Towards a Model of Mentoring in South African Higher Education

Rubby Dhunpath
Heidi Matisonn
Michael Samuel

Abstract

The imperative to replenish the South African higher education professoriate has inspired varied responses, ranging from aggressive recruitment of post graduate students to the induction of academics from outside the academy. One such response is the Staffing South Africa's Universities Framework (SSAUF), which recognises the challenges facing early career academics (ECAs), especially as they relate to higher education pedagogies, curriculum development, supervising students, and developing scholarship in teaching. Notable in this framework is the absence of any substantive discussion around mentorship, and its potential to socialise emerging academics into the distinctive culture of the academy in all its manifestations, especially what it means to be an effective university teacher. This article surveys some of the literature on mentoring in higher education, as a precursor to introducing a proposed mentoring model, developed for a South African university. Acknowledging the complexity inherent in the practice of mentoring and the attendant power relations, the proposed model is a departure from the individualistic performance management approach typically associated with the dominant master-apprenticeship model. Instead, the authors offer a non-hierarchical, co-constructed menu of possibilities based on negotiated reflection, arising out of the specific, situated contexts of mentor and mentee.

Keywords: mentorship, professional development, collaboration, higher education

Print ISSN 1023-1757; Electronic ISSN: 2519-5476; DOI https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2018/v25n2a4

Introduction

Traditionally, mentorship in higher education has typically occurred formally, between individuals through the 'master-apprenticeship' model, where an experienced individual is paired with a junior staff member to facilitate the requisite transfer of learning, which is expected to generate opportunities for professional development. Mentorship is considered a valuable mechanism for mobility and is regarded as essential in fostering students' intellectual development and fulfilling the career aspirations of staff (Darwin & Palmer 2009). While it has proved beneficial to both those offering mentorship and beneficiaries thereof, research has shown that mentorship opportunities are not easily accessible to those that need it (Darwin & Palmer 2009; Pfleeger & Mertz 1995). In response, the then Minister of Higher Education released a set of proposals in 2015, which constitute the Staffing South Africa's Universities Framework (SSAUF), a 'multi-pronged, nationally coordinated' initiative which 'aims to provide effective induction into and development of all aspects of academic work: teaching, research, social engagement, academic leadership and management' (Nzimande 2015: 1). The Framework signals 'growing realisation that the development of academics' knowledge and skills in relation to teaching and community engagement requires the same deliberate nurturing that the development of research capacity has always enjoyed in some institutions' (Quinn & Vorster 2012). Research published by the Council for Higher Education (CHE) in 2017 concludes that:

> the conditions which enable and constrain the professional learning of academics in their role as teachers have not received serious attention in South Africa. The efficacy of various approaches to academic staff development using certified courses, workshops, collaborative research projects or grants and symbolic awards, has not been studied extensively, nor in comparative projects across higher education settings (Leibowitz *et al.* 2017: 17).

Like the SSAUF, the CHE study does not explicitly refer to mentoring. This may be because the implementation of mentoring in South Africa has been relatively uncoordinated, especially in higher education. As such, it remains an unexplored phenomenon and little is known about the effects on those who have experienced mentoring. While context is critical and has a significant impact on academics' mentoring experiences, global trends have influenced

academic development in South Africa (Darwin & Palmer 2009; Foote & Solem 2008). For this reason, much of what we learn from the literature is from non-South African contexts.

One explanation for the limited mentoring opportunities is the real and perceived challenges of identifying appropriate mentors – not only those who are able, but those who are willing. Quinn and Vorster (2012) point out that because of powerful neoliberal forces in higher education, academics tend to be competitive and often preoccupied with the 'publish or perish' imperative. Finding mentors, given the multiple demands on academics' time, might not be easy (Quinn & Vorster 2012). This is regrettable, given that mentorship has long been regarded as an essential component in nurturing and developing early career academics 'to grow into confident, competent, scholarly teachers – teachers who are able to design relevant curriculums, facilitate learning and assess students who come from increasingly diverse social, cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds' (Quinn & Vorster 2012). As Quinn and Vorster (2012: webpage) suggest, 'the "sink or swim" orthodoxy in relation to new staff joining academia is no longer tenable'.

Mentorship in Higher Education

Scholars have long pointed to the 'ill-defined and elusive' nature of the concept of mentoring (Welch 1996; Foote & Solem 2009). In the context of higher education, Rockquemore, founder of the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity in Detroit argues that mentoring is not 'a reliable and valid construct'. She adds that 'mentoring is one of the most misunderstood concepts in faculty development' and that if you ask 10 different faculty members what mentoring is … you will get 10 different responses ranging from a once-a-year coffee date to a quasi-parental, lifelong relationship' (Rockquemore 2016: webpage).

In recent times, there have been efforts to define mentorship, which may be expressed in the following typology listed by the School of Medicine at Wake Forest University (cf. Hanover Research 2014).

- **One-to-One mentoring**: one mentor and one mentee/protégé
- **Group mentoring**: one mentor and multiple mentees/protégés
- **Team mentoring**: multiple mentors and a single mentee/protégé

- **Peer mentoring**: a junior faculty member provides guidance to another junior faculty member
- **E-mentoring**: one mentor and one mentee/protégé where the relationship is conducted over the internet
- **Informal mentoring**: the mentee self-selects their mentor, no formal agreement in place
- **Reverse mentoring**: junior faculty member offers expertise in a particular area to a senior faculty member

However, despite the abundant classifications of mentoring and the different mentoring types that have surfaced in the discourse over the years; the current literature demonstrates a lack of consensus on a specific definition of what mentorship is, the roles of a mentor, how mentors select protégés or how protégés are drawn to certain mentors (Crisp & Cruz 2009). The duration of mentorship relationships also seems to vary: while some have been found to be as short as one meeting between the parties involved, others last several months or longer. Mentorship relationships can be informal or formal, long term or short lived, and planned or spontaneous. Informal relationships have been recognised to be unstructured, unmanaged, and not formally recognised by the institution (Crisp & Cruz 2009). They often develop organically between parties who need each other's assistance and are typically established with the aim of achieving long term goals (Crisp & Cruz 2009). On the other hand, formal mentoring relationships have been found to be sanctioned by an institution and there is usually a third party who matches the mentor with the mentee (Foote & Solem 2009).

One of the most common factors in designing mentorship programmes is the age of the mentor and mentee. While it is deemed important that the mentor is old enough to have attained the requisite experience to benefit the mentee, Hunt and Michael (1983) found that where he/she is older by 20 years or more, such relationships can lead to negative outcomes. In this context, the mentorship relationship has been observed to approximate a parent-child one, where the mentee is likely to experience instances of inability to express their needs due to the mentor's desire to adopt a parental role.

On the other hand, an age difference of less than 6 to 8 years has been found to have minimal mentoring benefits since the participants are most likely to relate as peers (Hunt & Michael 1983). Mentors and mentees of the same age are deemed to be less likely to have networks that would be beneficial to

the psychosocial development of the mentee. It has been argued, that for mentorship relationships to be effective, there should be an age gap of at least half a generation; where the mentor is roughly older by 8 to 15 years (Hunt & Michael 1983). Needless to say, these generalisations are by no means absolute categorisations, as the context and culture influence relationships.

The classic older mentor-younger mentee model signalled above is advocated as an effective succession-planning tool, because it prevents the knowledge 'brain drain' (Pfleeger & Mertz 1995) that would otherwise take place when a senior academic retires. In the South African context, which is experiencing a decline in the number of 'senior' academics and an increase in the number of 'junior' early career academics, it is worth acknowledging that there is a wealth of expertise and experience at both levels which the model presented in this article attempts to harness.

Like age, the gender composition of the mentor-mentee relationship has been found to play a crucial role in determining its success. Typically, both participants have to deal with sexual tensions and fears, public scrutiny and stereotypical male/female roles (Hunt & Michael 1983). Kram (1980) found that female mentees are most likely to experience greater social distance and general discomfort when the mentor is male. Similarly, some of the women in Gibson's (2006) study did not feel that male mentors are able to address 'women-concerns' due to a lack of experience and/or understanding. In contrast, Stewart (1977) found that female mentees are most likely to forge emotional ties with their male mentors. While the challenges posed by mixed gender mentorship relationships have long been noted in the literature, little information exists on female mentor-female mentee or female mentor-male mentee relationships. The lack of female mentors could be due to the fact that senior positions in many professions, including higher education, are occupied by men.

Perhaps more than any other factor, race is a critical consideration in mentoring relationships in South African higher education. Given the country's history, in most South African institutions, including higher education, 'the higher the rank the fewer the number of women, Africans, Coloureds and Indians' (Gilmore, Coetzee & Schreuder 2005: 28). Racial diversity and inequality are, of course, not unique to South Africa; Aminian's (2018) study of the impact of same race mentoring on adult female students enrolled at an American College found that 'although some African-American students have been successful in their mentoring relationships with mentors outside of their

race and gender, they all expressed their preference to have a female African-American mentor (2018: iv). Similarly, Richard *et al.* conclude that 'within a sample of 197 employees from various U.S. companies, racial dissimilarity was negatively related to mentoring quality' (2017: 1).

Despite mentees' expressed preference for same-race mentors, cross race mentoring is deemed necessary because of the skewed racial make-up among academics – the more senior the staff, the more likely he/she is to be white. This underscores the need to be aware that cross-race mentoring 'requires extra sensitivity because racial, cultural, and ethnic differences strongly influence how individuals view and experience the world' (Hunter 2014: 2). Variables such as 'cultural differences regarding communication style, power and authority, individualism versus collectivism, and conflict management may hinder relationships' (Hunter 2014: 2).

In light of the literature on the effects of age, gender, and race on mentorship relationships, many argue for the concept of homophily in such relationships. Homophily is defined by Rogers and Bhowmik (1970) as the degree to which a group or pairs of individuals who interact are similar with regard to attributes, beliefs, values, and social factors. It rests on the notion that the psychosocial functions of mentoring – role modelling, respect, confirmation, and assistance in coping with work demands (Hunter 2014) – are more easily provided by mentors of the same race, age, and/or gender as the mentee. In a study by Holmes *et al.* (2007), black women:

> ... described both positive and negative experiences with same-race and same-gender mentors, and mentors who were a different race and gender. The most important factor was mentor's commitment to the mentee's success, regardless of the race and gender of the mentor (College of Medicine – Phoenix n.d.: 2).

Other research affirms this view. Hunter (2014: 16) quotes Smith *et al.*'s study that 'finds no significant differences in career mentoring or psychosocial support when comparing homogenous mentoring pairs (same gender and race) and diversified pairings (different gender or race)'. She concludes that while race and gender matter in some areas, they are not the most important factors.

Perhaps the most important of Hunter's claims in terms of their relevance to our proposed model, is that 'numerous studies have shown that women and faculty of colour have fewer mentors, face more isolation, and may

be less entrenched in informal departmental networks' (Hunter 2014, referring to Fox 2001; Preston 2004; Thompson 2008; Wasburn 2007). She explains:

> Because mentors may unintentionally gravitate toward people like themselves, women and minorities may be mentored less frequently than white males and therefore be less likely to reap the many rewards of receiving mentoring. Majority faculty members may also be hesitant to mentor underrepresented faculty simply because they are inexperienced with it (Hunter 2014: 18).

In order to reduce the challenges a diverse faculty can face in terms of mentorship, our model is also informed by the idea of 'Mutual Mentoring' developed by Yun, Baldi and Sorcinelli. They provide compelling evidence that this model has had a 'successful and sustainable impact' (2016: 449):

> 'Mutual Mentoring' distinguishes itself from the traditional model by encouraging the development of a broader, more flexible network of support that mirrors the diversity of real-life mentoring in which no single person is required or expected to possess the expertise of many. Within this model, early-career faculty build robust networks by engaging multiple 'mentoring partners' in non-hierarchical, collaborative partnerships to address specific areas of knowledge and experience, such as research, teaching, tenure, and work-life balance. These partnerships should be designed to benefit not only the person traditionally known as the 'protégé', but also the person traditionally known as the 'mentor', thus building on the idea that all members of an academic community have something to teach and learn from each other (Yun, Baldi & Sorcinelli 2016: 449).

The assumption underpinning this approach is that a single mentor may not embody all the attributes that constitute an academic's work. The multiple mentor/partnership seeks to harness the collective wisdom and expertise which allow different needs to be met through the diverse range of expertise available. It may also reduce the burden on mentors who would otherwise be overwhelmed in an effort to be all things to all people. It recognises that mentoring is not an innate attribute for many of us – in that we do not possess

pre-wired knowledge about how to mentor or be mentored. Rather, it is a skill that needs to be learned, cultivated and internalised.

Peer mentoring is another model formulated as a response to traditional mentoring, and evident in both academia and industry. Like traditional mentoring, it has been found to be beneficial in promoting career enhancement and psychosocial wellbeing between the parties involved (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor 2002). While traditional mentoring is a relationship between an older, experienced individual, and a younger novice who is still navigating the academy, peer mentoring involves participants of similar age, rank and experience. It is understood to be reciprocal in nature, since all participants usually have something of value to contribute and gain from one another (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor 2002).

Although peer mentoring is a familiar approach, Cassese and Holman acknowledge that a 'systematic assessment of peer-mentoring programs is largely absent from the literature' (2018: 4). There is some evidence however, that amongst other benefits, peer mentoring promotes information sharing, career planning, and job related feedback (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor 2002). While it has been effective in eliminating hierarchies between the parties involved, it has been found to limit career enhancing functions (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor 2002), since peers have lesser exposure to the field of academia and their networks are not as broad as those offered by mentors in traditional relationships. Furthermore, due to the fact that peers have the same level of experience and are bound by similar perspectives, they are often unable to assist one another with the wisdom gained from hindsight (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor 2002).

While mentorship in higher education has long been acknowledged as a valuable tool for professional development and upward mobility (Welch 1996) it is not without its hazards and is not always beneficial to the mentee and mentor. Eby, McManus, Simon and Russell (2000 cited in Hezlett & Gibson 2005) identified five negative mentorship relationships: mismatches between dyads; distancing behaviour; manipulative behaviour; lack of mentor expertise; and general dysfunctionality. Such negative relationships often result in feelings of depression and job withdrawal and sometimes prompt the mentee to terminate the relationship. In addition, consistent with Bandura's (1977) social learning theory, mentees who admire their mentors may be more likely to assimilate their behaviour, which may be productive, but, which also may not be, in some cases.

Blunt and Conolly's (2006) study in South Africa found that mentoring was different from managing, coaching and supervising. Upon initiation of the mentoring relationship, mentors were found to be less focused on a defined outcome and seemed to expect 'whatever comes up' (Blunt & Conolly 2006: 205). Unlike managing, coaching and supervising; mentoring has also been found to be confidential with a strong emphasis on trust (Blunt & Conolly 2006).

Analysing mentoring relationships, Kram (1985) cautions that classical relationships where individuals are assigned to each other by a higher authority may not be as beneficial as relationships that develop spontaneously between individuals. Noe (1998) recognised that personality conflicts may arise between individuals where the supervisor may perceive his/her ability to supervise the protégé to have been eroded by the presence of a mentor. Moreover, forced mentorship relationships may cause protégés to perceive that they are unable to make autonomous decisions.

In what follows, we elucidate mentorship development in relation to professional development at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN). This is followed by the elucidation of a model which was designed in response to the UKZN context, underpinned by universal principles gleaned from the literature. The model is a combination of traditional and peer mentoring practices, drawing on the work of Sorcinelli and Yun (2009). They propose 'non-hierarchical, collaborative, and cross-cultural partnerships' (2009: 369).

Mentorship and Professional Development

Although it may be argued that mentoring in the South African higher education context is largely ad hoc in practice and under-explored in research, professional development in higher education has a much longer history. For example, consonant with the SSAUF, UKZN has approximately 20 policies designed to 'promote professional practice and enhance the productivity of its staff' (Subbaye & Dhunpath 2016: 4). The University has also introduced the On-Boarding Line Manager Tool Kit – a 12-month process aimed at welcoming new employees to UKZN, ensuring 'effective integration of employees into the University' and helping to create a 'positive and supportive working environment through defining performance expectations, maintaining motivation and identify training and development needs to assist them perform their duties effectively and efficiently'.

On-boarding takes place between the new employee (irrespective of academic level) and his/her line manager. The process is supposed to begin at least one month before the new employee's arrival and continues for a year during which the line manager conducts performance reviews at six-month intervals. However, there is no mention of mentorship in this process. At most, the line manager is expected to schedule meetings with 'key role players who will be working with the new employee (e.g. colleagues, finance, academic administration)'.

UKZN also has a formal University Education Induction Programme (UEIP), distinct from a typical mentorship programme, which all new and existing academic staff (below the level of senior lecturer) are required to complete. The 80-hour programme comprises four modules taken over two years: teaching and learning in higher education, assessing teaching and learning in higher education, designing and evaluating curricula in higher education, and research supervision in higher education. While there has been significant compliance with this requirement, given that academic staff at or above the level of senior lecturer are exempted, many academics have not completed this – or any other – programme aimed at developing and promoting teaching and learning and research excellence.

Emphasising the importance of both 'relevant theoretical knowledge for underpinning practice and that of supportive networks for collaborative learning from experience, critical reflection on practice and wider participation', CHE researchers, Leibowitz *et al.* (2017: 28), suggest that academic staff development could be 'located along a continuum, with largely theory-based learning at the one end of the continuum, and informal, practice-based acquisition at the other end' (Leibowitz *et al.* 2017: 29).

While UKZN has institutionalised the formal aspects of staff development – PhD qualifications and the requirement of Teaching Portfolios for promotion – limited attention has been paid to less formal aspects such as reading circles, work groups, and mentoring. Comments taken from a survey of UKZN academics who participated in the UEIP indicate that this gap is felt acutely by staff:

> We are not mentored or shown the ropes by anyone, and have to fumble our way around finding our feet. Nothing is made easy and we aren't told what we need to do (Lecturer 48, CLMS, quoted in Subbaye & Dhunpath 2016: 11).

> I would have loved to have a mentor because sometimes when you keep asking colleagues about things some of them start to look at you like you are lazy or stupid while all what you need is to understand how things are done (Lecturer 34, CHS, quoted in Subbaye & Dhunpath 2016: 11).

As a result of the institutionalisation of the formal aspects of staff development, it may be argued that the emphasis is on compliance with legislative requirements rather than on the creation and promotion of an ethos of professional development. At the time of concluding this article, the UKZN Human Resources Division was in the process of developing a mentorship programme for its early career academics. The structural location of a mentorship programme within a Human Resources Division could arguably have the effect of privileging compliance to preferred institutional identities which emanate largely from a centralised managerial discourse. Matters foregrounding adherence to staff conditions of service could potentially dominate the discourse when evaluating the impact of the interventions chosen. Instead, the goal for the unfolding mentorship initiative recognises that it is academics themselves who should exercise their agentic capabilities to define the nature and direction of the growth trajectories they select whilst cognisant that such choices are not independent of ambient institutional expectations and wider societal contextual imperatives.

Towards an Inclusive Model of Mentorship in Higher Education

In its quest to activate knowledge that is socially responsive and contributes to the realisation of social justice, UKZN's Strategic Plan emphasises four domains of professional development: teaching, learning, and assessment; research development and dissemination; community engagement; and university service and administration. The proposed model of mentorship is designed to respond to these four domains, taking cognisance of the fact that they expand and intersect, revealing changing, and sometimes competing, roles and expectations.

The UKZN Strategic Plan adopts a people-centred approach and aims to recast the notion of the academic as individual – to the individual as part of

the collective. As such, the model for professional development moves away from the procedural to the substantive, from the atomistic to the relational. As Pithouse-Morgan *et al.* argue, there is a need to see:

> ... collegial relationships as critical to the growth of self-belief and self-resourcefulness in becoming and being academics … how, through collective participation, novice and experienced academics can become valuable sources of learning and support for each other (Pithouse-Morgan *et al.* 2016: 224).

Central to this model is the mentee who is the primary determiner of goals and needs. As Gee explains, 'universities are vastly diverse' (Gee 2017: webpage) and as such, an 'institution must understand why – or if – they need a mentor programme' (ibid.). We take this a step further and suggest that in the context of diversity, it is the mentee rather than the institution that makes decisions about mentoring needs and goals, where the mentee self-selects a mentor and a formal agreement is not an expectation. This is due to the problems associated with the most common approach to mentoring programmes, in which mentors are matched with mentees based on some real (or perceived) skill that the mentor has and the mentee lacks and needs. This 'guru' model assumes a number of things: that a single person (the mentor) can meet all the mentee's needs; and that someone external to the relationship (usually non-academic human resources personnel) can determine the suitability of and chemistry between the members of the match.

The matrix below serves as a generic menu of possibilities for establishing growing levels of complexification of possible targets. Each cell is illustrative of potential rather than the expansive coverage of the continuum of possibilities for the creation of a professional development plan. While the grid suggests that different ranks of lectureship (lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, and full professor) might operate at different levels (A, B, or C), it is more likely that each academic might be more accomplished in some than other levels across the grid. This opens the official recognition of diversity and the recognition of diverse strengths and areas of expertise and exceptionalism, as well as areas of excellence, and the acknowledgement of individual performance in the high stakes of various forms of merit. This though, does not detract from the desirability, nor the fostering of skills and knowledge in the various generic performance areas.

		A	B	C
		Some baseline elements	**Further dimensions**	**More advanced levels**
	Targeted level→	**Lecturer/ Senior Lecturer (L/SL)**	**Lecturer/ Senior Lecturer/ Associate Professor (L/SL/AP)**	**Associate Professor/ Full Professor (AP/FP)**
1. TEACHING				
1.1	Classroom/ lecture room pedagogy	Includes classroom strategies to manage the pedagogical space to promote 'systematic organisation of learning' (Morrow 1997) (*Teacher as Skilled Practitioner*)	Includes designing appropriate teaching, learning, and assessment strategies to respond to targeted students (Chikoko 2016) (*Teacher as knowledge organiser*)	Includes developing publishable teaching/ learning material related to 'signature pedagogy' (Shulman 2016) in the discipline (*Teacher as knowledge producer*)
1.2	Curriculum Design	Includes being able to select relevant material and pedagogical strategies to scaffold learning for the targeted learning	Includes remaining abreast of disciplinary knowledge within the field of expertise through networking with the academic	Includes knowledge of (higher education) policy requirements in formulation of new courses, including quality assurance and regulatory procedures for such. This extends to the role of regulating/ assuring/ developing the quality of their curriculum activity.

		group (students) (*Teacher as curriculum designer*)	community (Lave & Wenger 1991) (*Teacher as discipline expert*)	(*Teacher as curriculum policy developer*) of an academic in self-
1.3	Developing scholarship of teaching and learning	Includes developing competences to research one's own practice, and monitor and evaluate pedagogical inputs, processes and outputs (Samuel 2017) (*Teacher as researcher of pedagogy*)	Includes foregrounding student success with classroom pedagogy and curriculum choices. This includes debates around curriculum choices/ selections which could accept/ exclude particular knowledges related to agendas such as social justice, hegemonic demarcations and contestions, knowledge privileging, decolonisations, etc. (Dhunpath & Vithal 2012) (*Teacher as facilitator of learning*)	Includes publication around higher education pedagogy and curriculum, evaluated against social responsiveness and social justice considerations (Singh 2001) (*Teacher as publisher*)

2. RESEARCH				
2.1	Completing a (postgrad-duate) qualification	Includes reviewing selected pragmatic strategies for designing a research study; Conducting research and literature review; Selecting a research focus and topic; Establishing supervisor-supervised expectations; Managing time and budget for research (*Researcher as student*)	Includes engaging with theoretical development of the chosen field of research *(Researcher as reader/ commentator developer of the theoretical landscape of discipline/s)*	Includes completing/ overseeing the target examination process and product requirements (e.g. proposal defence, thesis writing, language editing, oral defence, response to examiners' reports) (Traffford & Leshem 2008) (*Researcher as 'the examined'/ the examiner)*
2.2	Designing and conducting fieldwork research	Includes developing relevant socially responsive research design projects (small scale) with coordinated fieldwork, time frames and budget	Includes understanding and engaging the possibilities and limitations of inter-/ trans-/ juxta-/ multi-disciplinary research (Nikitinia 2006)	Includes developing grant proposals for funding of large scale research projects which involve management of multiple partners in the collaborative research process; Engaging with regional, national and/or international research collaborations; Setting up research partnerships across inter-

		(Researcher as manager of a small research project)	*(Researcher as mediator across disciplines)*	institutional partners (*Researcher as team worker*)
2.3	Supervising research	Includes managing, coordinating and overseeing the research design, development and dissertation/ thesis construction of individual postgraduate students (*Researcher as supervisor of postgraduate students*)	Includes managing and coordinating teams of supervisors and students in collaborative study projects (*Researcher as supervisory manager of teams in collaborative research projects*)	Includes development and advisory role in a network of supervisors within, between, and/or across disciplinary focal areas in large-scale projects involving multiple institutions, students, researchers, research partners to address macro-systemic issues. Could involve policy-making processes (*Researcher as developer, innovator of theories, models, policy designs*)
2.4	Developing a(n) (inter)nationa l research profile	Includes planning, co-ordination and engaging with institutional, local, regional networks to disseminate and participate in research dialogues: presentations seminars,	Includes responding to the target of being (inter) nationally recognised for one's scholarship in research; Leading the design and delivery of research forums to	Includes being involved in sharing research knowledge as a key shaper of/ contributor to the direction of the discipline/ field (e.g. being invited as keynote speaker at conferences, plenary panel member at an (inter)national conference/ research forum; lead and conduct colloquia in

		workshops, colloquia, conferences (*Researcher as participator in research forums*)	activate the body of inter-/trans-/ /juxta-/multi-disciplinary knowledge and practice (*Researcher as knowledge mediator*)	new focal areas; organise and develop conference agendas and themes to establish the field) (*Researcher as international expert*)
2.5	Publication	Includes being able to successfully submit and publish articles in conference proceedings, and/or an accredited journal. Mentors should guide mentees about the 'publication industries' which have commodified academic publication outputs, as well as alert them to the hostile 'predatory' publishing houses and journals'	Includes widening the scope of publications such as chapters in books, editorial compilations of anthologies; Includes peer reviewing for academic publishing in publishing houses, and /or journals (*Researcher as quality assurer of research publications)*	Includes publication of single authored books outlining a targeted areas of expertise; shaping the development of international handbooks in targeted disciplines/ fields; Includes serving on editorial boards and serving as Guest Editor of special issues of journals Includes single-authored research monographs scoping the development of(new) directions for the discipline/field (*Researcher as informed shaper of the field*)

		practices which prey on novice/ unsuspecting victims in academia (*Researcher as knowledge disseminator through reputed publications outlets*)		

3. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT				
3.1	Linking academic work and the social world	Includes developing operational strategies and practices for collaboration between the world of academia (higher education institutions) and the targeted social community in small scale projects (*Community developer as social agent*)	Includes organising and managing the intersection of multiple teams of research partners, community participants and targeted collaborative sites for co-defined growth and innovation (Preece 2016) (*Community engager as team builder of socially relevant knowledges*)	Includes the development of relevant and socially just (institutional, national and international) policy and practice related to activating the scholarship of the field of academia within, with and for the social context (*Community engagers as shapers of systemic responses*)

3.2	Service the needs of the community	Includes development of scoping of challenges and opportunities within targeted community to activate scholarship, research or innovative practices (*Community developers raising awareness of social challenges and opportunities*)	Includes designing the processes of addressing challenges, harnessing strengths within a targeted community to address, expand, contribute to the development of a more socially just community (*Community engager as agent of community assuring the value of knowledge in, of, for and with partners*)	Includes the alignment of appropriate macro-political/ social/ economic/ cultural resources, practices, knowledges to activate a more systemic socially just response to the needs of targeted communities; Responses might include a variety of public awareness raising and dissemination strategies including development of policy, communication strategies, media involvement, publications outlining the limits and potential of communities, distribution of human, physical and/or financial resources (*Community engager as systemic developer*)

4. UNIVERSITY SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION				
4.1	Within discipline/ school	Includes familiarity with the policies and practices within the School with respect to areas listed above (# 1, 2, 3 and 4) *(University academic as employee)* [Induction/orientation]	Includes participation in team work to critique discipline/ School practices and policies; Includes reviewing the limits and	Includes the development of policy and practices to shape the operational and conceptual worlds of the School's activities (e.g.

			potential of existing policies and practices within the discipline and schools; Includes promoting the blurring of boundaries across disciplines and schools. (*University service as shared dialogue amongst discipline/ School*)	through participation in sub-committees of the discipline, cluster; being a member of School Board committees and structures) (*University service as service to discipline/School development*)
4.2	Within the institution	Includes familiarity with the policies and practices within the College, the institution with respect to areas listed above (# 1,2, 3 and 4) (*University academic as employee*) [Induction/orientation]	Includes participation in team work to critique College and institutional policies and practices; Includes reviewing the limits and potential of existing policies and practices within the College and institution; Includes promoting the blurring of boundaries across Colleges	Includes the development of policy and practices to shape the operational and conceptual worlds of the institution's activities through e.g. involvement in College, Senate institutional committees; participation in institutional committees/ structures/ processes Includes involvement in national policy

			and across different higher education institutions (*University service as shared dialogue amongst College, institution collaborators*)	making processes (e.g. national departmental policy consultation and/or development processes; involvement in international networks systemically related to high education) (*University administrator as shaper of systemic institutional, regional, national, international processes*)

The model attempts to shift the conversation about mentoring 'from one that is centred around the ability to find a relationship with a senior faculty member on campus to one that focuses on identifying needs and getting them met' (Gee 2017: webpage). The underlying principle is that successful mentors intervene appropriately in response to the selected goals of the individual mentee – related to their specific contexts, circumstances, rank, and their network of available peers, together with their responsiveness to the broader social context. Together, mentor and mentee tailor-make unique pathways for mutual development, providing opportunities for monitoring achievement of such. As such, mentoring resists the hierarchical imposition of targets in favour of an agenda co-constructed through *collaborative negotiated reflection,* arising out of the specific contexts of the mentor and mentee. The model acknowledges the importance of embracing the complexities of the world of work as well as connecting with the personal and psycho-social and affective domains which mediate the quality of engagement of the mentee within institutional spaces. Simultaneously, personal, home,

community and institutional expectations coalesce to activate mentee selections, redefining both the mentee and the institutional space. This necessarily includes attention to both mentee's being (present status) and becoming (projected status) in a planned career trajectory. Finally, the model acknowledges the current competence level of the mentee and the projected short-medium-and long-term goals for their professional development. Each plan is necessarily unique and requires selected formal, informal, and non-formal interventions.

Concluding Comments

In this discussion, we have sought to demonstrate that the roles, identities, accountabilities and responsibilities of academics (i.e. 'academic work') are not necessarily uni-dimensional, stable or coherent. These roles shift over time and space, in different disciplines, units, or teams and some may conflict with others. The role of the mentor is to assist the mentee to make judgements across these multiple roles and identities in relation to targeted goals of advancement and the mentee's career planning. Mentorship relies strongly on the knowledge, commitment, and experiences of both the mentor and mentee. It is a relationship of trust to set and review manageable and feasible goals to assist mentees to achieve their prospective plans toward personal and professional growth.

It is also critical that we recognise that not all (senior) (experienced) staff are automatically skilled mentors. Targeted programmes may need to be designed to activate specific competences of mentors to achieve the range of goals set out in the above matrix. These programmes are a form of 'mentoring the mentor'. Furthermore, we should not assume that mentors need to be sourced only from within full-time university staff members. Outside experts/consultants/veterans, retired university staff members and other community-based experts who can share knowledge from the wider social world could also be drawn in to serve as mentors.

Finally, while there is a place for 'institutionalised mentorship programmes which enable early career academics and more experienced academics to share their individual experiences through critical conversations' (Subbaye & Dhunpath 2016: 15), there is no 'one-size-fits-all' approach to a mentorship model; context matters. Because every model has its benefits and burdens, we should be less concerned with ranking types of mentoring and focus more on

understanding which mentorship approaches best fulfil the mentorship needs at hand. While the waters surrounding the concept of mentorship may be muddy, we do need to wade through them because, as Lundquist and Misra point out, 'while academe lacks day-to-day structures to encourage mentoring, long-term tenure and promotion prospects essentially rely on it' (Lundquist & Misra 2017: webpage).

Acknowledgement

We express our gratitude to Nolwazi Zama, a UTLO Research Intern, who undertook the literature search for this article. We also acknowledge the contribution of the UKZN Mentorship Development Pilot Group of 2018.

References

Aminian, Z. 2018. Impact of Same-Race Mentoring on Adult Female African-American Students Enrolled at a Regional State College. *All Theses and Dissertations 151*. Available at: http://dune.une.edu/theses/151. (Accessed on 11 February 2018.)

Angelique, H., K. Kyle & E. Taylor 2002. Mentors and Muses: New Strategies for Academic Success. *Innovative Higher Education* 26,3:195 - 209. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017968906264

Bandura, A. 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Blunt, R.J.S. & J. Conolly 2006. Perceptions of Mentoring: Expectations of a Key Resource for Higher Education. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 20,2:195 - 208.

Cassese, E. & M. Holman 2018. Writing Groups as Models for Peer Mentorship among Female Faculty in Political Science. *Political Science and Politics* 51,2:401 - 405. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096517002049

Chikoko, V. 2016. Issues in Africanising Higher Education Curricula. In Msila, V. & M.T. Gumbo (eds): *Africanising the Curriculum: Indigenous Perspectives and Theories*. Stellenbosch: SUNMeDIA.

College of Medicine – Phoenix. n.d. Diversity Issues in Mentoring. Available at:

http://phoenixmed.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/faculty/facdev/mentoring/diversity-issues-mentoring.pdf (Accessed on 11 February 2018.)

Crisp, G. & I. Cruz 2009. Mentoring College Students: A Critical Review of the Literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education* 50,6:525 - 545. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9130-2

Darwin, A. & E. Palmer 2009. Mentoring Circles in Higher Education. *Higher Education Research and Development* 28,2:125 - 136. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360902725017

Dhunpath, R. & R. Vithal 2012. *Alternative Access to Higher Education: Under-prepared Students or Under-prepared Institutions*. Cape Town: Pearson.

Foote, K.E. & M.N. Solem 2009. Toward Better Mentoring for Early Career Faculty: Results of a Study of US Geographers. *International Journal for Academic Development* 14,1:47 - 58. https://doi.org/10.1080/13601440802659403

Gee, C. 2017. 5 Fairy Tales People Believe about Mentoring in Higher Education: Academic Impressions. Available at: https://www.academicimpressions.com/5-fairy-tales-people-believe-about-mentoring-in-higher-ed/. (Accessed on 08 March 2018).

Gibson, S.K. 2006. Whose Best Interests are Served? The Distinction between Mentoring and Support. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 7,4:470 - 488. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422305279678

Gilmore, N., M. Coetzee & D. Schreuder 2005. Experiences of the Mentoring Relationship: A Study in a Mining Company. *South African Journal of Resource Management* 3,3:27 - 32. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v3i3.71

Hanover Research 2014. Faculty Mentoring Models and Effective Mentoring. Hanover: Academy Administration Practice. Available at: http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/guidelines.shtml (Accessed on 02 February 2018.)

Hezlett, S.A. & S.K. Gibson 2005. Mentoring and Human Resource Development: Where We are and Where We Need to Go. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 7,4:446 - 469. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422305279667

Holmes, S.L., L.D. Land & V.D. Hinton-Hudson 2007. Race Still Matters:

Considerations for Mentoring Black Women in Academe. *The Negro Educational Review* 58,1-2:105 - 129.

Hunt, D.M. & C. Michael 1983. Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool. *Academy of Management Review* 8,3:475 - 485. https://doi.org/10.2307/257836

Hunter, L. 2014. Faculty Mentoring Handbook, University of Arizona. Available at: http://live-uarizona-diversity.pantheon.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/diversity_issues.pdf. (Accessed on 18 February 2018.)

Kram, K.E. 1980. *Mentoring Processes at Work: Developmental Relationships in Managerial Careers*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, New Haven.

Lave, J. & E. Wenger (eds.) 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Leibowitz, B., V. Bozalek, J. Garraway, N. Herman, J. Jawitz, P. Muhuro, C. Ndebele, L.Quinn, S. van Schalkwyk, J-A. Vorster & C. Winberg 2017. *Learning to Teach in Higher Education in South Africa: An Investigation into the Influences of Institutional Context on the Professional Learning of Academics in their Roles as Teachers.* Pretoria: Council on Higher Education. (Higher Education Monitor 14.) Available at: http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/PUB_HE%20Monitor%2014_20170401.pdf (Accessed on 16 June 2018.)

Lundquist, J. & J. Misra 2017. Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring. *Inside Higher Education* 13 July 2017. Available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2017/07/13/how-find-mentors-and-be-good-one-yourself-essay (Accessed on 08 March 2018.)

Morrow, W. 1997. *Learning to Teach in South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

Nikitinia, S. 2006. Three Strategies for Interdisciplinary Teaching: Contextualising, Conceptualising and Problem-centring. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 38,3:251 - 271. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270500422632

Noe, R.A. 1998. Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda: *The Academy of Management Review* 13,1:65 - 78. https://doi.org/10.2307/258355

Nzimande, B.E. 2015. Foreword by the Minister. Available at: http://www.ssauf.dhet.gov.za/Content/Foreword%20by%20Minister.pdf. (Accessed on 11 February 2018.)

Pithouse-Morgan, K., I. Naicker, D. Pillay, D. Masinga & T. Hlao 2016. Sink or Swim? Learning from Stories of Becoming Academics within a Transforming University Terrain. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 30,1:224 - 244. https://doi.org/10.20853/30-1-561

Pfleeger, S.L. & N. Mertz 1995. Executive Mentoring: What Makes it Work? *Communications of the ACM* 38,1:63 - 73. https://doi.org/10.1145/204865.204880

Preece, J. 2016. Mediating Power through a Pedagogy of Dialogue and Listening in Community Engagement. In Samuel, M.A., R. Dhunpath & N. Amin (eds): *Disrupting Higher Education Curriculum: Undoing Cognitive Damage*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-896-9_10

Quinn, L. & J-A. Vorster 2012. Training New Academics is a Complex Challenge. *Mail & Guardian*. Available at: https://mg.co.za/article/2012-10-05-00-training-new-academics-is-a-complex-challenge. (Accessed on 11 February 2018.)

Richard, O.C., P.F. McKay, S. Garg & S. Pustovit 2017. The Impact of Supervisor – Subordinate, Racial - Ethnic and Gender Dissimilarity on Mentoring Quality and Turnover Intentions: Do Positive Affectivity and Communal Culture Matter? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 1 - 28. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1344288

Rogers, E.M. & D.K. Bhowmik 1970. Homophily-heterophily: Relational Concepts for Communication Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 34,4:523 - 538. https://doi.org/10.1086/267838

Rockquemore, K.A. 2016. Why Mentor Matches Fail. *Inside Higher Education* 03 February 2016. Available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2016/02/03/most-mentoring-today-based-outdated-model-essay. (Accessed on 08 March 2018.)

Samuel, M.A. 2017. Developing a Syntax for SOTL. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South* 1,1:19 - 38.

Shulman, L. 2016. Between Research and Practice: Situating a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning within the Professional, Intellectual and Moral Landscape of the Academy. Keynote address presented at University Teaching and Learning 10th Annual Conference. Durban. September 2016. Available at: http://utlo.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/Documents/Lee_Shulman.sflb.ashx (Accessed on 7 July 2017.)

Singh, M. 2001. Re-inserting the 'Public Good' into Higher Education Transformation. In *Kagisano: Higher Education Discussion Series* 1:8 - 18.

Sorcinelli, M. & J. Yun 2009. *Mutual Mentoring Guide*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.

Stewart, W.A. 1977. *A Psychosocial Study of the Formation of the Early Adult Life Structure in Women*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Subbaye, R. & R. Dhunpath 2016. Early-Career Academic Support at the University of KwaZulu-Natal: Towards a Scholarship of Teaching. *Studies in Higher Education* 41,10:1803 - 1819. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1221657

Traffford, V. & S. Leshem 2008. *Stepping Stones to Achieving your Doctorate: by Focusing on Your Viva from the Start*. Berkshire: OUP.

Welch, O. 1996. An Examination of Effective Mentoring Models in the Academy. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. Available at: https://archive.org/stream/ERIC_ED394464/ERIC_ED394464_djvu.txt. (Accessed on 7 July 2017.)

Yun, J., B. Baldi & M. Sorcinelli 2016. Mutual Mentoring for Early-Career and Underrepresented Faculty: Model, Research, and Practice. *Innovative Higher Education* 41:441 - 451. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-016-9359-6

Yun, J., B. Baldi & D. Sorcinelli 2016. Mutual Mentoring Model. Available at: http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/guidelines.shtml (Accessed on 02 February 2018.)

Rubby Dhunpath
University Teaching and Learning Office
University of KwaZulu-Natal
dhunpath@ukzn.ac.za

Towards a Model of Mentoring in South African Higher Education

Heidi Matissonn
School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics
University of KwaZulu-Natal
matisonnh@ukzn.ac.za

Michael Samuel
School of Education
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Samuelm@ukzn.ac.za