

Mentoring In and Outside Institutional Politics, Policies, and Practices

B. Gloria Guzmán Johannessen and Laurette Bristol

Abstract In this chapter, the authors discuss the impact of the new global society on higher education and questioned whether universities are preparing faculty, and more specifically minority and females, to meet the demands of the twentieth century. The authors recognize the continued underrepresentation of minorities and female faculty in higher education and examined it under the lenses of the historical and cultural onset of universities in USA and Australia. Using a multi-site study approach, they explored institutional politics and practices across international and geo-politically located universities (USA, Caribbean, and Australia). This investigation is based on the perspectives of institutional leaders (an under explored area within the field of mentoring research), and looked at university leaderships' understanding of existing mentoring practices in their universities. The findings articulate the evident compatibilities and dissonances between private (institutional leadership) understandings of practice and public (institutional websites) support practices for minority and female faculty. This study brings a new perspective on faculty formal and informal mentoring in and outside institutions of higher learning.

Keywords Higher education • Mentoring • Formal mentoring • Informal mentoring • Mentoring policies • Institutional policies • Minority faculty • Female faculty

1 Introduction and Background

The global demands, in twenty-first century, make the attainment of a position in higher education and academic success more difficult than in the previous centuries. The expectations of faculty work have changed from traditional teaching and

B.G.G. Johannessen (✉)
Texas State University, Round Rock, San Marcos, USA
e-mail: bgjohannessen@txstate.edu

L. Bristol
Catholic College of Mandeville, Williamsfield, Jamaica

research in local and national levels to international engagement in a global context. Faculty's ability to succeed academically in global contexts depends not only on knowledge, but also on the ability to collaborate with scholars from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, languages, cultures, and ideologies across international boundaries (Gopal 2011; Tenuto and Gardiner 2013). These international demands call for universities to be clear on how they are positioned in the new global society, and whether they are preparing their faculties to succeed, not only at regional and national levels but also internationally. This is an area that points to the need to build institutional climates and cultures that embrace diversity, promote collaboration, and support faculty mentoring within and outside the gates of their institutions. It also signals the need for faculty mentoring to be aligned with their institutions national and international missions. We point out that minority faculty, as marginalized members in a dominant society, navigate across language, racial/ethnic, and cultural borders. In addition their lived experiences cultivate in them the understanding of the intersection of diversity with academic work, which is the foundation for global intercultural engagement. Thus, they have the potential to be pivotal to their institutions' international global schemes. Nevertheless, minority faculty continues to be inequitably represented in numbers and in the ranks of the academy. There is also evidence that for white female faculty, marginalization has been and continues to be a reality (National Center for Education Statistics 2014).

Faculty formal and informal mentoring needs to be viewed as an institutional leadership priority, not only as a faculty concern, as it is commonly portrayed in the literature. This is specially needed because there is no research evidence that universities are providing mentoring and/or other professional development to ensure that their faculties have the skills to face the challenges and to engage effectively in teaching and research at a global level (Gopal 2011; Tenuto and Gardiner 2013). Mentoring is critical for professional support and development (Pennan & Willsher, 2014). Gopal (2011) questions "If they [faculty] are not prepared to teach in a cross-cultural, globally diverse setting, then how can they provide an equitable educational environment for their students?" (p. 63).

The challenges academic faculty need to face in the global society, the limited ethnic representation in the academe, and mentoring inconsistencies kindled our inquiry and framed our investigation. We grounded our inquiry on compared policies, structures, and processes of private and public universities in USA, Australia, and the Caribbean with respect to: (a) institutional position on globalization; (b) economic, political and/or social drivers influencing faculty hiring; (c) structures that support collaborative professional practices; (d) institutional mentoring; and (e) institutional perceptions of the service and contributions of minorities and female faculties. We asked institutional leaderships to give their perceptions on their institutions' positions with regard to their involvement at the international level and how collaboration and mentoring are addressed for minority and female faculties.

To better understand the position of the academy with respect to minority and female faculty that would serve as the framework of our investigation, we: (a) reviewed the literature on the historical and traditional development of universities in USA and Australia; (b) examined the representation of minority and female faculties at the national level; (c) reviewed the literature on mentoring; and (d) explored formal and informal alternative approaches to faculty mentoring, taking place within and outside universities.

To provide clarity to our work, and at the same time as an attempt to engage the reader in the issues presented in this chapter, we interchange *institution of higher education* (IHEs) with university(s) to avoid over-using the IHE acronym. We use the term minority to denote ethno-cultural minority, and use these terms interchangeably. We refer to women faculty as female faculty to be consistent with federal and other reports and represent the United States of America as United States of America (USA), instead the common term *America or US*. We do this because there are other countries in the American continent that also have *states* as their political-geographical boundaries.

2 Institutional Politics, Culture, and Climate

Higher education, as a link in the chain of educational institution, has a social structure grounded in an ideology of unequal power relationships. Framed by a hierarchical social structure and guided by norms of interpersonal behavior traditionally defined by those it is intended to serve, it leaves little room for the contribution of women faculty of color (Balderrama et al. 2004, p. 141).

While the above quote refers to universities in USA, the course of unequal opportunities for women and minorities appears to be similar in Australia (Devos 2008). In our review of the literature, we found that the ongoing discriminatory practices in both countries have similarities in their historical evolution, past, and current policies. For both countries, the roots for the marginalization of minorities and females began at the onset of their first universities, because these institutions were founded for the elites—not for the common populations (Forsyth 2014; Dzuback 2003).

The discrimination of Indigenous populations in USA and Australia also had and continues to have similar pathways. Minchin (2010) provides a critical view of Australians' perceptions on the history of White domination in Australia and USA, which serves to illustrate the parallelism between the two countries in terms of discriminatory traditions and practices. Minchin mentions that in Australia,

...a referendum in 1967 that allowed indigenous Australians to be included in the federal census and gave the Australian Commonwealth the right to legislate on Australian Aborigines... In the United States, however, black Americans' equal citizenship rights were—at least on paper—protected by the Fourteenth Amendment of 1868 (p. 1107).

3 Australian Early Universities

Forsyth (2014) describes the foundation of the oldest university in Australia as having been established in 1851 as an elite “sandstone” with British traditions and academic faculty from Oxford or Cambridge (p. 367). In her description of the historical evolution of Australian universities, Forsyth (2014) provides the following insights: Males were the highest and most significant majority, which had and continues to have implications for the “gender gap” across Australian higher education. The system of merit-based selection in Australia’s public universities appeared to work well for women, who by 1920 composed half of the academic staff. However, while females were well represented in universities, Aboriginals and other Indigenous populations were not allowed to enter to enter higher education institutions. At the turn of World War II, the return of Australian males from war negatively impacted the representation of females, which was considerably reduced. This situation lasted up to 1970 when “New categories of oppression attracted their [universities] attention. Race, gender, and sexuality were added to class as sites of struggle and liberation” (p. 371). Finally, in 1960, the first aboriginal student entered an Australian university, but Sydney University did not open its gates for them till the 1980s. Even so, Sydney University did not have “a systematic solution to social and educational inclusion of Aboriginal people through undergraduate opportunity” (Forsyth 2014, p. 377).

4 USA Early Universities

The goal and purpose for the foundation of American institutions of higher learning was the education of the male elite. It was based on the belief that knowledge belonged only to them. Female’s role was to support males on their path of wisdom, as well as in their personal and familial lives (Dzuback 2003). In her review of the history of USA universities, Dzuback (2003) describes the role of females as supporters—not doers, which entitled only White males to higher education, and at the same time made it inaccessible to females, Afro-Americans, and Native Americans. In these early colleges, dominated by males, keeping females and African-Americans outside their gates was “a matter of masculine honor” (Dzuback 2003, p. 179). These exclusionary tactics delayed the establishment of women and Black colleges for 200 years. However, by the latter part of the 19th century, neither females nor Afro-Americans continued to stand patiently and passively at the margin of intellectual progress and their ongoing relegation to intellectual impoverishment. They founded Black and Women universities and challenged White male institutions, and their determination opened the sacred halls of higher education; thus, changing the course of institutions of higher learning (Dzuback 2003). Nevertheless, in their intellectual journey, females and Afro-Americans continued to be treated as *outsiders* in terms of support and recognition of their intellectual

and research contributions (Dzuback 2003). It is incontrovertible that gender and the educational advancement of minorities have been fundamental issues in the history and evolution of USA higher education and continue to be a concern in present times.

5 Minority and Female Representation in the Academe

5.1 Australian Higher Education

The Australian Government Department of Education and Training Report (8 April, 2014) shows the following: There is a total of 113,630 faculty staff in public and private universities, of which 85,016 full-time faculty and 27,630 part-time. The representation of Indigenous (Aboriginals) is 958 (0.008 %). “No data are available on ethnicity or race of Australian academics with the exception of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders” (Devos 2008, p. 203). Furthermore, gender inequality continues to be present in Australian universities (Devos 2008). The presence of females in Australian public and private universities reaches only 39 % of the total number of faculty in these institutions, and the percentage of females who are at the associate and full-professorship ranks a mere 19 % (Devos 2008). This is a clear indication of the unequal position female faculty have in Australian institutions of higher education.

6 USA Higher Education

According to the report of the National Center for Education Statistics (2014), the total number of faculty in USA universities in 2013 is 791,391, and the total number of professors 181,530; associate 155,095; assistant 166,045; instructors 99,304; lecturers 36,728; and 152,689 other faculty (non determined).

Table 1 serves to illustrate the unequal representation of minorities and documents the need for universities to embrace diversity by recognizing and valuing the contributions of minorities and advancement in their academic careers. What is most compelling in these demographics is the fact that Hispanics comprise the largest minority group in USA with approximately 50.5 million (16 %) of the total population (US Census 2010), but their presence in the academy is only 4 %. The same can be said for Black Americans whose population is approximately 42 million (14 %) of the total population, but their presence in the academy is only 6 %. Asian/Pacific Islander Americans, on the contrary, appear to be equitably represented in the academy, given that their population is only 5220.579 (2 %); but their presence in the academy is 6 % and represent 10 % of the total number of faculty at the rank of professor.

Table 1 National Center for Education Statistics (2014)

Total number of full-time faculty by rank and ethnicity (2013)						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian Pacific Island	Am. Ind. Alaska Nat.	Unknown. Alien
Number of Faculty	575,491	43,188 0.07 %	33,217 0.06 %	72,246 12 %	3538 0.006 %	67,249 12 %
Professor	181,530 82 %	6665 0.4 %	5604 0.03 %	15,417 0.08 %	573 0.003 %	5267 0.03 %
Assoc. Professor	116,817 % 99 %	8812 0.07 %	6381 0.05	15,809 0.1 %	591 0.005 %	7276 0.06 %
Assist. Professor	112,262 69 %	10,542 0.09 %	10,542 0.09 %	18,402 16 %	683 0.006 %	17,709 15 %
Instructor	73,859 90 %	7448 10 %	6340 0.08	4950 0.07 %	879 0.01 %	6421 0.09 %
Lecturer	36,728 99 %	1728 0.5 %	2015 0.05 %	2436 0.06 %	117 0.003 %	3096 0.08 %
Other Faculty	96,523 57 %	7993 0.08 %	5747 0.06 %	14,946 15 %	695 0.007 %	26,858 28 %

The percentages in Table 1 represent, the number of faculty by rank and ethnicity compared to the number of faculty by rank and ethnicity of White faculty.

With respect to White female faculty, their presence in the academy is not as unequal as that of racial/ethnic minorities. In comparison to their representation the difference is only 9 % less than White males, but in the attainment of rank, there is a difference of 35 % for the rank of professor and 12 % difference for the rank of associate professor (US Census 2010).

Another legitimate concern is the contrast in salaries between males and females as presented by Fox-Cardamone and Wilson (2010):

Certainly there is discussion of perceived disparities in salary between men and female at all academic ranks. In addition, there is discussion of the failure of females to progress through the academic ranks in numbers consistent with those of their male colleagues. These two topics are related, since progression through the academic ranks generally results in higher pay for the individual. While the reasons for these disparities in both pay and promotion are not always transparent, the disparities themselves are quite clear. (p. 2)

The disparity in salaries between males and females gives an indication that universities characterize the endeavors of males as having more worth than those of females, an issue that may be centered in the foundation USA universities and traditional practices. The base salary for university faculty in 2010–2013 was \$84,000 for males and \$69,100 for females, a difference of \$14,900. A comparison of salaries among the various Racial/Ethnic groups shows that the base salary for White males is approximately \$5000 less than for Asian/Pacific Islanders but higher

than Blacks and Hispanics (*The Condition of Education 2014* (NCES 2014-083). It appears that institutions of higher education fail to recognize that, "...barriers for females in higher education...place serious limitations on the success of educational institutions themselves" (West and Curtis 2006, p. 4).

The low representation and inequitable standing of minorities and discriminatory practices demonstrate that universities continue to be "Framed by a hierarchical social structure and guided by norms of interpersonal behavior traditionally defined by those it is intended to serve, it leaves little room for the contribution of women faculty of color." (Balderrama et al. 2004, p. 141).

It seems that these inequities need to be a central issue in the academy because universities, even in this century, continue to be white male-dominated, and homogenized institutions. More often than not, this type of culture and climate negatively interfere with faculty's potential for academic and scholarly progress within an institution (Gibson 2006; Balderrama et al. 2004). Institutional priorities continue to have dissonant ideological bases for White males than for minority and female faculties. It may be because these were outspoken politics, policies, and practices in early universities (Balderrama et al. 2004; Dzuback 2003; Berkovitch et al. 2012), which persist to the present time as tacit (unspoken and hidden) policies and practices; thus, contributing to the persistent marginalization of minority and female faculties.

7 Mentoring Politics, Policies, and Practices

The literature on mentoring focuses on its many aspects from historical and political influences (Gibson 2006; Berkovitch et al. 2012; Johannessen et al. 2012); effectiveness of mentoring programs (Mullen et al. 2008) faculty dissatisfaction (Monk et al. 2010; Johannessen and Unterreiner 2010; Chadiha et al. 2014) mentoring ethno-cultural and women groups (Barak et al. 2013); and institutional culture and climate affecting faculty advancement (Trower 2011) among other themes intricately related to faculty mentoring in institutions of higher learning.

Mentoring in academia is presented in the literature as a process through which new seasoned faculty provide advice and support to new faculty into the politics, policies, and practices of an institution. It is intended to guide new faculty on a path toward successful advancement in the academy and with the potential to advance higher education institutions toward more inclusive environments. Mentoring can also contribute to the transformation of an institution's political climate and culture, which more often than not negatively interferes with faculty's potential for academic and scholarly progress (Gibson 2006; Balderrama et al. 2004).

Formal mentoring tends to reinforce the unchanging homogenization of an institution's intellectual reservoir, culture, and climate, and while it has the potential to help new White male faculty to become acclimatize to the institution's

environment and engage on the path toward retention, tenure, and promotion. For female and minorities this is not always the case, because they are not always provided with the mentoring they need. Formal mentoring partnerships in which a seasoned and/or older faculty member is assigned to mentor new and often younger faculty do not always meet with success when the mentor has different intellectual interests and does not have the needed knowledge and cultural sensitivity to understand the needs of the minority mentee.

Faculty dissatisfaction and frustration with the limited mentorship they received at their institutions, or in some cases not receiving any at all, is consistent in the literature of mentoring (Barak et al. 2013; Fox-Cardamone & Wilson 2010; Johannessen and Unterreiner 2010). We suggest that there is a need to ensure that the culture of their institutions embrace and value the intellectual and creative endeavors of minorities and females, because doing otherwise, is unwittingly contributing to the prevalent marginalization of females and minorities, as well as to institutional intellectual impoverishment. Gibson (2006) study on mentoring women faculty showed that "...the political climate of the organization as an essential attribute to this experience" (p. 63) and further describes how the misalignment between institutional missions, politics, priorities, and departmental practices, cultures, roles, and responsibilities create inconsistencies on how mentoring for females takes place in institutions' colleges and departments. Trower (2011) documented this instability as follows:

Three quarters of associate and full professors agreed that institutional priorities have changed in ways that affect their work. Far fewer associate and full professors felt that the institution's priorities are stated consistently across various levels of leadership and fewer still felt that those priorities are acted upon consistently. (p. 6)

The low representation of minorities and females reveals that universities continue to be "Framed by a hierarchical social structure and guided by norms of interpersonal behavior traditionally defined by those it is intended to serve, it leaves little room for the contribution of women faculty of color." (Balderrama et al. 2004, p. 141). Also, the marginalization of women and minorities persists to be a central issue in the academy because universities continue to be white, male-dominated, and homogenized institutions. More often than not, this type of culture and climate negatively interferes with faculty's potential for academic and scholarly progress within an institution (Gibson 2006; Balderrama et al. 2004). Institutional priorities commonly have dissonant ideological bases for those of minority and female faculty.

While the institution of education tends toward rationality and logic in carrying out its social and economic mission, it does have its share of contradictions. The presence of faculty of women of color and their scholarly work grounded in social action-research crystallizes these ideological clashes between the institution and individuals whose participation was not written in the original treatise (Balderrama et al. 2004, p. 141).

While it appears that institutions of higher learning are attempting to include minority and female faculties in their institutions, numbers alone do not adequately indicate their status and positioning in universities because "These twin forces—

inclusion and marginalization are the organizational setting that requires further investigation into the hidden cultural representation of these two processes.” (Berkovitch et al. 2012).

Equitable representation of minorities and females in any organization is not only a privilege, it is a right in a professed democratic society, and as such it needs to be considered an issue of social justice. This is even more compelling in universities because they are the pulse of a society’s drive toward philosophical, political, and social evolution, and in most cases where they take root.

8 The Transformative Role of Mentoring

8.1 *Politics and Policies*

Gibson’s (2006) study on mentoring female faculty showed that “...the political climate of the organization as an essential attribute to this experience” (p. 77). It describes how the misalignment between institutional missions, politics, and priorities and departmental structures, culture, roles, and responsibilities, create inconsistencies on mentoring across departments and colleges. This points out to the need to ensure that the climates and cultures of universities embrace and value the intellectual and creative endeavors of minorities and females. Doing otherwise is unwittingly contributing to the prevalent marginalization of females and minorities and to institutional intellectual impoverishment.

What is needed is the creation of environments where the intellectual synergy between faculty and leadership become the force moving the institutional community toward increased creativity and innovation and common mutual goals and practices aimed at the institution’s advancement (Mullen and Lick 1999).

Trower (2011) documents this instability as follows:

Three quarters of associate and full professors agreed that institutional priorities have changed in ways that affect their work. Far fewer associate and full professors felt that the institution’s priorities are stated consistently across various levels of leadership and fewer still felt that those priorities are acted upon consistently.” (p. 6)

While there is a large body of literature on women and minority faculty perspectives on mentoring (presented in our background and literature review) we did not find any literature on faculty mentoring from institutional leaderships’ perspectives. This disproportion in the literature may be reflective of the distance between faculty and institutional leadership, based on institutional culture and organizational politics, which as mentioned by Nejad and Abbaszadeh (2011) “... political behavior has dysfunctional results such as conflict, job satisfaction, and lower productivity” (p. 66).

Contradictions between institutional expectations and focus on mentoring and faculty’s perceptions on the *what* and *how* they need to be supported in their academic and professional endeavors create the dysfunction alluded by Nejad and

Abbaszadeh (2011). It is basic to universities' visions and missions to include in them the *why* and *how* their faculties are supported in their academic paths and the ways in which their institutions facilitate their success and are invested in the achievement of the institutions' realization of their missions and goals, because, "...irrespective of whether faculty are entering the gates of academia or are already established professors, they all play a vital role in the ongoing transformation of educational programs" (Johannessen & Unterreiner 2010, p. 32). We believe there must be equilibrium between an institution's organizational obligations and interests and its accountability to nurturing and supporting their faculties. It is also crucial for universities to realize that the marginalization of faculty women and minorities continues to be present, even in those institutions where mentoring is available to them. Faculty in general, need to have mentoring that guides them toward the fulfillment of their academic careers, which is even more important for faculty from traditionally marginalized groups, because the mentoring they receive is also influenced by the organization's climate and culture (Gibson 2006; Nejad & Abbaszadeh 2011). It is undeniable that present conditions of society influence how institutions perceive and/or support faculty from traditionally disenfranchised groups. In institutions where minorities and females are only minimally represented in numbers and rank, leaderships need to look at their present institutional cultures, especially in terms of hiring practices, hiring practices and mentoring for retention and promotion.

Equity and access to the academy in the absence of supporting practices are nothing more than visions or illusions. Furthermore, continued complacency with the status quo reflect an unwittingly contribution to the ongoing marginalization of minorities and female faculty in the academe, as well as to institutional intellectual impoverishment. Universities in the twenty-first century can begin to change traditional discrimination by acknowledging the inequitable conditions of minority and female faculty and actively engage in initiatives to move forward their institutions toward more equitable conditions for *all* faculty because they are "...the fire that maintains the intellectual ardor needed for universities to cradle new world knowledge and to carry forward a future global evolution." (Johannessen & Unterreiner 2010, p. 32). This fire needs to be ignited and sustained by providing new faculty with support through formal and informal mentoring that honestly encourages their intellectual, physical, and emotional wellbeing; thus, aimed at enhancing their confidence in that their contributions will be acknowledged and supported.

Changing the current status of minorities and female faculty entails looking forward instead of continuing to believe that the answers to current and future issues can be solved through the lenses of antiquated models. If there is no forward thought, then the intellectual contributions of minorities and females will continue to be obscured and disenfranchised in the academy.

The presence of faculty of women of color and their scholarly work grounded in social action-research crystallizes these ideological clashes between the institution and individuals whose participation was not written in the original treatise. We believe this is one of the

reasons we sing the same tune with different lyrics—our experiences begin with personal/individual and local political issues. But as we continue to hear the song we begin to realize that it is more than local and personal and extends into the institutional and structural. (Balderrama et al. 2004, p. 1)

9 Mentoring Practices

Mentoring in academia, as presented in the literature, is a process through which new seasoned faculty provide advice and support to new faculty into the politics, policies, and practices of an institution. It is also intended to guide new faculty on a path toward successful advancement in the academy. The literature on mentoring practices focuses on its many aspects from historical and political influences (Gibson 2006; Berkovitch et al. 2012; Johannessen et al. 2012); effective mentoring programs (Mullen and Hutinger 2008) faculty dissatisfaction (Monk et al. 2010; Johannessen and Unterreiner 2010; Chadiha et al. 2014), mentoring ethno-cultural and female faculty (Kusselman et al. 2003; Barak et al. 2013), and institutional culture and climate affecting faculty advancement (Trower 2011) and other themes intricately related to faculty mentoring in IHEs. However, the institutional goals for mentoring are commonly centered in the acclimatization of new faculty; thus, reinforcing the unchanging homogenization of an institution's intellectual reservoir, culture, and climate. While it has the potential to help new White male faculty to become acclimatize to the institution's environment and to engage in the path toward retention, tenure, and promotion, this is not the reality for females and minorities. Formal mentoring partnerships in which a seasoned and/or older faculty member is assigned to mentor new and often younger faculty do not always meet with success when the mentor has different intellectual interests and does not have the needed knowledge and cultural sensitivity to understand the needs of the mentee. This type of formal mentoring does not seem to work for traditionally marginalized groups in the academy when the institutional climate is not deliberately engaged in their transformation from homogenized institutions to organizations willing to take into account the intellectual diversity of thought that female and minorities can offer to them.

Faculty dissatisfaction and frustration with the limited mentorship they received at their institutions, or in some cases not receiving any at all is consistent in the literature of mentoring (Barak et al. 2013; Fox-Cardamone & Wilson 2010; Johannessen & Unterreiner 2010). This lack of appropriate mentoring is a major influence on faculty failure. For members of traditionally marginalized groups, 'acclimatization' should not mean to surrender their own intellectual and personal identities. Gibson (2006) study on mentoring women faculty showed that "...the political climate of the organization as an essential attribute to this experience" (p. 63) and describes how the misalignment between institutional missions, politics, priorities, and departmental practices, cultures, roles, and responsibilities create inconsistencies on how mentoring women takes place in institutions departments and colleges.

10 Alternative Forms of Mentoring

There is variety of forms of mentoring addressing the needs of faculty who dissatisfied, and in some cases embittered by traditional formal mentoring (dyads) at their universities, faculty seek alternative ways of mentoring. Johannessen et al. (2012) describe different models of informal mentoring from traditional dyads to mentoring that includes one or more mentees working with one or more mentors. Another form of mentoring is group mentoring, such as *mentoring circles*, which provide the opportunity to work collaboratively with one or more mentors or mentees. *Speed mentoring* utilizes a match-making approach to find and match mentors and mentees according to their academic interests, gender, and styles. These configurations of mentoring can take in universities or are across universities, and may be at national or global levels.

An excellent example of group mentoring (actually co-mentoring) is CURVE-Y-FRIENDS (C-Y-F), a global mentoring network that evolved out of a common need to seek academic mentoring relationships that were appropriate to women's personal and professional learning needs.

C-Y-F is more than a model of an international peer mentoring; it is an illustration of peer mentoring support for females from diverse ethnic groups operating outside the political structures of their members' universities.

Established in 2011 C-Y-F was initially composed of 19 women representing four major ethnic groups across the US, Australia, Egypt, and the Caribbean. The members represent academic experiences across early career, mid-career and late career, as well as variety of academic ranks. It also includes females who work on the periphery of the university as adjunct or short-term contract faculty.

The network is comprised of two previously established peer-mentoring groups, Caribbean Educators Research Initiative (CURVE) and Female Researchers in Education, Networking and Dialogue (FRiENDs); the Y, Spanish for 'and' represents a dynamic alliance of females providing support for each other in shared universities through a range of current collegial relationships (PhD supervision, team teaching or co-authorship). The members' relationships are sustained by innovations in collaborative technology (Skype, Dropbox, Google Groups, GotoMeetings).

Bristol, Adams, & Johannessen (2014), members of C-Y-F, characterized the network as a "social experiment that encouraged members of the...group ... to go beyond their safe and familiar mentoring and collaborative writing zones" (p. 3/4). Further, they outlined that:

The description of our purpose and collaborative mentoring processes were illustrative of ways of working shaped by values of *mutuality* (drawing on the strengths of each other), *collaboration* (purposefully exploiting the relationship to promote and enhance our professional, academic, and personal lives), and *interrogation* (challenging assumptions and practices of mentoring in and through community). p. 4 *Original in Italics*

11 Method

11.1 *Significance of the Study*

This study contributes to a better understanding of formal and informal mentoring policies, structures, processes, and practices, based on institutional leaderships and leadership perceptions—not on faculty perceptions, commonly found in the literature on faculty mentoring. It also contributes to the body of literature on the marginalization of minorities and females in the academe, which is based on the historical and cultural onset of institutions of higher education in USA, Australia, brings forth a new perspectives, and invites a new discourse on faculty formal and informal mentoring in and outside institutional borders.

We guided our research with the following questions:

1. How is the university positioned to serve the wider public at the national and international levels?
2. What are the university's key areas of funding?
3. What are the university's economic, political, or social drivers influencing faculty hiring, retention, promotion, and mentoring?
4. What structures are in place to support collaborative professional practices in general and specifically among women and minority faculty?
5. How does the institution view the service and contributions of minority and female faculty?

Employing a multi-site case study approach, we explored institutionalized mentoring practices and processes across international and geo-politically located universities targeting the perspectives of institutional leaders (an under explored area within the field of mentoring research) We examined first, their understandings of existing mentoring practices within their universities; second, their understanding of their institutions' positioning at the international and global level; third, their interpretations of the social, political, professional developmental role of promoting faculty collaborative work; and fourth, the role that institutional formal mentoring may play in the academic lives of faculty broadly, and more critically, in the academic lives of minority and female faculty.

Given the social and academic status of the participants, and the proportional difficulties with access to this category of institutional leadership, convenience and snowballing sampling techniques were employed to recruit eight institutional leaders in private and public universities in the USA, Australia and the Caribbean. The sample of universities is characterized as large (>5000 students) or small (<5000 students) in urban, suburban, and rural locations.

The data was gathered using two means:

First, the authors conducted a content analysis of the universities websites and other documentation commonly available to the public. Attention was directed to the principles of collaborative practices expressed in the institutions' mission statements and public service goals. Special consideration was given to the description and

purposes of available faculty mentoring programs, paying close attention to agendas that targeted minority and female faculty. Data were refined using a thematic analysis approach that was guided by the research questions for the study.

Second, through structured interviews of approximately 30–45 min with faculty members in high profile institutional leadership roles responsible for, or with shared responsibility for the identification of faculty needs, and for finding the areas of research and pedagogical development. During the interviews the authors explored a variety of issues which included: (a) How the university was positioned to serve the wider public at the national and international levels; (b) key areas of research funding; (c) economic, political or social drivers influencing faculty hiring; (d) the structures in place to support collaborative professional practices in general and specifically among women and minority faculty; and (e) the institution's view of the service and contributions of minority and female faculty.

The institutional leaders' understandings and suggested practices around institutionally located mentoring practices were juxtaposed against the ways in which these positions reflected or refracted policy located positions on mentoring replicated on the related universities' (public) websites. The findings shared in this paper, articulates the evident compatibilities and dissonances between private (institutional leadership) understandings of practice and public (institutional websites) articulations of support practices for minority and women faculty. As such the case presented here maps institutional mentoring nuances across content (expressed through practice, and policy) and method (interviews, text analysis and reflective narratives).

12 Limitations of the Study

Given the social and academic status of participants and the proportional difficulties with access to this category of participant, there is limited number of participants. Also, due to the limited or non-existent demographics and historical information about Caribbean universities, the historical review of the development of institutions of higher education was limited to USA and Australia.

13 Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Future Research

13.1 Interpretive Thematic Website Analysis

The focus of our interpretive analysis of the universities Websites for the 3 private and 5 public universities was on a thematic interpretation of publication of their missions, visions, and strategic plans published in their Websites.

Mission and vision statements reflect commitment to global involvement. All but one private university showed a global vision and/or mission with emphasis on study abroad student programs; international students in their campuses; and encouragement and support to faculty work and research at the international level.

Strategic plans support for faculty teaching and research with or in other countries. Only USA universities in USA had internationalization in their vision and mission statements (3 public and 2 private universities), and of these 2 public university and one private university included specific plans on inclusion of global issues their strategic plans.

Recruitment and/or mentoring is referenced in the Website. Only one public university mentioned recruitment and retention of diverse faculty.

Mentoring and faculty development is referenced in the Website. Only one public university referenced faculty development and mentoring, and this statement was specific to establishing an environment of inclusiveness and development of faculty with the cross-cultural sophistication and skills.

14 Interpretive Thematic Analysis of Interviews

Position within the global demands of the 21st century. With the exception of one rural university, the leaderships expressed commitment to internationalization and service within regional, national, and global societies orientation and support faculty to teach and conduct research in regional, national, and global contexts.

Key funding sources. There were differences between public and private universities. While public universities seem to rely on governmental and private grants, private universities rely mainly on student tuition, manufacturing and business sources, as well as some form of international funding. There is a variety of funding sources, with the main sources as follows: only one private university had student fees as only source of funding; two public universities on competitive grants (government and international funding; one private on student tuition; one private and two public universities on funding from industry, business, and private grants, and one private university did not provide information on key funding sources.

Economic, political, and social drivers. (Faculty hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion). Responses diverge from a focus on the attraction of the university in terms of location (one private and one public university); commitment to social justice (one private and one public university) lagging behind in attracting faculty representative of diverse ethno-cultural groups (one public university); minorities are hired, but not retained—few attain tenure (one public and one private university); and students do well in a mono-cultural university and learn more than with people who have an international perspective (one public university).

Mentoring and professional development formal structures. No professional development due to lack of funding (two private universities) responsibility of the Faculty Center—not at the department level (one public university); Faculty Development Center with emphasis on mentoring new faculty (one public

university); semi-formal structures (one public university); no conversation on mentoring beyond the college level (one public university); no mentoring policies (two public universities); mentoring through faculty development—not effective (one public university).

Service and contributions of minority and female faculty. Services of females and minorities are viewed the same as for other faculty (one public university); stated in the mission—excellent representation of females and minorities (one public university); service of minorities is not always recognized (one private and one public university); responsibility of the coalition of Black faculty and Hispanic Council (one public university) allocation of resources, but difficult to deal with discrimination (one public university); focus is on undergraduate students (one public university); and no mentoring program (one public university).

Discussion. The authors found commonalities among the universities in terms of visions, mission statements and congruency between Website information and the leadership's responses to the interviews. All but two of the interviewees described their universities as institutions engaged in global initiatives. The two universities described only in terms of local and regional serving institutions were located in rural areas.

Websites with mission and vision statements use the language of diversity and equity in terms of compliance, but not as embracing them in their practice. Although all but one university addressed diversity in their vision and mission, the interviews revealed that there seems to be a great deal of work to be done to transform their institutions' culture and climate reflected in their mission statements. It is also confounding that even in those universities with social justice, as their primary missions, they had no plans for recruitment of minority faculty. At one private university, minority hired left the institution when they did not attain tenure. Nevertheless, there was no indication that there were any formalized plans for program changes to ensure inclusivity in their hiring practices. Furthermore, there was no evidence, from the interviews, that in institutions with designated offices for equity and inclusion, the process of hiring is a shared responsibility of these office and colleges and departments.

The question remaining to be asked is whether support to minorities and women is reflected in their strategic plans and budgets because the lack of resources allocated to hire and retain women and minorities was not revealed in the interviews; therefore, the stated commitments do not match the allocation of resources. The institutional budget is not public, so this is an internal question for those in university leadership positions.

What is needed is that institutions go beyond compliance to fully embrace and support the institutionalization of their practices by including in their mission statements their commitment to furthering the inclusion of minorities and females. Institutional policies also need to be specific to the affirmation of institutional commitment to hiring and providing mentoring to minorities and females. Induction to the institution should be a request for minorities and females that they need to become part of a mold. Their mentoring should be based on the recognition that

faculty from diverse ethno-cultural groups and females need to be supported in maintaining their personal, relational, and collective identities (Johannessen 2015).

It is also confounding that even in those universities with social justice as their primary mission, minority there were no formalized plans for program changes to ensure inclusivity in their hiring and retention practices. The interviews brought forth the apparent inability to actualize commitment to practice. What seems to be the main issue is to how to bring about sustainable and systemic changes in mentoring practices, especially for minority and female faculty. It is, therefore, fundamental to the advancement of inclusiveness in institutions of higher learning that their leaderships engage in their own growth with respect to the transformation of the politics, climate, and culture of their institutions. Their committed engagement in these issues is crucial to change the discourse of the traditional and ongoing marginalization of minority and female faculty. University leaderships also need to look at alternative forms of mentoring within and outside their institutions and support faculty with time, resources, and other incentives.

As we stated in the body of our chapter, university leaderships need to look forward for new innovative ways to eliminate prevalent discriminatory practices (low numbers of minorities faculty and unequal representation of females and minorities in academic ranks). The solution of problems carried from the past cannot depend on looking at the review of historical practices, they require fresh new thinking.

15 Recommendations for Future Research

More research on mentoring focused on institutional missions, goals, and the perceptions of their leaderships is needed. This type of research would bring a better understand of the institutions' position on the ongoing effect of hidden and/or overt discriminatory practices that maintain low representation of minority faculty in these institutions. It would also help to raise institutional leaderships' awareness that their institutions need to make the inclusion of minorities a permanent goal—not a priority that may change from time to time, and that this goal must be explicitly communicated. Other investigations may focus on the connection and shared responsibility between colleges and departments with offices responsible for monitoring equitable access and support of minority and female faculty.

References

- Australian Government Department of Education and Training Report (8 April, 2014).
- Balderrama, M., Texeira, M. T., & Valdez, E. (2004). *Una Lucha de Fronteras (A Struggle of Borders): Women of Color in the Academy*. *Race, Gender & Class Website: www.suno.edu/sunorgc/*. Vol. 11, No. 4, (135–154).

- Berkovitch, N., Waldman, A., & Yanay, N. (2012). The politics of (in)visibility: On the blind spots of women's discrimination in the academy. *Culture and Organization*, 18(3), 251–275.
- Bristol, L., Adams, A. E., & Johannessen, B. G. G. (2014). Academic life support: the self study of a transnational collaborative mentoring group. Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning. doi:[10.1080/13611267.2014.983325](https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.983325). <http://www.tandonline.com/loi/cmet20>
- Barak, L. O., Kheir-Farraj, R., & Becher, A. (2013). Mentoring in Contexts of Cultural and Political Friction: Moral Dilemmas of Mentors and Their Management in Practice. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 21(1), 76–95. doi:[10.1080/13611267.2013.784060](https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2013.784060)
- Chadiha, L.A., Aranda, M.P., Begel, D.E., & Chang, C. (2014). The importance of mentoring faculty members of color in schools of social work. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 34:4, 351–362. doi:[10.1080/08841233.2014.937891](https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2014.937891). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2014.937891>
- Devos, A. (2008). Where enterprise and equity meet: the rise of mentoring for women in Australian Universities. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(2), 195–205.
- Dzuback, M. A. (2003). Gender and the politics of knowledge. *History of Education Quarterly*, 43(2), 171–195.
- Forsyth, H. (2014). Expanding higher education: institutional responses in Australia from the post-war era to the 1970s. *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, 51(3), 365–380. doi:[10.1080/00309230.2014.929592](https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2014.929592)
- Fox-Cardamone, L., & Wilson, K. (2010). Inequity in the academy: A case study of factors influencing promotion and compensation in American universities. Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table; Vol. 2010 Issue 5, Spec. Section p1 181–204. doi:[10.1080/13674580801951012](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580801951012)
- Gibson, Sharon K. (2006). Mentoring of women faculty: the role of organizational politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(1). doi:[10.1007/s10755-006-9007-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-006-9007-7)
- Gopal, A. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: preparing faculty to teach cross-culturally. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 373–381 <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Johannessen, B. G., & Unterreiner, A. (2010). Formal and informal mentoring in academia for the 21st century. *Education and Society*, 28(3), 21–49.
- Johannessen, B. G., Unterreiner, A., Sitienei, I., & Zajda, J. (2012). Global and cross-cultural perspectives on mentoring in higher education. *Education and Society*, 30(2), 27–48.
- Johannessen, B. G. G. (2015). A Latina's conversation on personal and social contextual issues of identity. In F. Obiokor & J. Martinez (Eds.), *Latin@ Voices in Multicultural Education: From Invisibility to Visibility in Higher Education*. USA: Nova Science Publishers
- Kusselman, J., Hensley, C., & Tewksbury, R. (2003). Mentoring in acadme: Models for facilitating academic development. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 14(1), 17–35.
- Minchin, T. J. (2010). Exploring the “American obsession” down under: teaching civil rights history in Australia. *The Journal of American History*, 9, 1104–1111.
- Monk, P. E., Irons, E. J., Carlson, N. L., & Walker, C. (2010). *National Science Journal*, 33(2), 126.
- Mullen, C. A., & Lick, D. W. (Eds.). (1999). *New Directions in Mentoring: Creating a Culture of Synergy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Mullen, C. A., & Huting, J. L. (2008). At the Tipping Point? Role of formal faculty mentoring in changing university research cultures. *Journal of In-service Education*, 34(2), 181–204. doi:[10.1080/13674580801951012](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580801951012)
- National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Education (2014) <https://nces.ed.gov/>
- Nejad, B. A., & Abbaszadeh, M. M. S. (2011). Organizational political tactics in universities. *Higher Education Studies*, 1(2), 65–72. doi:[10.5539/hes.v1n2p65](https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v1n2p65)
- Pennan, J., & Willsher, K. (2014). Academic partnerships at a regional university campus: A fresh look at faculty mentoring. *Education in Rural Australia, Whyalla Campus Education in Rural Australia*, 17(2), 55–65.

- Tenuto, P. L., & Gardiner, M. E. (2013). Seeking balance between challenge and success in an age of accountability: A first-year faculty growth model (FFGM). *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 3(2). ISSN: 2161-7252 <http://www.jielusa.org/>
- Trower, C. A. (2011). Senior faculty satisfaction: Perceptions of Associate and Full Professors. TIAA-CREF Institute Research Dialogue: Harvard Graduate School of Education, Issue No. 101.
- US Census Bureau. Census 2010.
- West, M. S., & Curtis, J. W. (2006). AAUP faculty gender equity indicators 2006. *On Campus with Women* 35, 15. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=28328213&site=ehost-live>. Accessed May 19 2015.

Global Co-Mentoring Networks in Higher Education

Politics, Policies, and Practices

Johannessen, B.G.G. (Ed.)

2016, XI, 227 p. 2 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-27506-2