MLS - EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
http://mlsjournals.com/Educational-Research-Journal
ISSN: 2603-5820

Cómo citar este artículo:

Cruz Álvarez, L. A. & Rodríguez Fernández, S. (2019). Characteristics of the tutors for the worker of the peruvian "Y" generation: image based on a field study. *MLS-Educational Research, 3* (2), 7-32. Doi: 10.29314/mlser.v3i2.149

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TUTORS FOR THE WORKER OF THE PERUVIAN "Y" GENERATION: IMAGE BASED ON A FIELD STUDY

Luis Alfonso Cruz Álvarez
Universidad Internacional Iberoamericana (México)
hagen78@hotmail.com · https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8123-0729
Sonia Rodríguez Fernández
Universidad de Granada (España)
soniarf@ugr.es · https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6883-8884

Abstract. This article aims to contribute in the fields of knowledge's pedagogy and people management by investigating the perception that Peruvian millennial workers have of what should be the figure of a leader who takes the role of Mentor and Counselor in an environment labor. For this research, a review of the literature on the subject has been carried out and, in addition, a field study using a data collection tool designed ad hoc. This tool has been validated by a group of experts whose results were analyzed by means of two analyzes, one of means of value of each question and then by a statistician to verify the internal concordance of the questions, W of Kendall. In general, the tool had a Kendall index (W) of 0.572 and a level of significance (Sig) of 0.032, which concludes that it is a tool of high level of agreement among the experts. After this validation we applied the survey to a group of 149 Peruvian millennial workers from different labor fields. The results were subjected to nonparametric analysis of mean differences of both the T-Student and ANOVA types, with the main conclusion that millennial workers with higher education have a favorable predisposition to the figure of the mentor at work. Also this figure presents certain characteristics that we can analyze more in detail in the discussion of results. It is important to emphasize that these results are in line with other similar investigations carried out.
Keywords: Millennials, innovation, mentoring and couseling.

CARACTERÍSTICAS DE LOS TUTORES PARA EL TRABAJADOR DE LA GENERACIÓN "Y" PERUANO: IMAGEN EN BASE A UN ESTUDIO DE CAMPO

Resumen. El presente artículo es parte de una investigación doctoral la cual pretende aportar en los campos del conocimiento de la pedagogía y la gestión de personas, investigando la percepción que tienen los trabajadores peruanos de la generación "Y" de lo que debe ser la figura de un líder que tome el papel de Tutor y Orientador en un ambiente laboral. Para esta investigación se ha realizado una revisión de la literatura sobre el tema y adicionalmente un estudio de campo utilizando una herramienta de recolección de datos diseñada ad hoc. Esta herramienta ha sido validada por un grupo de expertos cuyos resultados

fueron analizados mediante el estadístico W de Kendall para verificar la concordancia interna de las preguntas. En general la herramienta tuvo un índice de Kendall (W) de 0.572 y un nivel de significancia (Sig) de 0.032, lo cual se concluye que es una herramienta de un adecuado nivel de concordancia entre los expertos, así como que la concordancia entre ellos no se debe al azar. Luego de la validación, hemos aplicado la encuesta a un grupo de 149 trabajadores de la generación "Y" peruanos de distintos campos laborales. Los resultados fueron sometidos a análisis no paramétricos de diferencias de medias del tipo T-Student y ANOVA, concluyendo que los trabajadores de la generación "Y" con educación superior tienen una predisposición favorable a la figura del tutor en el trabajo. Así mismo, esta figura presenta determinadas características que podremos analizar más al detalle en la discusión de resultados. Es importante recalcar que estos resultados están en línea con otras investigaciones similares realizadas.
Palabras clave: generación "Y", innovación, orientación y tutoría

Introduction

Millennial workers are those who were born between 1982 and 2002 (Epstein and Hershatter, 2006; Howe and Strauss, 2000) and who were born into prosperous times, have great expectations and search for meaning in the work that they carry out (Howe and Strauss, 2000). Boschma and Groen (2008) likewise added that such workers are recognized as those from the society of information, always connected, anywhere and at any time. Peruvian researchers Castro and Yamada (2010) concur with what was said about millennial workers, since the Peruvian context in which these types of workers grew in was characterized by a period of economic growth, by which their basic needs were covered with a carefree attitude before reality.

The Deliotte consulting firm (2015) defines some of the characteristics of the Peruvian millennial workers as hyperconnected, with a high job turnover trend, informal in their behavior, participatory, seeking balance in their lives, enjoying continuous learning, seeking their self-development and likely to receive mentoring. The consulting firm also points out that they seek the marked important type of leadership that they desire, and so ask for a leader who is: a source of inspiration, has interpersonal skills, vision, passion and enthusiasm, takes decisions, strategic in thinking, conveys comfort, flexibility, knows how to provide feedback and is people-oriented. In other words, they want a mentor. (Deloitte, 2015 and Pricewaterhouse, 2014). Within this same line of thought, the consultant EP|Roland (2014) indicates that: "Bosses should act as guides beyond just the professional life and create ongoing challenges" (ER|Roland, 2014 p.11) reinforcing the image of a mentor or tutor that these types of workers are looking for.

Tapscott (2009, cited by Gonzáles, 2011) defines some of the guidelines that any millennial worker wants to find in an ideal working environment:

a) Freedom to work when and where they want, or time flexibility.
b) Customization, demanding not to be treated as a mass but as individuals.
c) Fluid and open information between peers and leaders.
d) Integrity, as these workers hope to collaborate with a company that is transparent, honest and considerate in their environment.
e) Collaboration, working with others to achieve the objectives.
f) Enjoy the work they do, by which the work environments must be entertaining and enjoyable.

Gonzales (2011) also reinforces the topic of mentoring, explaining that these workers are looking for someone to guide and advise them, be a reference, a person of integrity and one who they feel confident developing themselves with.

Rounding out the presented ideas, Begazo and Fernández (2015) identify that this group will accentuate their desire for immediate access to the organization's contribution, constant and more detailed feedback from their superiors, better balance between personal and work life and spaces to give back to the community through philanthropic work.

In conclusion, we appreciate that the major features that stand out in this generation of workers are: being hyperconnected, participatory, searching for work-life balance, continuous learning, self-development and searching for guidance. It is a generation that, therefore, expects their development to be fostered through feedback and a boss or leaders who can lead.

The other point that drives this research is mentoring and guidance, a point where we clarify that the research takes on the approach of mentoring and guidance within the work environment, even though this concept stems from the field of pedagogy.

To begin with, we need to specify what kind of education is provided in companies themselves. For Vasquez (1998, cited by Carrasco, 2014), this is a non-formal education, since it is focused on developing one or several functions at work.

This education has a learning component that for Agrys and Schon (1960, cited by Carrasco, 2014) is a double cycle where existing knowledge is exploited and new knowledge is generated, allowing us to think in other ways. In the words of Carrasco (2014) education and learning in the company provide us with the ability to: "to be able, as an organization, to sustain useful and known knowledge, as well as break patterns and find new and better ways to do the job" (Carrasco, 2014 p.32). As we have seen, education in the occupational field is aimed at on-the-job training from a starting level, but also toward the generation of new knowledge. This implies the existence of occupational competencies that produces said action and for this process to become enhanced through the mentoring figure guiding this process.

Mentoring and guidance, in the business world, is within the functions of the human resources department, specifically within two of their processes; introducing new workers into the company, and performance evaluation, where feedback and follow-up actions are created for worker improvement (Cannice, Koontz and Weihrich, 2012). Although the authors place this process within the functions mentioned above, in reality, mentoring and guidance is provided in two daily occupational practices: coaching and mentoring. Coaching is a process where the worker and the coach or counselor have individual sessions and address topics that involve profound changes in the worker's professional life. On the other hand, mentoring is a learning methodology where the mentor and student have conversations that are clearly aimed at having a result upon the occupational role's function. It is passing knowledge from experience (Espinosa, 2011, Serrat, 2010).

Both techniques aim to provide the worker with strategic or significant learning, relating the activity, the subject and the context. A key element within the acquisition of this type of learning is the job mentor, who for Schalk (2005) is:

> Makes the worker feel part of a new universe and highly motivates them, integrating and incorporating them. For this, the following is necessary: knowing the worker, providing suggestions regarding their goals and the needs of enrolling them in a given activity. (Schalk, 2005 p.82)

Reinforcing the previous proposal, Coll, Mauri and Onrubia (2008) speak of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as an area where the trainer where the trainer, as an expert, favors the apprentice's inter-psychological operation which is fundamental to building knowledge. In this way, the mentor's role is indispensable for the apprentice to internalize knowledge.

The research of Brcic and Mihelic (2015) point to the fact that millennials have the willingness to receive more mentoring, by which organizations are recommended to place greater emphasis on fostering intergenerational mentoring relationships in a systematic manner. In line with what is observed by these researchers, the Great Place to Work survey (2013) indicates that millennial workers ask for communication and feedback from their superiors for purposes of their professional development, molding a type of relationship in which the leaders or superiors are likewise: "mentors or coaches" (Great Place to Work, 2013 p. 6).

Of all the literature reviewed, we can conclude that there is a point of convergence, in theory, between the concepts of millennial workers and mentoring and guidance. This point of convergence points to the fact that millennials have a tendency of favorably receiving mentoring and guidance through the figure of the Mentor. But is there any type of study that focused on the perceptions of Peruvian millennial workers on the figure that the mentor must exude in work environments?

One of the first studies, after reviewing the literature on the issue, is that of Dávila and Mitta (2015) which sought to identify retention policies and practices for millennial workers within different Peruvian organizations for which the study was divided in two parts; the work requirements and expectations of millennials in the first study, and the policies and practices identified in the second study on the current retention of human resources departments in those organizations that participated in the study. To this end, an ad hoc survey was created aimed at final year university students based on the profile of young millennial Americans. An ad hoc interview was then carried out on those in charge of human resources so as to know their opinions on millennials. The results of this study demonstrate a gap between what businesses expect from millennials in the employment world, compared to who they really are. This is not a negative gap, however, but rather a gap on expectations. This is to say, both parties expect a pivot for developing said potential. It is of special interest that companies see that millennials have the capacity for innovation, for creating new ideas and providing a different perspective on the world, and for them to be seen as flexible with the rules, but not yet as innovative as they would like. So it is important to note that they always ask for constant feedback on what they do, denoting a need for guidance and mentoring to justly take advantage of said innovative potential, as well as other competences.

In another study on the use of mentoring or coaching for the retention of millennial workers and developing their potential was made by Newell (2015), who studied a proposal for training millennial workers through social learning for which he conducted the study with workers for a telecommunications company in Peru. To this end, several focus group were carried out on how to generate the content required for these new learning platforms. The main conclusion reached was that learning addressed toward millennial workers will have the greatest impact when built with internal resources. This is the same as taking advantage of the knowledge of expert partners on specific issues, making them mentors of this learning format.

Another case study on mentoring, although outside the scope of Peru, was the development of the worker program in Spaniard occupational settings as carried out by Grande and Núñez-Cacho (2012). The research established the figure of mentoring as assigning an apprentice, who is an employee with the possibility of promotion and improvement within the company, to a mentor who is another more experienced employee with deep knowledge of the organization. This part is defined as critical since the success of this process will very much depend on the affinity, trust and positive environment in the relationship between apprentice and mentor. The research was conducted in two parts, first an ad hoc survey where information on the company's productivity and growth based on mentoring programs was collected. This took place in companies from different sectors in Spain, where the average workers were around 35 years old. In the second part, the results were then subjected to a structural equation model which dependent variable was the company's growth. The conclusion from these authors is:

> When the organization employs a mentor for the employee's personal and professional development, the processes are programed by the organization (formal mentoring), including the program objectives, employing an outside mentor whose profile has carefully studied the process. It is also a long-term development with participants that are satisfied with their careers within the organization and who are committed to the mentoring relationship. This, then, improves the performance of human capital. (Grande and Nuñez-Cacho, 2012 p.78)

Lastly, the study from Guillaume, Jones and Wood (2015) tries to find a method to scientifically measure the effectiveness of coaching in the workplace. To do this, they suggest measuring the effect of coaching in three dimensions of occupational activity: learning, training and development. In each of these aspects, the researchers measured the results in four dimensions inherent in the coaching process: feedback, coaching teaching format, internal coaching versus external coaching, and the duration of coaching. The study showed that effective coaching is based on providing effective feedback, with a coach who knows the company culture, more so if they come from the same area where coaching is needed.

After reviewing the existing literature, we can arrive at the following conclusions: research has not yet been carried out that seeks to find the true perception of Peruvian millennial workers on the figure of the mentor within in work environments. What we did find were outside studies and others at the national levels that indirectly concluded that a good perception toward the figure of the mentor at work would exist. Lastly, the reviewed literature shows us that the characteristics of millennial workers are favorable, a priori, for the introduction of the mentoring and guidance programs in work environments. This is evident in the need for constant feedback, which supports itself on the figure of a mentor who will guide them and teach them in their respective careers.

From the perspective of the theory reviewed and according to our research needs, the following general objective is presented on the study's objective: discover the image of Peruvian millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor in work environments.

In order to achieve this main objective for the research, the following secondary objectives are:

a) To demonstrate if there is a significant difference, and of what type, in the perspective of millennial workers with respects to the figure of the mentor depending on their gender.
b) To demonstrate if there is any significant difference, and of what type, in the perspective of millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on the environment they work in.
c) To demonstrate if there is any significant difference, and of what type, in the perspective of millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on whether they are employed in the career they previously studied or not.
d) To demonstrate if there is any significant difference, and of what type, in the perspective of millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on the industry sector where they work.
e) To demonstrate if there is any significant difference, and of what type, in the perspective of millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on the education of the workers.
f) To demonstrate if there is any significant difference, and of what type, in the perspective of millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on the amount of years working in a company.

Methodology

According to the research, this will be descriptive since it will seek to describe the most important characteristics of the study's objective (Gómez-Peremistré and Reidl, 2010), which in our case will be the characteristics that the mentors must have for Peruvian millennial workers. At the same time, the design will be a non-experimental one when observing the phenomenon and collecting data, since there will be no intervention upon the phenomenon, with the observations taking place in the same environment where it occurs (Gómez-Peremistré and Reidl, 2010). This is to say, within the Peruvian millennial workforce. With regard to the analysis of the data collected, the focus will be preferably a quantitative one.

To carry out the above, we need to have a data collection tool, for which an ad hoc survey was designed that will not only serve the purposes of this article but those of the doctoral research that will be carried out later on.

The mentoring and guidance topic within the labor world has a broad spectrum for application. In order to refine the doctoral research, it was decided to introduce a delimitation factor to the questions, which is innovation. The introduction of this factor is to see whether the effect of mentoring is based on the work reviewed in the literature that followed a similar methodology to those of Grande and Núñez-Cacho (2012), and Guillaume, Jones and Wood (2015) to measure the effectiveness of coaching and/or mentoring. However, for the purposes of this article, we will not analyze this dimension of the survey.

To build the data collection tool, we have resorted to other surveys from previous research that point to the employment characteristics of millennial workers, mentoring at work and innovation in the occupational field:

a) Gallup Poll 12 and EFR from Boston for retaining talent (Frías, 2014)
b) Inventory Survey System for Transfer of Learning (Baron and Morin, 2009), where we will take the topics that enable us to see how we may influence the

transfer of knowledge in occupational settings applied to millennial workers for them to develop innovation.

c) Achievement Orientation Scale (Kunda, Jordan and Lockwood, 2002) which appears in the study by Chang et. Al (2007), where the questions will guide us to see how millennial workers may achieve their objectives in innovation.
d) Oriented LMX Scale for the Coach and Apprentice Relationship (Graen and Scandura, 1984) which appears in the study by Chang et. Al (2007) with focused questions to describe the relationship between the coach and trainee within occupational settings
e) Job Satisfaction Scale (Cook, Wall and Warr, 1979) that appears in the study by Huamán and Vasquez (2012), with the purpose of having an overview on how millennial workers feel with regard to their relationship with the mentors.
f) Questionnaire on the Functions of Mentoring (Scandura, 2004)
g) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Allen and Meyer, 1990) that appears in the work by Frías (2014), for measuring the level of commitment to a mentoring program for millennial workers, and whether it focuses on developing innovation
h) Construct for measuring shared knowledge behaviors (Brcic and Mihelic, 2015)
i) TMX Survey for detecting relationship qualities among workers in the same team (Seers, 1989)
j) Survey model for finding an index of innovation (Camio et. Al, 2010)
k) List of capacities for innovation (Bin Ali, and Edison, 2010) that appears in the research by Camio et. Al (2010).

From this set of listed tools, several questions were taken and adapted for the design of the different items or questions in our ad hoc survey, measuring the dimensions of innovation, mentoring and guidance and the characteristics of Millennials. The survey covers these three dimensions, as it has not only been designed for this article's research but for the future doctoral research as well, where these three dimensions will be explored. As previously mentioned, we will only analyze the mentoring and guidance dimension at the end of this article. The items or questions arising from this adaptation are shown in Annex 1.

The resulting survey was subjected to an expert opinion with the purpose of knowing if said instrument truly measured the variables that we intend to measure through an analysis of content validity. To do this, we have resorted to the methodology of expert judgments. For this, we asked for the collaboration of 8 judges who came from the field of human resources management in the company, apart from being managers or the superiors in these areas.

The criteria that the judges would measure in each question or item of the tool are:

a) Clarity: The item is easily understood, that is to say, its syntax and semantics are appropriate.

b) Coherence: The item has a logical relationship with the dimension or indicator that is being measuring.

c) Relevance: The item is essential or important, i.e. It must be included.

These criteria are generally in common use in various content validity tests with regard to the item evaluations (Badia, 2012).

A Likert scale of 1 to 4 was used for evaluating these criteria, where 1 was deficient, 2 was acceptable, 3 good and 4 was excellent.

The judgments by the experts was carried out between the months of January and February 2018 and had a 75% level of response. The results obtained from the judges for each criterion from each question were subjected to the Kendall statistical W which helped us to find the concordance index of the judges to evaluate each of the questionnaire blocks. According to the theory, a W of Kendall (W) equal to 1 indicates a total concordance among the judges who evaluate the tool, with 0 being the opposite.

Another issue to evaluate is determining if the concordances between the judges are associated either from the effects of chance, probabilities, or by an agreement arising out of the judgment process from the experts. To do this we will use the significance level (Sig.) that enables us to contrast the following Null Hypothesis: The concordances between the judges is due to probabilities or chance. In terms of values, if Sig. is greater than 0.05 then the Null Hypothesis is valid; if the opposite, the null hypothesis will be discarded. This structure and value of the significance level is suggested by the majority of researchers for the validation of measurement tools, whether they exist or were created ad hoc, where the risk of concluding that the classifications are associated, when they are not, is 5% (Badia, 2012).

The following is a summary table showing the values obtained on the consistency of the judges with respect to the ratings of each question block, and from the survey in general:

Table 1

Concordance Index between judges based on Kendall (W) and Degree of Significance (Sig)

Valuation	Innovation		Mentoring and Guidance		Characteristics of Millennial Workers	
	W	Sig.	W	Sig.	W	Sig.
By question blocks	0.798	0.008	0.121	0.483	0.12	0.486
	W	Sig.				
General	0.572	0.032				

Note: Author's own creation where Kendall's W is the index and Sig. is the Significance Level.

With this data, we find that the survey has a significance level among the judges (sig) of 0.032 and Kendall's W of 0.572 for the concordance. As such, we can conclude that the survey creates a level of concordance between judges, where said concordance is not due to the effect of chances or probabilities but is rather associated with each other through the same process. With these results, we can say that the survey is validated in its internal structure, measuring three factors: Innovation, Mentoring, and Career Guidance and the Characteristics of millennial workers. Each of these factors will have a group of questions composed of 14 items for innovation, 14 items for

mentoring and career guidance and 18 items for the characteristics of millennial workers. Each item will also be evaluated according to a Likert scale from 1 to 5, where:

-1: Completely Disagree

-2: Disagree

-3: Neither Agree nor Disagree

-4: Agree

-5: Completely Agree

The detail for each item and its codification are presented in Annex 2.

Turning to the survey's implementation phase, this was carried out with a total of 149 participants from different items of Peruvian business between the months of June to October 2018. The sample size determination has been based on a non-probabilistic sampling for convenience as "it enables us to select those accessible cases that accept being included. This is based on the convenient accessibility and proximity of the subjects for the researcher" (Manterola and Otzen, 2017 p. 230)

It is also important to note that the number of respondents was limited both by the research's material resources and amount of available time.

Among the main socio-demographic data of participants in the survey we have:

Table 2

Main sociodemographic data of participating Peruvian millennial workers

Variables	*Categories*	*Quantity*	*Percentage*
Gender	Woman	70	51%
	Man	66	49%
Service Area		89	65%
	Business	36	26%
	Manufacturing	11	8%
Elementary Education		0	0%
	Secondary Education	6	4%
	Technical Education	69	51%
	University Education	52	38%
	Post-graduate	9	7%
	Doctorate	0	0%
Rural Environment		12	9%
	Urban Environment	124	91%
Performance	Yes	56	41%
	No	80	59%

Time in the Company	Less than 3 months	37	27%
	Between 6 months and 1 year	26	19%
	Between 1 and 3 years	40	29%
	More than 3 years	33	24%

Note: Author's own creation. Variable Performance should be interpreted as "As working in the occupation that they originally studied". It contains data from 136 participants since 13 people did not complete the survey in the correct way.

The next step will be to submit the participants' responses to the respective statistical analysis in order to obtain the answers for our research objectives. For Gomez-Peresmitré and Reidl (2010) and Sánchez (2015) there are a group of tests for this type of study which assumes the existence of two or more independent sample. These are the parametric tests, which are based on two assumptions: that the sample size is greater than 30 individuals and that the data distribution is a normal type. In this group, there are two types of statistical analysis that will be used in accordance with the following research needs:

a) Student's T-test, which will enable us to relate those dichotomous independent variables with the dependent variables of our survey. In the group of dichotomous variables we have: Sex, Environment and Performance, which relate to the objectives of the research), a), b) and c) respectively. It assumes a null hypothesis where significant differences exist between the dependent variables and sex, performance and environment respectively.
b) ANOVA. This will enable us to relate those independent variables with more than two options with the dependent variables of our survey. In this group we have the variables: Area, Level of Education and Time in the Company, which relate to the research objectives d), e) and f) respectively. It supposes a null hypothesis where significant differences exist between the dependent variables and the rubric, level of education and time in the company respectively.

A confidence level of 95% with a significance of 0.05 were decided upon for both average comparison analyses, since these are the values used in the research type carried out (Gomez-Peresmitré and Reidl, 2010).

The survey was conducted with a total of 149 millennial workers from different business areas. Of this total, 13 surveys were discarded for the following reasons:

- Outside the objective age range
- Did not complete some of the socio-demographic data
- Did not complete one or more survey questions

Therefore, there were a total of 136 valid surveys, with a level of response of 91.3%.

Results

As we saw earlier, we have a total of six secondary targets of research that have to do with the figure of the mentor, which will be measured using the Mentoring and Guidance dimension of the survey. Of these six goals, the first three relate to finding

significant differences between the millennial workers' vision with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on the variables of Sex, Environment and Performance. In order to meet these goals, we have undertaken a Student's T-test for dichotomous type variables, as those that we have analyzed, obtaining the following results:

Table 3

Main statistics for the Student's T-test for the analysis of the variables on Sex, Environment and Performance.

Items	Dimensions	Dimension Category	Means	Significance Level	Dimensions	Dimension Category	Means	Significance Level	Dimensions	Dimension Category	Means	Significance Level
OYT1	SEX	Woman	3.67	.829	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.67	.922	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.77	.483
		Man	3.71			Urban Environment	3.70			No	3.63	
OYT2	SEX	Woman	3.61	.689	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.58	.801	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.57	.469
		Man	3.68			Urban Environment	3.66			No	3.70	
OYT3	SEX	Woman	3.67	.267	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.25	.065	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.88	.279
		Man	3.86			Urban Environment	3.81			No	3.68	
OYT4	SEX	Woman	3.84	.534	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.83	.824	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.95	.481
		Man	3.94			Urban Environment	3.89			No	3.84	
OYT5	SEX	Woman	3.70	.876	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.33	.177	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.80	.374
		Man	3.73			Urban Environment	3.75			No	3.65	
OYT6	SEX	Woman	3.93	.945	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	4.08	.554	PERFORMANCE	Yes	4.05	.171
		Man	3.94			Urban Environment	3.92			No	3.84	
OYT7	SEX	Woman	3.91	.874	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.92	.994	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.98	.498
		Man	3.94			Urban Environment	3.92			No	3.87	
OYT8	SEX	Woman	3.74	.798	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.67	.714	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.66	.330
		Man	3.79			Urban Environment	3.78			No	3.84	
OYT9	SEX	Woman	3.63	.550	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.50	.513	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.77	.341
		Man	3.73			Urban Environment	3.69			No	3.61	
OYT10	SEX	Woman	3.69	.244	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.75	.917	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.88	.327
		Man	3.88			Urban	3.78			No	3.71	

					Environment						
OYT11	SEX	Woman	3.83	.815	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.83	.963	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.93	.347
		Man	3.86			Urban Environment	3.85			No	3.78	
OYT12	SEX	Woman	3.79	.869	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.25	.057	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.91	.190
		Man	3.76			Urban Environment	3.82			No	3.68	
OYT13	SEX	Woman	3.86	.338	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.67	.281	PERFORMANCE	Yes	4.07	.102
		Man	4.00			Urban Environment	3.95			No	3.82	
OYT14	SEX	Woman	3.74	.865	ENVIRONMENT	Rural	3.83	.784	PERFORMANCE	Yes	3.79	.720
		Man	3.77			Urban Environment	3.75			No	3.72	

Note: Author's own creation.

From the Table, may deduce that no value of significance for the Mentoring and Guidance dimension with respect to the variables of Sex, Environment and Performance is less than 0.05, which leads us to reject the null hypothesis taking for granted the existence of significant differences. We can thus conclude that there is no evidence of differences with respect to the vision of the figure of the mentor by millennial workers according to the variables Sex, Environment nor Performance.

Continuing with the answers to our research objectives, the next group analyzed are those that relate to finding significant differences between the vision of millennial workers with respect to the figure of the mentor depending on the variables of Education and Time in the Company. In order to meet these goals, we have undertaken an ANOVA analysis for variables that have more than two possible answers, such as those we have analyzed, obtaining the following results:

Table 4

Main statistics from the ANOVA test for the analysis of the Education, Time in the Company variable and Company Area

Item/Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Category	Mean Differences (I-J)	Dev. Error	Sig.
OYT1	University Education	Secondary School	.962*	0.464	0.040
		Technical Education	.425*	0.197	0.033
OYT2	University Education	Technical Education	.392*	0.178	0.029
OYT6	University Education	Technical Education	.535*	0.163	0.001
OYT8	University Education	Technical Education	.454*	0.185	0.015
OYT9	University Education	Technical Education	.348*	0.175	0.049
OYT10	University Education	Technical Education	.425*	0.175	0.016
OYT11	University Education	Technical Education	.415*	0.157	0.009
OYT12	University Education	Secondary School	.840*	0.407	0.041
		Technical Education	.666*	0.173	0.000
OYT13	University Education	Technical Education	.588*	0.152	0.000
OYT14	University Education	Technical Education	.478*	0.184	0.011
OYT4	Less than 3 months	Between 6 months and 1 year	.454*	0.229	0.050
OYT7	Less than 3 months	Between 1 and 3 years	.418*	0.206	0.045
		More than 3 years	.455*	0.217	0.038

Note: Author's own creation. * Differences in means is significant at the 0.05 level. Extract from the complete table presented in Annex 3 with those variables that present significant differences.

The evidence shown in the above table may be summarized in two large categories: evidence with respect to the independent education variable and evidence

with respect to the independent time in the company variable. After this first division, we will proceed to present evidence specific to each group.

In evidences related to the independent education variable, we can see differences between those workers who have a university education with respect to those who have a technical education in the items that have to do with mentoring and guidance:

-OYT1: I receive feedback from my superior

-OYT2: My superior is receptive of any feedback that may provide

-OYT6: My relationship with my superior is positive

-OYT8: My superior understands the problems and difficulties of the area and carries out actions to resolve them

-OYT9: My superior has been an important factor for my proper integration or performance within my work

-OYT10: My superior creates confidence

-OYT11: Feedback sessions with my superior or mentor enable me to reflect and project future objectives at work

-OYT12: My mentor or superior supports my actions and/or decisions

-OYT13: My boss supports me when I need to resolve a problem at work

-OYT14: I recognize my superior as someone who motivates me

In most cases, a more favorable trend is evidenced of all these practices among workers with a university education. Special cases we may find in the items: I receive feedback on my work from my superior (OYT1) and my mentor or superior supports my actions and/or decisions (OYT12); where the evidence of significant differences extend to the group of workers with secondary schooling.

The next group refers to the independent variable of time in the company which evidences significant differences for the guidance and mentoring dimension. The items my superior is honest with me (OYT4) and my superior has the necessary knowledge to guide me on my activities (OYT7) evidences the significant differences in favor of those workers who have less than 6 months with respect to those who have more time.

In the last group, with regard to the variable Company Area, there is no evidence of any data that demonstrates that there is a significant difference, by which the results are not displayed in table 4 in this regard.

Discussions and Conclusions

The first thing this research shows us is that between the independent variables of Sex, Environment, Performance and Company Area and the Guidance and Mentoring dimension, there are no significant differences, by which these variables do not affect the Peruvian millennial workers' view on the figure of the mentor within work environments.

On the other hand, the analysis of the variables Education and Time in the Company with the Guidance and Mentoring dimension provided much more information that explained the figure of the millennial worker with respect to the figure of the mentor in the employment world. In particular, we can see that the worker's Education variable has significant relationships with the figure of the mentor's take within the company and more specific, with those millennial workers who have a college education and who favor having a mentor for their daily work.

With the proposed results we can conclude that Peruvian millennial workers have an image in them with respect to the figure of the mentor within work environments whose characteristics are the following:

a) Is a person who gives feedback on the work done
b) Is receptive to feedback that the worker may provide
c) May have a positive relationship with them
d) Knows the area, its problems and difficulties, but also performs actions to resolve them
e) Is an important person in the integration and subsequent development in the area of their workers
f) Creates a climate of confidence.
g) The feedbacks provided are substantial and enable reflecting on and, likewise, projecting future goals about our daily work.
h) Supports the decisions and actions of their workers
i) Is a person who supports the worker during the need for solving problems
j) Motivates us to do the things

We can see from these points that there is a coincidence with other studies that were reviewed from literature such as Grande and Núñez-Cacho (2012) and Davila and Mita (2015) where they point out that millennial workers see the figure of a mentor/tutor/superior in a positive light, whether as a professional development tool and/or as retention of talent, having the characteristics of providing feedback, motivating doing things and supporting the worker's job development.

Apart from the model of the mentor, a less relevant fact is that of the coincidence with the studies from Newell (2015) and Dávila and Mita (2015) in which the main findings were in those working populations with higher studies, mainly a university education, where more findings have been made.

To this we can add that, according to the literature reviewed, the characteristics of those millennial workers most compatible with the characteristics of the mentor figure we've found are:

a) Feeling that the work has meaning for them
b) Feeling the superior as a person that guides and teaches
c) Perceiving the reception of constructive criticism about their job performance

With regard to the limitations of this study, the most important is the number of people who participated. This limitation is due to the factor of time, since the surveys were conducted when the majority of companies were also conducting their annual job performance surveys, by which many refused to saturate their workers with additional surveys.

Some of the issues that would be left to study are verifying if the results on the mentor figure within the work environments without higher education match or differ with regard to those workers with higher education. At the same time, the entire Innovation dimension of the survey is still to be researched with regard to the figure of the mentor, a topic which will be considered later during the doctoral research.

Lastly, with the number of millennial workers surveyed, no significant differences were observed in the variables for sex, environment, performance and area with respect to the way the mentor figure is perceived. This must be verified whether it stays the same when increasing the amount of workers surveyed.

References

Badia, D. (2012). *Metodología de los mapas de concordancia para la estratificación de variables cuantitativas: Aplicación a la asignatura de Medidas Electrónicas*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Universidad Ramon Llull, Cataluña.

Baron, L. & Morin, L. (2009). The Coach-Coachee Relationship in Executive Coaching: A Field Study. [Digital version]. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 20 (1), 85-106 Doi: 10.1002/hrdq.20009

Begazo, J. y Fernandez, W. (2015). Los Millennials peruanos: Características y Proyecciones de Vida. *Gestión en el Tercer Milenio. Revista de Investigación de la Facultad de Ciencias Administrativas Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos*, 18(36), 9- 15. Retrieved from http://revistasinvestigacion.unmsm.edu.pe/index.php/administrativas/article/view/11699/10489

Brcic, Z. y Mihelic, K. (2015). Knowledge sharing between different generations of employees: an example from Slovenia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja* 28(1), 853-867. doi: 10.1080/1331677X.2015.1092308

Boschma, J. y Groen, I. (2008). *Generación Einstein. Más listos, más rápidos y más sociables*. Madrid:Ediciones Gestión 2000

Camio, M., Rébori, A. y Romero, M. (2010). Un Índice para "medir" el nivel de innovación tecnológica en empresas intensivas en el uso de tecnología. [Digital version] *Revista de Administración e Innovación* 7(1), 3-20.

Cannice, M., Koontz, H. y Weihrich, H. (2012). *Administración: una perspectiva global y empresarial* (14ª ed.) Mexico: McGraw-Hill Interamericana

Carrasco, E. (2014). De la capacitación al desarrollo organizacional y de éste hacia la ambidestreza. *novaRua revista universitaria de administración Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez*, 4(9), 25-33

Castro, J. y Yamada, G. (2010). La economía peruana en la última década: Mejor desempeño y mayor resilencia a la crisis. Trabajo presentado en la Conferencia Internacional Políticas Económicas en América Latina Quito: Servicios de publicaciones de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador.

Coll, C., Mauri, T. y Onrubia, J. (2008). Ayudar a aprender en contextos educativos: el ejercicio de la influencia educativa y el análisis de la enseñanza. *Revista de Educación*, 346, 33-70

Chang, Y., Jeng Lin, W. & Yu Lin, Ch. (2017). The impact of coaching orientation on subordinate performance: the moderating effects of implicit person theory and LMX. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 55, 86-10

Dávila, C. y Mitta, D. (2015). *Retención del talento humano: Políticas y prácticas aplicadas sobre jóvenes "Millennials" en grupo de organizaciones*. Thesis presented to obtain the bachelor's in Management, with mention in Business Management, Faculty of Administration and Senior Management, Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Lima. Retrieved from http://tesis.pucp.edu.pe/repositorio/handle/123456789/6948

Deloitte (2015). *Brechas Importantes Encuesta Deloitte 2015 Generación del Milenio*. Retrieved from http://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/cr/Documents/human-capital/estudios/150225-EncuestaDeloitte2015-Generacion-del-Milenio.pdf

Epstein, M. & Hershatter, A. (2006). *Is yout Firm ready for the Millennials?*. Retrieved from http://knowledge.emory.edu/article.cfm?articleid=950#

Espinosa, F. (2011). Diseño y Construcción de Organizaciones Inteligentes. Recuperado de http://www.otr.com.mx/compartidos/Org%20Int.pdf

Frías, P. (2014). *Compromiso y satisfacción laboral como factores de permanencia de la generación Y*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Chile, Santiago de Chile.

Gonzáles, R. (2011). La incorporación de la Generación "Y" al mercado laboral. El caso de una entidad financiera de la ciudad de Resistencia. *Palermo Business Review* 5 67-93

Grande, F. y Nuñez-Cacho, P. (2012). El desarrollo de los recursos humanos a través del mentoring: El caso español. [Digital version] *Intangible Capital*, 8(1), 61-91.

Great Place to Work (2013). Generación Y: *¿Cómo retener a la generación que siempre se quiere ir?*. Retrieved from http://www.greatplacetowork.com.pe/storage/documents/GPTWP2_-_2014_AGO_-_Reporte_GPTW_-_Generacion_Y_-_V2.pdf

Gómez-Peresmitré, G. y Reidl, L. (2010). *Metodología de Investigación en Ciencias Sociales*. México: U.N.A.M

Guillaume, Y., Jones, R. & Woods, S. (2015). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 89(2), 249-277 doi: 10.1111/joop.12119

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation*. London. Vintage Books

Huamán, I. y Vásquez, M. (2012). *Habilidades sociales y tutoría docente según la percepción de los alumnos de 6to grado: Red Educativa Ventanilla*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, San Ignacio de Loyola University, Lima.

Manterola, C. y Otzen, T. (2017). Técnicas de Muestreo sobre una Población a Estudio. *Int. J. Morphol*, 35(1), 227-232.

Newell, T. (2015). *Propuesta de formación Social Learning 2.0 para la generación "Y". Tesis para optar el grado académico de Master en Dirección Estratégica del Fac-tor Humano*, Programa de Master en Dirección Estratégica del Factor Humano, Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas, Lima. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10757/576181

Penagos, T. y Rubio, E (2014). *Millennials y Millennials peruanos. Realidad, expectativas y proyecciones*. Lima: ER|Roland

Pricewaterhouse Coopers (2014). *1er estudio: Tendencias de Retención del talento Perú 2014. Un desafío para las organizaciones de hoy*. Lima: Autor

Sanchez, R. (2015). T-Student: Usos y Abusos. *Revista Mexicana de Cardiología*, 26(1), 59-61. Retrieved from

http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0188-21982015000100009

Serrat, O. (2010). *Coaching and mentoring*. Washington, DC: Asian Development Bank. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/intl/114

Schalk, E. (2005). Modelo de enseñanza-aprendizaje para adultos en la Era del Conocimiento. Diseño y estructura del Modelo. *Gestión en el Tercer Milenio, Revista de la facultad de Ciencias Administrativas UNMSM*, 8 (16), 63-87.

Receipt date: 1/9/2019

Review date: 1/10/2019

Acceptance date: 6/10/2019

Annexes

Annex 1

Survey items before validation from the judges

Item codification	Writing the items
INN1	New services and/or products and ways of working were witnessed during your time working in the company
INN2	The company approaches its employees for innovative ideas
INN3	I may extract the new knowledge I acquire during my daily activity
INN4	The company tolerates mistakes
INN5	The company awards the creation of new ideas
INN6	The company is open to changes
INN7	I feel motivated to learn something new
INN8	I am commonly up against new and unusual situations during my daily work
INN9	I prefer unique and original approaches to each project that is handed to me
INN10	I tend to act by anticipating future problems, needs and changes in my work
INN11	I am in favor of experimentation and original approximations when solving work-related problems
INN12	I feel that I can share information with my peers
INN13	I feel that the company has more innovative processes and/or products than the competition
INN14	I am curious to research and know more about the company
INN15	I can change my way of working if the surrounding work conditions are changed
INN16	I question, in a constructive manner, the way of doing things
INN17	I use digital tools to carry out my daily work in a more flexible and efficient manner
INN18	I search for the opportunities to contribute new ideas in my daily work
INN19	I am receptive to new ideas from my peers at work
INN20	I create more than one alternative solutions for the problems in my work environment
INN21	I produce a big number of ideas in search of solutions for complex problems
OYT1	I receive feedback from my superior
OYT2	My superior is receptive of any feedback that may provide
OYT3	I receive help to learn and/or grow professionally
OYT4	My superior is honest with me
OYT5	I feel that I am advised on important issues in my daily work

OYT6	My relationship with my superior is positive
OYT7	My superior has the necessary knowledge to guide me through the activities
OYT8	My superior understands the problems and difficulties of the area and carries out actions to resolve them
OYT9	My superior has been an important factor for my proper integration or performance within my work
OYT10	My superior creates confidence
OYT11	Feedback sessions with my superior or mentor enable me to reflect and project future objectives at work
OYT12	My mentor or superior supports my actions and/or decisions
OYT13	My boss supports me when I need to resolve a problem at work
OYT14	I recognize my superior as someone who motivates me
OYT15	My superior procures that I have all of the necessary tools for me to carry out my work
ACT1	I am clear of what the organization expects of me
ACT2	I receive recognition for my work
ACT3	They look out for my well-being, as a person, in my work
ACT4	I feel that I may develop my full potential
ACT5	My opinions are taken into account in my work
ACT6	I feel committed with the company's mission
ACT7	I feel that my work has meaning for me
ACT8	Teamwork is promoted where I work
ACT9	I receive constructive criticism about my job performance
ACT10	I feel my superior is a person that guides and teaches
ACT11	I feel that I have the freedom to select my own method of work
ACT12	I feel proud of where I work
ACT13	I feel that I can stay with this company for a long time
ACT14	I feel that there exists an air of confidence between my peers
ACT15	I frequently offer my help to carry out the work in my area or in the team
ACT16	In my work environment, I feel that I am free to use digital tools for my daily work
ACT17	In my work, the type of communication with my peers and superior is immediate
ACT18	The work environment encourages the use of technology

Annex 2
Survey items after validation from the judges

Item codification	Writing the items
INN1	The company approaches its employees for innovative ideas
INN2	I may extract the new knowledge I acquire during my daily activity
INN3	The company tolerates mistakes
INN4	The company awards the creation of new ideas
INN5	The company is open to changes
INN6	I feel motivated to learn something new
INN7	I prefer unique and original approaches to each project that is handed to me
INN8	I tend to act by anticipating future problems, needs and changes in my work
INN9	I feel that I can share information with my peers
INN10	I feel that the company has more innovative processes and/or products than the competition
INN11	I am curious to research and know more about the company
INN12	I question, in a constructive manner, the way of doing things
INN13	I search for the opportunities to contribute new ideas in my daily work
INN14	I create more than one alternative solutions for the problems in my work environment
OYT1	I receive feedback from my superior
OYT2	My superior is receptive of any feedback that may provide
OYT3	I receive help to learn and/or grow professionally
OYT4	My superior is honest with me
OYT5	I feel that I am advised on important issues in my daily work
OYT6	My relationship with my superior is positive
OYT7	My superior has the necessary knowledge to guide me through the activities
OYT8	My superior understands the problems and difficulties of the area and carries out actions to resolve them
OYT9	My superior has been an important factor for my proper integration or performance within my work
OYT10	My superior creates confidence
OYT11	Feedback sessions with my superior or mentor enable me to reflect and project future objectives at work
OYT12	My mentor or superior supports my actions and/or decisions
OYT13	My boss supports me when I need to resolve a problem at work
OYT14	I recognize my superior as someone who motivates me

ACT1	I am clear of what the organization expects of me
ACT2	I receive recognition for my work
ACT3	They look out for my well-being, as a person, in my work
ACT4	I feel that I may develop my full potential
ACT5	My opinions are taken into account in my work
ACT6	I feel committed with the company's mission
ACT7	I feel that my work has meaning for me
ACT8	Teamwork is promoted where I work
ACT9	I receive constructive criticism about my job performance
ACT10	I feel my superior is a person that guides and teaches
ACT11	I feel that I have the freedom to select my own method of work
ACT12	I feel proud of where I work
ACT13	I feel that I can stay with this company for a long time
ACT14	I feel that there exists an air of confidence between my peers
ACT15	I frequently offer my help to carry out the work in my area or in the team
ACT16	In my work environment, I feel that I am free to use digital tools for my daily work
ACT17	In my work, the type of communication with my peers and superior is immediate
ACT18	The work environment encourages the use of technology

Annex 3

Statistics of the ANOVA test for the analysis of the Company Area variable with respects to Guidance and Mentoring

Item	Time in Company Dimension				
	Category		Mean Differences (I-J)	Dev. Error	Sig.
OYT1	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.204	0.217	0.348
		MANUFACTURING	-0.098	0.350	0.780
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.204	0.217	0.348
		MANUFACTURING	0.106	0.378	0.779
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	0.098	0.350	0.780
		COMMERCIAL	-0.106	0.378	0.779
OYT2	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.154	0.194	0.427
		MANUFACTURING	-0.132	0.314	0.675
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.154	0.194	0.427
		MANUFACTURING	0.023	0.338	0.947
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	0.132	0.314	0.675
		COMMERCIAL	-0.023	0.338	0.947
OYT3	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.053	0.200	0.792
		MANUFACTURING	0.026	0.324	0.937
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.053	0.200	0.792
		MANUFACTURING	0.078	0.349	0.823
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.026	0.324	0.937
		COMMERCIAL	-0.078	0.349	0.823
OYT4	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.085	0.178	0.636
		MANUFACTURING	0.251	0.289	0.385
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.085	0.178	0.636
		MANUFACTURING	0.336	0.311	0.282
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.251	0.289	0.385
		COMMERCIAL	-0.336	0.311	0.282

OYT5	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.008	0.200	0.966
		MANUFACTURING	0.378	0.324	0.245
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.008	0.200	0.966
		MANUFACTURING	0.386	0.349	0.270
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.378	0.324	0.245
		COMMERCIAL	-0.386	0.349	0.270
OYT6	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.089	0.181	0.625
		MANUFACTURING	0.250	0.293	0.394
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.089	0.181	0.625
		MANUFACTURING	0.162	0.316	0.610
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.250	0.293	0.394
		COMMERCIAL	-0.162	0.316	0.610
OYT7	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.105	0.182	0.564
		MANUFACTURING	0.148	0.294	0.616
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.105	0.182	0.564
		MANUFACTURING	0.043	0.317	0.893
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.148	0.294	0.616
		COMMERCIAL	-0.043	0.317	0.893
OYT8	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.204	0.202	0.314
		MANUFACTURING	0.297	0.327	0.364
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.204	0.202	0.314
		MANUFACTURING	0.093	0.352	0.791
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.297	0.327	0.364
		COMMERCIAL	-0.093	0.352	0.791
OYT9	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.114	0.188	0.546
		MANUFACTURING	0.571	0.304	0.063
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.114	0.188	0.546
		MANUFACTURING	0.457	0.328	0.166
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.571	0.304	0.063
		COMMERCIAL	-0.457	0.328	0.166
OYT10	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.069	0.192	0.718
		MANUFACTURING	0.037	0.310	0.906

	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.069	0.192	0.718
		MANUFACTURING	0.106	0.334	0.752
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.037	0.310	0.906
		COMMERCIAL	-0.106	0.334	0.752
OYT11	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.071	0.173	0.682
		MANUFACTURING	0.149	0.279	0.594
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.071	0.173	0.682
		MANUFACTURING	0.078	0.301	0.795
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.149	0.279	0.594
		COMMERCIAL	-0.078	0.301	0.795
OYT12	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.003	0.196	0.989
		MANUFACTURING	-0.247	0.318	0.438
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.003	0.196	0.989
		MANUFACTURING	-0.250	0.342	0.466
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	0.247	0.318	0.438
		COMMERCIAL	0.250	0.342	0.466
OYT13	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	-0.124	0.172	0.473
		MANUFACTURING	-0.215	0.278	0.442
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	0.124	0.172	0.473
		MANUFACTURING	-0.091	0.300	0.762
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	0.215	0.278	0.442
		COMMERCIAL	0.091	0.300	0.762
OYT14	SERVICE	COMMERCIAL	0.087	0.202	0.669
		MANUFACTURING	0.354	0.328	0.281
	COMMERCIAL	SERVICE	-0.087	0.202	0.669
		MANUFACTURING	0.268	0.353	0.450
	MANUFACTURING	SERVICE	-0.354	0.328	0.281
		COMMERCIAL	-0.268	0.353	0.450