



Mentoring Guides for U.S. College Faculty and Administrators in Culturally Diverse Settings

Ngozi Caleb Kamalu Ph.D. *

Professor of Political Science Department of Intelligence Studies, Geospatial Science, Political Science & History (IGPH).

College of Humanities and Social Sciences Fayetteville State University, US

Email: nkamalu@uncfsu.edu

Johnson A. Kamalu Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Nutrition & Hospitality Management Department of Family & Consumer Sciences, College of Agricultural, Life and Natural Sciences Alabama A&M University, US

Article History

Received: August 4, 2021

Revised: October 16, 2021

Accepted: October 19, 2021

Published: October 22, 2021

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to provide answers to the following research questions: Is effective mentoring a function of culture, learning or hereditary, birth/ nature? Or are people born with certain traits that make them more effective or better mentors than others or is it based on learning or socialization/ nurture?; Is cross gender or cross-racial more effective than mentoring based on demographic similarities characteristics? Are there some types or techniques or practices of mentoring that are more appropriate or more suitable to some demographic groups or populations – women, blacks and other racial minorities etc. than others? This paper defines mentoring, discusses competing schools/ theories of mentorship, as well as typologies of mentoring approaches. The paper concludes that multiple/ group mentoring approach is indicative of the new trend in the business; and that while each mentoring technique or model supplements or complements the other, multiple mentoring styles or systems tend to present the best possible path to achieving efficiency and effectiveness. Finally, it recommends appropriate mentoring strategies and techniques to improve mentoring that include programs that take into account demographic similarities between mentors and protégés, gender and race-based norms, stereotypes and discrimination, as well as cultural diversity.

Keywords: Psychosocial; Career development; Diversity; Matching; Flash mentoring; Protégé; Mentor; Mentee; Peer; Organizational development; Professional identity; Affirmative action; Glass ceiling; virtual mentoring; Tokenism; Stereotype; Quota system; Cross-gender mentor; Career competencies; Job boundaries; STEM.

1. Introduction

According to Becky Wai-Packard of Mount Holyoke College, “mentoring is a relationship between a less experienced individual called mentee or protégé and a more experienced individual known as a mentor”. Also, Yolanda S. George and

David and Yolanda (2006) in their report presented the definition by Marilyn Suiter of the National Science Foundation that “mentoring is an interaction between a more experienced person and a less experienced person that provides guidance which motivates the mentored person to take action”.

Traditionally, mentoring approaches have mimicked culture and are thus dictated, driven and shaped by forms of social mores and norms. Hence, women are matched with other women; minority groups with other minority groups and men with men, as protégé and as mentors. However, Blake-Beard (1999) has argued against this practice, by claiming that cross-gender or cross-racial mentoring (matching of mentors according along demographic lines or characteristics) is not a panacea for effective mentoring, but that an effective mentor could differ from the mentee based on racial and ethnic background, socioeconomic status or even disability status. In contrast, Frierson *et al.*, (1994) argue that regardless of the diversity elements or the differentiation between the mentor and mentee, the mentee is more likely to prefer a mentor who is a close match along demographic lines – race/ ethnicity, gender, language, religious, class, age, geography, national origin and physical ability.

A study by Suzanne (2010) which examined mentoring and advising in an academic medical setting found that the distinction between advising and mentoring was an important discovery which was supported by literature that identifies that mentors and advisors differ in multiple ways. A mentor is often selected to match resources and expertise with a resident's needs or professional interests. An advisor is assigned with a role to counsel and guide the resident (mentee or student) through the residency processes, procedures, and key learning milestones.

The primary purpose of mentoring, argued (Donaldson *et al.*, 2000) is to “foster the mentee’s professional, academic or personal development.” Each mentor could perform or take on different scopes. That is what (Kram, 1985; Ragins *et al.*, 2000) mean when they claimed that mentoring is not necessarily an all or nothing task, but that while some may fulfill some specific, particular and distinct roles, others take on a variety of roles and dynamics.

Mentoring is usually a formal or informal relationship between two people- a senior called mentor and a junior referred to as mentee or protégé. Mentoring plays an important role in almost all bureaucracies in the area of

*Corresponding Author

professional development of the mentee in specific areas of endeavor including their facilitation in successfully completing the programs in which they are enrolled or involved.

Organizations do not establish or create mentoring programs just for the sake of it. Many link them to their business goals. For example entities that forecast tremendous growth in a specific job discipline or sector may need a mentoring program to help prepare their workers for certain skills or sharpen the ones they already have. These practices are replete in organizations involved in international competition in the era of globalization and outsourcing of jobs. Hence, they are able to marshal the time, effort, attention and financial resources required to make their targeted mentoring program work. In the same vein, even establishments anticipating reorganization sometimes establish mentoring programs designed to help them to guarantee, facilitate and sustain continuity in their organizational performance. Different organizations create formal mentorship programs for various reasons, including achieving major organizational goals of increasing the morale of their employees; enhancing their career development and or boost organizational output or productivity.

In contemporary organizational experiences, mentoring successes always carry a mixed bag. For mentoring programs to achieve success, they require proper planning, understanding, implementation and evaluation. While some succeed, a myriad of others fail woefully. Failure of several mentorship programs often occur as a result of a variety of causes and problems associated with lack of involvement and commitment of time, effort, attention and resources by leadership, poor planning, unrealistic (not within reach) expectation, unclear, untenable, lacking specificity and what [OPM \(2002\)](#) referred to as “fuzzy goals”. But, for the successful mentoring programs, they have been able to enhance employee’s organizational advancement, career development and career satisfaction.

Mentoring has become such a fascinating and complex concept to understand, that it has taken on the unsettled and unresolved Nature vs. Nurture debate or the “egg v. chicken argument. Proponents of this school, such as Greek thinker Plato saw mentoring as nature center their arguments on the contribution of genetic inheritance (biological and family factors) to human development. That is that effective mentoring behaviors in people are based on hereditary rather than a learned behavior. In other words, they suggest that certain things are born, or that they simply occur naturally. They also postulate that the ability to mentor is dictated by a person’s innate qualities irrespective of other forces in their lives. As a test of this hypothesis regarding effective mentoring, [Allen \(2003\)](#) examined the dispositional and motivational variables related to the propensity to mentor others as well as the provision of career and psychosocial mentoring. The findings of the study showed that pro-social personality traits or variables such as empathy and helpfulness related to willingness to mentor others and also accounted for unique variance beyond variables associated with life and career stages. Further results indicated that other oriented empathy related or correlated with actual experience as a mentor; and that motivation for mentoring others differentially related to psychosocial and career mentoring.

In contrast, others philosophers, empiricists or behaviorists, such as philosopher John Locke saw effective mentoring as a byproduct of “nurture”- social and environmental factors, or even personal experiences, in terms of determining, or causing individual differences in behavioral characteristics or even mentoring traits. Put succinctly, these theorists see the mentor as a “blank slate”, suggesting that every knowledge, including mentoring skills are a byproduct of our environment and experiences. These Empiricists also take the position that all or most mentoring behaviors and characteristics are the result of learning and socialization processes. In order to test this assumption, [Ragins and Scandura \(1999\)](#) investigated the relationship between anticipated cost and benefits of being a mentor, mentoring experience, and intentions to become a mentor among a sample of 275 executives. The researchers discovered that those persons lacking mentoring experiences anticipated greater costs and fewer benefits than experienced persons. Moreover, they found that anticipated costs and benefits were related to intentions to mentor, and that this relationship varied according to mentoring experience. The findings of this study suggest that mentoring may be an intergenerational process that is maintained or sustained through modeling, learning behaviors and socialization.

The purpose of this paper is to provide answers to the following research questions:

- Is there any difference between mentoring and academic advising?
- Is mentoring taught or learned? Or are people born with certain traits that make them more effective or better mentors than others? In other words, are nature and nurture determinants or predictors of effective mentoring?
- Is cross gender, cross-racial matching (tagging or pairing of mentor and mentee) based on demographic characteristics?
- Are there some types or techniques or practices of mentoring that are more appropriate or more suitable to some demographic groups or populations – women and racial minorities than others?
- What kinds of mentoring techniques or models are the most effective or what are the best practices in academic mentoring designed to improve retention, graduation or career outcomes/ successes of students

For the purpose of this paper, protégé and mentee will be used interchangeably. Also, mentorship and mentoring will be used in likewise manner to denote mentoring/ mentorship programs.

2. Types of Mentors

Types of mentors mean different things to different people, and are determined by whom you ask. In fact, the list and criteria vary and remains elastic and unending. For example, [Educause \(2013\)](#) listed types of mentors as strictly based of two typologies of functions – Career and Psychosocial. In terms of Career Mentor, services such as sponsorship, exposure/ visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments are provided to the mentee. For Psychosocial function, a mentor provides guidance, support and direction in terms of role modeling, acceptance /

confirmation, counseling and friendship functions. Nevertheless, a more compelling Mentor Types are compiled and listed by the [United States office of Personnel Management \(2008\)](#) as four types:

- **Career Guide:** Mentor who promotes development via career guidance, counseling and visibility
- **Information Source:** Mentor provides or serves as source for information about formal and informal expectations to the mentee
- **Friend:** Mentor interacts with the protégé socially and also provides vital information about people.
- **Intellectual Guide:** Mentor promotes an equal relationship, collaborates with mentees in such areas as research projects as well as feedback and constructive criticism to protégés.

3. The Scramble for Mentoring Programs

Notwithstanding the benefits of mentoring far outweigh their shortcomings, any organizational entity that strives to compete successfully and survive must do so for the reasons highlighted by [OPM \(2002\)](#) as to why agencies implement or establish mentoring program:

- As part of on-boarding process: Mentoring helps new recruits and trainees to settle into the organization
- Skills enhancement: Mentoring enables experienced and highly competent staff pass on their expertise to other employees hungry to acquire such skills

This promotes continuity of experts in various areas or units of production

- Professional identity: fresh and inexperienced employees are helped to know their expectations in their working or organizational environment.

For example, a young faculty member in an institution of Higher education needs to understand what it means to be a teacher, mentor and advisor to students, as well as the need for collegiality on campus. Hence, they are socialized to inculcate the ethics, behavior and culture of the organization. This will enable them to serve as role models to future employees. This time of acculturation often takes place when employees are first hired, either during their orientation periods or when serving out their probationary period in an agency or during their non-tenured status in colleges and universities. It should be noted that true professionals always embody the true spirit and values of their profession, which ultimately make them to be self-initiating and self-regulating.

Career Development: Mentoring assists employees to plan, develop and manage their careers. Mentees are counseled or coached to be determined, persistent, resilient, self-directed and improving, and adaptive with their careers especially during times of change and to become more self-reliant in the management of their careers.

Leadership and management development: Leadership qualities are enhanced during mentoring. Grooming new and talented Leadership qualities also involves help develop competencies necessary for effective leadership. These competencies are acquired and sharpened through mentoring, emulation/ example, modeling, examples, guided practice, observation and experience more so than through education/ teaching and training

Education Support: Mentoring provides the avenue or platform through which the gap between theory and practice is bridged. Here, formal teaching/ education is complemented by knowledge, experience, learning by doing as well as hands –on experience.

Organizational Development and Culture Change: Mentoring programs help to communicate institutional values, visions and missions. One-on-one relationships with a competent mentor can help employees to comprehend organizational culture so that they can adopt them and make necessary changes in their adaptation process.

Customer service: Mentoring helps employees to model desired organizational behavior, as well as encourage the development of competencies that will make interaction between customers and employees better, in terms of responses, treatment, and depicting the right attitudes and enhancing the image of the organization through communication

Staff Retention: Mentoring provides and encouraging and enabling environment that symbolically communicate the fact that employees who stick around (remain) will in the long run in their careers reach their potential as well as achieve their professional goals and objectives. Mentoring also provides the platform of interaction, teaching, coaching and role modeling that facilitates the growth experience of the worker along his or her career experiential continuum. Mentoring promotes employee promotion by helping establish organizational culture of tolerance, respect for diversity, mutual respect and opportunity. The organizational ecology so established will help to attract talented workers, retain them and extract their ultimate performance. Mentoring is a measurable or tangible way that an organization communicates its spirit of inclusiveness, opportunity, and value placed on the life, wellbeing and work of the employees. This type of work environment also breeds cooperation, decreases absenteeism, conflict among employees and management, decrease job related accidents and lawsuits.

Recruitment: Mentoring enhances the recruitment goal of an entity when potential or prospective employees during or after their job interviews learn of a sustained institutional support system designed to guide, channel and support their effort in the organization for the purpose of helping them to achieve their personal and professional goal of self-enrichment and personal growth throughout the progression of their anticipated long career – from hiring, through job training and promotion all the way to retirement.

Knowledge Management / Knowledge Transfer: Through mentoring, employees are readily furnished with inter-organizational information and knowledge. That is workers are made aware of the successes, challenges and promises of production facing other similarly situated entities. It also includes coping and adaptive strategies available to each management in the environment. For example, the impacts of the preferences of customers, international competition among auto manufacturers in the areas of wages, competition, prices, labor unionization, government policy, international climate, raw material availability, outsourcing, and product quality.

4. Typologies of Mentoring Approaches and Systems

Wake Forest School of Medicine Office of Faculty Development (2013) identified seven types of mentoring:

1. **One-On-One Mentoring:** Here, one mentor meets with one mentee at a time. The individualized attention the mentor pays to the mentee makes for greater rapport. This type of relationship, though structured can last for years if not a life time and can be enriching and beneficial to both the mentor and protégé. This type of mentoring, argued (Bird and Didion, 1992) can equally involve a network of multiple mentors, and in the words of Burlew (1991) and Packard (2003) can be enlisted concurrently; or even sequentially, argued (Baugh and Scandura, 1999; Nolinske, 1995)
2. **Group Mentoring:** Here, One mentor meets with several mentees at a time. Mentees here are often more compatible because they are more likely to have identical goals; and is amenable to situations where time is of essence. Once rapport, comfort, openness and trust are established in the group, it becomes much easier to share common experiences, ideas and knowledge, which inevitably may lead into bigger things and possibilities.
3. **Team Mentoring:** This entails that many mentors work with one mentee or a group of mentees. Team mentoring allows mentors to work together or separately to assist the mentees reach their identified developmental goals. The relationship here is always short-lived pending the accomplishment of the projected goal or project. The emphasis of the mentoring relationship is the performance and functioning of the group as opposed to “psychosocial” bonding. Psychosocial bonding is construed by Noe (1988); Ragins and McFarlin (1990) as a product of mentoring involving mentor roles such as friend or counselor. While the mentors are supposed to serve as guides and resources, providing feedback on the task ahead, it is the responsibility of the protégée to learn and to adhere to directives and guidance and thus act accordingly.
4. **Peer Mentoring.** In this type of relationship, instead of the traditional expectation that a senior faculty peer providing guidance or feedback to a junior faculty member and vice versa, the relationship is the other way around. In the example of Davis (2001), mentoring may involve a peer group when women scientists convene to discuss the science community. Junior faculty providing guidance and direction to fellow junior faculty. The relationship which is usually informal and less structured can take the path of one-to-one or a group, and is more susceptible, amenable and effective for sharing job related experiences and knowledge, as well as insights, experiences and challenges others may or have confronted.
5. **E-Mentoring (also known as Tele-mentoring/ Online/Virtual Mentoring)**

In this type of relationship, the mentor works with a single mentee at a time using the internet or other forms of electronic devices such as the telephone. In some cases, an initial face to face meeting may be arranged if possible and if time and distance permit, otherwise interface or interaction between the mentor and mentee take place exclusively by electronic. This type of relationship is most effective where participants find themselves located in far distant places from others. For example, colleges and universities as well as other businesses which have satellite campuses or branches worldwide usually rely on this mode of mentoring. It is also beneficial for those who in rural or remote areas and communities. Virtual mentoring is also less expensive compared to face-to-face mentoring. It also provides parties with an alternative mentoring strategy.

In order for this type of mentoring to be effective, the parties must be self-motivated in order to maintain their regular regimentations, communications, schedules and agreed upon tasks on their own volition and without the need to meet face-to-face.

6. **Informal Mentoring:** In this type of mentoring, mentee self-selects his mentor. Usually, this action may be preceded by a conversation between the mentor and mentee. In most cases, the mentee may have known the mentor or identified him/ her as a role model. The United States Office of Personnel Management (2008) referred to this mode of mentoring as “flash mentoring” that requires little investment of time and short sessions where mentors share lessons learned, their life experiences and advice to their protégés. According to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, this type of mentoring can take on the form of “situational Mentoring”, in which the mentee seeks the right help at the right time from a mentor when he/ she needs guidance and direction. Although ad hoc in appearance, it is usually short term addressing an immediate situation but could still develop or transition into a more long and lasting relationship.

Hence, this type of natural intercourse may develop without the need of any formal structure or formal agreement. In most cases, the relationship progresses at the behest or dictates or discretion of the mentee. Although goals exist in such relationship, they are often overlooked because it often operates outside the scope of a program.

7. **Reverse mentoring:** In reverse mentoring, the senior person, with respect to age, experience or position receives counseling or guidance from a junior person, in terms of age, experience or status. In fact, reverse mentoring is designed to assist older, and senior people learn from the knowledge and experiences of younger people. This type of mentorship is very effective in the fields of Information communication Technology (ICT) - computing and internet communications. Also, this type of mentoring is often used to encourage diversity and cross generational communication and understanding. It is more conducive in an atmosphere of openness, and collegiality; and should be devoid of hierarchy and status.

5. Best Mentoring Practices That Work: What Effective Mentoring Really Looks Like

Research literatures are replete with tips on the best practices designed to produce effective mentorship of faculty in terms of what types of support strategies designed help new faculty thrive and cope while mentoring. Boice (1992), suggested a mentoring process that builds collegiality through social support networks. He suggests

that any effective mentoring routine must help faculty find time, fluency and balance as researchers, teachers and writers; and suggested a variety of self-help projects that include exercise and mood management groups run largely by new faculty, all completed by faculty handbooks and newsletters. He suggests the crucial support of academic administrators, chairs, deans etc. in securing needed funds to support faculty development and the success of new programs.

Chester and Chester (2002) suggest increased mentoring that focuses extensively on female graduate students and faculty as one strategy for increasing the hiring, presence, retention and advancement of women scholars, especially in STEM, while deemphasizing gender-roles that make the construction or design of and maintenance of mentoring relationships especially difficult for women in male dominated fields like STEM. In addition, they suggested the implementation of nontraditional mentoring strategies which tend to be more women friendly or gender-sensitive, such as peer, multiple and collective mentoring methods. Finally, they suggested organizational change strategies designed to provide a more equalitarian and egalitarian and cooperative atmosphere in both the departments and science programs to signify an institutionalized community caring that is supportive of all its members personal and professional wellbeing, success and professional growth and enrichment.

Davidson and Foster-Johnson (2001), emphasized the challenges of attracting students and faculty of color. They suggested that effective mentoring within programs, colleges and departments can improve faculty multicultural experiences that will better position them to succeed in their teaching careers. To be an effective mentor, the authors argue, a faculty member must cultivate understanding the experiences of the faculty from various cultural backgrounds. This, according to them is even more challenging for white faculty members because of societal issues involving race and ethnicity. In all, they proposed actions that would prepare faculty members to enhance their multicultural competencies in mentoring.

Ensher et al. (2002), examined how perceived attitudinal similarities (general outlook, values, problem solving approach, demography –race and gender affected protégé support and satisfaction from their informal mentoring relationships. The authors used **Scandura (1998)** 3-factor scale of mentor functions to measure vocational, psych-social, and role-modeling support. 144 protégés from diverse backgrounds, of which 54% were female and 54% were non-white. The researchers concluded that perceived attitudinal similarity was a better predictor of protégés' satisfaction with and support received from their mentors than was demographic similarity.

Kalev (2006), Tested the premise that segregation blocks career opportunities for women minorities; and that work structures that expand opportunities for women and minorities to network and so demonstrate their capabilities may increase their chances of being hired, retained and subsequently hired in high ranking jobs. The investigators relied on data from reorganized work over twenty years and examined whether the adoption of programs that counteract segregation – self-directed work teams and cross-job training are followed by or result in higher managerial diversity. The authors found that teams and training programs that fail to transcend job boundaries, such as problem solving teams or job training do not lead to an increase in managerial diversity. In reverse, when employers adopt programs that increase workers exposure to other people and jobs, such as self-directed teams or cross-job training, the proportion of white women and black women and men among managers increases. In conclusion, the authors call for the promotion and encouragement of workplace diversity among faculty.

Kidd et al. (2003), analyzed the outcomes that resulted from career discussions experienced by 104 employees. In the study, employees appeared to benefit from discussions about their careers with individuals in a wide range of roles. It was concluded that while many effective career discussions produced multiple long lasting outcomes, the most common types of outcomes experienced were those that focused on a clearer view of future direction, self-insight, awareness of opportunities, or feeling reassured or better about self or work. The study encouraged informal mentoring that emphasize career intervention, informal career discussions

Kram (1985), dispelled the myths about mentoring – that if the primary beneficiary is the protégé; that it always results in a positive experience; that their relationships are similar; that mentoring is the sole key to career success, and that that mentoring is readily very accessible (available to all those who want it). The study also examined two types of functions of mentoring relations, namely Career function and Psycho-social functions. Career functions focuses on sponsorship, visibility, coaching, buffering and challenging assignments, while Psychosocial functions emphasize role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling and friendship. The author recommends the development of mentoring relationships that involve more than one person and with peers as well as supervisors.

Milem (2003), reviewed empirical research on diversity, climate and affirmative action; and found that positive interaction among diverse groups of people can lead to learning experiences, creative insights in teaching and research as well as improve departmental and institutional climate. He argues that a positive interaction and positive climate eventually encourages faculty and students to not only remain at the university (enhance retention), but increase output or productivity.

Peluchette and Jeanquart (2000), looked at various sources of mentors used by university professor; how these sources influenced their objective and subjective career sources and whether the participants used different sources of mentors at different stages of their careers. Relying on data from 430 faculty members at 2 U.S. research institutions, the researcher found that although the participants used different sources of mentors at different stages of their careers, assistant professor with mentors in their profession; associate professors with mentors outside the work place; and professors with mentors within their organizations scored highest in objective career success. Further, assistant professors with multiple sources of mentors yielded significantly higher levels of both objective and subjective career success that those with single sources or no mentors.

Raabe and Beehr (2003), who studied formal mentoring programs in two companies examined the extent to which mentees and mentors agreed on the nature of their mentoring relationships and the length to which dimensions of mentoring relationships were related to outcomes for mentees, compared with the extent to which dimensions of

supervisory and coworker relationships were related to the same outcomes- job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. In the study, the authors concluded that mentoring functions performed by supervisors and coworkers were more likely to affect employees job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organizational commitment rather than assigned formal mentors from higher up in the organization chain or hierarchy.

Seibert (1999), examined a one-year longitudinal quasi experiment that studied the effectiveness of a formal mentoring program at a fortune 100 corporation. The author compared employees who participated in the program with a control group who reported never having a mentor. The author found no significant statistical difference between subject participating in mentor program with their non-mentored counterparts with respect to work-role stress or self-esteem at work. This study's result suggests that while a formal mentor program can have positive effects on individual and organizational outcomes, its effectiveness or efficacy may not be as strong as envisioned or as widely expected.

Subramaniam and Wyer (1998), conducted a focused group study in a seminar setting that examined mentoring and the unwritten rule and unconscious biases that influenced it, such as the unwritten rules of academia; describing which faculty students would like changed or relieved of their duties. The authors suggest a less individualized and a more community-based approach to mentoring as opposed to the more traditional models that focused on the culture of science, historical arguments for excluding women in the sciences, gender norms, and other stereotypes.

6. Effective Mentoring Process: A Win-Win for All

In an organizational setting, effective mentoring provides a lot of benefits for both mentors and protégés, according to the OPM (2002) United States Office of Personnel Management (2002). To Mentors, (OPM) argues that just playing the role of mentor automatically enables the mentor to:

- Renew their enthusiasm for the role of expert
- Gain greater understanding of the barriers experienced at lower levels of the organization
- Enhance his/ her skills in coaching, counseling, listening and modeling
- Develop and practice a more personal style of leadership
- Demonstrate expertise and share knowledge
- Increase his/her general awareness

With respect to Protégés, OPM observes that an employee who has a mentor is likely to a wealth of benefits that include:

- Making smooth transition into the workforce
- Furthering his/ her development as a professional
- Gains the capacity to translate values and strategies into productive actions
- Complements ongoing formal study and/or training and development activities
- Gains some career development opportunities
- Develops new and/ or different perspectives
- Gets assistance with ideas
- Builds capacity to demonstrate strength and explore potential
- Increases career networks and receives greater agency exposure.

There is also a heap of research studies that enumerate the benefits of effective mentoring. Athey *et al.* (2000) studied how diversity evolves at a firm with entry-level and upper-level employees who vary in ability and type (gender and ethnicity), and found that the ability of entry-level employees is increased by mentoring. The predicts that such possibilities may bold well for employees with "glass ceiling" where few women remain or are retained in the upper management of a company; primarily based on their finding that optimal promotions are based by type, in that an employee might receive more mentoring when more upper-level employees have the same type. That is that the reason why few women are in the top management of big companies is because few women are mentored by virtue of the fact that few women are mentors. Hence, the researchers concluded that mentoring could serve as a n\better alternative to affirmative action policies.

Bahniuk *et al.* (1990), replicated a study by Hill *et al.* (1989) which explored the relationship between mentoring and career success. The study surveyed 215 males and 43 female managers about mentoring support, perceived success and demographics. Four dimensions of informal support were identified in the study – collegial/task, mentor/protégé, collegial/social, and teacher/ coach support. The results were consistent with the findings of Hill et al. showing that the importance of a mentor for career success. The study observed that men had higher success score on managerial rank and income than women; and both men and women with mentors scored higher on informal and formal communication variables than those with no mentors.

Cleveland *et al.* (2000), conducted a research that showed that mentoring is related to organizational advancement, career development and career satisfaction; and that mentoring programs essentially help to break barriers to integrating a diverse workforce into the social networks of an organization. They argued that although can be beneficial at almost every career stage, yet different kinds of mentoring are necessary at different stages of an employee's career; and more especially women who experience special difficulties in serving as mentors due to several reasons that include fewer opportunities to:

- establish contact with other potential mentors due to lack of access to informal information networks

- Tokenism that undermine their abilities to obtain mentors because of the ghost of affirmative action policies that are misunderstood as the result of quota, favoritism, spoil and so unqualified in the eyes of the employees
- Negative stereotypes and perceptions and other cultural roles of women affect how mentees view women mentors
- Peer perceptions that any cross-gender mentor relationships are likely or have the potential of ending up in a sexual relationship could discourage men from mentoring women and the other way around (women from seeking male mentors)
- Women are socialized to downplay their successes, making coworkers from choosing them as protégé

Greene and Puetzer (2002), who conducted their research in a clinical setting among nurses concluded that the use of other staff as preceptors and resources was one of the most effective mechanisms to enhance diversity in skill and knowledge development. For a mentoring system to effective, the researchers concluded that elements such as tracking forms, planning calendars and feedback mechanisms must be present in order to ensure success in monitoring such programs.

Ragins (1999), investigated mentoring as a critical resource in organizations, and found that protégés receive more promotions, greater compensation and more career mobility than nonprotéges

He author also observed that mentoring is highly related to greater career satisfaction, career commitment, career planning, organizational socialization and self- esteem at work, and job satisfaction, job involvement and lower turnover intentions. He also found that persons with mentors received more power in the organization, and advanced at a faster rate than those without mentors. He also concluded that mentoring relationships are particularly important for women who are less likely than men to receive personal support, job related information, as well as developmental support from their supervisors. He also argued that mentoring can help women overcome barriers to advancement, act as buffers, for overt and covert discrimination; and alter stereotypes by showing support and legitimating protégé's work as well as help women to create valuable networks. The researcher also claimed that mentors provide two key functions that include:

- a. **Career development functions:** coaching, sponsoring advancement, protecting protégés from adverse forces, providing challenging assignments, and fostering positive visibility
- b. **Psychosocial functions:** - personal support, friendship, acceptance, counseling and role modeling)

Ragins and Cotton (1999), compared the effectiveness of formal mentoring to informal mentoring, in a survey of 614 proteges in male-female and nonbiased occupations. They found that protégés in informal mentoring reported more career development functions than did those in informal mentoring relationships. They also observed higher levels of compensation; and that protégés of (male and female) of male mentors made more money than protégés of female mentors. The investigators also learned that male protégés of male mentors made the most money, female protégés of female mentors made the least; formal protégés made the same amount of money and had the same number of promotions as individuals with no mentors; only informal protégés out-earned and had more promotions than those with no mentors.

Hence, they concluded with caution that male mentors probably had more organizational power and knowledge than female mentors; and that the effectiveness of informal mentoring may be due to selection factors.

Scadura and Williams (2001), investigated the moderating effect of gender on the relationships between mentorship initiation and protégé perceptions of mentoring functions. This study was conducted in the backdrop of empirical research conclusions that suggested that the more the mentor is involved in relationship initiation, the greater the benefits to the protégé ; and the presence of very limited if any studies examining the impacts of protégé gender on the relationship between initiation and mentoring.

In the study, the researchers observed that male protégés received more mentoring than female protégé initiated mentorships. Female protégés, however, reported receiving more mentoring than male protégés if the relationship was mentor-initiated or where both mentors and protégés initiated the relationship. They also noted that protégés in informal mentorships reported receiving more mentoring than those in formal organizational programs. Further, their study showed that protégés may benefit more from same-sex relationships than cross-sex relationships as far as role modeling is concerned.

7. The Don'ts in Mentoring: Things to Avoid Based On Empirical Research

This segment tells us what to avoid during mentoring.

7.1. Avoid Demographic Incompatibility- Ideology/ Values, Interest and Expertise When Choosing or Matching Mentors with Mentees

In the process of matching mentors and protégés, mentoring programs should emphasize format that determine preferences for a prospective or possible mentor (For example, matching mentors to mentees on the basis that mentor and protégés are of identical or similar interests; the same race, ethnicity or gender.

Eby *et al.* (2000), conducted a study that suggests the need of ideological compatibility when choosing or pairing mentors. For Example, cross gender or cross ethnic/ racial mentoring could present special forms of challenges and sensitivities. In their study of 15 types of negative mentoring experiences grouped under five broad themes or categories – matching, distancing behavior, manipulative behavior, lack of mentor expertise and general disfunctionalities in mentoring, they found that protégés were more likely to report that their mentors had dissimilar attitudes, values and belief when describing their most negative mentoring behaviors and experiences. The conclusions of this study, however, supports the research findings of Scadura and Williams (2001) that same sex

relationships, rather than cross-gender mentoring interactions yield more positive mentoring relationships especially with respect to role modeling. In the same vein, (Frierson *et al.*, 1994) argue that regardless of diversity elements or differentiation between mentors and mentees (matching of mentors along demographic characteristics) the mentee is more likely or predisposed to prefer or choose a mentor who shares similar characteristics or in put in another way, a close match. Of course, this hypothesis has been vigorously challenged by the arguments by Blake-Beard (1999) who claimed that cross gender or cross racial mentoring is in no way a panacea or guarantee of mentoring success or effectiveness.

7.2. Do Not be Consumed with Highly Structured/ Formal and Distant Relationships with Mentees

It is goal defeating to develop negative relationship with mentors. These relationships may include distancing, lack of respect and empathy. These negative experienced turn off mentees and eventually undermine the mentoring process. This is important to know because the study by Eby and Allen (2002), which buttressed the findings of their previous study Eby *et al.* (2000) that manipulative behavior, social distancing behavior etc. were reported by protégés as their most negative mentoring experiences that affected their levels of their stress levels, job satisfaction and increased their intentions to quit their programs or jobs in comparison to their contemporaries in informal or highly structured mentoring relationships.

7.3. Denounce All Forms of Social and Gender-Based Discrimination

An effective mentor should always guard against discrimination in all its forms. Gersick *et al.* (2000) studied 37 faculty members that included 10 senior women and 9 junior women, and found that 55% of the senior women and 70% of the junior women told at least one story of harm; and only 33% of the junior men and 11% of the senior men told at least one such story. The study observed that most of the women admitted that their harm or negative mentoring experiences involved discrimination, denial of resources, rejection and tokenism

7.4. Disavow Dysfunctional Mentoring Relationships

An effective mentor would always try to make sure healthy mentoring relationships don't degenerate into dysfunctional type as characterized by negative relationship, sabotage, bullying, sexual harassment, deception, spoiling and submissiveness. A research study by Scadura, T.A. (1998) established a correlation between mentoring and career opportunities for mentees. In the study, mentors accommodated various vocational career and psychosocial support to their mentees, including sponsorship, counseling, coaching and friendship. The author found that while a number of relationship dysfunction have been correlated with mentoring relationship at work, such as those identified above, most eventually result in anger, hostility or frustration thereby ending up in the termination of mentees in the mentoring programs, eventually.

7.5. Do Away with Gender-Based Norms and Stereotypes

Mentoring based on gender-based norms and stereotypes undermine effective mentoring experiences. A study by Subramaniam, B. & Wyer, M. (1998) found that the culture of science, historical arguments, gender-based stereotypes, gender norms, male-female relationships fester and maintain the practice of "unwritten rules" which in essence account for gender discrimination. Hence, the reasons why few women are recruited into science programs, hired in STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) or even find employment in the field. Hence, the authors suggest a more community or group/collective mentoring approach to the traditional model that extensively focused on traditional gender norms/ roles

7.6. Do Not Shy Away from Incorporating Diversity and Multicultural Competencies

Cultural assimilation in mentoring has its root in anthropology. This perspective is based on "social integrationist" theory that requires assimilation process, where mentees would have to give up or do away with parts or portions of their identities and thereby separate them from their cultures and communities. Cultural assimilation is a much deeper form of cultural immersion in which the mentees learn new cultures in their mentoring program. The mentorship environment becomes the medium of expression, communication, instruction and learning. In a study by Tierney (1992), the authors present a critique of cultural assimilation as not only associated with such terms as "rite of passage", but that it breeds cultural insensitivity

8. Multiple Mentoring: The Mother of All Mentoring Techniques/ Strategies

It appears based on evidentiary research that almost all types of mentoring styles are gradually and systematically converging into the multiple mentoring approach. Different scholars and researchers have used other terms, such as "mosaics" mentoring, and "collective" mentoring which mean virtually the same. In fact, this model of mentorship has been highly praised by researchers of all persuasions as about the most promising, satisfying and effective type of mentoring system.

Boice (1992), sees multiple mentoring as providing a strong support strategy designed to assist young and new faculty cope and strive in their new situations. In terms of finding time, fluency and balance as researchers. Further, it helps them by providing self-help projects that include exercise and mood changes. He further posits that this type of approach in mentorship helps build collegiality through social support networks that include their direct college supervisors and other high ranking managers, such as chairs, deans, provost etc.

Chester and Chester (2002) argue that the nontraditional multiple mentoring strategy will be more helpful and successful for majority women and some men, because it serves as a catalyst or change strategy especially on college campuses and selected programs by providing a more egalitarian/ equalitarian, inclusive and cooperative atmosphere; and being perceived as a caring and supportive system for all members; and so would help promote the personal and professional growth of all. The researchers further claim that the multiple mentoring strategy would also help to increase the hiring/ recruitment, presence, retention and advancement of women in programs such as engineering that has traditionally excluded them, primarily because of institutional forms of discrimination moderated and shaped by gender roles and dynamics that further find expression in the marginalization of women in their mentoring experiences especially in male dominated fields.

Cleveland *et al.* (2000) argue in the same vein in their presentation that multiple mentoring programs would help break down barriers, especially for women by integrating a diverse workforce into the social network of organizations. The authors note that the utility of multiple mentoring systems is derived from its ability to be both beneficial and relevant at several career stages, and may equally be needed at various decision points and stages in the mentoring programs. Moreover, the investigators observed that since, traditionally, finding and becoming a mentor can be difficult for women for several reasons, of which the multiple mentoring styles would eventually help to temper. The forces that multiple mentoring strategy would help to cushion its negative effects include: lack of access to information networks; tokenism; negative stereotypes and attitudes about women; and negative peer perceptions about cross-gender mentor relationships and their being construed as eventually leading to sexual relationships.

De Janasz and Sullivan (2004), suggest that because of the efficiencies and efficacy of the multiple mentorship systems, the traditional practices of a student being guided throughout their careers by one primary mentor, usually academic advisor or dissertation advisor is over. Hence, they argue that instead, students or professor mentees may be better served by a portfolio (a battery/ an array/ a body or group) of mentors who are able to facilitate the protégé's career development. Hence, the authors concluded that the need for faculty to develop multiple mentoring relationships across their academic and professional careers are predicated on the multiple mentoring style that dictate how the career competencies for mentees to know why, how and whom to interface or interact with and what to know or learn in order to produce the need for faculty mentees to develop multiple mentoring relationships across their careers in the academy.

Kalev (2006), conducted a study whose backdrop or which operated on the assumption that segregation and discrimination blocks or inhibits career opportunities for women and minorities; and that work structures that expand opportunities for women and minorities to network and demonstrate their capabilities may help boost their chances of gaining high ranking jobs. Thus, the researcher set to examine whether the adoption of programs that counteract segregation and discrimination, namely self-directed work teams and cross-job training was followed or had correlation with higher managerial diversity. The researcher discovered that teams and training that do not transcend job boundaries, such as problem –solving teams or job training, failed to increase managerial diversity. On the contrary, the investigator observed that when employers adopt programs that increased workers' exposure to other people and jobs, such as self-directed teams or cross-job training, the proportion of women and minorities (blacks) increased. While the research observed inequality at work for minorities and women due to racial and gender discrimination, the new way to remedy the situation which the researcher suggests end up eventually to be multiple mentoring strategy.

Peluchette and Jeanquart (2000), investigated various sources of mentors utilized by professionals, how these sources influenced their objective and subjective career successes; and whether the participants used different sources of mentors at different stages of their careers. The authors found that protégé professors with mentors in their professions, those with mentors outside the work place, as well as those within their own organizations had the highest levels of objective career successes. However, those with multiple sources of mentors yielded significantly higher levels of both objective and subjective career successes than those with single sources or no mentor at all. The authors then concluded that when professional rank is corresponded with career stages, the results suggest that the participants' resulted because they used different sources of mentors at different stages of their careers.

Raabe and Beehr (2003), examined the extent to which dimensions of mentoring relationships were related to outcomes for the mentees. The researchers found that mentoring relationships were not related to mentee outcomes; and the extent to which protégés and mentors agreed on the nature of the mentoring relationships. In this latter context, mentors and mentees belonged to different hierarchies and did not reach a consensus or agreement regarding the nature of their mentoring relationships. But, the investigation revealed that mentoring functions performed by supervisors and coworkers (multiple sources) significantly affected job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organizational commitment.

Ragins and Cotton (1999), conducted a survey of 614 proteges comparing the effectiveness of formal and informal mentoring in non-biased occupations.; and found that protégés in informal mentoring reported more career development functions than did those in formal mentoring relationships. The researchers reported higher levels of compensation for both males and females mentees of male mentors than protégés of female mentors. Their study also indicated that male mentees of male mentors made the most money, while female protégés of female mentors made the least money. Thus, the authors concluded that male mentors perhaps have more organizational power and knowledge than female mentors. The research finding also showed that while formal protégés made the same amount of money and had the same number of promotions than those without mentors, only informal protégés out-earned and had more promotions than those with no mentors. The investigators, in the end, suggested that formal mentoring should mimic or emulate informal mentoring as much as possible.

Scadura and Williams (2001), conducted a research that shows that male protégés receive more mentoring services than female protégés in protégé-initiated mentorships. It also indicates that female protégés reported receiving more mentoring than their male counterparts, when the relationships were mentor-initiated or where both mentor and mentee jointly initiated the relationships. Further observation of the study shows that protégés in informal mentorships reported receiving more mentoring than those in formal programs; and that protégés stand a better chance of benefiting more from the less traditional same- sex relationships than the more traditional cross-sex relationships, especially in the area of role modeling.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

Two main traditional schools of thought in mentorship exist, namely the “biological” (Trait) school, which argues that effectiveness in mentoring is as a result of hereditary factors. In other words, they claim that great mentors are born. Among the theorist of this school is Allen, T.D. (2003). This view is however, contradicted by a counter view postulated by scholars such as Ragins, B.R. & Scandura, T.A. (1999) who argue that effective mentoring is a consequence of learning behavior. These theorists belong to the “empiricist or Behavioral” school.

Some of the great debates regarding the effectiveness of mentoring is whether an effective mentoring strategy should focus on tagging, matching or pairing mentors and mentees based on demographic characteristics -cross gender or cross racial lines. Proponents of this thesis who argue in favor of matching mentors and mentees who share common characteristics include scholars such as Eby *et al.* (2000); Scadura and Williams (2001) and Frierson *et al.* (1994). However, opponents such as Blake-Beard (1999) argue against this hypothesis –that cross gender or cross racial mentoring is not necessarily a guarantee to effective mentoring outcome include researcher Blake-Beard (1999). This debate has enormous implication to minority and female mentees because of gender and race based victimization faced by these groups in both the industry and society.

Academic advisors of women racial minorities-black, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian and students should strongly consider mentoring techniques that match mentor and mentees of similar backgrounds and demographic characteristics because under such characteristics will mentors will experiences of mentees considered but also sensitivities to their culture expressed by their mentors. Such positive mentoring environment and experiences would affect mentees’ stress levels, increase their job satisfaction levels and thus depress their intentions to quit their programs or jobs. Similar strategies, when adopted in college campuses would more than likely, yield positive mentoring results in student advisement and mentoring programs by faculty, and eventually might result in increased student successes, in terms of retention, graduation or career outcomes.

For mentoring programs to prove effective, they must incorporate mentoring strategies and practices characterized by matching of mentors with mentees along demographic similarities; embrace informal rather than highly structured mentorship approach; avoid social and gender based norms, stereotypes and discrimination; and embrace multicultural skills and competencies as well as cultural diversity.

References

- Allen, T. D. (2003). Mentoring Others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(1): 134-54.
- Athey, S., Avery, C. and Zemsky, P. (2000). Mentoring and diversity. *American Economic Review*, 90(4): 765-86.
- Bahniuk, M. H., Dubos, J. and Hill, S. K. (1990). The impact of mentoring. Collegial support, and information adequacy on career success; A replication. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 5(4): 431-52.
- Baugh, S. G. and Scandura, T. A. (1999). The Effect of multiple mentors on protégé attitudes toward the work setting. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 14(4): 503-21.
- Bird, S. J. and Didion, C. J. (1992). Retaining women science students: A mentoring project of the association for women in science. *Initiatives*, 55: 3-12.
- Blake-Beard, S. D. (1999). The costs of living as an outsider within: An analysis of the mentoring relationships and career success of black and white women in the corporate sector. *Journal of Career Development*, 26(1): 21-36.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. Jossey-Bass Inc.: San Francisco, CA.
- Burlew, L. D. (1991). Multiple mentor model: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Career Development*, 17(3): 213-21.
- Chester, N. C. and Chester, M. A. (2002). Gender-informed mentoring strategies for women engineering scholars; on establishing a caring community. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 91(9): 49-55.
- Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M. and 7 Murphy, K. R. (2000). *Women and men in organizations: Gender issues at work*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, NJ.
- David, N. and Yolanda, S. G. (2006). Report from group meetings to develop a research and action Agenda on STEM career and workforce mentoring, December 2006.
- Davidson, M. N. and Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparation of graduate researchers of color. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(4): 549-74.
- Davis, K. S. (2001). Peripheral and subversive”: Women making connections and challenging the boundaries of the science community. *Science Education*, 85(4): 368-409.
- De Janasz, S. C. and Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professorial network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(2): 263-83.

- Donaldson, S. I., Ensher, E. A. and Grant-Vollone, E. J. (2000). Longitudinal Examination of mentoring relationships of organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Career Development*, 26(4): 233-48.
- Eby, L. T. and Allen, T. D. (2002). Further investigation of protégés' negative mentoring experiences: Patterns and Outcomes. *Group and Organization Management*, 27(4): 456-79.
- Eby, L. T., McManus, S. E., Simon, S. A. and Russel, J. E. (2000). The protégé's Perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57(1): 1-21.
- Educause (2013). Mentoring toolkit. Available: <https://www.educause.edu/focus-areas-and-initiatives/policy-and-security/cybersecurity-program/resources/information-security-guide/career-and-workforce-development/mentoring-toolkit>
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J. and Marelich, W. D. (2002). Effects of perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity on protégés' support and satisfaction gained from their mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(7): 1407-30.
- Frierson, H. T. J., Hargrove, B. K. and Lewis, N. R. (1994). Black summer research students' perceptions related to research mentors' race and gender. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35(6): 475-80.
- Gersick, C. J., Bartunek, J. M. and Dutton, J. E. (2000). Learning from Academia: the importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6): 1026-44.
- Greene, M. T. and Puetzer, M. (2002). The Value of Mentoring: A strategic approach to recruitment and retention. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 17(1): 63-70.
- Hill, S. E., Bahnuik, M. H. and Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 38(1): 15-33.
- Kalev, A. (2006). Cracking the glass cages? Job segregation, the restructuring of works, and managerial diversity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(6): 1591-643.
- Kidd, J. M., Jackson, C. and Hirsh, W. (2003). The outcomes of effective career discussion at work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(1): 119-33.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Development relationships in organizational life*. Scott, Foresman: Glenview, IL.
- Milem, J. F. (2003). *The educational benefits of diversity; evidence from multiple sectors." compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities*. Stanford University Press. 126-69.
- Noe, R. A. (1988). Women and Mentoring: A review of research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1): 65-78.
- Nolinske, T. (1995). Multiple mentoring relationships facilitate learning during fieldwork. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 49(1): 39-43.
- OPM (2002). U.S. Office of personnel management (2002). Available: <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/training-and-development/career-development/bestpractices-mentoring.pdf>
- Packard, B. W. (2003). Student training promotes mentoring awareness and action. *Career Development Quarterly*, 51: 335-45.
- Peluchette, J. V. E. and Jeanquart, S. (2000). Professionals' use of different mentor sources at various career stages: Implications for career success. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(5): 549-64.
- Raabe, B. and Beehr, T. A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationship: Differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(3): 271-93.
- Ragins, B. R. (1999). *Gender and Mentoring Relationships: A Review and research Agenda for the Next Decade*. In G. Powell (ed.), *Hand Book of Gender and Work*. Sage publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, CA. 347-70.
- Ragins, B. R. and McFarlin, D. B. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37(3): 321-39.
- Ragins, B. R. and Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor Functions and Outcomes: A comparison of Men and Women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4): 529-50.
- Ragins, B. R. and Scandura, T. A. (1999). Burden or blessing? Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(4): 493-509.
- Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L. and Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal Mentoring: the effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6): 1177-94.
- Scandura, T. A. and Williams, E. A. (2001). An Investigation of the moderating effects of gender on the relationships between mentorship initiation and protégé perceptions of mentoring functions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3): 342-63.
- Scandura, T. A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 24(3): 449-68.
- Seibert, S. (1999). The effectiveness of facilitated mentoring: A longitudinal quasi-experiment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3): 483-502.
- Subramaniam, B. and Wyer, M. (1998). Assimilating the "culture of no culture" in Science; Feminist intervention in (De) Mentoring Graduate Women. *Feminist Teacher*, 12(1): 12-28.
- Suzanne, K. W. (2010). Defining the roles of advisors and mentors in postgraduate medical education: Faculty perceptions, roles, responsibilities, and resource needs. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 2(2): 195-200.

- Tierney, W. (1992). An anthropological analysis of student participation in college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63(6): 603-18.
- United States office of Personnel Management (2008). Best practices: Mentoring. 15. Available: <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/training-and-development/career-development/bestpractices-mentoring.pdf>
- Wake Forest School of Medicine Office of Faculty Development (2013). Mentoring. Available: <https://school.wakehealth.edu/About-the-School/Faculty-Affairs/Mentoring>