve its mission, objectives and goals as mentorship ensures that organizational skills, knowledge and best practices are transferred from the mentor to the mentee. As a result of this knowledge transfer mentorship, the organization benefits through the development of more highly trained and competent employees who are loyal, with enhanced efficiency; and, competence in their jobs. In this case mentorship is viewed as a method of developing strategic leaders (Zachary *et al*, 2012).

Mentorship has immense benefits to an organization besides being the key to improving project capability. While there is a reliance on personal knowledge, explicit knowledge and collaboration within the project external networks play a crucial role in terms of knowledge creation. These networks tend to be the informal networks of project team members when external knowledge or expertise is required (Jennex, 2007). The process of mentorship can be used to instruct organization culture, pass on technical expertise, develop creative problem solving, foster critical thinking, and build interpersonal skills, which are requisites to successful performance of an organization (Coppola *et al*, 2010). There is a need to establish how leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, and knowledge transfer mentorship affect employee performance in small manufacturing firms. Furthermore, leadership and innovative competencies can be developed by an employee through mentorship. This study therefore endeavours to find out how leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, Knowledge transfer mentorship and Talent development mentorship influence employee performance in small firms in Garissa County.

Statement of the Problem:

Mentorship, as a system of semi-structured guidance where one person or group of people shares their knowledge, skills and experience with others to enhance their own lives and careers, is key to developing employee leadership and innovative competencies, and knowledge transfer mentorship. In this regard, there is a need to establish how leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, knowledge-transfer mentorship and Talent-development mentorship affect employee performance in small manufacturing firms in Garissa County. The extent of how mentorship practices influence employee performance is not fully known especially for the small manufacturing firms in Garissa County. While literature is replete with immense benefits of mentorship as a way of transferring knowledge, skills and appropriate behaviour necessary for effective performance of the relevant jobs from more experienced employees to less experienced ones, many organizations do not seem to take employ mentorship in their human resource development schedules. From my observation and based on preliminary discussion with some managers in these small manufacturing firms, it become evident that they do have some mentorship in place. There is a need therefore to critically examine the mentorship programs in these firms with a view of understanding whether and how relevant necessary job knowledge, skills, experiences and behaviour are acquired or transferred as the case may be. This study therefore intends to examine how employee performance in small manufacturing firms in Garissa County is affected by the following mentorship practices: leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, knowledge-transfer mentorship and Talent-development mentorship.

Hypothesis:

The study tested the following hypothesis:

H₀₁: Organizational culture does not significantly affect the relationship between talent development mentorship practice and employee performance

H₀₂: Organizational culture does not moderate the relationship between talent development mentorship practice and employee performance

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is based on Albert Bandura's (2005) Social Cognitive Theory. The theory proposes that individuals do not simply respond to environmental influences - thus observing and modelling the behaviour, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others - but rather they actively seek and interpret information (Nevid, 2009) and in this case individuals function as contributors to their own motivation, behaviour, and development within a network of reciprocally interacting influences. According to Bandura (2005), Social Cognitive Theory takes on an agent-like perspective to change, development and adaptation. Bandura describes an agent as someone who intentionally influences one's functioning and life circumstances. In this view, people are self organizing, proactive, self-regulating, and self-reflecting. They are contributors to their life circumstances not just products of them.

Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes how cognitive, behavioural, personal, and environmental factors interact to determine motivation and behaviour (Crothers, Hughes, & Morine, 2008). The Social Cognitive Theory is composed of four processes of goal realization: self-observation, self-evaluation, self-reaction and self-efficacy. These components are interrelated, each having an effect on motivation and goal attainment (Redmond, 2010). Self-observation arises when an individual observes self and this can inform and motivate. It can be used to assess one's progress toward goal attainment as well as motivate behavioural change (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001). Self-evaluation compares an individual's current performance with a desired performance or goal (Schunk and Zimmerman, 1994). Self-reaction to one's performance can be motivating. If the progress made is deemed acceptable, then one will have a feeling of self-efficacy with regard to continuing, and will be motivated towards the achievement of their goal. Self-efficacy, for instance, one's belief in the likelihood of goal completion can be motivating in itself (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). Self-efficacy refers to people's judgements about their capability to perform particular tasks. Task-related self-efficacy increases the effort and persistence towards challenging tasks; therefore, increasing the likelihood that they will be completed (Axtell & Parker, 2003).

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous research has shown that mentorship can be seen as a strategy, a formalized scheme, ranging from relationships that provide advice and sponsorship to those that are highly intense, career focused and developmental (Gibson, 2004). However, attempts at a universal definition of mentorship have become a quagmire (D'Abate, Eddy & Tannenbaum, 2003; Clutterbuck 2004). This is partly due to disagreement of the core purpose and meaning of mentorship (D'Abate *et al.*, 2003), differences between countries and cultures (Bright, 2005; Liu, 2009), differing perceptions from differing disciplines or contexts (Allen *et al.*, 2008) and perceived overlap with other workplace relationships, for instance coaching and mentoring (D'Abate *et al.*, 2003; Tyler, 2004).

Russell & Adams, (1997) define mentorship as an intense interpersonal exchange between a Senior experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced junior colleague (Mentee) in which the mentor provides support, direction, and feedback regarding career plans and personal development. Mentorship is a developmental relationship that supports and facilitates learning (Parsloe and Wray, 2004). Wronka (2012) considers Mentorship as an interactive process of developmental learning based on the premise that the participants will have reasonable frequent contact and sufficient interactive time together.

There are two sides involved in the process of mentorship. Firstly, a Mentee defined as an individual who is committed to expanding their capabilities, open and receptive to new ways of learning and trying new ideas (Schlee, 2000). Secondly, a Mentor, traditionally seen as an individual with advanced experience, knowledge, wisdom, skills and influence who provide support to and promote the career development of their Mentee through an interactive relationship (Allen, 2003; Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2005; Gibson, 2004).

To improve processes, decision-making, networking and interpersonal relations, Jarvis (2012) says that mentorship is the best tool for institutions to use which has the net effect of improving mentee's work performance. Klasen *et al* (2002) articulate that mentorship positively affects employee performance: through thoroughly identified development needs, informed work planning, availed supportive and enabling problem-solving environment, thus mentors can help mentees to enhance competence substantially. Jarvis (2012) expresses that mentorship gives an opportunity to mentee to ask mentor questions. Asking questions allows the mentor to reflect, share practice and collaborate to improve the mentee's practice. Furthermore, because the development is tailored to mentee's individual needs, mentoring helps them to acquire skills, for instance, systematic analysis and decisiveness and attitudes that are directly relevant to their jobs and will improve performance (Clutterbuck, 2004; Klasen *et al*, 2002). At the same time mentees have many original ideas to contribute about the company and its overall direction (Zey,1984) and this has a possible improvement mentee performance. Organizations that are able to convert the substantial and insubstantial benefits that mentees acquire from mentors to quantifiable economies stand a chance to have competitive dominance. Mentorship creates a good environment for learning and sharing knowledge. The importance of learning for our survival and continued well-being cannot be underestimated as everything an individual knows or can do, except for a few basic reflexes, have been learned, including all attitudes, assumptions, values and beliefs (Clutterbuck, 2012).

Blandford (2005) views mentorship as a tool by which an individual may learn and understand the ethics, rules and skills of a given community. In this case the mentor articulates the skills and knowledge he/she has acquired over time and Blake-Beard *et al* (2012) add that mentorship is a tool for preserving knowledge, encouraging learning and socializing employees. Jarvis (2012) further states that helping mentee in a systematic way enables the mentee to develop processes by which he/she can interrogate his/her own practice through critical reflection and making explicit his/her tacit actions.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out in firms located in Garissa County and adopted a cross-sectional survey design. According to Gay (1992), cross-sectional survey determines and reports the way things are in their natural environment. The design attempts to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) states that a cross-sectional survey design attempts to describe such things as possible behaviour, attitudes, values, and characteristics, while Orodho (2004) observes that a cross-sectional survey design are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret them for the purpose of clarification. The design was therefore appropriate for the study.

The population of the study was all the employees of small manufacturing firms in Garissa County. This will comprise of one hundred and ten (110) employees working in manufacturing firms in Garissa County. Two specific manufacturing companies in Garissa County were targeted: Garissa Textile Manufacturers has seventy five (75) employees; and, Al-Bakery which has thirty five employees. Census survey design was used to obtain the respondents for the proposed study. Hence all the 110 employees of the small manufacturing firms in Garissa County were sampled. A census survey is easier to administer, because it includes all persons and census surveys tend to enhance feelings of security surrounding the accuracy of the results. For this study the sample size is small and therefore a census method was utilized. A questionnaire was used to collect data.

Random sampling was used in this study. In this study, questionnaires was piloted by being administered to similar categories of employees sourced from other organizations including small manufacturing firms in Mombasa county which have similar characteristic but shall not be inclusive in the research study.

5. RESULTS

Response Rate:

Out of the targeted 110 employees of the small manufacturing firms chosen as the respondents, 75 completed the questionnaire. This gave response rate of 68%.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents:

The respondents were required to provide information about their gender, age, education level. The gender distribution of the survey respondents was 20.0% female and 60.0% male. The age distribution for the employees was 12.0% were in the

age bracket under 20, 44.0% age bracket 21-34, 30.7% age bracket 35-44, 6.7% age bracket 45-54, and 6.7% were above 54 years old. Thus majority of the respondents were above in the age bracket 21-34 years. The educational level for the managers indicated that none had doctorate or masters, 2.7% had degree level, 4.0 % had diploma level and 26.6% had professional training/certificate while 66.7% had had secondary education. None had primary or no formal education. Thus majority of the employees had secondary level of education. For the category of employment, 12.0% were in the management, 52.0% in non-management, and 36.0% in temporary employment. The demographic characteristics of the respondents are as summarized in table 4.1.

Descriptive Statistics of the Variables:

Descriptive statistics of means, standard errors, and standard deviation were obtained for the variables leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, knowledge transfer mentorship, talent development mentorship, organizational culture and employee performance. The results are presented in table 2. Results as captured in table 2, on the 5-point likert scale used in this study, all the variables had above average rating.

Reliability Test:

Cronbach's alpha reliability test was used to determine the internal consistency of the question items that measured the variables leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, knowledge transfer mentorship, talent development mentorship, organizational culture and employee performance. Sekeran (2000) benchmark of Cronbach's coefficient value of greater than 0.7 indicates the tool was reliable to measure the variable. From tabulated results in table 3, Cronbach's alpha coefficient for all the variables under study were in the range .886-.945. Hence are above the benchmark of values above 0.7 suggested by Sekeran (2000) and thus the scales were reliable for measuring the variables.

Test of Regression Assumptions:

The data was tested to determine whether the assumptions of ordinary least square (OLS) were met. Both kurtosis and skewness were used to determine the normality of the data distribution for the variable under study. The results of the kurtosis and skewness tests are presented in table 4. The skewness statistic and kurtosis statistic obtained for the variables of interest in this study were in the range .251 to .323 for skewness and -.896 to -.449 for kurtosis. According to Hair *et al.*, (2010) the requisite range for normally distributed data is between -1.00 and +1.00. All the values of skewness and kurtosis fell in the range -1.00 and +1.00 and it was concluded that the distribution of data for the variables was normal.

Further, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to check the normality of the distribution for the variables. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test compares scores in the sample to a normally distributed set of scores with the same mean and standard deviation and if the test is non-significant ($p > 0.5$) then the distribution of the sample is not significantly different from normal distribution (Field, 2005). The results of the K-S test are presented as indicated in table 5. The K-S test statistic for the variables leadership mentorship, innovative mentorship, knowledge transfer mentorship, talent development mentorship, organizational culture and employee performance were not significant and it was concluded that the variables are normally distributed.

Correlation Analysis:

Correlation analysis was done to determine the strength and direction of the relationships between the variables in the study. Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used. This test was done as a precursor to regression analysis so as to first determine whether the variables were related in a linear manner. The results of the correlation analysis are presented in table 6. The results as presented in table 6 show a significant strong positive correlation between employee performance and leadership talent development mentorship ($r = .825, p = 0.000$). The results showed linear relationships between the variables of interest that were to be used in regression analysis to construct the regression models of interest.

Test of Hypotheses:

The study was based on the premise that talent mentorship practice influence employee performance but this influence is moderated by organizational culture. In order to establish the statistical significance of the respective hypotheses, multiple linear regressions was used to test direct relationship, while moderated multiple regression used to test the moderating effect of organizational culture on the relationship. Analysis was conducted as appropriate at 95 percent confidence level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Effect of Talent Mentorship Practice on Employee Performance:

Simple regression analysis was selected as it is viewed as an appropriate method for this study. The summary of results analysis is shown in Table 7. The F-statistics produced ($F = 51.671$) was significant at 5 per cent level ($\text{Sig. } F < 0.05$), thus confirming the fitness for the model. Therefore, there is a statistically significant relationship between the talent development mentorship practice and employee performance. The coefficient of determination R^2 was .733. Thus, mentorship practices can significantly account for 73.3% of employee performance.

The results also shows talent development mentorship practice significantly affect employee performance ($\beta = 0.448$, $p < 0.05$). Hence, the hypotheses H_0 , was rejected.

Moderation Tests:

To determine the moderating effect of organizational culture on the relationship between talent development mentorship and employee performance, the relevant null hypothesis postulated was:

H_{02} : Organizational culture does not significantly affect the relationship between talent development mentorship practices and employee performance

Using the moderated multiple regression analysis, the moderating effect of the variable organizational culture was analyzed by interpreting; the R^2 change in the models obtained from the model summaries and the regression coefficients for the product term obtained from the model summaries.

Table 8 shows that for Model 1, $R = .825$, $R^2 = .680$ and ($F(1, 73) = 155.304$, $p = 0.000$). Model 2 shows the results after the product term ($ZTD * ZOC$) was included in the equation. Table 4.16 indicates that the inclusion of the product term resulted in an R^2 change of .050, ($F(2, 72) = 78.328$, $p = 0.000$). The results show presence of moderating effect. Thus the moderating effect of organizational culture explains 5.0% variance in employee performance above the variance by knowledge talent development mentorship scores. Thus it can be concluded that hypothesis H_{05d} is not supported since $\beta \neq 0$ and p-value is less than 0.05. Model 1 indicates that knowledge transfer mentorship was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$; Beta value = 1.010).

6. CONCLUSION

The first objective and hence hypothesis one (H_{04}) sought to establish whether talent development mentorship had any effect on employee performance. Hypothesis testing results showed that talent development mentorship had a significant effect on employee performance. It was therefore concluded that talent development mentorship does have a positive effect on employee performance.

The second, and hence hypotheses two (H_{02}) sought to establish whether organizational culture had any moderating effect on the relationship between talent development mentorship practice and employee performance. Results showed that organizational culture had a significant moderating effect on the relationship between talent development mentorship practice and employee performance. It was therefore concluded that organizational culture is of the essence when considering the relationship between the respective mentorship practice and employee performance.

From the findings of the study, it was therefore concluded that talent development mentorship did significantly affect the employee performance. Also, the organizational culture did have some moderating effects on the relationship between talent development mentorship practice and employee performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adler, P.S., McDonald, W.D., & McDonald, F. (1992). Strategic management of technical functions. *Sloan Management Review*.
- [2] Allen, T. D. (2003). Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(1).
- [3] Allen, T. D. (2007). Mentoring Relationships from the Perspective of the Mentor. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.). *The Handbook Of Mentoring At Work: Theory, Research And Practice* (Pp. 123–147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

- [4] Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., O'Brien, K. E & Lentz, E. (2008). The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.
- [5] Calo, T. (2008). Talent management in the era of the aging workforce: The critical role of knowledge transfer mentorship. *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 37, No. 4, p. Retrieved November 6, 2009, from ProQuest Business database.
- [6] Chrisler, J.C. & McCreary, D.R.(2010). *Handbook of Gender in Psychology*, Volume 2. New York, Springer.
- [7] Clutterbuck, D. (2004). *Everyone needs a Mentor – fostering talent in your organisations*, 4th ed. London: CIPD.
- [8] Deshpande, R., Farley, J., & Webster, F. (1993). Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: A quadrature analysis', *Journal of Marketing*, vol.57, no.1, pp.23-57.
- [9] Dibrell, C., Craig, J. & Hansen, E. (2011). 'How managerial attitudes toward the natural
- [10] Gebelein, S. (2006). Talent management: Today's HR departments do much more than just hiring and firing. Personnel decisions international (PDI). *Minnesota Business Magazine*.
- [11] Gordon, A.L. (2001). Cybercentrism: The new, virtual management. *Management Decision*.
- [12] Hair, J.F., Black, C.W., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. Seventh Edition upper saddle River, NJ Prentice Hall.
- [13] Hennig-Thurau T. (2000). *Relationship Marketing: Gaining Competitive Advantage through Customer Satisfaction and Customer Retention*. Springer.
- [14] Hilbun, J. & Akin, L. (2007). E-mentoring in three voices. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*.
- [15] Kwansa, F.A., & Parsa, H.G. (2002). *Quick Service Restaurants, Franchising and Multi Unit Chain Management*. Delaware. Routledge.
- [16] Merrick, I. (2012) How coaching & mentoring can drive success in your organization. Chronus Mentoring and Talent development mentorship Solutions. Retrieved from: www.chronus.com.
- [17] Murrell, A.J & Beard, S.B (2012). *The Executive Leadership Council's Guide to effective mentoring relationships: A Publication of the Institute of Leadership Development of Research*. Retrieved From www.pitt.edu/~Prpvpst/ELC_Guide.pdf.
- [18] Nemiro, E. J. (2004). *Creativity in virtual teams*. Business Book Review Library.
- [19] Orodho, J. A. (2004). *Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports in Education and Social Sciences*. Nairobi. Masola Publishers.
- [20] Parsloe, E. & Wray, M. (2004). *Coaching and Mentoring – Practical Methods for Improving Learning*, London: Kogan Page
- [21] Peebles, E. (2003). Inspiring innovation: in *Harvard Business Review on the Innovative Enterprise*. Harvard Business School Press.
- [22] Punch, F.K. (1998). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.
- [23] Rousseau, M. (2008). *Structured Mentoring For Sure Success*. Oklahoma. Pennwell Books.
- [24] Rowland, K. N. (2012). E-Mentoring: An Innovative Twist to Traditional Mentoring. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation* 2012, Volume 7, Issue 1. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-27242012000100015>
- [25] Rumelt, R. P. (1991). How Much Does Industry Matter? *Strategic Management Journal* 12, 167–
- [26] Zachary, L.J. (2005). *Creating A Mentoring Culture: The Organization's Guide*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
- [27] Zachary L.J. (2011). *The Mentor's guide: Facilitating Effective Learning Relationship*. 2nd Ed. John Wiley & Sons.
- [28] Zey, M.G. (1984). *The Mentor Connection: Strategic Alliance Incorporate Life*. New Jersey. Transaction Publishers

APPENDICES: A

Table 1: Summary of Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	60	80.0
	Female	15	20.0
	Totals	75	100.0
Age	Under 20	9	12.0
	21-34	33	44.0
	35-44	23	30.7
	45-54	5	6.7
	Above54	5	6.7
	Totals	75	100.0
Education Level	Doctorate	0	0.0
	Master's degree	0	0.0
	Degree	2	2.7
	Diploma	3	4.0
	Professional Training/Certificate	20	26.7
	Secondary Education	50	66.7
	Primary Education	0	0.0
	No formal education	0	0.0
	Totals	75	100.0
Employment Category	Management	9	12.0
	Non-Management	39	52.0
	Temporary	27	36.0
	Totals	75	100.0

Source: Survey Data (2015)

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Variables

Variables	Min	Max	Mean		Std. Dev
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Talent development mentorship	1.20	5.00	2.8720	.11521	.99774
Organizational Culture	1.00	4.86	2.6952	.13714	1.18767
Employee Performance	1.00	5.00	2.7619	.14110	1.22200

Source: Survey Data (2015)

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient

Variables	No of items used	Alpha
Talent development mentorship	5	.896
Organizational Culture	7	.945
Employee Performance	7	.886

Source: Survey data (2015)

Table 4: Results for Skewness and Kurtosis Analysis (N=75)

	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Talent development mentorship	.323	.277	-.449	.548
Organizational Culture	.258	.277	-.726	.548
Employee Performance	.251	.277	-.896	.548

Source: Survey data (2015)

Table 5: One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (N=75)

		EP	TD	OC
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	2.7619	2.8720	2.6952
	Std. Deviation	1.22200	.99774	1.18767
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.111	.156	.132
	Positive	.111	.156	.132
	Negative	-.078	-.071	-.089
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.962	1.348	1.144
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.314	.053	.146

Source: Survey Data (2015)

(LM=Leadership mentorship, IM=Innovative mentorship, KTM=Knowledge transfer mentorship, TD=Talent development mentorship, OC=Organizational culture, and EP=employee performance).

Table 6: Correlation Results

	1	2	3
Employee Performance	1		
Talent Development Mentorship	.825**		
Organizational Culture	.782**	.949**	

Source: survey data 2015

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7: Results on Relationship between Talent Mentorship Practice and Employee Performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
4	(Constant)	.012	.274		.045	.964
	Talent development mentorship	.448	.187	.366	2.395	.019

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Notes: Overall model F= 51.671; p < 0.05; R= 0.864; R²= 0.747; Adjusted R²= 0.733

Table 8: Results of moderating effect of organizational culture on the relationship between that talent development mentorship and employee performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients			R ²	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error					Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-.139	.246	.680	-.565	.573			
	TD	1.010	.081		12.462	.000	1.000	1.000	
2	(Constant)	-.609	.509		-1.197	.235			
	TD	1.334	.318		4.201	.000	1.265	.7905	
	ZTD*ZOC	-.052	.049	0.050	-1.055	.295	1.065	.9389	

Notes: Overall model 1: R= .825, R²= .680 and (F (1, 73) = 155.304, p=0.000).

Overall model 2: R² =.050, (F (2, 72) = 78.328, p= 0.000)

ZKTM= Talent development mentorship, ZOC= Organizational culture, ZTD*ZOC = Talent development mentorship*Organizational Culture

Source: Research results (2015)