

## Call for Research & Practice Presentation Proposals 2006 Annual Conference

July 10-12, 2006

Big Sky Resort, Bozeman, Montana

Submission Deadline: March 3, 2006

### Presentation Proposal:

1)

<b>Name of presenters</b>	Gilian H. MacPherson	Dr. James P. Mahone
<b>Title</b>	Senior Executive Officer	Associate Professor
<b>Organization</b>	University of Guelph	University of Guelph
<b>Mailing address</b>	Office of Research, University of Guelph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> level, 1 Stone Road W., Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 4Y1.	School of Environmental Design & Rural Development, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada, N1G 2W1.
<b>E-mail address</b>	gmacpher@uoguelph.ca	jmahone@uoguelph.ca
<b>Daytime phone</b>	519 826-3801	519 82404120, ext 56781

2) **Title of presentation:** Developing Leaders: A Needs Assessment of New Faculty Mentoring at a Canadian University

3) **Presentation track:** Research

4) **A 50-word description (to be used in conference advertising.) of the session.**

Mentoring, an important leadership function plays a critical role in establishing academic careers. Models of new faculty mentoring range from formal programs, in which mentors are assigned, to informal communities of mentors. A culturally-appropriate model at one university was determined by analysing current practice and the needs of new faculty.

5) **A one-paragraph biographical profile of the presenter(s) to be used for conference promotion**

Gilian MacPherson is a professional staff member at the University of Guelph. With extensive administrative experience, her expertise in human resources and financial management recently resulted in being seconded by the President to assist with a number of special projects, ranging from financial and human resources restructuring of various units to producing an evidence-based model for mentoring new faculty, a initiative completed in conjunction with fulfilling the requirements of the Masters in Leadership program at the University of Guelph.

Jim Mahone is an Associate Professor in the School of Environmental Design and Rural Development at the University of Guelph. His teaching and research interests are in the areas of leadership development, facilitation, conflict management and capacity development.

- 6) **A paper to be printed in the ALE Conference Proceedings with the following attributes:** Research proposal submissions (3000 word **minimum** excluding references).

## Introduction

Interest in mentoring has increased in recent decades, from a practice pertaining to youth to a leadership and management tool employed within many different organizations, as well as with underrepresented populations within specific occupations. Of particular relevance to leadership and leadership development is the body of knowledge around mentoring university faculty, a population frequently responsible for mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. However, upon completion of the doctoral degree and attaining a faculty position within a university, too frequently new faculty members are left to their own devices to establish successful career paths. This reflects a failure of leadership through demonstration of neglectful management practice and lack of protection of the most valuable investment and resource of a university.

There are many compelling reasons for organizations to foster mentoring (Capioppe, 1998). Organizational benefits of mentoring include job satisfaction, increased organizational commitment and retention or reduced turnover (Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Fagenson, 1989; Kram, 1985), in addition to the development of the social and intellectual capital of an organization (Sosik & Godshalk, 2004). Those who have been mentored are more likely to provide mentoring to the next generation (Bozionelos, 2004), thereby preserving and enhancing the organizational investment in their greatest resource, human capital. Many organizations are aware of the fiscal benefits of mentoring in preparing junior employees for more senior positions (Lyons & Oppler, 2004). In times of fiscal restraint, when organizational funding for training, education and professional development may be scarce, mentoring provides inexpensive but invaluable professional and personal development to protégés and mentors alike (Billet, 2003). In these ways, mentoring contributes to the development of the future leaders of an organization.

In order to secure the future of universities, academic leaders must be more proactive in facilitating the success of new faculty. Although Hudson, Skamp, and Brooks (2005) are in the process of developing an instrument to measure the effectiveness of mentoring in teaching at the primary school level, others (Berk, Berg, Mortimer, Walton-Moss, & Yeo, 2005; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004) condemn the lack of evidence of effective mentoring in academia, citing imprecision of instruments and lack of empirical evidence. Few research studies simultaneously examine both mentoring practices and needs from the perspectives of mentors and protégés respectively. The involvement of new faculty in determining their mentoring needs compared to the mentoring academic leaders believe they are providing needs to be examined. By comparing similarities and differences, a culturally appropriate, evidence-based model of faculty mentoring can be developed. This study provides empirical data in addressing these issues.

## **Literature Review**

The literature has been reviewed to provide a synopsis of the concept of mentoring, including a definition. This is followed by a description of various models of faculty mentoring in universities and gender issues therein. The literature review concludes with a summary of measures necessary to ensure the success of mentoring initiatives.

It is appropriate to begin by paying homage to Homer's *The Odyssey*, in which the character of Mentor was first introduced. In this classical tale, Odysseus leaves his young son, Telemachus, in the care of his trusted friend, Mentor, while he pursues his 'odyssey'. Mentor was created to be a tutor, guide, advisor, and protector to watch over Telemachus during his father's ten-year absence (Stapleton, 1978).

### ***Mentoring Defined***

The 'construct' of mentoring is defined in the academic literature in numerous ways. Kram (1985), considered to be one of the most influential experts in this field, states that mentoring is a special type of developmental relationship, characterized by two main functions: career functions, involving sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments; and psychosocial functions, including role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1985). Finkelstein, Allen, and Rhoton (2003) capture commonly used elements in the portrayal of a mentor as an older, more experienced, wiser individual who acts as an advisor, tutor, coach, and protector of a younger, inexperienced person. Mentoring is more than a role with a list of preconceived duties; rather it is a unique personal relationship, characterized by trust, the sharing of expertise and moral support, knowing when to provide access to this expertise and support, and when it should be withheld (Awaya, McEwan, Heyler, Linsky, Lum, & Wakukawa, 2003). Essential elements in definitions of mentoring are that it is a multi-dimensional and multi-functional developmental relationship that evolves over time. These elements distinguish mentoring from its individual components, establishing mentoring relationships as an example of the sum being greater than the parts.

Mentoring is a mutually beneficial and developmental relationship between two or more individuals that evolves over time, and includes a range career and psychosocial functions. Within a single interaction or activity, the career functions and psychosocial functions of mentoring often occur simultaneously. While many of the career functions of mentoring depend upon the organizational roles of the individuals, most of the psychosocial functions of mentoring require a personal commitment on the part of both individuals.

### ***Faculty Mentoring in Universities***

For a number of reasons, the traditional application of the classical hierarchical model of mentoring has limitations within the context of university faculty. First, the collegial peer relationship between faculty members is complicated by the tenure and

promotion peer review process, which creates a potential conflict with the traditional model of mentoring. New faculty members, on one hand, are colleagues with established faculty; on the other hand they find themselves in unequal and vulnerable positions as their senior, tenured colleagues sit in judgment during tenure evaluation proceedings (Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). This dichotomy can be unsettling, and may create barriers to establishing effective mentoring relationships.

Second, new faculty, fresh from completing their doctoral degrees may be in the final stages of a traditional mentoring relationship with their Ph.D. advisors. Common criteria for being hired into the faculty ranks are demonstrated preparedness and established expertise (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004), yet new faculty frequently find themselves in unfamiliar territory, much the same as many new employees, having to learn to teach while preparing new course material, establishing their research program, often from the ground up, becoming oriented to a new organizational culture, often in a new geographic setting. No longer are they the protégés, but rather are now expected to be mentors to segments of the student body.

Third, becoming a member of faculty does not automatically confer the qualities of an effective mentor. Faculty members who do not contribute to a collegial, collaborative environment with their peers may be ill suited to assume the role of a mentor (Noe, 1988). Finally, Selby and Calhoun (1998) provide a warning that formalized faculty mentoring programs are paternalistic and demeaning of new faculty, and are wasteful of the time of established faculty members. They advise that providing better preparation at the graduate school level is a more effective use of departmental resources.

From these limitations, new models of faculty mentoring are evolving in response to the challenges faced by universities across North America, including unprecedented numbers of faculty retirements, a demographic trend predicted to increase over the next ten to fifteen years. Societal demand for access to university education is creating pressures for universities to increase enrolment capacity, which in turn complicates this challenge, making faculty recruitment, success, and retention priorities for academic institutions.

## ***Models of Faculty Mentoring***

### ***Formal mentoring programs for faculty***

The incidence of abuse of power and misuse of influence, deliberate or unintentional, can be minimized in formal mentoring programs with appropriate mentor selection and training, and the existence of remedial structures for the protégé (O'Neill & Sankowsky, 2001). However, establishing formalized institutional mentoring programs have the potential to give rise to unrealistically expectations of new faculty. Recognizing that not all mentoring relationships are positive (Tenner, 2004) is essential to enabling those in dysfunctional relationships a means of exiting without being labelled as aberrant (Eby & Allen, 2002).

### ***One-to-one faculty mentoring***

Madison and Huston's (1996) survey research of faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships follows the traditional model of one senior-ranked, older, and more experienced mentor paired with a more junior protégé. The voluntary pairs in this study tended to be same-gendered. Mentoring appeared to be particularly valuable in academic environments that were perceived to be unsupportive, difficult, and jealousy-ridden in this cross-cultural study of American and Australian respondents (Madison & Huston, 1996).

### ***Faculty peer mentoring***

Angelique, Kyle, and Taylor (2002) differentiate peer mentoring from traditional mentoring in that the former involves participants of roughly the same age, experience, and rank. Accordingly, peer mentoring involves mutuality rather than complementarity, providing a greater focus on psychosocial functions over career enhancement functions of the more traditional model of mentoring common in other occupational settings. Without the organizational and hierarchical authority that tenure provides to offer career mentoring functions of sponsorship, visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments (Kram 1985), the strength of peer mentoring for untenured faculty is in the provision of the benefits of psychosocial functions of mentoring, particularly friendship, counselling, and acceptance-and-confirmation. Harnish and Wild (1998) found that untenured faculty were more inclined than tenured faculty to develop peer mentoring relationships. Angelique, Kyle, and Taylor (2002) warn of a potential barrier to effective peer mentoring. In academic environments where there is competition for limited resources, new faculty may perceive that they are pitted against each other, and be reluctant to engage in a peer mentoring relationship when trust, sharing and mutual respect are lacking.

### ***Faculty co-mentoring and collaboration***

In response to the traditional hierarchical model of mentoring, McGuire and Reger (2003) propose that co-mentoring may be especially beneficial to underrepresented groups of faculty, particularly women. Where the traditional mentor-protégé relationship has the potential to be competitive, 'masculine', and power-imbalanced, a more collegial, collaborative, 'feminist' approach of equals co-mentoring each other may be a more appropriate model to follow in university settings of today (McGuire & Reger, 2003). The model of co-mentoring within the professoriate is further supported by de Janasz and Sullivan (2004) who agree that the traditional mentor-protégé model has limited applicability to professorial ranks.

Mentoring is also provided through membership in professional associations which are natural sources for stimulating and promoting networks and collaborative projects among junior and senior scholars (Wright & Wright, 1987). These relationships can be more beneficial and enduring than those with colleagues within the same department or at the same university and should be encouraged.

### ***Feminist mentoring***

Proceeding further along this line of research, Humble, Solomon, Allen, Blaisure and Johnson (2006) identify feminist mentoring in academia as an extension of co-mentoring and collaborative models of mentoring, particularly with graduate students. This paradigm is a reaction to the maintenance of the patriarchal status quo and power inequities inherent in traditional models of mentoring. Feminist mentoring challenges questions of power and inequity, emphasizes the processes of career development, encouraging self-disclosure and examination, and psychosocial aspects, particularly personal relationships

### ***Gender issues in mentoring***

There is considerable literature on mentoring in academia focused on specific disciplines, i.e. business management (Stewart & Knowles, 2003) as a means of encouraging women to continue studies at the graduate level, and to pursue academic careers. One of the primary benefits of same-discipline mentoring is that it can “change the academic climate, making a scientific career more rewarding for women” (Nolan, 1992). Kronik’s (1990) address speaks from anecdotal memory, to the advantages women faculty in the 1960s experienced in being mentored by men. Necessitated by the rarity of same gender role models, male mentors imparted upon female protégés the social expectations needed to succeed in the male-dominated academe of that time. Kronik (1990) perceived that two decades later, in the academic environment, gender balance had shifted to the point that new female faculty could successfully seek same-gender mentors.

Current research indicates that Kronik’s (1990) speculation may have been overly optimistic. Although there have been shifts towards gender balance, it has not been uniform across all academic disciplines, particularly the sciences. While Nolan’s 1992 research utilized the case study method to show that junior researchers in the sciences benefit from same-discipline mentors, archival data comparing science and engineering student and faculty numbers in American universities shows the extent of the retention of women faculty, concluding that effective formal and informal programs of networking and mentoring play important roles in creating climates of inclusivity (Pell, 1996). Using specific case descriptions, Wadsworth (2002) demonstrates that women in engineering find same-gender mentoring to be supportive. While gender, race, and retention are not issues across all the sciences, Beck and Swanson (2003) and Casey and Plaut (2003) identify through statistical and demographic data, that gender balance and mentoring of women continues to be a concern in the disciplines of animal agriculture and animal science.

Gibson’s (2004) phenomenological study of the experiences of nine women who had been mentored while in faculty positions found that mentoring is an important means of alleviating the sense of isolation women faculty have reported to experience. The respondents also reported the perception that mentoring was profoundly related to their ability to achieve academic success. Interestingly, this small sample study suggested that cross-institutional mentoring should be considered to avoid the potential of intra-departmental politics.

### ***Elements of Successful Mentoring Initiatives***

Boyle and Boice (1998) and Hegstad and Wentling (2004) identify five elements of an exemplary formal mentoring program. The first element is an assessment of needs, followed by protégé involvement in the selection of mentors, training of those involved in the mentoring relationship, senior leadership support, and finally, evaluation processes. Determining the need, if any, is the essential first step, and most include the primary stakeholders, the protégés. This is critical to the effective delivery of mentoring, for the benefit of all the mentorship partners, including the organization.

### ***Assessing Mentoring Needs within a Cultural Context***

The divergent views in the literature make it apparent that the success or effectiveness of mentoring is dependent upon the cultural context in which it occurs. Madison and Huston (1996), in their cross-cultural comparison, found American and Australian samples perceived and valued mentoring differently from each other. It is quite conceivable then, that there are further differences in the perceptions and values of faculty at Canadian universities. The following study examines one Canadian university to determine an organizationally-specific culturally appropriate model of new faculty mentoring.

## **Methods**

Focussing on one mid-sized Canadian university, this study included a needs assessment survey, focus groups and semi-structured interviews. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members hired within a six-year period, the maximum period allowable for achieving tenure, comprised the survey subject pool, and provided empirical data. The focus groups were populated with volunteers from the surveyed pool of new faculty. A critical component of any needs assessment is determining an inventory of current practices in order to provide a basis of comparison. To accomplish this, individual semi-structured interviews with the academic leaders, including deans and academic departmental chairs and school directors, were conducted.

### ***The Survey***

Mentoring Needs Scale. The survey was a 13-item questionnaire, which had been pre-tested before distribution to the research population. Survey questions asked participants to respond on a seven point Likert type scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). An option of “I do not wish to respond” provided an eighth alternative to each question.

Open-ended questions. The survey concluded with two open-ended questions: “When should mentoring commence?” and any other additional comments

### ***The Focus Groups***

The concept of mentoring implies a participatory, interactive relationship. Therefore, holding focus groups to participate in the developing of a mentoring program relates well to the nature of the phenomenon of mentoring. The information gained from selected focus groups on participants’ views and experiences is seen to provide a valuable contribution (Gibbs, 1997) to the development of faculty mentoring and to the

implementation processes. In the present study, four focus groups were conducted over a two-day period. Facilitators collected the perceptions and opinions of the 21 participants within 1 to 1 ½ hour period.

### ***The Semi-Structured Interview***

Six deans and 32 chairs and directors, representing 100% participation of this pool, plus five other academic leaders and two representatives of the executive of the faculty association were interviewed to determine an inventory of current faculty mentoring practices. If there was no current practice or activity known to the interviewee, the questions were designed to probe for reasons for the lack of activity, and attempted to ascertain future plans or their perceptions of the structure of ideal mentoring, and what sort of program or mentoring initiatives would be supported by the interviewee.

The interview data were compared to the needs identified by new faculty in the survey scale, the open-ended questions on the survey and in the focus groups to determine if there were gaps between current practice and future plans and needs of new faculty.

## **Findings**

### ***The Survey***

#### ***Mentoring Needs Assessment Score***

A measure, referred to as a “mentoring needs assessment score”, indicates levels of agreement among the different demographic groups. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of the college in which the respondents were appointed to the mentoring needs assessment score. There was no statistically significant difference at  $p < .05$  level in the survey scores for the six college groups [ $F(5, 75) = 1.19, p = .322$ ]. However, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was moderate. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .073.

Length of service was the term used to describe the number of years in which an individual held a tenure-track appointment at this university. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of the length of service of respondents to the mentoring needs assessment score. Subjects were divided into six groups corresponding to the number of years from 1 to 6 in their length of service. There was no statistically significant difference at  $p < .05$  level in length of service scores for the six groups [ $F(5, 74), p = .750$ ]. The mentoring needs scale scores for college and length of service are illustrated in Table 1.

**Table 1**

Analysis of Variance of New Faculty Mentoring Needs Assessment Scale Scores by Years of Service and College

Source	<i>df</i>	MS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Years of Service	5	75.01	0.534	.75
College	5	158.92	1.19	.322

The majority of survey respondents across the six different colleges and the interview respondents were in agreement that it would be beneficial to have a mentor from the same or a related discipline. However, mentorship outside one’s department was seen to have benefits or potential benefits.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the mentoring needs assessment scores for males (N=51) and females (N=40). There was no significant difference in scores for males ( $\underline{M}$ =55.98,  $\underline{SD}$ =12.36), and females [ $\underline{M}$ =59.61,  $\underline{SD}$ =10.56;  $t(79)= 1.41, p=.162$ ].

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the mentoring needs assessment scores for untenured (N=50) and tenured faculty (N=40). There was a significant difference in scores for untenured faculty ( $\underline{M}$ =61.23,  $\underline{SD}$ =9.72), and tenured faculty [ $\underline{M}$ =52.13,  $\underline{SD}$ =12.34;  $t(78)=3.68, p=.000$ ]. The magnitude of the differences in the means was large (eta squared=.148).

***Mentoring models***

The three levels of agreement on the seven-point Likert scale were combined. Table 2 illustrates responses in agreement to the individual items of the survey scale. A majority indicated that mentoring contributes to success, is time well spent and that mentoring contributes to their job satisfaction. There was moderate support for a formal mentoring program. Only a minority indicated that having the support of a mentor contributes to retention. New faculty strongly supported having a mentor in their academic discipline. There was moderate support for team mentoring. New faculty expressed a preference for selecting their own mentor. A small minority preferred to be assigned a mentor, or had a preference for gender matched mentor. See details in Table 2.

**Table 2**

Frequencies of Responses to Individual Items on the Mentoring Needs Assessment Survey

Survey Questions	F	Mean	SD	Valid Percentages			
				Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Having a mentor will contribute to my success as a faculty member	90	5.60	1.40	24.4	33.3	28.9	86.6
Participating in a formal program will contribute to my success	89	4.85	1.59	31.5	24.7	13.5	69.7
Having a mentor will help me attain tenure	86	4.88	1.51	31.4	22.1	14.0	67.5
Having a mentor will contribute to my job satisfaction	90	5.27	1.48	26.7	31.1	20.0	77.8
I would prefer a mentoring program in which I am assigned a mentor	91	2.99	1.78	11.0	3.3	5.5	19.8
I would prefer a mentoring program in which I select a mentor	91	5.01	1.82	25.3	24.2	23.1	72.6
Having a team of mentors will contribute to my success	90	4.60	1.58	28.9	24.4	7.8	61.1
Having a mentor in my academic discipline would be beneficial	91	4.45	1.51	19.8	34.1	26.4	80.3
Having a mentor in an unrelated discipline would be beneficial	91	3.35	1.77	15.4	13.2	2.2	30.8
I would prefer to have a mentor who is the same gender as me	90	3.63	1.53	2.2	7.8	4.4	14.4
“Peer mentoring” will contribute to my success	91	3.68	1.58	24.2	7.7	3.3	35.2
Having the support of a mentor would be a factor in my decision to stay	90	3.49	1.99	20.3	2.2	11.1	33.3
Time spent in mentoring will contribute to my success	90	4.64	1.61	36.7	18.9	10.0	65.6

### ***The Survey Comments***

Responses to the open-ended question, “When should mentoring commence?” ranged from upon receiving the offer of employment letter to the summer following the first year of teaching. The most frequently cited time for mentoring to commence was upon arrival or shortly thereafter, while several faculty indicated that mentoring should commence after the first two semesters of teaching.

New faculty expressed interest in a model of multiple mentors, specifically supporting informal mentoring and condemned the concept of formally assigning mentors. Peer mentoring and mentoring from mid-career colleagues were also suggested. One of the most frequently mentioned topics essential to mentoring was tenure and promotion processes.

### ***The Focus Groups***

The new faculty in the focus groups felt that mentoring should be an informal relationship, rather than a formal program. However, there was concern that the current unstructured and informal nature of mentoring often precluded it from occurring at all. In order to ensure that mentoring relationships were established, focus group participants agreed that the process of mentoring should be somewhat more structured and formalized than currently occurred. In whatever form, the message was that it was important that mentoring occur. Most focus group participants also felt strongly about being actively involved in the selection of their mentors.

### ***The Semi-Structured Interviews***

All academic administrator interviewees strongly supported the local delivery of mentoring, opposed a formal, centrally mandated program, and equally strongly insisted that mentoring must be voluntary. There was wide-spread support for further mentoring initiatives, with several units indicating that they were in the process of developing plans for more formalized mentoring initiatives. Several academic administrators stated that it would be helpful to have a document outlining examples of mentoring models and activities currently in practice in other departments, as well as suggestions for best practices. There was little support for a structured training workshop for faculty mentors.

All interviewees said they either practiced or expressed a strong preference for a discipline-based model of mentoring, particularly in research program planning and grants funding application preparation. Mentoring in the area of teaching was also seen as frequently, though not solely, most effective coming from within the department. Mentoring by the academic administrators was frequently provided in a reactive manner, often initiated to address perceived deficiencies or problems, particularly following a tenure and promotion review.

### ***Similarities and Differences***

Both new faculty and academic administrators were almost unanimous in supporting the concept of faculty mentoring. There was strong agreement that it must be an informal initiative and voluntary relationship, delivered predominately within an

academic discipline. Several of the interviewees emphasized that, in addition to the informal mentoring that occurs there should be more formalized mentoring to ensure that it happens, and that it happens in a manner meaningful to the new faculty member, to minimize those who are quiet in nature from being overlooked, and to ensure everyone has equal opportunity for mentoring. There was also strong and enthusiastic support for a brief “best mentoring practices” document that would illustrate examples of mentoring activities across campus. In contrast, there was limited support for formal mentor/protégé training.

New faculty stated that they should be involved in selection of their mentors, facilitated by their departmental chairs, rather than be assigned mentors, whereas academic leaders were less adamant, believing in some cases that they should select and assign mentors to the new faculty. Both populations agreed that mentoring, in most cases, be with a mentor within the same discipline, in order to support the research path of the new faculty member, and much of this mentoring should occur within the new faculty member’s department.

There were major areas of notable differences between what new faculty members reported needing and what academic administrators reported delivering. The foremost gap was in the area of tenure and promotion processes in general. Academic administrators stated that explaining tenure and promotion was a topic of early and frequent discussion they personally had with each new faculty member. However, new faculty reported being distressed by their own lack of understanding of the review process, structure and membership of tenure and promotion committees, how and when to complete forms, and what to include. Furthermore, new faculty members did not understand how departmental evaluation criteria translated specifically to them as individuals.

One striking finding was that while chairs or colleagues tried and were perceived to be helpful when questions are raised by new faculty members, frequently new faculty are not aware of the questions that they should be asking. Some new faculty mentioned that they were reluctant to ask questions for fear of being an imposition or judged at a later date for their lack of knowledge.

Another notable difference was that new faculty preferred a model of multiple mentors, whereas academic administrators supported a traditional mentorship one-to-one model. Academic administrators felt multiple mentors would be difficult to arrange, take up too much time for senior faculty, provide too much and possibly conflicting information to new faculty, and be too difficult a process for them to manage or administer. New faculty felt that multiple mentors would provide them with valuable alternate opinions, advice and perspectives, upon which to form their own opinions, be useful for development of different aspects of their career paths and responsibilities, and extend their professional and social networks.

Team mentoring (i.e. having more than one mentor) was supported by new faculty, while the academic administrators preferred the one-to-one model of

mentoring. There was little support amongst new faculty for gender-matched mentoring, although a few academic administrators felt that women faculty may need women faculty role models.

### **Conclusions/Recommendations/Implications**

This research study indicates a number of similarities as well as differences in the mentoring needs of new faculty and current practices reported by academic leaders. While there was strong universal support for new faculty mentoring, establishment of a university-wide formal mentoring program was not supported. No single model of mentoring would appropriately address the diverse cultures found across this particular campus. To be effective, mentoring must be tailored to and locally delivered within the individual departments and colleges.

It has been determined that the best fit for the consultative and collegial organizational culture of this particular university is a flexible, informal model of faculty mentoring, delivered locally at the departmental and college level to ensure that the models selected are most conducive to the unique individual culture of each department and academic discipline.

While this study was exploratory in nature, it established that mentoring of new faculty should be provided at this Canadian university in an informal but more structured manner. As one new faculty member commented, “mentoring .... does not need to be formal but it does need to be explicit and supported.”

Leadership is a critical issue in moving this initiative forward (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Capioppe, 1998; Hegstad & Wentling, 2004). The leadership function of contributing to the development of others is one of the purposes of a university. It is recommended that the President, Provost, and the Associate Vice-President (Academic) provide this leadership function by continuing discussions with the deans and subsequently with other academic leaders, urging implementation of culturally appropriate mentoring initiatives at college and departmental levels. Deans, chairs and directors can show leadership and support for faculty mentoring, by recognizing mentoring activities and encouraging documentation of it on tenure and promotion submissions. Faculty mentoring must be seen at all levels to be an important issue. Leaders mentoring future leaders will help everyone in the university reach their potential. By ensuring that mentoring of new faculty occurs, benefits will accrue to the new faculty; to their mentors and to the university as a whole institution.

In addition to continued analysis of the wealth of data collected, another interesting research question to pursue is, do the greater percentages of women who want mentoring indicate higher levels of prosocial behaviour (Allen, 2003), or does it reflect latent discrimination of a ‘masculinized culture’?

It also will be necessary to continue research into the final component of a successful faculty mentoring initiative, evaluating or measuring success of the initiative. While measuring the effects of an informal mentoring initiative will be

difficult, perhaps development and emergence new faculty as leaders is the ultimate measure of success of mentoring initiatives.

### References

- Allen, T.D., Eby, L.T., Poteet, M.L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 127-136.
- Angelique, H., Kyle, K., & Taylor, E. (2002). Mentors and muses: New strategies for academic success. *Innovative Higher Education, 26*, 195-209.
- Awaya, A., McEwan, H., Heyler, D., Linsky, S., Lum, D., & Wakukawa, P. (2003). Mentoring as a journey. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 45-56.
- Beck, M.M., & Swanson, J.C. (2003). Value-added animal agriculture: Inclusion of race and gender in the professional formula. *Journal of Animal Science, 82*, 2895-2903.
- Berk, R.A., Berg, J., Mortimer, R., Walton-Moss, B. & Yeo, T.P. (2005). Measuring the effectiveness of faculty mentoring relationships. *Academic Medicine, 80*, 66-71.
- Billett, S. (2003). Workplace mentors: Demands and benefits. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 15*, 105-113.
- Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants. *Innovative Higher Education, 22*, 157-179.
- Bozionelos, N. (2004). Mentoring provided: Relation to mentor's career success, personality, and mentoring received. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 24-46.
- Casey, T.M., & Plaut, K. (2003). Women and minorities in animal science: Do issues exist? *Journal of Dairy Science, 86* (E. Suppl.) E35-E46.
- Capioppe, R. (1998). Leaders developing leaders: An effective way to enhance leadership development programs. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 19*, 194-198.
- de Janasz, S.C., & Sullivan, S.E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professorial network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62*, 263-283.
- Eby, L.T., & Allen, T.D. (2002). Further investigation of protégés' negative mentoring experiences: Patterns and outcomes. *Group & Organization Management, 27*, 456-479.
- Fagenson, E.A. (1989). The mentor advantage: perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 309-320.
- Finkelstein, L.M., Allen, T.D., & Rhoton, L.A. (2003). An examination of the role of age in mentoring relationships. *Group and Organization Management, 28*, 249-281.
- Gibson, S.K. (2004). Being mentored: The experience of women faculty. *Journal of Career Development, 30*, 173-188.
- Harnish, D., & Wild, L.A. (1998). Peer mentoring in higher education: A professional development strategy for faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 17*, 271-282.

- Hegstad, C.D., & Wentling, R.M. (2004). The development and maintenance of exemplary formal mentoring programs in Fortune 500 companies. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*, 421-446.
- Hudson, P., Skamp, K., & Brooks, L. (2005). Development of an instrument: mentoring for effective primary science teaching. *Science Education, 89*, 657-674.
- Humble, A.M., Solomon, C.R., Allen, K.R., Blaisure, K.R., & Johnson, M.P. (2006). Feminism and mentoring of graduate students. *Family Relations, 55*, 2-15.
- Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL; Scott, Foresman & Co.
- Kronik, J.W. (1990). On men mentoring women: Then and now. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin, 21*, 22-27.
- Lyons, B.D., & Oppler, E.S. (2004). The effects of structural attributes and demographic characteristics on protégé satisfaction in mentoring programs. *Journal of Career Development, 30*, 215-229.
- Madison, J., & Huston, C. (1996). Faculty-faculty mentoring relationships: An American and Australian perspective. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 316-330*.
- McGuire, G.M., & Reger, J. (2003). Feminist co-mentoring: A model for academic professional development. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 15*, 54-72.
- Noe, R.A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479.
- Nolan, D. (1992). Women in statistics in academe: Mentors matter. *Statistical Science, 7*, 267-272.
- O'Neill, R.M., & Sankowsky, D. (2001). The Caligula Phenomenon: Mentoring relationships and theoretical abuse. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 10*, 206-216.
- Pell, A.N. (1996). Fixing the leaky pipeline: Women scientists in academia. *Journal of Animal Science, 74*, 2843-2843.
- Raabe, B. & Beehr, T.A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationships: differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 271-293.
- Ragins, B.R., & 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*, 529-550.
- Sands, R.G., Parson, A.A., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education, 62*, 174-193.
- Selby, J.W., & Calhoun, L.G. (1998). Mentoring programs for new faculty: Unintended consequences? *Teaching of Psychology, 25*, 210-211.
- Sosik, J.J., & Godshalk, V.M. (2004). Self-other rating agreement in mentoring: Meeting protégé expectations for development and career advancement. *Group and Organization Management, 29*, 442-469.
- Stapleton, M. (1978). *A dictionary of Greek and Roman mythology*. Bell Publishing Co., N.Y.

- Stewart, J., & Knowles, V. (2003) Mentoring in undergraduate business management programmes. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 27, 147-159.
- Tenner, E. (2004). The pitfalls of academic mentorship. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50. <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i49/49b00601.htm> .
- Wadsworth, E.M. (2002). *Giving much, gaining more: Mentoring for success*. Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, IN.
- Wright, C.A., & Wright, S.D. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. *Family Relations*, 36, 204-208.