

**A Sociological Discuss of Mentoring Among Academic Staff in Selected Universities in Edo State**

**By**

**Enaruna Ehimwenma IDUBOR**

**PG/SSC1615323**

**Department of Sociology and Anthropology,  
Faculty of Social Sciences,  
University of Benin, Benin City**

**December 2019**

**A Sociological Discuss of Mentoring Among Academic Staff in Selected Universities in Edo State**

**Enaruna Ehimwenma IDUBOR**

**PG/SSC1615323**

**Being a Thesis presented to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Award of Master of Science (M.Sc) in Industrial Sociology and Labour Relations**

**Prof. A. O. Dokpesi  
Supervisor**

**December 2019**

## **DECLARATION**

I, Enaruna Ehimwenma IDUBOR declare that this submission is my own work and to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously written by another person except where due acknowledgement has been made in the text.

**Enaruna Ehimwenma IDUBOR**

## **CERTIFICATION**

We certify that this work was carried out by Enaruna Ehimwenma IDUBOR in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City.

**Prof. A. O. Dokpesi**  
**Supervisor**

**Dr. Osunde**  
**Head of Department**

\

## **DEDICATION**

This work is respectfully dedicated to Professor Barnabas Aigbojie Agbonifoh who is a Mentor of mentors, my teacher and my friend. Your tireless assistance and encouragement especially in my academic career is very much appreciated. Also to Professor Festus Iyayi who remains a beacon for me towards academic excellence. Thank you both for believing in me.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I thank the Almighty God for His benevolence and abundant mercy upon my life over the years and during the course of this program. My love and thanks goes to my husband Efehi Idubor for remaining a caring husband, brother and friend. I am grateful to my children and family for their love and support.

I acknowledge with deep gratitude my mentors who over the years have taught me all that I now know – Archbishop Margaret Benson Idahosa, Hon. Justice V. Eborieme, Bishop Dickson Ogbahon, Profs. Dafe Otobo, C. A. Okafor, F. I. O. Izedonmi, Eseosa Bob- Osaze, J. O. Ilaboya, Bayo Akerele, Dr. Ibrahim Shaibu, Dr. Simon Adekunle (Master), Prof. (Mrs.). C. A. Ofovwe, and Dr. J. A. Egonmwan

I wish to express my immense gratitude to my supervisor and mentor Prof. A. O. Dokpesi who has taught me so much and has given me opportunities both to learn and teach.

I am very grateful to my friends both within and outside the University of Benin who greatly assisted me in the course of this program – Mr. Kelvin Ajayi, Dr. Joseph Aihie, Dr. Osunde, Eng. Harry Omogiawi, Prof. Kingsley Omoyibo, Dr. Obarisiagbon, Dr. Sadoh, Prof. Osemwenkhae, my elder brother Prof. Dickson Oriakhi, Dr. David Umuobarie, Dr. Ogie, Dr. Raphael, and indeed all the lecturers in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and my classmates especially Mr. Precious Iduoba and Mrs Janice Asonye. I say a big thank you to all my colleagues in the Department of Business Administration especially Mrs. Iso and Mrs. Sanni.

I am especially grateful to the lecturers who graciously took part in this study in the University of Benin, Ambrose Alli University, and Igbinedion University.

I wish to also thank Mrs. Maria and Miss Success for patiently and expertly typing this work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
DECLARATION	ii
CERTIFICATION	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
ABSTRACT	xi
<b>SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Research Problem	2
1.3 Research Questions	4
1.4 Statement of the Research Objectives	4
1.5 Scope of the Study	5
1.6 Significance of the Study	5
1.7 Definition of Key Terms	6
<b>SECTION TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Concept of Mentoring	7
2.3 Types of Mentoring	9
2.4 Benefits of Mentoring	14

2.4.1	Benefits of mentoring for Protégés	14
2.4.2	Benefits of Mentoring for Mentors	16
2.4.3	Benefits of mentoring for the University	18
2.5	Theories Underpinning Mentoring	20
2.5.1	Social Learning Theory	20
2.5.3	Action – Reflection Model	22
2.5.4	The Apprenticeship Model	23
2.6	Need for Mentoring amongst Nigerian Academic Staff	25
2.7	Challenges Associated with Mentoring in Nigerian Universities	26
2.8	Empirical Review of Literature	29
2.9	Research Gaps	39
2.10	Theoretical Framework	40
2.11	Research Hypotheses	41
<b>SECTION THREE: METHODOLOGY</b>		
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Research Design	43
3.3	The Study Population	43
3.4	Sample Size and Sampling Technique	44
3.5	Operationalization and Measurement of Variables	45
3.6	Sources of Data	46
3.7	The Research Instrument	46
3.8	Validity and Reliability of Research Instrument	47
3.9	Method of Data Analysis	48

## **SECTION FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION**

4.1	Introduction	49
4.2	Description of respondents' demographic variables	49
4.3	Adoption of Mentoring among Academics in Universities in Edo State	55
4.4	Mentoring Activities among Academics in Universities in Edo State	56
4.5	Attitude of Universities' Academics in Edo State towards Mentoring	58
4.6	Challenges of Mentoring among Academics in Universities in Edo State	61
4.7	Specific Challenges associated with different Gender Mentoring Relationships in the University System	63
4.8	Academics' Attitude towards Mentoring System and Practices based on University Ownership	65
4.9	Hypothesis Testing	68
4.10	Discussion of Findings	73

## **SECTION FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1	Introduction	83
5.2	Summary of Findings	83
5.3	Conclusion	84
5.4	Recommendations	85
5.5	Recommendations for Further Research	86
	REFERENCES	87
	APPENDICES	95

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Summary of Empirical Literature	36
Table 3.1: Sampling frame of Population	44
Table 3.2: Measurement of Variables	45
Table 3.3: Reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha	47
Table 4.1: Questionnaire distribution to sampled universities	49
Table 4.2: Sex of respondents	50
Table 4.3: Age of respondents	50
Table 4.4: Marital status of respondents	51
Table 4.5: Educational qualification of respondents	51
Table 4.6: Working experience of respondents	52
Table 4.7: Institutions of respondents	52
Table 4.8: Ranks of respondents	53
Table 4.9: Mentoring experience of respondents (Being a mentor to others)	53
Table 4.10: Mentoring experience of respondents (Being mentored by others)	54
Table 4.11: Current mentoring relationship of respondents	54
Table 4.12: Mentoring status of respondents	55
Table 4.13: Adoption of mentoring practices in universities	55
Table 4.14: Mentoring activities in universities	56
Table 4.15: Attitude of Universities' Academics towards Mentoring	58
Table 4.16: Challenges of Mentoring among Academics in Universities in Edo State	61
Table 4.17: Specific Challenges associated with different Gender Mentoring Relationships	64
Table 4.18: Attitude to mentoring based on universities ownership	66
Table 4.19: Binomial Test for Hypothesis One	69
Table 4.20: Binomial Test for Hypothesis Two	69
Table 4.21: One-Sample Test for Hypothesis Three	70
Table 4.22: Independent Sample test for Hypothesis Four	70
Table 4.23: ANOVA Result of mentoring systems among academics based on ownership structure	71
Table 4.24: Difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership	72

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix I: Questionnaire	95
Appendix II: Reliability Test	101
Appendix III: Frequency Distribution of Items	102

## SECTION ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background to the Study

The act of mentoring is an age long practice that dates back to ancient Greek mythology when Odysseus entrusted the care of his son Telemachus to the charge of an old man named Mentor who guided Telemachus to adulthood and saved his life several times (Cartwright, 2012). Inzer and Crawford (2005) state that mentoring is a one to one relationship that exists between the mentor and the protégé with the aim of the expert (mentor) voluntarily giving time to teach, support and encourage a younger, less experienced person (Protégé). Many organizations have come to recognize the importance of mentoring and coaching programmes and have formalized systems of doing both. The world of work is rapidly changing in Nigeria with the influx of younger persons, women and other minorities into the workforce and the exit of older workers either voluntarily or involuntarily (Agbonifoh & Idubor, 2016). It is therefore expedient that the experience and knowledge of the older workforce be passed on seamlessly to the younger generation through the act of mentoring and knowledge management (Maxwell, 1998).

The importance of mentoring and its benefits not only to the organization, the mentor and protégé, have been severally demonstrated especially in Western countries (Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988; Zachary, 2000; Leidenfrost, Strassnig, Schutz, Carbon & Schabmann, 2014). The situation may be slightly different in Nigerian organizations as noted by Okurame (2008) because the negative connotations of mentors as godfathers. The notion of godfatherism is that an employee is under the protection and influence of a more powerful person with the aim of the junior employee getting benefits he may not ordinarily be entitled to, and for him to avoid punishment

for infractions. Mentoring however is to ensure that the protégé acquires the requisite knowledge, experience and guidance to enable him perform exceptionally on the job in particular and in life generally. It is about getting the protégé to learn from the mentor what he may not ordinarily learn or for him to learn it faster and in greater depth.

Agbonifoh and Idubor (2016) allude to the attitude of many young people in the workplace who regard the older generation as “old school” and the reciprocal perception by the older generation that the young ones have nothing to offer. These attitudes may make mentoring quite difficult. Mentoring requires involvement and sacrifice on both the part of the mentor and protégé.

The number of universities in Nigeria has grown steadily through the years and now stands at 41 Federal universities, 47 State universities and 75 Private universities making a total of 163 universities as at 2017 (National Universities Commission, 2018) with yearly increases in student enrolment. Qualified lecturers are direly needed to perform the roles of teachers, researchers and administrators. Qualification does not reside in certification alone; there is a vast pool of knowledge and experience that resides in older and senior academics that new entrants can greatly benefit from. If effectively used, mentoring can be a veritable tool for enhancing educational standards and performance among lecturers (Ojokulu & Sajuyigbe, 2015), increasing productivity (Sola, 2018), reducing stress for new entrants into the lecturing profession, promoting better organisational norms ( Sweeney, 2004), transmission of positive attitudes (Payne, 2006), helps in the resolution of challenges and predicaments (Okurame, 2008).

## **1.2 Statement of the Research Problem**

The academic environment in Nigerian universities is fraught with a lot of challenges for young academics and it is thought that they can learn a lot from older academics already in the system

(Kolade, 2015; Tanoli, 2016). Nigeria's educational system has come under sharp criticisms in recent times and most of the graduates are said to be unemployable (Uddin & Uddin, 2013; Longe, 2017). The falling standard of education in Nigeria and how to raise the educational bar so that Nigerian graduates can compete favorably with their foreign counterparts is a topical issue in academic discourse (Ojokuku & Sajuyigbe, 2015; Sola, 2018). This fall in educational standard has been suggested to be one of the major reasons for youth unemployment and underperformance of those employed in Nigeria (Anah, Nwosu & Ezeji, 2017). Mentoring and coaching are viable ways to redress this deficiency in their educational training and improve their subsequent performance in the workplace.

An appreciable number of studies have been done on the concept of mentoring in organizations in many parts of the world and there is a general consensus on the need for, and the benefits of mentoring (Kram, 1985; Rothwell, 2005; Olowookere, 2012; Ekechukwu & Horsfall, 2015; Tanoli, 2016). An informal mentoring system is in place within many organizations and formal mentoring is also greatly advocated (Inzer & Crawford, 2005; Kolade, 2015, Sola, 2018).

Several studies have also been done in Nigeria concerning the subject matter. The general approach of Nigerian studies has been to stress the importance and benefits of mentoring in organizations as a tool for accelerating employee performance, career growth, competencies and even for succession planning and staff retention (Elegbuanya, 2012; Ekechukwu & Horsfall, 2015; Omale, Oguiche, Durru & Idodo, 2017). While many studies done on mentoring in Nigerian universities have typically lauded the importance of mentoring and its benefits, few have actually investigated the actual practice of mentoring in Nigerian universities to see if there is actually a formal mentoring system in place, the challenges associated with mentoring for both the mentor and the protégé; the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring

and more importantly, the attitude of academics towards mentoring (Okurame, 2008; Kolade, 2015; Sola, 2018). This study therefore aims to examine these aspects of mentoring within the Nigerian university system.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

In order to investigate the above stated research problem, the following research questions will guide this study:

- (i) To what extent is mentoring (formal and informal) adopted among academics in universities in Edo state?
- (ii) What are the mentoring activities practiced among academic staff of universities in Edo State?
- (iii) What is the attitude of universities' academics in Edo State towards mentoring?
- (iv) What are the challenges of mentoring among academic staff of universities in Edo State?
- (v) Are there specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the University system?
- (vi) Does the attitude towards mentoring among academics in Edo State differ based on ownership of the universities (federal, state and private)?

### **1.4 Statement of the Research Objectives**

The broad objective of the study is to investigate the attitude of academic staff to mentoring in selected universities in Edo State. The specific objectives of the study are to:

- i. Determine the extent to which mentoring is adopted and practiced among academic staff in Universities in Edo state;

- ii. Investigate the mentoring activities that take place among academic staff in Universities in Edo State;
- iii. Find out the attitude of Universities' academics in Edo State towards mentoring;
- iv. Identify the challenges encountered by academics in Universities in Edo State in mentoring relationships;
- v. Find out if there are any specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the University system;
- vi. Investigate if the attitude of academics towards mentoring differs based on ownership structure of the Universities (federal, state and private).

### **1.5 Scope of the Study**

This study is focused on investigating the attitude of academics towards mentoring and the challenges associated with mentoring relationships. It is limited to academic staff of Universities in Edo State and the proposed time frame of the study is between the months of October and November 2018.

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

Considering the importance that many organizations attach to mentoring programs and the benefits that have been demonstrated to accrue from it, it is imperative that the concept should also be studied in relation to academics in Nigerian Universities. This study thus would provide information on the attitude of University academic staff towards mentoring, and the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationship among other things. The information that will be generated by this study will help Universities to embark on or improve on their mentoring programs as a way of improving service delivery. Moreover it will be useful

to educational policy makers to enable them make policies that will harness the vast potentials that mentoring offers.

The study aims to draw attention to challenges associated with mentoring and by so doing will proffer solutions to these challenges and hence make mentoring more beneficial to both the mentor and protégé.

The study will also be invaluable to young academic staff as it will afford them the opportunity of knowing about mentoring and the vast benefits they can derive from been involved in mentoring relationships.

This study will furthermore add to the body of empirical literature on mentoring especially within the academic environment thereby providing important and current information to the academic community and the reading public.

## **1.7 Definition of Key Terms**

**Junior Academic Staff:** For this study junior academic staff will be regarded as those who are Graduate assistants to those who are Lecturer 1.

**Mentor:** A mentor is an experienced and knowledgeable person who voluntarily gives his time to teach, guide and support a less experienced and usually younger person.

**Mentoring:** The methods and process, through which a mentor instructs, coaches, teaches, and guides a protégé.

**Protégé:** An inexperienced person, who is taught, guided and supported by a mentor to gain more knowledge and experience in order to perform creditably on his job and in life.

**Senior Academic Staff:** For this study senior academic staff will be regarded as those who are Senior Lecturers and above.

## SECTION TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature on various aspects of mentoring with particular emphasis on the concept of mentoring, theories of mentoring, importance and benefits of mentoring, challenges of mentoring, the Nigerian perspective of mentoring, methods of academic mentoring and empirical review of studies on mentoring.

#### 2.2 Concept of Mentoring

The concept of mentoring is by no means a new one. The term was first used in 1616 based on Greek mythology when Odysseus entrusted the education of his son Telemachus to his friend Mentor (Cartwright, 2012). However judging from the current definitions of the word mentor as a trusted counselor (Kram, 1985), guide (Moon, 2014), tutor (Azman, Muhammad & Sebastian, 2009), coach (Collins, Brown & Newman, 1987), it would seem that the mentoring function has been going on for as long as man has existed. The Bible records the relationship between Moses and Joshua, Elijah and Elisha, and even Jesus Christ and His disciples; these were all forms of mentoring relationships. Invariably, the end result of mentoring is for the mentor to at least reproduce himself in the protégé or to produce a protégé that can surpass him in his field of expertise and to be able to say like Jesus Christ said to His disciples ‘he that believeth on Me (follows my footsteps), the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do...’ (John 14: 12. The Holy Bible KJV).

Mentoring is one of the few concepts in the Social and Management sciences that have a very homogenous definition across disciplines. This points to the importance of the concept and the agreement by all on the functions it entails. The term mentor is used to refer to the more experienced person while the recipient of the mentoring is variously referred to as either a protégé or mentee, however for this work, the term protégé is used.

Carmin (1988) states that mentoring is a complex interactive process occurring between individuals of different levels of experience and expertise which incorporates interpersonal or psychological development and socialization functions into the relationship. Mentoring has also been defined as a mentor helping a protégé learn something that he would have learned less well, more slowly or not at all if he had not been mentored (Bell, 2000). Zachary (2002) indicates that a mentor is a person who possesses knowledge of relevant subjects, facilitates the personal development of the protégé, encourages him to make wise choices and helps him to make transitions.

Santamaria (2003) defines mentoring as a one-to-one relationship in which an expert voluntarily gives his time to teach, support and encourage a less experienced person. Bayley, Chambers and Donovan (2004) define mentoring as a transformational process that seeks to help individuals develop and use knowledge to improve themselves on an ongoing basis; it is a professional dialogue that encourages reflection and development, signposting protégés to other sources of help as required. While Bozeman and Feeney (2007) state that it is a process for the informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and the psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career or professional development.

Rao (2010) defines mentoring as a relationship in which a senior manager in an organization assumes the responsibility for grooming a junior person. The relationship involves technical, interpersonal and political skills that are taught by the more experienced person to the less experienced person. Popoola, Adesopo and Ajayi (2013) opine that it is the process whereby an experienced and highly empathic person called the mentor, assists and guides another individual called the protégé (whether male or female) in the development of their skills, knowledge and attitudes and their competence in the workplace.

In the academic setting which is the focus of this study, Olasupo (2011) states that an academic mentor is usually a senior faculty member who guides a junior faculty member by way of advice, guidance, support and other relevant means in matters connected to the attainment of academic success; the protégé on the other hand, is the junior faculty member who is the beneficiary of the mentorship. Generally, it has been agreed that mentoring is one of the easiest and most effective methods of assisting individuals to develop the required skill sets in different organizations (Olasupo, 2011; Olowookere, 2012; Okurame, 2013; Ojokuku & Sajuyigbe, 2015; Sola, 2018).

### **2.3 Types of Mentoring**

A formal mentoring relationship is one which the organization supports and is well structured so that members of the organization who need mentoring can benefit from it. The outcomes of the mentoring relationship are measurable because goals are set at the beginning of mentoring and mentors and protégés are deliberately matched, organisational or departmental goals and the specific needs of the protégés (Metros & Yang, 2006). The organization provides mentorship to all within the organization who meet the requirements. Douglas (1997) states that formal mentoring is assigned, maintained and monitored by the organization. In other words, the

organization sets the rules and regulations guiding the mentoring relationship within the organization.

The rules guiding the mentoring program, meeting schedules are clearly spelt out and both the mentor and protégé connect to the structured process for the duration of the mentoring. Due to the fact that organizations who engage in formal mentoring programs have specific and clear goals in mind, the process is well managed to increase the possibility of having a successful outcome. Formal mentoring programmes usually occur on a one on one basis, though it could also be done in groups depending on the organization and availability of mentors.

Informal mentoring on the other hand is a mentoring relationship that has little or no structure, there are no specific goals and the process is not controlled to achieve a predetermined goal. This mentoring relationship is created spontaneously without the active involvement of the organization. The relationship may occur as a result of the mentor taking a social interest in the protégé or the protégé approaching the mentor and expressing a desire to be mentored by him. The relationship between the mentor and protégé is based on the personal chemistry between the two and the mentoring covers a wide range of activities and usually last for a very long and it is not strictly based on job rank or hierarchy.

Byrne (1991) states that informal mentoring is the oldest form of mentoring where mentors choose protégés which they deem as possessing some admirable qualities or which they consider as having potentials. This form of mentoring however has some concerns; the major one being that the mentor usually neglects the protégés' professional competence and other qualities while focusing on what he (the mentor) wants. Another concern is that because the mentor is at liberty

to decide whom to mentor, there is usually a same - sex mentoring relationship to the detriment of the mentoring needs of others who are not the same sex with the mentor.

Induction mentoring according to the University of Cambridge (2018), involves assigning a mentor to a new member of staff to help him orientate himself to the organization's procedures, policies, personnel and other relevant information. The purpose is to help the newcomer adjust well to the new post. The mentor acts as a neutral and impartial guide for any concerns or difficulties the protégé may have and help him to work out strategies to succeed on the job. The mentor is not usually someone in direct authority over the new staff, though he is usually one who does similar work with the protégé.

Peer mentoring is a situation where someone that is approximately at the same level, or age, social group as the person to be mentored is assigned to the protégé. Peer mentoring is a one – on – one approach to mentoring which targets an area of expertise and assigns the protégé to a more experienced or knowledgeable peer who does the same work at the same level. The relationship here is not based on hierarchy, the aim is to encourage a learning environment that is reciprocal and promotes a sense of community. Peer mentors hold each other accountable for their performance and assist each other achieve their goals.

Developmental mentoring is mentoring where the protégé has different mentors for different areas of his personal and professional life. As the level of responsibility of the protégé increases, he is faced with new duties and roles hence his mentoring needs therefore evolve. In developmental mentoring, a synergy is created between several people to generate specific solutions, strategies and action plans to enable the protégé to achieve success. The protégé acquires individuals who become role models in different areas and hence his support network

widens thus improving his motivation and confidence. An experienced mentor helps the protégé develop his strengths and potential, identify the protégé's changing needs and even help him reach out to other mentors who can help him in those areas in which he (the mentor) is not proficient. The aim of developmental mentoring is to plan the professional development and career steps of the protégé.

Long-term, top – down mentoring is the form of mentoring also referred to as executive mentoring. Tucker (2017) describes it as a situation where a senior – level employee is required to teach, instruct, coach or guide a subordinate. It is an effective method of increasing and improving industry knowledge and work skills. The mentor may have more than one protégé at the same time and the main objective is to teach and help them understand the company culture, hone their work skills and gain knowledge about the industry. The mentor can take the protégés along to attend meetings, review and assess reports together. This form of mentoring is very useful in equipping workers to fill senior – level positions in future.

Short-term, training based mentoring is again described by Trucker (2017) as the sort of mentoring that takes place when some companies organize in house training sessions for their employees or send their employees to training seminars that are industry specific. Here, a mentor is assigned to a protégé to assist him in developing the skills that are being taught in the training program. The protégés are expected to learn about new technologies, and improved practices for business strategies. This mentoring approach is very specific and it is a short term assignment that last for the period of training. It is very effective in assisting the protégés develop or learn a new skill but it does not extend to developing a broader skill set for the protégé.

Reverse mentoring is a mentoring form in which the traditional roles of mentoring are reversed. The younger employee assumes the role of the mentor while the older and more experienced employee becomes the protégée. Reverse mentoring is very useful when getting the technology savvy younger generation to teach the older generation employees how to make use of social media to improve business communication. Trucker (2017) states that reverse mentoring is a way to bridge the generation gap that exist between the older and younger generations of employees and create a two – way exchange of knowledge. It encourages the two parties to learn and teach simultaneously.

Distance mentoring is the type of mentoring that usually occur as a result of the needed mentor not been in the same physical location as the protégés. The protégé actively seeks out the mentor wherever he is located because that particular mentor would best satisfy his mentoring needs. Vast advances in technology in the workplace have made this type of mentoring feasible. The mentoring is done via electronic tools like email, audio/video conferencing, Skype and other such tools.

Group or team mentoring unlike the traditional one – on – one mentoring approach, is mentoring that may involve one mentor being paired with several protégés or one protégé having multiple mentors. This approach has an additional benefit of strengthening the ties between all included participants. Though it is a less structured mentoring approach, it encourages a natural exchange of information across the team as experiences and insight are shared and everyone benefits from the discussions. In addition, the mentors pool their resources to help the protégés reach the identified developmental goals.

Situational mentoring refers to a mentoring relationship that last for a relatively short period and is used for a very specific purpose when the protégé needs guidance and advice. It does not address overall development of the protégée but focuses on a specific need addressing an immediate situation.

Mentoring Circles is a form of mentoring using a combination of action learning, coaching and peer mentoring which allows those involved to take turns being mentors and protégées. It is quite a fluid approach to mentoring as it keeps changing thus, creating a wider source of inspiration and support for all the parties.

## **2.4 Benefits of Mentoring**

The benefits of mentoring are not limited to the protégé alone, the mentor and the organization also gain from the process. We are going to discuss the importance of mentoring based on the benefits to these three categories – protégé, mentor, and organizations.

### **2.4.1 Benefits of mentoring for Protégés**

Duke (2012) avers that new and younger academic staff are often confronted by a new culture and tradition which is different from what they may have been used to in their previous places of work or institutions of learning. Nnaji, Uko and Nwafor (2015) agrees by stating that the range of duties that faces a new academic staff in the university can be quite daunting and if appropriate support is not given, it can lead to a host of problems for the staff. Some may be entering the world of work for the first time and hence would need guidance to navigate the new territory successfully.

Mgbekem (2004) outlines the duties of lecturers in the university to include teaching, research, administrative roles, membership in faculty and administrative committees and, at a higher level, membership of senate. The workload of the average lecture according to Duke (2012) is rigorous and demanding – teaching, project supervision, research, classroom management, mastery of subject matter and other ad hoc duties imposed on him on a continuous basis. Due to the fact that newly employed younger academics would be thrust into the performance of some of these tasks, it is imperative that proper guidance, assistance and preparation of the younger lecturers be done by the older and more experienced lecturers through proper mentoring (Mgbekem, 2004). A new lecturer, especially one coming into the system at a lower level will experience some form of isolation (Hobson, Maxwell, Stevens, Doyle & Malderez, 2015); may have problems in the “boarding process” (Duke, 2012).

Mentoring is also a way of enhancing the skill sets of the junior academics. Ballet and Kelchetermans (2009) opines that in fluid societies, it is important to stress continuous professional development if teachers are to successfully adapt to changes and cope with the pressure of meeting organisational standards. In Nigeria, the declining standards in the academic sector is being continually decried, the general opinion is that academic excellence which the country enjoyed in time past is fast decaying and it is all blamed on the “younger generation”. A potent way of stopping this seeming downward spiral is to get the older generation of the “good old days” of academics to transfer knowledge through mentoring to the younger generation in order to regain the lost academic glory.

Mentoring is another way for new academics to gain a professional identity. When coming into the academic system, the new employee may know little or nothing about the profession or the values of the profession. Through mentoring, mentors pass on the values and tenets of the

profession; regulate the behaviour of new employees by ensuring that they understand the professional ethics and requirements of their job (Hobson et al., 2015).

Through mentoring impartial advice and encouragement is given to the new and younger employee. A mentor can help the protégé plan, develop and manage his career. Ukim (2014) states that young academics need to be mentored by older and more experienced lecturers to enable them improve their performance and competence in order for them to gain promotion into higher lecturing cadre. Hobson et al (2015) also state that since professional development cannot happen by itself, the young academic needs the active assistance of the more experienced academic.

Mentoring is a very important tool for knowledge transfer and assistance with problem solving, older and more experienced academic have encountered and overcome many of the problems young academic staff are likely to face in the workplace and therefore are able to prevent them from making avoidable mistakes. This saves time and improves efficiency both for the protégé and the organization as a whole.

A good mentoring programme will promote the socialization of new staff, increase motivation and confidence, help new employees articulate issues consciously and thoughtfully and generally help protégés to be able to analyze and solve difficulties.

#### **2.4.2 Benefits of Mentoring for Mentors**

Mentors also benefit a great deal from the mentoring process personally and for the general good of the organization. The self actualization which Maslow talks about in the needs theory comes into play here (Maslow, 1954). Mentors are usually well established, experienced and accomplished people in their fields and in life generally. After attaining this height i.e. they have

actualized themselves, what is left for them is building the next generation that may surpass them. This feeling of being a part of and contributing to something that will outlive their physical presence in the organization actually gives a sense of purpose and deep satisfaction to these mentors.

Kram (1985) talks about the dual role of the mentor in offering both career support and psychosocial support to the protégé. The career support function is where the mentor assists the protégé to learn the ropes as it concerns the profession by helping them navigate the steps of organisational advancement and protect them against disadvantageous assignments. The psychosocial support on the other hand refers to the mentor helping the protégé by building up his self efficacy and ensuring his emotional wellbeing. The mentor does this by being a role model for the protégé, offering acceptance to the protégé and through counseling.

In addition to this, Irvine (2018) state that mentors gains insight into the challenges faced by other members of a professional community. Through the interaction with a protégé, the mentor can gain understanding of issues affecting the younger ones which they would have otherwise not be privy to. This is beneficial to the protégé and the institution too, because the mentor may be in a position to address such problems.

Secondly, mentoring offers the mentor an opportunity to see new perspectives on the culture of the university. With the rapid changes in the world of work, organisational culture is also changing, therefore by interacting with the younger and newer generation; the mentor is able to grasp the changing dynamics of culture thus enabling him to stay in touch with his environment.

Thirdly, mentoring gives mentors countless opportunities to share their experience and expertise. Many senior academics have been prompted to write books documenting their experience and

expertise by their protégés so that many others can benefit from that wealth of information. This also causes the mentor to reflect on current practices to see if they are an improvement or not on former practices so as to refine them. Mentoring also enables the mentor to focus on their ideas, behaviour and choices because they realize that junior academic staff are looking up to them in terms of morals and workplace ethics. In this way, standards are maintained and younger academics have befitting role models on which to model their own behaviours, ideas and choices. Finally mentoring affords an opportunity to the mentors to mould the next generation of leaders by helping them build the requisite leadership skills. When mentoring is properly done and the mentoring relationship well cultivated, the mentor remains relevant for life even, because from time to time, the protégé, no matter his current status will revert to the mentor when faced with thorny issues.

### **2.4.3 Benefits of mentoring for the University**

A proper and well structured mentoring programme is also of great importance to the university, and not just to the mentor and protégé. Firstly, it will help in the identification and retention of excellent staff. The mentoring process thrusts the mentor and protégé close together under many situations in the workplace. The mentor is able to observe, test and gauge the capabilities of the protégés and therefore able to identify those who have the skill sets that are valued by the organization. Such people are then carefully groomed, provided with training and learning opportunities and steered into positions of increasing responsibilities. A staff that has been so treated is more likely to develop some degree of loyalty to the organization and therefore less likely to entertain turnover intentions.

Another benefit for the organization is that when excellent staff are identified and retained in the organization, this will eventually raise the standard of the organization and enable it compete favorably with other similar organizations.

A good mentoring programme will also increase diversity within the organization. One major challenge with mentoring is that mentors and protégés alike enter into mentoring relationships with people similar to them. The effect of this is that those people in the minority (women, minority ethnic groups, minority religions, the physically challenged, those with different sexual orientations etc) are usually left out of mentoring relationships or are not properly mentored. An effective mentoring programme however, will ensure that these groups are included and therefore well mentored so that their not insignificant contributions will be made available to the organization. Their inclusion will bring fresh ideas, new perspectives and deeper understanding that if properly harnessed may become a competitive advantage for the organization.

Finally mentoring is an effective means of transmitting corporate culture within the organization and also increasing communication in the organization. Through mentoring, management's views can be passed on to protégés in a non-threatening, non-combative atmosphere where they have the liberty to question what they do not understand or agree with and management through the mentors will take time to explain and educate the protégés on them. Likewise, information about issues affecting the protégés can also be passed on to management through the mentors. In this way, the mentors form and become a link bridging the gap between younger employees and management thereby improving organisational communication.

## **2.5 Theories Underpinning Mentoring**

Ehrich, Hansford and Tennent (2001) made a very useful categorization of various theories that underpin the study of mentoring. They classified the theories into eight distinctive categories – economics, developmental theory, selection process of mentoring theory, theories related power, leadership/management theory, learning theory, theories related to organisational structures / socialization and networks and theories related to interpersonal relationships. A detailed discussion of all these theories is beyond the scope of this study, however the theories that are most related to the focus of this present study will be critically examined.

The concept of mentoring has been around for a long time; probably predates the story of Mentor and Telemachus in the ancient Greek mythical story. Every time a more experienced person guides a less experienced person with the purpose of getting the younger to develop skills and gain experiences, mentoring takes place. Mentoring can take place either formally or informally and in a variety of ways and situations that have already been described. In spite all these, the majority of research on organisational mentoring has been done in the last three decades (Scandura & Pellegrine, 2007), therefore mentoring theories draw on already existing theories in Psychology, Sociology and the Behavioral sciences to explain the relationships between mentors and their protégés. On the basis of this, we shall review some of the most relevant theories that underpin mentoring as it relates to this study – social learning theory; social exchange theory; action – reflection model and apprenticeship model.

**2.5.1 Social Learning Theory:** Social learning theory holds the view that people can learn by being instructed, by watching what happens to other people as well as through direct experiences (Bandura, 1977). Meijers and Wardekker (2005) states that there is a lack of an adequate theory

of mentoring but that the prevailing view that the mentor functions as an example, a role model for the protégé makes Bandura's social learning theory a cornerstone of the mentoring concept. Bandura (1986) and Meyer (1994) also clearly state that role modeling has an important place in learning and in the development of attitudes. The definition of Henry and Tally (2008) that mentoring is a method by which novice practitioners are taught to adapt and succeed in new professional roles clearly bring to mind the idea of role acquisition and socialization through learning that is interactive. In addition, Godshalk and Sosik (2000) state that mentoring is a form of social support which may alleviate job related stress of organization members.

The social learning theory by Bandura (1977) explains how patterns of behaviour are acquired and how they are maintained or regulated by the interplay between self – generated and external sources of influence. Thambokwayo (2012) avers that the protégé acquires the new behaviour through observing the mentor and how that behaviour is rewarded. Mentors therefore become role models for the protégé who imitate or emulate the behaviour of the mentor and by so doing learn organisational culture and duties.

Applying the social learning theory suggests that protégés learn new behaviours through a process that includes observing the mentor, interacting with him and modeling their behaviour after that of the mentor. Kytte (1978) also emphasizes that the social learning process includes behaviour that is acquired, maintained and modified. These are the processes also involved in mentoring especially when it is viewed as a form of social learning. This view is supported by Lankau (2002) who states that the most crucial aspect of mentoring as a social learning process is that mentoring by its very nature is a collaborative process that requires the mentor and protégé to work together. Crow (2001) attests to this fact also by maintaining that mentoring is an active process in which both the mentor and protégé are actively involved with each other in learning.

Having established that mentoring is a collaborative process, it is therefore important to ensure that an acceptable environment (social context) is provided to facilitate the relations between the mentor and protégé to ensure that learning becomes beneficial for all the parties involved. For this relationship to be successful as a social learning process, the role of the mentor and the willingness of the protégé must be emphasized as crucial. Finally Crow (2001) insists that a climate that is conducive for mentoring, where learning is appreciated and mentoring is seen as a collective organisational responsibility must be fostered if mentoring is to be successful.

**2.5.3 Action – Reflection Model:** Proponents of this model are Handal and Lauvas (1983) and has become one of the most influential mentoring models. The action –reflection model has as its central theme “practice theory”, which has been defined as the values, experiences and knowledge that determine the person’s actions or plan of action (Lauvas & Handal, 2000). The theory holds that every individual has a strategy for action which improves as the individual learn and gather experience from interacting with other people. The application of this theory to mentoring is that it aims to assist the protégé in becoming better at understanding his practice theory. The purpose is to create awareness about core values that direct action in the protégé. What mentoring does therefore is to help the protégés achieve an increasing understanding of those core values when asked to justify and explain their own actions. Carson and Birkeland (2009) give a clear description of what practice is about by stating that the theory is individualistic because everyone possesses different knowledge, values and experience.

Secondly, practice theory is always changing because people continue to make new experiences, which can lead to a change in values. Finally Carson & Birkeland (2009) holds that everyone has a practice theory though it is largely unconscious and difficult to formulate. It is often incoherent and the values can be contradictory to one another. The action – reflection model of mentoring

emphasizes planned, formalized mentor – protégé conferences and the mentoring is based on the needs of the protégé as expressed by him.

There have been several criticisms of this model as it is believed to weaken the mentor's professional authority because the emphasis is on dialogue and what the protégé expresses as his needs (Skagen, 2004). Another criticism is that there is a lot of emphasis on individual differences and preferences and less emphasis on the ability of the protégé to adapt to the specific mentoring tasks. Skagen (2004) avers that the theoretical basis for the model is not clear and that by stressing reflection, focus on proper actions is lost. Lastly, the model is tilted in favour of protégés who have good verbal skills to the detriment of those who are unable to clearly articulate their mentoring needs.

#### **2.5.4 The Apprenticeship Model**

Barab and Hay (2001) define apprenticeship as a process where apprentices work side by side with an expert in order to learn a specific task. Traditionally, apprenticeship was associated with the training of craftsmen and later in vocational training, however in recent times; it has been extended to other types of training. Nielson and Kvale (1997) indicate that the apprenticeship model has now been introduced outside of the traditional vocational education as a general pedagogical model. Apprenticeship as a term has gone beyond the description of the statutory institutional structures that dominates vocational training to becoming a general metaphor for a relationship where a novice (protégé) learns from an experienced person (mentor). Nielsen and Kvale (1997) discuss four things that characterizes the apprenticeship model – participation in a community of practice, professional identity, learning through imitations of the master and that the qualities of work is evaluated through practice.

Wagner – Trayner and Wenger – Trayner (2015) define communities of practice as groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. The communities of practice have three main characteristics that are very important or that must exist before a community can be called a community of practice and they are the domain, the community and the practice. According to Wenger – Trayner and Wenger – Trayner (2015), the domain refers to the commitment that members must have to the community and involves a shared competence that differentiates members from non members. The members value their collective competence and learn from each other. The community means that members of the community of practice engage in joint accounts and discussions, assist one another and share information. Relationships are built that allow them learn from each other, there is active interaction which may not necessarily be on a daily basis. Lastly the practice refers to members of the community of practice being practitioners, they share practice by developing a joint repertoire of resources – experiences, stories, tools, methods of handling recurring challenges. This happens over time and sustained interaction.

In a community of practice, there are several types of mentoring relationships going on. The traditional mentor – protégé, is available where protégés have access to several mentors to aid their development. Peer mentorship also goes on the communities of practice because people come together to share ideas and learn from each other. The internet has made it possible for the members of a community of practice to be in various locations and still be able to interact closely. The benefits for protégés in belonging to a community of practice are obviously enormous. As the protégé learns by taking part in a group of competent practitioners of his profession, he becomes more and more competent until he himself becomes a very competent member of the professional community.

Professional identity is acquired by the protégé as he acquires and masters new skills by learning and completing practical assignments that are increasingly become more tasking. The protégé is engaged in a reflective conversation soon after the completion of the assignment to ensure that he understands the processes and that his success was not just a fluke. In learning through imitation of the master (mentor), the protégé not only observes the work of the mentor or other skilled professionals in the community, he must imitate it. The mentoring process here is quite clear, the mentor demonstrates how a task should be properly executed, then the protégé begins to practice how to execute the same task, he is corrected and guided by the master until he becomes proficient at the task or acquires the skill.

Finally, the work of the protégé will be evaluated through practice. The mentor has accumulated knowledge about the required skills necessary to execute a task therefore he will judge the quality of the protégé's work based on his own knowledge, functionality and the feedback from others.

## **2.6 Need for Mentoring amongst Nigerian Academic Staff**

Many studies have been undertaken to establish the need for mentoring among academic staff in Nigerian universities (Sola, 2018; Omale, Oguiche, Duru, Daniel, 2017; Undiyaundeye & Basake, 2017; Kolade, 2015; Nnaji, Uko & Nwafor 2015). The general consensus is that young academic staff just entering the university system face many challenges and that if not properly guided they may be unable to successfully overcome them at the appropriate time. The academic environment is fraught with many pitfalls for the unwary new entrant and at the same time it holds many opportunities for growth and advancement that a new academic staff may not be knowledgeable enough to take advantage of quickly. The role of mentoring therefore is to help

the protégé avoid the dangers inherent in lecturing and harness the positive potentials to ensure a rewarding academic career.

According to Undiyaundeye and Basake (2017), the pursuit of development by young academic staff in Nigeria is not without challenges, fears and anxieties and therefore mentoring can be an effective way of mitigating the stress of new lecturers, help them resolve challenges and help them achieve their career goals more readily. Mentoring has also been advocated as a means of transferring the skills which protégés need and can apply in diverse professional circumstances, promote learning and productive use of knowledge, definition of goals and career paths and job satisfaction (Okurame & Balogun, 2005). Ayodeji and Adebayo (2015) also indicates that mentoring can ensure and maintain effective school administration in Nigeria, because teaching is a multifaceted and complex task that demands the guidance and experience of senior academic staff. Undiyaundeye and Basake (2017) also state that mentoring is needed in academics because it increases job satisfaction, self confidence, enhances staff retention rate, encourages professional growth, develops competence and encourages collaboration while reducing competition. This view is also collaborated by Nnaji et al. (2015) who states that professional competence of newly employed lecturers could be significantly enhanced through mentoring Sola (2018) also concurs when he states that mentoring has significant influence on the career development of academic staff. Kolade (2015) advocates mentoring as a means of building a new generation of academics and responsible leadership. Omale et al. (2017) aver that mentoring improves staff retention and knowledge transfer in Nigerian universities.

## **2.7 Challenges Associated with Mentoring in Nigerian Universities**

Mentoring, in spite of the tremendous benefits that can be gotten from it for all those involved in the mentoring relationship is not been practiced as it should be because of some inherent

challenges associated with it. Akanni (2011) avers that though mentoring is a positive exercise, it can also have a negative side if not properly handled and it therefore becomes dysfunctional. Olowookere (2011) defines dysfunctional mentoring as the situation that occurs when the mentoring relationship produces negative outcomes for all involved in the mentoring relationship. One of the challenges that have been identified as a major challenge to mentoring in Nigerian universities is the widespread use of the advancement in Information and Communication Technology (ICT). This has made it possible for senior faculty members (Professors) to easily reach out to their counterparts across the country to collaborate with them on studies, to the detriment of the local junior counterparts (Olasupo, 2011; Olowookere, 2012). Olowookere (2012) avers also that the age gap between senior and junior faculty members can present a hindrance to effective mentoring in the university system. This view is supported by Agbonifoh & Idubor (2016) in their study of workforce diversity and classism in the university where they found that younger members of staff rated themselves higher than older members of staff. This infers that the younger staff felt superior to the older staff and as a result, they may feel that they have nothing to learn from the older members of staff who some refer to as “the old school”. Clearly, this attitude can pose a huge challenge for the mentoring relationship. Agbonifoh and Idubor (2016) also found that newer members of staff also displayed classism towards the older members of staff confirming that workforce diversity, if not properly managed can breed bias, discrimination and classism. In such an environment, mentoring may not be thought of as important and if engaged in at all, the results may be negative.

Another challenge to effective mentoring within the Nigerian university system is the balance of power between the mentor and the protégé. According to Rodriguez and Sjostrom (2000) the mentors see themselves as older, wiser, having reached the pinnacle of their careers and holding

all the power in the mentoring relationship. Some mentors may overawe the new academic, treat him as a mere errand boy and fail to impart any knowledge to him. This act of superiority may make the protégé feel resentful and begin to avoid the mentor since he cannot perceive any benefit from the relationship. The mentoring style that is purely hierarchical instead of including a collaborative or communal style is bound to breed these types of problems. Inappropriate choice of mentor/protégé, unrealistic expectations from the relationship by the parties, feelings of superiority/inferiority can create serious problems with the mentoring relationship. According to Olorunreke and Dabiri (2006) the mentoring programme is built on trust and respect, where this is lacking, the relationship is doomed to fail.

Many senior academics that ought to act as mentors to new and younger lecturers are hardly around. Many professors are either on sabbatical in other universities, leave of absence, or are busy being adjunct lecturers, external examiners and consultants elsewhere. This creates a situation where the younger lecturers are left without mentors who they can relate with. The senior academics are always in a hurry when they are available, they are saddled with being Deans of faculties, Heads of Department and hold other positions within the university that makes it difficult for them to have a meaningful mentoring relationship with their protégés if they have any. According to Hoy and Spero (2003), the most frequently anticipated characteristic of effective mentors is the willingness and ability to nurture another person. Nnaji et al. (2015) adds that the mentor should be people oriented, open minded, flexible, empathetic, collaborative, willing to make time and space for productive discussions, establish an equitable relationship and so on. These are obviously activities that require time and commitment.

Undiyaundeye and Basake (2017) state that the challenges to effective mentoring in the academia includes the inability and unwillingness of young academics to follow instructions

from mentors, due to the “get rich quick” mentality, the inability of the institution to manage personnel and ensure good community partnerships, inability and unwillingness of the mentors to support subordinate professional growth and finally, the inability of the school management to sanction untoward behaviour by young academics due to godfatherism.

Other challenges identified by Omale et al (2017) include absence of the right culture, entrance of the wrong employees into the system due to faulty recruitment processes, lack of training, poor pay, lack of reward for competence, rigidity in the system.

## **2.8 Empirical Review of Literature**

This section presents a review of previous empirical studies in the area of mentoring amongst academic staff of universities in Nigeria.

Okurame (2008) using both qualitative and quantitative measures explored the mentoring experiences and challenges of academic staff in a Nigerian university. His sample size was 48 academic staff from five units of the sampled faculty and data was obtained with the aid of the modified mentoring function scale. In addition to the questionnaire, open ended questions were also used, requiring respondents to provide written responses. The study was conducted in a faculty of a Federal University that is one of the first five generation Federal Universities in Nigeria. The respondents were required to provide responses to whether mentoring opportunities existed in the faculty and how those interested could avail themselves of such opportunities, if they had been recipients of mentoring and if it had as an important part of their development. Also to indicate the barriers to the mentoring relationship, and finally to rate the potential staff development strategies that can be used by the institution.

The findings of the study indicated that 37% of the respondents reported that mentoring was a significant part of their development, that all the respondents recognized mentoring as a valuable developmental tool but disagreed over the type of mentoring programme to be encouraged. 70% of the respondents disapproved of the establishment of a formal mentoring programme. All the respondents were in an informal mentoring relationship and believed that opportunities for such relationships abound in the faculty. Finally, the study found that the perceived barriers to the maintenance and assumption of mentor roles includes – branding of mentors as spearheads of cliques, and protégés as favored, lack of funds and laziness of protégés and their unresponsive attitude, lack of formal structures that encourage mentoring, self withdrawal of junior academic staff members and pressure of administrative duties to assumption of mentor roles. Challenges experienced by protégés, the study revealed to include inability to measure up to the mentor’s standard, inadequate attention from mentor, balancing conviction with expectations of a mentor, not enough opportunity to speak freely about their ideas, fear of being branded as “the anointed” of the mentor and the pressure of deadlines.

A major deficiency in Okurame’s (2008) study is the size of the population and the sample. Not only was the study restricted to one university, it was further limited to one faculty where only 48 academic staff was selected. Secondly, the gender of the selected staff was skewed toward males – 42 while there were only 6 female respondents. Considering the issues that have been raised in different sex mentoring relationships, it is our view that an important aspect of the mentoring relationship was left unexplored.

Okurame (2008) states that he used both quantitative and qualitative measures to elicit information from the respondents, however in the discussion of results, a clear distinction was not made between the answers gotten qualitatively and quantitatively.

Afolabi, Faleye and Adeola (2015) examined mentoring among academic staff of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife Nigeria. The aim of the study was to examine the perception of mentoring by the academic staff, ascertain the form and extent of mentoring, examine how existing mentoring relationships were initiated, identify the challenges experienced by protégés and mentors alike and finally to examine the influence of job status and years of service on the perception of mentoring by the academic staff. Afolabi et al (2015) made use of all academic staff in the university as their population and through purposive sampling, selected a sample of 200 academic staff from the 13 faculties of the university. The study was a study and it used an instrument titled “academic staff mentoring questionnaire” to collect data. Afolabi et al (2015) found out that 86% of the academic staff sampled were involved in a mentoring relationship, 93% were favorably disposed towards mentoring as a developmental tool. The respondents also identified some challenges associated with mentoring relationships to include self withdrawal of junior members, laziness and unresponsive attitudes of protégés, balancing conviction with expectation of a mentor, inadequate attention from a mentor. The study also found, that there was no difference between the perception of respondents of mentoring on the basis of job status and that there is no significance difference in the perception of the respondents based on their years of service.

Afolabi et al (2015) found in their study that mentoring relationships exist among academic staff of Nigerian universities; however the study failed to define whether the mentoring that exists was informal or formal mentoring. This is important because what people regard as mentoring at times, especially when it is informal falls short of what the mentoring relationship ought to be. Secondly Afolabi et al (2015) used only job status and years in determining mentoring relationships while ignoring gender. Gender differences have been found to be very

significant in determining mentoring relationships and with the advent of more women into academics; we feel that it is an aspect that ought not to be neglected. Afolabi et al. (2015) dealt with only one university – a Federal 1<sup>st</sup> generation university. Today in Nigeria, there are state and private universities and the dynamics for mentoring relationships might be different across these universities. The scope focus of the study in terms of population is therefore deemed to be too narrow and should have been expanded to capture both state and private universities.

Kolade (2015) investigated mentoring as a competency tool for the development of the university teaching staff using Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko as a case study. It was a cross sectional survey of all the faculties of the university and a sample size of 100 that was purposively selected was used of out which 80 responses were found valid. A questionnaire was the research instrument that was used to collected data from all categories of lecturers from professor to graduate assistants. The instrument was highly structured, open ended and distributed by hand. The aim of the study was to find out the practices that can cumulate to mentoring practices in Adekunle Ajasin University. Kolade (2015) found from his study that age was closely related to academic position, that 44% of the respondents had benefited from a mentoring relationship while 40% of senior academics have provided mentorship to younger colleagues. It was also discovered that over 80% of the respondents reported interest in the career development of their colleagues. This study was limited to one University and many of the factors that could influence the mentoring relationship like age, gender, length of service were disregarded in this study.

Nnaji, Uko and Nwafor (2015) investigated the relationship between mentorship and professional competence of newly employed lecturers in universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. The aim of the study was to find out the benefits of mentoring to newly employed

lecturers in the university. The population consisted of all academic staff of the institution out of which a sample size of 220 was selected from the two universities in the state. The instrument used for the study was titled “mentoring and professional competence of newly employed lecturers questionnaire” (MPCNELQ). The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant relationship between mentorship and professional competence of newly employed lecturers.

Tanoli (2016) conducted a study to find out the impact of training and mentoring on employee performance. It was an empirical analysis of public and private universities staff members in Islamabad. The objective of the study was to find out the effects of training and mentoring on employee performance and how a mentor prepares his protégés for enhanced commitment, performance of challenging task and increased performance.

The population of the study was all staff of public and private sector universities based in south Punjab area of Pakistan. The selected sample size of 250 was used and a five point Likert scale questionnaire was used to collected data. The study found that employee training and mentoring has a significant and positive impact on employee performance. Secondly, that attaching employees to senior professionals help to hone the abilities of the employee and assist them in quickly correcting errors made during performance of routine tasks.

Omale, Oguiche, Duru and Idodo (2017) investigated the impact of mentoring on staff retention through knowledge transfer. The study was an empirical evaluation of four private universities in the North Central Zone of Nigeria. The objective of the study was to determine the extent to which mentoring improves staff retention in private universities in Nigeria and to ascertain whether transfer of knowledge enhances staff mentoring and retention in Nigerian universities.

The population was all staff of the four private universities and a sample size of 346 was selected. The instrument used for collecting data was a structured questionnaire. The study found that over 80% of the respondents agreed that mentoring improves staff retention in private universities in Nigeria. Secondly, it was also found that transmission of knowledge enhances staff mentoring in private universities in Nigeria.

Undiyaundeye and Basake (2017) examined mentoring and career development of academics in colleges of education in Cross Rivers State. The aim of the study was to ascertain if mentoring was in practice in colleges of education in Cross River State; to discover if there was a difference in the extent of mentoring between Federal and State institutions and finally whether there was any difference between male and female lecturers in the degree of challenges experienced by protégés in mentoring relationships.

The study adopted a descriptive survey design and out of the total population of 1075 lecturers, a sample size of 570 was selected and used for the study. The instrument used for collecting data was a questionnaire titled “Mentoring and Career Development for Academia Questionnaire (MCDAQ) developed by the researchers.

The findings of the study revealed that firstly, mentoring existed in Colleges of education in Cross River State, Nigeria; that there is no significant difference between mentoring in Federal and State Colleges of Education and lastly that there is so significant difference between the mean rating scores of male and female academia on the challenges they face in the mentoring relationship.

Sola (2018) investigated mentoring and its influence on career development of academic members of selected Tertiary institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria. The study used lecturers (senior

and junior academic members) from the University of Ibadan and the Polytechnic Ibadan totaling 160 academic staff. The objective of the study was to identify the means of fostering mentoring relationships among academic members, find out the perceived barriers to the maintenance of mentor role in an academic setting, identify challenges experienced by protégés during mentoring relationships and finally examine the extent to which mentoring influence career development of academic members. The research design used was a descriptive cross-sectional one and a structured questionnaire was employed for the study.

Sola (2018) found that mutual respect and reverence for academic feats, resolve to share resources and experience, appreciation of the need to mentor or be mentored, joint research, publication, teaching and conference/workshop attendance and approaching senior colleagues with development problems are major ways of fostering mentoring relationships among academic members. Secondly, the study found that branding mentors as spearheads of cliques and protégés as favored is a daunting challenge to maintenance of mentor role in academic setting. Finally the study found that challenges experienced by protégés include inadequate opportunity to speak freely, inadequate attention from mentor and balancing conviction with expectations of a mentor. The hypothesis testing revealed that mentoring has a significant influence on career development of academic staff.

**Table 2.1: Summary of Empirical Literature**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Researcher(s)</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Variable(s) of interest</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>Major findings and conclusions</b>
1	Okurame (2008)	University of Ibadan, Nigeria.	The mentoring experiences and challenges academic staff in a Nigerian university.	Qualitative and quantitative measures were used. Data was obtained with the aid of the modified mentoring function scale. Open ended questions were also used, requiring respondents to provide written responses	37% of the respondents reported that mentoring was a significant part of their development, 70% disapproved of the establishment of a formal mentoring programme. All the respondents were in an informal mentoring relationship. The perceived barriers to the maintenance and assumption of mentor roles includes – branding of mentors as spearheads of cliques, and protégés as favored, and laziness of protégés and their unresponsive attitude, lack of formal structures that encourage mentoring, self withdrawal of junior academic staff members and pressure of administrative duties to assumption of mentor roles. Challenges experienced by protégés, include inability to measure up to the mentor’s standard, inadequate attention from mentor, balancing conviction with expectations of a mentor, not enough opportunity to speak freely about their ideas, fear of being branded as “the anointed” of the mentor and the pressure of deadlines.
2	Afolabi, Faleye and Adeola (2015)	Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife Nigeria.	The perception of mentoring by the academic staff, the form and extent of mentoring, how existing mentoring relationships were initiated, identify the challenges experienced by protégés	The study used an instrument titled “academic staff mentoring questionnaire” to collect data.	. Afolabi et al (2015) found out that 86% of the academic staff sampled were involved in a mentoring relationship, 93% were favorably disposed towards mentoring as a developmental tool. The respondents also identified some challenges associated with mentoring relationships to include self withdrawal of junior members, laziness and unresponsive attitudes of protégés, balancing conviction from mentor. There was no difference between the perception of respondents of mentoring on the basis of job status and that there is no significance difference in the perception of the respondents based on

			and mentors alike and finally to examine the influence of job status and years of service on the perception of mentoring by the academic staff.		their years of service. They also found that mentoring relationships exists among academic staff of Nigerian universities.
3	Kolade (2015)	Adekunle Ajasin University Akungba Akoko	Kolade (2015) investigated mentoring as a competency tool for the development of the university teaching staff	A questionnaire was the research instrument that was used to collected data from all categories of lecturers. The instrument was highly structured, open ended and distributed by hand.	Kolade (2015) found that age was closely related to academic position. 44% of the respondents had benefited from a mentoring relationship while 40% of senior academics have provided mentorship to younger colleagues. It was also discovered that over 80% of the respondents reported interest in the career development of their colleagues.
4	Nnaji, Uko and Nwafor (2015)	Universities in Cross River State, Nigeria.	The relationship between mentorship and professional competence of new employed lecturers.	The instrument used for the study was titled “mentoring and professional competence of newly employed lecturers questionnaire” (MPCNELQ).	The findings of the study revealed that a significant relationship between mentorship and professional competence of newly employed lecturers
5	Tanoli (2016)	Islamabad. South Punjab area of Pakistan.	The objective of the study was to find out the effects of training and mentoring on employee performance and how a mentor prepares his protégés for enhanced commitment,	A five point Likert scale questionnaire was used to collected data.	The study found that employee training and mentoring has a significant and positive impact on employee performance. Secondly, that attaching employees to senior professionals help to hone the abilities of the employee and assist them in quickly correcting errors made during performance of routine task.

			performance of challenging task and increased performance.		
6	Omale, Oguche, Duru and Idodo (2017)	North Central Zone of Nigeria.	The impact of mentoring on staff retention through knowledge transfer.	The instrument used for collecting data was a structured questionnaire sample size of 346 was selected	The study found that over 80% of the respondents agreed that mentoring improves staff retention in private universities in Nigeria. Secondly, it was also found that transmission of knowledge enhances staff mentoring in private universities in Nigeria.
7	Undiyau ndeye and Basake (2017)	Cross Rivers State, Nigeria	The aim of the study was to ascertain if mentoring was in practice in colleges of education in Cross River State; to discover if there was a difference in the extent of mentoring between Federal and State institutions and finally whether there was any difference between male and female lecturers in the degree of challenges experienced by protégés in mentoring relationships.	The instrument used for the study. The instrument used for collecting data was a questionnaire titled “Mentoring and Career Development for Academia Questionnaire (MCDAQ) developed by the researchers.	The findings of the study revealed that firstly, mentoring existed in colleges of education in Cross River State, Nigeria; that there is no significant difference between mentoring in Federal and State colleges of Education and lastly that there is so significant difference between the mean rating scores of male and female academia on the challenges they face in the mentoring relationship.
8	Sola (2018)	Oyo State, Nigeria.	investigated mentoring and its	The research design used was a descriptive	Sola (2018) found that mutual respect and reverence for academic feats, resolve to share resources and

			influence on career development of academic members of selected Tertiary institutions	cross-sectional one and a structured questionnaire was employed for the study.	experience, appreciation of the need to mentor or be mentored, joint research, publication, teaching and conference / workshop attendance and approaching senior colleagues with development problems are major ways of fostering mentoring relationships among academic members. Secondly, the study found that branding mentors as spearheads of cliques and protégés as favored is a daunting challenge to maintenance of mentor role in academic setting. Finally the study found that challenges experienced by protégés include inadequate opportunity to speak freely, inadequate attention from mentor and balancing conviction with expectations of a mentor. The hypothesis testing revealed that mentoring has a significant influence on career development of academic staff.
--	--	--	---	--	--

**Source:** Researcher's compilation (2018).

## 2.9 Research Gaps

The review of empirical studies has helped to identify some research gaps which this study intends to address.

First, none of the studies that were reviewed explored the challenges that may be inherent in different sex mentor – protégé relationship in the University system. With the changing face of the world of work and the advent of many women into a hitherto male dominated profession, we are of the opinion that considering the Nigerian context in which this study is situated that it is an important area to be explored.

Secondly, many of the studies that were reviewed used only one institution for their studies (Okurame, 2008; Afolabi et al., 2015; Kolade, 2015), however Undiyaundeye and Basake's (2017) study was on Federal and State Colleges of Education in Cross River State, Omale et al.

(2017) studied four private universities in the North Central Zone of Nigeria, Nnaji et al. (2015) studied two universities in Cross River State, one federal and one state university while Sola (2018) studied the university of Ibadan and the Polytechnic Ibadan. This study intends to bridge this gap by studying a Federal University, a state university and two private universities. This will expand the frontiers of the body of knowledge on mentoring in these different academic settings.

In conclusion, this study intends to explore the challenges associated with different sex mentoring relationships and to examine mentoring relationships across Federal, State and Private Universities in Nigerian universities.

## **2.10 Theoretical Framework**

Based on theoretical review, this study relies on the **Social Exchange Theory**. This theory was propounded by George Homans in 1958, Homans (1961: 13) says ‘for an interaction to qualify as a social exchange it must include the exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, more or less rewarding or costly, between at least two persons.’ The theory identifies exchange as a social behaviour that may occur in both economic and social outcomes. According to Raschdorf (2015: 21) ‘an examination of the social exchange theory reveals that the concepts of rewards and costs, value, comparison levels, and trust and commitment seem to compliment the dynamics and workings of an informal mentoring relationship.’

Thomas and Ensher (2013) state that the social exchange theory of mentoring alludes to an expectation of an exchange of benefits between mentor and protégé and that mentors who have themselves received help in the past feel obligated to give help in future mentoring relationships.

Ehrich et al. (2004) state that the social exchange theory as applied to mentoring is based on

social and economic costs and reciprocity so that mentors and protégés evaluate costs and benefits to determine if the relationship is viable. The social exchange theory is based on the conditions of social interactions and the characteristics of interpersonal relationships. Homans (1958) stresses the dyadic exchange relationship and framed social behaviour in terms of rewards and punishment. Blau (1969) however highlights the effect of these reciprocal exchanges in social interactions by referring to social exchange as the voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and do in fact bring from others.

There have been several modern modifications of the social exchange theory but nevertheless, the theory has come under some criticisms. One of such criticisms is that the theory is not testable. A major criteria for theories is that they be testable and therefore capable of been proven untrue (because some of its major concepts like rewards and cost are difficult to define). Another criticism of this theory is the portrayal of human interactions as purely rational, calculating the costs and rewards to be gotten from a particular relationship. It has been argued that human relationships cannot be reduced to one dimensional connection of cost and reward (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Raschdorf, 2015).

## **2.11 Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses will be tested:

H<sub>0i</sub>: Most universities in Edo State have not adopted mentoring as a policy.

H<sub>0ii</sub>: Mentoring is not widely practiced in universities in Edo State

H<sub>0iii</sub>: Academic staff in universities in Edo state do not have a positive attitude towards mentoring”

Hoiv: There is no significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring.

Hoiv: Mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do not differ based on ownership structure

Hov: Attitudes of academic staff in Edo State do not differ on the basis of ownership of the institutions.

## **SECTION THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This section describes the methodology that will be used to reach an understanding of the attitudes towards mentoring among academics in Nigerian universities. It presents also the procedures, modalities and sequential steps that will be adopted to ensure that the outcome of the study will not only be dependable but accurate and valid. The section carefully describes the research design, population, sample size, model specification, operationalization and measurement of variables, research instrument, sources of data, and method of data analysis.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The primary aim of this study is to find out the attitude of academic staff in Nigerian universities towards mentoring. This study will therefore employ a descriptive correlational survey research design.

#### **3.3 The Study Population**

The population consists of all academic staff in three Universities located in Edo State. The University of Benin (Federal University); Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma (State University); Igbinedion University Okada (Private University). These Universities were chosen for use in this study because they are the oldest universities in the State and they have a sizeable number of staff. Only those academic staff that has spent at least twelve months in the university will be included in the study. This is because new entrants in the university might not be aware of some of the issues the study seeks to investigate. Based on information from the registries of the

various universities, the total academic staff strength of these universities is 3054 as at July 2018.

The breakdown is as follows:

University of Benin – 1824

Ambrose Alli University – 680

Igbinedion University – 550

Total = 3054

### 3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

A stratified random sampling is performed to get a proper representation of each of the university. This method was chosen because of the non uniformity of the population sizes of the three universities under study. A proportional sampling frame was used to determine the sample size to be taken in each university and 15% of the population in each university was selected to form the sample size as depicted in table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Sampling frame of Population**

S/N	University	Population	Sample size
1	University of Benin	1824	274
2	Ambrose Alli University	680	102
3	Igbinedion University	550	83
<b>Total</b>		3054	459

**Source:** Researcher's compilation (2018).

Convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling method, will be used in administering questionnaires to the academic staff in the three universities. This is because convenience

sampling gives room for easy access and interaction with respondents that will fill the questionnaire. The researcher will ensure that copies of the questionnaire will be administered to the different categories of academic staff in the selected universities to provide a comprehensive assessment of the subject matter.

### 3.5 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables

**Table 3.2: Measurement of Variables**

S/N	Item	Operational definition	Measurement	Question No.
1	Gender	Sex of respondents	Two point categorical scale	Q1
2	Age	Current age of Respondents	Five point interval scale	Q2
3	Marital status	Marital status of the respondent	Four point categorical scale	Q3
4	Highest educational qualification	Respondents' highest educational qualification	Four point interval scale	Q4
5	Years of experience	Respondent's years of experience as an academic staff	Four point categorical scale	Q5
6	Name of institution	Respondent's employer	Four point categorical scale	Q6
7	Rank	Respondent's rank	Seven point categorical scale	Q7
8	Have you ever being a mentor		Two point categorical scale	Q8
9	Have you ever being a protege		Two point categorical scale	Q9

10	Are you currently in a mentoring relationship?		Two point categorical scale	Q10
11	Are you the mentor or protégé?		Two point categorical scale	Q11
12	Is mentoring formalized in your institution?			Q12
13	Mentoring activities	The activities involved in mentoring	Five point Likert scale	Q13 – Q30
14	Attitude to mentoring		Five point Likert scale	Q31 – Q56
15	Challenges of mentoring	Challenges experienced by the respondents in mentoring relationships	Five point Likert scale	Q57 – Q74

### 3.6 Sources of Data

This study will make use of primary data which will be gotten from academic staff from the aforementioned three Universities in Edo State through the use of a structured questionnaire and focus group discussion sessions (two each in each university, one with mentors and one with protégés).

### 3.7 The Research Instrument

The research instrument for this study is a 73-item questionnaire designed for academic staff in the University of Benin, Ambrose Alli University, Benson Idahosa University and Igbinedion University all in Edo State. The questionnaire is designed in sections (A to D). Section A

consists of personal information about the respondents. Section B consists of questions on mentoring activities, Section C contains questions on attitude to mentoring while Section D has questions on challenges of mentoring. The questions in Sections B, C and D are designed in a 5-point Likert scale of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 for Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree respectively. The instrument is attached as Appendix I to this research work.

### 3.8 Validity and Reliability of Research Instrument

The face and content validities of the research instrument was based on the meticulous scrutiny and evaluation by the Researcher's Supervisor and other Faculty members who are experts in Human Resource Management and Sociology.

With respect to the reliability of the instrument, a Pilot test was conducted to aid in testing the reliability of the research instrument. Fifty (50) questionnaires were administered to both senior and junior academic staff. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 24.0) was used to ascertain internal consistency as demonstrated by the Cronbach alpha values reported in table 3.2

**Table 3.3: Reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Item Number on the Questionnaire</b>	<b>Original Number of Items</b>	<b>Initial Cronbach's Alpha Value</b>	<b>Item to delete to increase reliability</b>	<b>Final Number of Items</b>	<b>Final Cronbach's Alpha Value</b>
Mentoring activities	13 – 30	18	0.901	Nil	18	0.901
Attitude to mentoring	31 – 56	25	0.683	40	24	0.704
Challenges of mentoring	57 – 74	18	0.888	Nil	18	0.888

*Source: Researcher's Compilation (2018)*

Mentoring activities has a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.901 using 18 items (questions). The other variables of the study are attitude to mentoring and challenges of mentoring with reliability values of 0.704 and 0.888 respectively using Cronbach alpha method that was derived from the above which shows that the instrument is reliable.

### **3.9 Method of Data Analysis**

The responses from the copies of questionnaire that will be administered will be analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation. Multiple regression analysis will be used to test the various hypotheses stated for this study. Multiple regression analysis is a technique that estimates a regression model with more than one outcome variable. The rationale for using multiple regression analysis is that it is a statistical methodology that helps estimate the strength and direction of the relationship between two or more variables. Hypotheses will be tested at 5% level of significance. This study will use Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 24) to conduct all the statistical analyses.

## SECTION FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collated with the questionnaire administered to academics in three selected universities in Edo state. The analysis was carried out with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 24) software. The presentation and analysis of the data in this chapter was guided by the research objectives.

Firstly, the demographic variables of the respondents are presented and discussed. These include sex, age, marital status, highest educational qualification, year of experience, institutions, and rank of the respondents. Data on relating to mentoring were also presented and analyzed. Secondly, data relating to the different research objectives were presented and analyzed accordingly. Lastly, the research hypotheses were tested and findings from the analyses of data discussed.

#### 4.2 Description of respondents' demographic variables

This section contains the different background information of the respondents which include information on questionnaire distribution, sex, age, marital status, highest educational qualification, year of experience, institutions and rank of the respondents. The results are presented in Tables 4.1 and 4.12 below:

**Table 4.1: Questionnaire distribution to sampled universities**

S/N	Institution	Questionnaire			Response Rate (%)
		Administered	Retrieved	Valid	
1	University of Benin	274	150	134	48.9
2	Ambrose Alli University	102	50	32	31.4
3	Igbinedion University	83	30	12	14.5
Total		459	230	178	38.8

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

Table 4.1 shows that 459 copies of questionnaire were administered while only 230 were retrieved. Only 178 copies of the questionnaire were found to be valid and usable. The response rates for the universities are: University of Benin (48.9%); Ambrose Alli University (31.4%); and Igbinedion University (14.5%). Overall total response rate stands at 38.8%.

**Table 4.2: Sex of respondents**

S/N	Category	Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Male	50	75.8	64	62.1	114	67.5
2	Female	16	24.2	39	37.9	55	32.5
Total		66	100	103	100	169	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Sex:** Table 4.2 shows that majority of the respondents are male, which are 114 accounting for 67.5% of the total respondents. The female respondents were 55. This represents 32.5% while 9 respondents did not indicate their gender.

**Table 4.3: Age of respondents**

S/N	Category	Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	18-24years	0	0	22	20.6	22	12.5
2	25-35years	9	13.0	38	35.5	47	26.7
3	36-45years	30	43.5	41	38.3	71	40.3
4	46-55years	19	27.5	6	5.6	25	14.2
5	56years and above	11	15.9	0	0	11	6.3
Total		69	100	107	100	176	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Age:** The age distribution shows that majority of the respondents (71) are between 36 and 45years old. This category accounts for 40.3% of the total respondents. This is followed by 25-35 years old (47, 26.6%) and 46-55years (25, 14.2%). Respondents within the age bracket of 18-24years accounts for 12.5%. Finally, respondents that are 56years old and above account for 6.3%. Only 2 of the respondents did not indicate their age category.

**Table 4.4: Marital status of respondents**

		Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
S/N	Category	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Single	3	4.5	36	35.3	39	23.2
2	Married	63	95.5	66	64.7	129	76.8
Total		66	100	102	100	168	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Marital Status:** For the marital status, 129 (76.8%) of the respondents were married, while 39 (57.6%) were single. Only 9 respondents representing 5% did not indicate their marital status.

**Table 4.5: Educational qualification of respondents**

		Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
S/N	Category	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	PhD	51	76.1	23	21.5	74	42.5
2	Masters	16	23.9	52	49.5	68	39.1
3	First Degree	0	0.0	32	29.0	32	18.4
Total		67	100	107	100	174	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Educational Qualification:** Majority of the respondents (74) had Ph.D. This category accounts for 42.5%. 68 (39.1%) of the respondents have Masters qualification while 32 (18.4%) of the respondents have first degree. Four (4) of the total respondents did not indicate their highest educational qualification.

**Table 4.6: Working experience of respondents**

S/N	Category	Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Less than 3years	12	17.1	43	53.0	55	32.4
2	3-6years	12	17.1	35	35.0	47	27.6
3	7-12years	22	31.4	19	19.0	41	24.1
4	Above 12years	24	34.3	3	3.0	27	15.9
Total		70	100	100	110	170	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Working experience:** From Table 4.6, majority of the respondents (55) have at most 3years working experience as lecturers which account for 32.4% of the total respondents. 27.6% of them have worked for three to six years while 24.1% have worked for 7 to 12years. Respondents who have worked for more than 12years accounted for 15.9% of the total respondents. 7 (3.9%) of the total respondents do not indicate their years of experience.

**Table 4.7: Institutions of respondents**

S/N	Category	Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	University of Benin	58	81.2	76	71.0	134	75.3
2	Ambrose Alli University	10	14.5	22	20.6	32	18
3	Igbinedion University	3	4.3	9	8.4	12	6.7
Total		71	100	107	100	178	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Institution:** Majority of the respondents (134) are from University of Benin. This category accounts for 75.3% of the total respondents. Respondents from Ambrose Alli University and Igbinedion University were 18% and 6.7% respectively.

**Table 4.8: Ranks of respondents**

S/N	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
	Category	Frequency	%	Category	Frequency	%
1	Senior Lecturer	37	54.4	Graduate Assistant	33	31.4
2	Associate Professor	13	19.1	Assistant Lecturer	34	32.4
3	Professor	18	26.5	Lecturer II	27	25.7
4	-	-		Lecturer I	11	10.5
Total		68	100		105	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Rank:** The respondents cut across the lecturing cadres in universities as follow: 18 Professors; 13 Associate Professor; 37 Senior Lecturers; 11 Lecturer I; 27 Lecturer II; 34 Assistant Lecturers and 33 Graduate Assistants.

**Table 4.9: Mentoring experience of respondents (Being a mentor to others)**

S/N	Category	Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Yes	53	76.8	45	43.3	98	56.6
2	No	16	23.2	59	56.7	75	43.4
Total		69	100	104	100	173	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

Table 4.9 shows that majority of the senior academics (53) have been mentors to junior colleagues while 16 ticked *NO* to the question. However, majority of the junior academics (59) said they have not been mentors to others. This group accounts for 56.7%.

**Table 4.10: Mentoring experience of respondents (Being mentored by others)**

		Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
S/N	Category	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Yes	53	75.7	84	79.2	137	77.8
2	No	17	24.3	22	20.8	39	22.2
Total		70	100	106	100	176	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

Table 4.10 shows that majority of the senior academics (53) have been mentors to junior colleagues while 17 ticked *NO* to the question. Similarly, majority of the junior academics (84) said they have been mentored by others. This group accounts for 79.2%.

**Table 4.11: Current mentoring relationship of respondents**

		Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
S/N	Category	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Yes	57	82.6	63	62.4	120	70.6
2	No	12	17.4	38	37.6	50	29.4
Total		69	100	101	100	170	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

Table 4.11 shows that majority of the senior academics (57) are currently engaged in mentoring relationship while 12 ticked *NO* to the question. Similarly, majority of the junior academics (63) are currently engaged in mentoring relationship. This group accounts for 62.4%.

**Table 4.12: Mentoring status of respondents**

		Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
S/N	Category	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Mentor	50	84.7	32	43.2	82	61.7
2	Protégé	9	15.3	42	56.8	51	38.3
Total		59	100	74	100	133	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

Table 4.12 shows that majority of the senior academics (50) are mentors to others. This group of senior academics accounts for 84.7% while only 9 of them ticked *NO* to the question. Similarly, majority of the junior academics (42) are protégé the in mentoring relationship. This group accounts for 56.8%.

### 4.3 Adoption of Mentoring among Academics in Universities in Edo State

To investigate the adoption of mentoring practices in the selected Nigerian universities in Edo State, respondents were asked whether their institutions have formalized mentoring system. The responses are presented in Table 4.13.

**Table 4.13: Adoption of mentoring practices in universities**

		Senior Academics		Junior Academics		Both	
S/N	Category	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
1	Yes	9	13.2	39	43.8	48	30.6
2	No	59	86.8	50	56.2	109	69.4
Total		68	100	89	100	157	100

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

Table 4.13 shows that majority of the senior academics (59, 86.8%) said that there is no formalized mentoring systems in their universities while only 9 (13.2%) agreed that their

universities have formalized mentoring system. In similar vein, majority of the junior academics (50, 56.2%) said that there is no formalized mentoring systems in their universities while only 39 (43.8%) agreed that their universities have formalized mentoring system. In summary, Table 4.13 shows that majority of the academics (109, 69.4%) said that there is no formalized mentoring systems in their universities while only 48 (30.6%) agreed that their universities have formalized mentoring system.

#### 4.4 Mentoring Activities among Academics in Universities in Edo State

One of the objectives of this study is to determine the mentoring activities commonly engaged in by mentors and protégés in the university setting. In achieving this objective, a number of mentoring activities were listed in the research instrument for respondents to indicate their level of agreement. The outcomes are shown in Table 4:14.

**Table 4.14: Mentoring activities in universities**

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q13	I take my Protégé to the classroom to observe me teach	63	3.13	15	96	3.21	15
Q14	I give my Protégé personal tasks to encourage him embark on personal projects	66	3.53	13	101	3.53	13
Q15	I hold private sessions with my Protégé on a weekly basis	67	2.82	16	100	2.82	16
Q16	I advice my Protégé to attend conferences	65	3.52	14	100	3.52	14
Q17	My Protégé and I have not collaborated in any research work	68	2.25	17	104	2.26	17
Q18	I am not always available for my Protégé because of my tight schedule	66	2.06	18	102	2.16	18
Q19	My Protégé is eager to learn	68	3.97	11	104	3.98	12

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q20	My Protégé can freely talk to me concerning his problems	68	4.28	1	104	4.25	2
Q21	My Protégé demonstrates professional integrity	67	4.04	7	103	4.12	6
Q22	My Protégé demonstrates potential for content expertise in his area of need	68	3.94	12	104	4.02	10
Q23	I am supportive and encouraging to my Protégé	68	4.15	4	104	4.21	4
Q24	I provide constructive and useful critique of my Protégé's work	68	4.16	3	104	4.23	3
Q25	I motivate my Protégé to improve his work product	67	4.27	2	103	4.33	1
Q26	I am helpful in providing direction and guidelines on professional issues to my Protégé	68	4.12	5	104	4.15	5
Q27	I answer my Protégé's questions satisfactorily (timely response, clear comprehension)	68	4.00	9	104	4.09	8
Q28	I acknowledges my Protégé's contributions appropriately	65	4.05	6	99	4.11	7
Q29	I suggests appropriate resources (experts, electronic contacts, source material, textbooks, etc) to my Protégé	67	4.00	8	103	4.05	9
Q30	I challenge my Protégé to extend his abilities e.g. risk taking, a new professional activity, draft a section of an article etc.	65	4.00	9	99	4.00	11

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Senior academics perspectives:** The first five mentoring activities acknowledged by senior academics to be important in their relationship with their protégés are: protégés can easily talk to

them concerning their problems ( $\bar{X} = 4.28$ ); motivate protégé to improve on their work ( $\bar{X} = 4.27$ ); provide constructive and useful critique on Protégé's work ( $\bar{X} = 4.16$ ); supporting and encouraging Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.15$ ); and providing helpful direction and guidelines on professional issues to Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.12$ ).

**Junior academics perspectives:** The first five mentoring activities acknowledged by junior academics to be important in their relationship with their mentors are: to be motivated by mentors to improve on their works ( $\bar{X} = 4.33$ ); protégés can freely talk to their mentors concerning their problems ( $\bar{X} = 4.25$ ); provide constructive and useful critique on Protégé's work ( $\bar{X} = 4.23$ ); supporting and encouraging Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.21$ ); and providing helpful direction and guidelines on professional issues to Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.12$ ).

#### 4.5 Attitude of Universities' Academics in Edo State towards Mentoring

This study sought to investigate the attitude of academic staff in universities in Edo state towards mentoring. Table 4.15 shows the responses of the respondents to the items.

**Table 4.15: Attitude of Universities' Academics towards Mentoring**

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q31	Mentoring is important for younger lecturers	68	4.78	1	103	4.73	1
Q32	Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles	70	4.61	2	106	4.69	2
Q33	Most new lecturers already have the skills they need to excel on the job	70	2.80	14	106	2.64	15
Q34	Mentoring is a good way of building skills	69	4.41	3	104	4.46	3
Q35	New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers	70	4.00	4	106	4.06	5

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q36	I do not feel I have much to learn from the older generation as times have changed	67	1.93	23	102	1.82	24
Q37	I do not have the time to be involved in a mentoring relationship	70	1.87	24	106	1.91	22
Q38	I am sufficiently equipped to handle my duties as a new lecturer	67	2.34	19	101	2.21	21
Q39	The procedures for handling my duties are so well spelt out that I do not need to be mentored	70	1.97	22	106	1.87	23
Q40	I do not think that mentoring can be useful to my career development and advancement	70	1.74	25	106	1.68	25
Q41	I do not believe younger academics need to be mentored for effective performance	70	1.73	26	106	1.67	26
Q42	Mentoring in the University system should be formalized	69	3.96	5	104	4.07	4
Q43	Senior academics are not current in their areas of specialization	70	2.34	20	106	2.32	19
Q44	Senior academics are not interested in mentoring the younger ones	70	2.54	17	106	2.44	18
Q45	Young academics do not seek mentoring	70	3.06	9	106	3.06	9
Q46	The amount of work that young academics do makes mentoring challenging for them	69	2.94	11	105	2.89	11
Q47	Young academics do not trust the older academics to give them right counsel in their career development	70	2.40	18	106	2.46	17
Q48	There are not enough resources to successfully carry out mentoring	69	2.93	12	105	2.83	12
Q49	Many young academics are arrogant and believe they do not need mentoring	70	2.96	10	106	2.96	10

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q50	Many young academics over estimate their academic abilities	70	3.46	7	106	3.57	6
Q51	Many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities	70	3.11	8	106	3.08	8
Q52	Mentors are usually overbearing, lording it over protégés	69	2.87	13	105	2.78	13
Q53	Mentors feel that their protégés do not know anything and hence do not seek their opinions	68	2.31	21	104	2.23	20
Q54	Mentors usually turn protégés to mere errand boys	70	2.71	15	106	2.64	14
Q55	Mentors usually gather protégés around themselves for political reasons	69	2.59	16	105	2.63	16
Q56	Young academic flock around certain senior academics because of their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored	69	3.51	6	104	3.54	7

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

*Senior academics:* The assessment of senior academics towards mentoring shows that majority of them agreed with the statements in the following order: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.78$ ); mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.61$ ); mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.41$ ); new lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.00$ ); mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 3.96$ ); young academic flock around certain senior academics because of their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored ( $\bar{X} = 3.51$ ); many young academics over estimate their academic abilities ( $\bar{X} = 3.46$ ); many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities ( $\bar{X} = 3.11$ ); and young academics do not seek mentoring ( $\bar{X} =$

3.06). However, majority of the senior academics disagreed with the remaining items measuring attitude to mentoring.

**Junior academics:** The first five items on attitude to mentoring junior academics majorly agreed with in the following order are: Mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.73$ ); Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.69$ ); Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.46$ ); Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 4.07$ ); and New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.06$ ).

#### 4.6 Challenges of Mentoring among Academics in Universities in Edo State

One of the objectives of this study is to identify the challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships. Table 4.16 shows the responses of the respondents to the items.

**Table 4.16: Challenges of Mentoring among Academics in Universities in Edo State**

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q57	Protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor	70	2.60	9	106	2.58	9
Q58	Mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé	70	2.91	7	106	2.74	8
Q59	Association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others	69	3.06	4	104	3.07	4
Q60	The protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor	70	3.24	1	107	3.21	2
Q61	Lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about his ideas and feelings	70	2.94	5	107	2.93	6
Q62	Fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members	70	3.23	2	107	3.20	3

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q63	Lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor	69	2.88	8	105	2.97	5
Q64	Young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains	70	3.13	3	107	3.27	1
Q65	Mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing	70	2.93	6	107	2.90	7
Q66	There is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring	70	2.50	10	107	2.49	10

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

**Senior academics:** Table 4.16 shows that majority of the senior academics agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 3.24$ ); fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members ( $\bar{X} = 3.23$ ); young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains ( $\bar{X} = 3.13$ ); and association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others ( $\bar{X} = 3.06$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about their ideas and feelings ( $\bar{X} = 2.94$ ); mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing ( $\bar{X} = 2.93$ ); mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé ( $\bar{X} = 2.91$ ); lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.88$ ); protégés are usually

unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.60$ ); and there is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring ( $\bar{X} = 2.50$ ).

**Junior academics:** Table 4.16 shows that majority of the junior academics agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains ( $\bar{X} = 3.27$ ); the protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 3.21$ ); fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members ( $\bar{X} = 3.20$ ); and association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others ( $\bar{X} = 3.07$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.97$ ); lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about his ideas and feelings ( $\bar{X} = 2.93$ ); mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing ( $\bar{X} = 2.90$ ); mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé ( $\bar{X} = 2.74$ ); protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.58$ ); and there is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring ( $\bar{X} = 2.49$ ).

#### **4.7 Specific Challenges associated with different Gender Mentoring Relationships in the University System**

One of the objectives of this study is to identify the challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships. Table 4.17 shows the responses of the respondents to the items.

**Table 4.17: Specific Challenges associated with different Gender Mentoring Relationships**

Q/N	Statements	Senior Academics			Junior Academics		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q67	Fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship	68	3.04	4	105	3.04	4
Q68	Fear of being approached by the mentor for sexual relationship (sexual harassment)	70	3.03	6	107	2.97	6
Q69	Inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say	70	3.03	5	107	3.04	5
Q70	Mentors of the preferred gender are lacking	70	3.11	2	107	3.13	3
Q71	Inadequate number of female mentors	69	3.19	1	105	3.25	1
Q72	I would prefer to mentor a protégé of the same gender as me	70	3.06	3	107	3.14	2
Q73	The mentoring relationship might become too personal for my liking	70	2.43	8	107	2.39	8
Q74	Lack of work – life balance makes mentoring difficult for me	69	2.81	7	106	2.79	7

**Source:** Field survey, 2019.

*Senior academics:* Table 4.17 shows that majority of the senior academics agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: inadequate number of female mentors ( $\bar{X} = 3.19$ ); mentors of the preferred gender are lacking ( $\bar{X} = 3.11$ ); I would prefer to mentor a protégé of the same gender as me ( $\bar{X} = 3.06$ ); fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ); inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say ( $\bar{X} = 3.03$ ); and fear of being approached by the protégés for sexual relationship (sexual harassment) ( $\bar{X} = 3.03$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: lack of work–life balance

makes mentoring difficult ( $\bar{X} = 2.81$ ); and the mentoring relationship might become too personal for mentors' liking ( $\bar{X} = 2.43$ ).

**Junior academics:** Table 4.17 shows that majority of the junior academics agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: inadequate number of female mentors ( $\bar{X} = 3.25$ ); I would prefer a mentor of the same gender as me ( $\bar{X} = 3.14$ ); mentors of the preferred gender are lacking ( $\bar{X} = 3.13$ ); fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ); and inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: fear of being approached by the mentor for sexual relationship (sexual harassment) ( $\bar{X} = 2.97$ ). lack of work–life balance makes mentoring difficult ( $\bar{X} = 2.79$ ); and the mentoring relationship might become too personal for mentors' liking ( $\bar{X} = 2.39$ ).

#### **4.8 Academics' Attitude towards Mentoring System and Practices based on University Ownership**

To investigate academics' attitude towards mentoring system and practices on the basis of ownership structure of the universities, responses to questions 31 to 56 were analysed based on federal, state and private ownership. The responses are presented in Table 4.18.

**Table 4.18: Attitude to mentoring based on universities ownership**

Q/N	Statement	Federal (University of Benin)			State (Ambrose Alli University)			Private (Igbinedion University)		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q31	Mentoring is important for younger lecturers	127	4.76	1	30	4.63	1	12	4.92	1
Q32	Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles	132	4.75	2	30	4.20	2	12	4.92	1
Q33	Most new lecturers already have the skills they need to excel on the job	132	2.61	16	30	2.93	13	12	2.92	13
Q34	Mentoring is a good way of building skills	129	4.52	3	30	4.20	3	12	4.17	5
Q35	New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers	132	4.14	5	30	3.43	4	12	4.50	4
Q36	I do not feel I have much to learn from the older generation as times have changed	129	1.82	23	27	1.96	24	12	1.92	25
Q37	I do not have the time to be involved in a mentoring relationship	132	1.87	22	30	1.90	25	12	2.08	23
Q38	I am sufficiently equipped to handle my duties as a new lecturer	124	2.23	20	30	2.43	17	12	2.25	21
Q39	The procedures for handling my duties are so well spelt out that I do not need to be mentored	132	1.80	24	30	2.33	20	12	2.08	23
Q40	I do not think that mentoring can be useful to my career development and advancement	132	1.60	26	30	2.00	23	12	2.17	22
Q41	I do not believe younger academics need to be mentored for effective performance	132	1.64	25	30	1.83	26	12	1.83	26
Q42	Mentoring in the University system should be formalized	130	4.14	4	30	3.40	5	11	4.64	3
Q43	Senior academics are not current in their areas of specialization	132	2.36	19	30	2.17	21	12	2.50	19
Q44	Senior academics are not interested in mentoring the younger ones	132	2.47	18	30	2.37	18	12	2.83	14

Q/N	Statement	Federal (University of Benin)			State (Ambrose Alli University)			Private (Igbinedion University)		
		N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank	N	Mean	Rank
Q45	Young academics do not seek mentoring	132	3.02	9	30	3.23	8	12	3.17	9
Q46	The amount of work that young academics do makes mentoring challenging for them	132	2.83	11	28	3.21	9	12	3.17	9
Q47	Young academics do not trust the older academics to give them right counsel in their career development	132	2.49	17	30	2.10	22	12	2.75	17
Q48	There are not enough resources to successfully carry out mentoring	132	2.82	12	28	3.29	6	12	2.42	20
Q49	Many young academics are arrogant and believe they do not need mentoring	132	2.99	10	30	2.77	14	12	3.08	11
Q50	Many young academics over estimate their academic abilities	132	3.58	7	30	3.20	10	12	3.75	6
Q51	Many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities	132	3.06	8	30	3.10	11	12	3.42	8
Q52	Mentors are usually overbearing, lording it over protégés	132	2.76	13	28	2.96	12	12	3.08	11
Q53	Mentors feel that their protégés do not know anything and hence do not seek their opinions	128	2.18	21	30	2.47	16	12	2.58	18
Q54	Mentors usually turn protégés to mere errand boys	132	2.67	14	30	2.57	15	12	2.83	14
Q55	Mentors usually gather protégés around themselves for political reasons	130	2.65	15	30	2.37	19	12	2.75	16
Q56	Young academic flock around certain senior academics because of their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored	129	3.59	6	30	3.27	7	12	3.50	7

Source: Field survey, 2019.

**Federal (University of Benin):** The first five items on attitude to mentoring federal university (University of Benin) majorly agreed with in the following order are: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.76$ ); Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.75$ ); Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.52$ ); Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 4.14$ ); and New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.14$ ).

**State (Ambrose Alli University):** The first five items on attitude to mentoring state university (Ambrose Alli University) majorly agreed with in the following order are: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.63$ ); mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.20$ ); Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.20$ ); New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 3.43$ ); and Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 3.40$ ).

**Private (Igbinedion University):** The first five items on attitude to mentoring private university (Igbinedion University) majorly agreed with in the following order are: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.92$ ); mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.92$ ); Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 4.64$ ); New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.50$ ); and Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.17$ ).

#### **4.9 Hypothesis Testing**

The six research hypotheses are tested and presented below:

##### **Hypothesis One**

H<sub>0</sub> Most universities in Edo State have not adopted mentoring as a policy.

H<sub>A</sub> Most universities in Edo State have adopted mentoring as a policy.

Table 4.19 shows the Binomial Test result for testing hypothesis one

**Table 4.19: Binomial Test for Hypothesis One**

	Category	N	Observed Prop.	Test Prop.	Exact Sig. (2-tailed)
Group 1	Yes	48	0.31	0.50	0.000
Group 2	No	109	0.69		
Total		157	1.00		

A binomial test indicated that the proportion of non adoption of mentoring as a policy is 0.69 which is higher than the expected 0.50,  $p = .000$  (1-sided). We therefore do not reject the null hypothesis. It is concluded that most universities in Edo State have not adopted mentoring as a policy.

### Hypothesis Two

$H_0$  Mentoring is not widely practiced in universities in Edo State.

$H_A$  Mentoring is widely practiced in universities in Edo State.

Table 4.20 shows the Binomial Test result for testing hypothesis two

**Table 4.20: Binomial Test for Hypothesis Two**

	Category	N	Observed Prop.	Test Prop.	Exact Sig. (2-tailed)
Group 1	Yes	120	0.71	0.50	0.000
Group 2	No	50	0.29		
Total		170	1.00		

A binomial test indicated that the proportion of NO mentoring relationship of 0.29 was lower than the expected 0.50,  $p = 0.000$  (1-sided). We therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that mentoring is widely practiced in universities in Edo State.

### Hypothesis Three

$H_0$  Academic staff in universities in Edo state do not have a positive attitude towards mentoring.

$H_A$  Academic staff in universities in Edo state have a positive attitude towards mentoring.

Table 4.21 shows the One-Sample T-Test result for testing hypothesis three

**Table 4.21: One-Sample Test for Hypothesis Three**

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
ATTITUDE	3.203	177	0.002	0.1311837	0.212014	0.050354

The results in Table 4.21 show that academic staff in universities in Edo state do have a positive attitude towards mentoring. The t-value of 3.203 with p-value of 0.002 provides evidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis. It is therefore concluded that academic staff in universities in Edo state do have a positive attitude towards mentoring.

### Hypothesis Four

$H_0$  There is no significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring.

$H_A$  There is a significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring.

Table 4.22 shows the Independent Sample T-Test result for testing hypothesis four. T-Test was used because the variable involves only two categories (senior and junior academics).

**Table 4.22: Independent Sample test for Hypothesis Four**

Attitude	Status	N	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Senior Academic Staff	70	2.917110			
	Junior Academic Staff	108	2.837515			

The result shows that academic status (senior or junior)  $\{t = 0.949; p = 0.344\}$  does not significantly influence their attitude to mentoring relationship at 5% level of significance. The result does not provide evidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis. It is therefore concluded that there is no significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring.

### Hypothesis Five

$H_0$  Mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do not differ based on ownership structure.

$H_A$  Mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do differ based on ownership structure.

Response to item 42 on the research instrument which states that: Mentoring in the University system should be formalized was used to test this hypothesis. The results are shown in Table 4.22

**Table 4.23: ANOVA Result of mentoring systems among academics based on ownership structure**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16.867	2	8.433	6.315	0.002
Within Groups	227.041	170	1.336		
Total	243.908	172			
<b>Post-Hoc-Test using Student-Newman-Keuls</b>					
Institutions	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05			
		I	II		
Ambrose Alli University	30	3.40			
University of Benin	132		4.11		
Igbinedion University	11		4.64		
Sig.		1.000	0.129		

**Source: Field survey, 2019.**

The result ( $F=6.315; p=0.002$ ) shows that mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do significantly differ based on ownership structure. Since the ANOVA result is found

to be significant, post-hoc-test using Student-Newman-Keuls (S-N-K) was conducted to categorize the perceptions of the respondents based on their different institutions. The result shows that Ambrose Alli University is in the first category (Category I) while University of Benin and Igbinedion University fall into Category II which means the mentoring systems of the institutions are significantly rated higher than that of Ambrose Alli University. Based on the result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore concluded that mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do differ based on ownership structure.

### Hypothesis Six

$H_0$  Attitudes of academic staff in Edo State do not differ on the basis of ownership of the institutions (federal, state and private).

$H_A$  Attitudes of academic staff in Edo State do differ on the basis of ownership of the institutions (federal, state and private).

In determining if there is any significant difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership (federal, state and private), analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The result is shown in Table 4.23:

**Table 4.24: Difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership**

University	Mean	N	Std. Deviation		
University of Benin	2.89	132	0.406		
Ambrose Alli University	2.68	32	0.778		
Igbinedion University	3.08	12	0.981		
Total	2.87	176	0.549		
Results of one-way ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.744	2	0.872	1.961	0.054
Within Groups	50.934	173	0.294		
Total	52.678	175			

Source: Field survey, 2019.

Table 4.19 shows that attitude of academics towards mentoring in Igbinedion University is the highest with a mean score of 3.08 while that of University of Benin and Ambrose Alli University are 2.89 and 2.68 respectively. The ANOVA result ( $F=1.961$ ;  $p=0.054$ ) shows that there is no statistically significant difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership (federal, state and private). It is therefore concluded that attitude of academics towards mentoring in the different institutions do not significantly differ.

#### **4.10 Discussion of Findings**

The aim of this study was to investigate to what extent mentoring is adopted among academic staff of some selected universities in Edo state, the attitude of academics towards mentoring, the challenges encountered in the mentoring relations, the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring and if mentoring systems/practices based on ownership structure of the universities (Federal, State and Private). The aim of this study was accomplished by distributing questionnaires to 459 academic staff in the three selected universities in Edo state – University of Benin (Federal), Ambrose Alli University (State), and Igbinedion University (Private). Of the 459 questionnaires distributed, 230 were retrieved and 178 were found to be valid.

The research instrument was a 73 item questionnaire that was specifically designed for this study. The questionnaire was structured into four sections (A – D). Section A consisted of personal information about the respondents, sections B, C and D contained questions on mentoring activities, attitude to mentoring and challenges of mentoring respectively. Sections B, C and D of the questionnaire were designed as a five point Likert scale. The said instrument was validated

and a reliability test was also conducted revealing Cronbach's alpha values of 0.90, 0.70 and 0.88 for sections B, C and D respectively indicating that the instrument is reliable.

Only 178 copies of the 459 questionnaires were found to be valid and usable. The response rates for the universities are: University of Benin (48.9%); Ambrose Alli University (31.4%); and Igbinedion University (14.5%). Overall total response rate stands at 38.8%. Majority of the respondents are male, which are 114 accounting for 67.5% of the total respondents. The female respondents were 55. This represents 32.5% while 9 respondents did not indicate their gender. The age distribution shows that majority of the respondents (71) are between 36 and 45 years old. This category accounts for 40.3% of the total respondents. This is followed by 25-35 years old (47, 26.6%) and 46-55 years (25, 14.2%). Respondents within the age bracket of 18-24 years accounts for 12.5%. Finally, respondents that are 56 years old and above accounted for 6.3%. Only 2 of the respondents did not indicate their age category. For the marital status, 129 (76.8%) of the respondents were married, while 39 (57.6%) were single. Only 9 respondents representing 5% did not indicate their marital status. Majority of the respondents (74) had Ph.D. This category accounts for 42.5%. 68 (39.1%) of the respondents have Masters qualification while 32 (18.4%) of the respondents have first degree. Four (4) of the total respondents did not indicate their highest educational qualification.

Majority of the respondents (55) have at most 3 years working experience as lecturers which account for 32.4% of the total respondents. 27.6% of them have worked for three to six years while 24.1% have worked for 7 to 12 years. Respondents who have worked for more than 12 years accounted for 15.9% of the total respondents. 7 (3.9%) of the total respondents do not indicate their years of experience. Majority of the respondents (134) are from University of

Benin. This category accounts for 75.3% of the total respondents. Respondents from Ambrose Alli University and Igbinedion University were 18% and 6.7% respectively.

The respondents cut across the lecturing cadres in universities as follow: 18 Professors; 13 Associate Professor; 37 Senior Lecturers; 11 Lecturer I; 27 Lecturer II; 34 Assistant Lecturers and 33 Graduate Assistants.

Majority of the senior academics (53) have been mentors to junior colleagues while 16 ticked *NO* to the question. However, majority of the junior academics (59) said they have not been mentors to others. This group accounts for 56.7%.

Majority of the senior academics (53) have been mentors to junior colleagues while 17 ticked *NO* to the question. Similarly, majority of the junior academics (84) said they have been mentored by others. This group accounts for 79.2%.

Majority of the senior academics (57) are currently engaged in mentoring relationship while 12 ticked *NO* to the question. Similarly, majority of the junior academics (63) are currently engaged in mentoring relationship. This group accounts for 62.4%.

Majority of the senior academics (50) are mentors to others. This group of senior academics accounts for 84.7% while only 9 of them ticked *NO* to the question. Similarly, majority of the junior academics (42) are protégé the in mentoring relationship. This group accounts for 56.8%.

Majority of the academics (109, 69.4%) said that there is no formalized mentoring systems in their universities while only 48 (30.6%) agreed that their universities have formalized mentoring system.

The first five mentoring activities acknowledged by senior academics to be important in their relationship with their protégés are: protégés can easily talk to them concerning their problems ( $\bar{X} = 4.28$ ); motivate protégé to improve on their work ( $\bar{X} = 4.27$ ); provide constructive and useful critique on Protégé's work ( $\bar{X} = 4.16$ ); supporting and encouraging Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.15$ ); and providing helpful direction and guidelines on professional issues to Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.12$ ).

***Junior academics perspectives:*** The first five mentoring activities acknowledged by junior academics to be important in their relationship with their mentors are: to be motivated by mentors to improve on their works ( $\bar{X} = 4.33$ ); protégés can freely talk to their mentors concerning their problems ( $\bar{X} = 4.25$ ); provide constructive and useful critique on Protégé's work ( $\bar{X} = 4.23$ ); supporting and encouraging Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.21$ ); and providing helpful direction and guidelines on professional issues to Protégé ( $\bar{X} = 4.12$ ).

The assessment of senior academics towards mentoring shows that majority of them agreed with the statements in the following order: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.78$ ); mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.61$ ); mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.41$ ); new lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.00$ ); mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 3.96$ ); young academic flock around certain senior academics because of their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored ( $\bar{X} = 3.51$ ); many young academics over estimate their academic abilities ( $\bar{X} = 3.46$ ); many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities ( $\bar{X} = 3.11$ ); and young academics do not seek mentoring ( $\bar{X} = 3.06$ ). However, majority of the senior academics disagreed with the remaining items measuring attitude to mentoring.

**Junior academics:** The first five items on attitude to mentoring junior academics majorly agreed with in the following order are: Mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.73$ ); Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.69$ ); Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.46$ ); Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 4.07$ ); and New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.06$ ).

majority of the senior academics agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 3.24$ ); fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members ( $\bar{X} = 3.23$ ); young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains ( $\bar{X} = 3.13$ ); and association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others ( $\bar{X} = 3.06$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about their ideas and feelings ( $\bar{X} = 2.94$ ); mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing ( $\bar{X} = 2.93$ ); mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé ( $\bar{X} = 2.91$ ); lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.88$ ); protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.60$ ); and there is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring ( $\bar{X} = 2.50$ ).

**Junior academics:** Table 4.16 shows that majority of the junior academics agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: young

academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains ( $\bar{X} = 3.27$ ); the protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 3.21$ ); fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members ( $\bar{X} = 3.20$ ); and association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others ( $\bar{X} = 3.07$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the followings are challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships: lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.97$ ); lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about his ideas and feelings ( $\bar{X} = 2.93$ ); mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing ( $\bar{X} = 2.90$ ); mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé ( $\bar{X} = 2.74$ ); protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor ( $\bar{X} = 2.58$ ); and there is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring ( $\bar{X} = 2.49$ ).

Majority of the senior academics agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: inadequate number of female mentors ( $\bar{X} = 3.19$ ); mentors of the preferred gender are lacking ( $\bar{X} = 3.11$ ); I would prefer to mentor a protégé of the same gender as me ( $\bar{X} = 3.06$ ); fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ); inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say ( $\bar{X} = 3.03$ ); and fear of being approached by the protégés for sexual relationship (sexual harassment) ( $\bar{X} = 3.03$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: lack of work–life balance makes mentoring difficult ( $\bar{X} = 2.81$ ); and the mentoring relationship might become too personal for mentors' liking ( $\bar{X} = 2.43$ ).

**Junior academics:** Table 4.17 shows that majority of the junior academics agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: inadequate number of female mentors ( $\bar{X} = 3.25$ ); I would prefer a mentor of the same gender as me ( $\bar{X} = 3.14$ ); mentors of the preferred gender are lacking ( $\bar{X} = 3.13$ ); fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ); and inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ). However, majority of them loosely agreed that the specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are: fear of being approached by the mentor for sexual relationship (sexual harassment) ( $\bar{X} = 2.97$ ). lack of work–life balance makes mentoring difficult ( $\bar{X} = 2.79$ ); and the mentoring relationship might become too personal for mentors' liking ( $\bar{X} = 2.39$ ).

The first five items on attitude to mentoring federal university (University of Benin) majorly agreed with in the following order are: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.76$ ); Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.75$ ); Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.52$ ); Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 4.14$ ); and New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.14$ ).

**State (Ambrose Alli University):** The first five items on attitude to mentoring state university (Ambrose Alli University) majorly agreed with in the following order are: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.63$ ); mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.20$ ); Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.20$ ); New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 3.43$ ); and Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 3.40$ ).

**Private (Igbinedion University):** The first five items on attitude to mentoring private university (Igbinedion University) majorly agreed with in the following order are: mentoring is important for younger lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.92$ ); mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles ( $\bar{X} = 4.92$ ); Mentoring in the University system should be formalized ( $\bar{X} = 4.64$ ); New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers ( $\bar{X} = 4.50$ ); and Mentoring is a good way of building skills ( $\bar{X} = 4.17$ ).

### **Hypothesis One**

$H_0$  Most universities in Edo State have not adopted mentoring as a policy. A binomial test indicated that the proportion of non adoption of mentoring as a policy is 0.69 which is higher than the expected 0.50,  $p = .000$  (1-sided). We therefore do not reject the null hypothesis. It is concluded that most universities in Edo State have not adopted mentoring as a policy.

### **Hypothesis Two**

$H_0$  Mentoring is not widely practiced in universities in Edo State.

A binomial test indicated that the proportion of NO mentoring relationship of 0.29 was lower than the expected 0.50,  $p = 0.000$  (1-sided). We therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that mentoring is widely practiced in universities in Edo State.

### **Hypothesis Three**

$H_0$  Academic staff in universities in Edo state do not have a positive attitude towards mentoring. The results in Table 4.21 show that academic staff in universities in Edo state do have a positive attitude towards mentoring. The t-value of 3.203 with p-value of 0.002 provides evidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis. It is therefore concluded that academic staff in universities in Edo state do have a positive attitude towards mentoring.

### **Hypothesis Four**

$H_0$  There is no significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring. The result shows that academic status (senior or junior)  $\{t = 0.949; p = 0.344\}$  does not significantly influence their attitude to mentoring relationship at 5% level of significance. The result does not provide evidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis. It is therefore concluded that there is no significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring.

### **Hypothesis Five**

$H_0$  Mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do not differ based on ownership structure. The result ( $F=6.315; p=0.002$ ) shows that mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do significantly differ based on ownership structure. Since the ANOVA result is found to be significant, post-hoc-test using Student-Newman-Keuls (S-N-K) was conducted to categorize the perceptions of the respondents based on their different institutions. The result shows that Ambrose Alli University is in the first category (Category I) while University of Benin and Igbinedion University fall into Category II which means the mentoring systems of the institutions are significantly rated higher than that of Ambrose Alli

University. Based on the result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It is therefore concluded that mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do differ based on ownership structure.

### **Hypothesis Six**

H<sub>0</sub> Attitudes of academic staff in Edo State do not differ on the basis of ownership of the institutions (federal, state and private). Table 4.19 shows that attitude of academics towards mentoring in Igbinedion University is the highest with a mean score of 3.08 while that of University of Benin and Ambrose Alli University are 2.89 and 2.68 respectively. The ANOVA result (F=1.961;  $p=0.054$ ) shows that there is no statistically significant difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership (federal, state and private). It is therefore concluded that attitude of academics towards mentoring in the different institutions do not significantly differ.

## SECTION FIVE

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of findings, contribution to knowledge, conclusions and recommendations.

#### 5.2 Summary of Findings

1. The study reveals that most universities in Edo State have not adopted mentoring as a policy.
2. It was also found that mentoring is widely practiced in universities in Edo State, possibly on an informal basis.
3. The study reveals that there is no significant difference in the attitude of senior and junior academics towards mentoring.
4. It was also found that mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do not differ based on ownership structure.
5. The study found that there is no statistically significant difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership (federal, state and private).
6. Commonly identified mentoring activities by senior and junior academics include: protégés can easily talk to mentors concerning their problems; mentors motivating protégé to improve on their work; providing constructive and useful critique on Protégé's work by mentors; supporting and encouraging Protégé; and providing helpful direction and guidelines on professional issues to Protégé.

7. The study also found that majority of the respondents (senior and junior academics) acknowledged that mentoring is important for younger lecturers; mentoring is good ways of helping new members understands their roles and build their skills.
8. Major challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships include protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor; fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members; young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains; and association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others.
9. The study found that the major specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are inadequate number of female mentors and lack of mentors of the preferred gender.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

The study examined mentoring among academic staff in Universities in Edo. Three Universities were selected for the study namely the University of Benin (Federal University), Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma (State owned University), and Igbinedion University, Okada (privately owned University),

It discovered that mentoring among Academic staff in the Universities sampled has not been formally adopted as a policy but that there is an appreciable level of mentoring going on in these universities. Interestingly, both the senior and junior academic staff were in agreement about the importance and need for mentoring in the University. It was also found that mentoring systems among academics in Universities in Edo State do differ based on ownership structure.

It was also found that there is no statistical significant difference in academics' attitude towards mentoring based on university ownership (federal, state and private).

Furthermore, it was found that commonly identified mentoring activities by both levels of academic staff include: protégés can easily talk to mentors concerning their problems; mentors motivating protégé to improve on their work; providing constructive and useful critique on Protégé's work by mentors; supporting and encouraging Protégé; and providing helpful direction and guidelines on professional issues to Protégé.

While the major challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships include protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor; fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members; young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains; and association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others. Another important finding of the study was the dearth of female mentors/mentors of preferred gender which is a major challenge of an effective mentoring relationship.

#### **5.4 Recommendations**

1. Considering the fact that the respondents were in agreement concerning the importance and need for mentoring, Universities should as a matter of urgency formalize the adoption of mentoring among its academic staff. This formalization will give institutional backing to mentoring and ensure it is more effective.
2. Some of the major challenges encountered by academics in mentoring relationships include protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor and fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty

members therefore an atmosphere of organizational harmony should be created in the university where faculty members will seek the growth of younger academic staff for the advancement of the educational system and shun petty squabbling.

3. Another finding was that young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains. This is a very worrying finding and may explain the current brain drain that Nigeria is experiencing. Secondly it may also explain the embarrassing cases of corruption and other vices that are regularly reported against lecturers. Thus it is recommended that the compensation packages of lecturers should be appreciably enhanced. Secondly, a reorientation of the values that are important to the university system should be taught and enforced across the university system.
4. The study found that the major specific challenges associated with different gender mentoring relationships in the university system are inadequate number of female mentors and lack of mentors of the preferred gender. On the basis of the foregoing, it is recommended that more women should be encouraged to not only seek for higher level academic positions within the university, they should also be urged to take up mentoring of younger faculty members by making themselves more available.

## **5.5 Recommendations for Further Research**

1. This study was limited to three universities in Edo State; it is therefore recommended that future studies should increase the geographical spread as this will make the results more generalizable.
2. The instrument used for this study was the self report questionnaire; future studies should include interviews and focus studies to get more accurate information and explore other areas that may not be adequately captured with the use of a questionnaire.

## REFERENCES

- Afolabi, E. R. I., Faleye, B. A., & Adeola, A. M. (2015). Mentoring among academic staff of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. *Nigeria Journal of Education and Human Development*, 4(2), 159 – 167 ISSN: 2334 – 2978.
- Agbonifoh, B. A., & Idubor, E. E. (2016). Workforce Diversity and Classism in a Public University Setting. *Nigerian Academy of Management Journal*, 10(1 & 2), 74 – 85.
- Akanni, A. A. (2011). *Mentoring relationship: A protégé experience* in A. A. Olowu (Ed.). *Mentoring: A key issue in human resource management* (pp 114 – 121). Ile-Ife. The Ife centre for psychological studies.
- Anah, C. I., Nwosu, A., & Ezeji, N. (2017). Graduate unemployment in Nigeria: Implications for national development. *Lwati: A Journal of Contemporary Research*, 14(1) 29 – 41.
- Ayodeji, I. O., & Adebayo, L. F. (2015). Role of mentorship in business development in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Humanity and Management*, 3(3), 17 – 38.
- Azman, I., Muhammad, M. A., & Sebastian, K. F. (2009). Mentoring program and its impact on individual's advancement in the Malaysian context. *Journal of industrial engineering and management*. 2 (3), 592 - 615.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: prentice – Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of thought and action: a Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood cliffs, NJ: prentice Hall.
- Ballet, K., & Kelchetermans, G. (2009). Struggling with workload: Primary teachers' experience of intensification. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(8) 1150 – 1157.
- Bayley, H., Chambers, R., & Donovan, C. (2004). *The Good Mentoring Toolkit for Healthcare*. Oxford/San Francisco: Redcliffe Publishing Ltd.
- Bell, C.R. (2000). The mentor as partner. *Training and development*, 54(2), 52 – 63.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley: New York.

- Bozeman, B. & Feeney, M.K. (2007). Toward a useful theory of mentoring: A conceptual analysis and critique. *Administrative and Society*, 39(6), 719 – 739.
- Byrne, D. (1991). *The Attraction Paradigm*. New York: Academic press.
- Carmin, C.N. (1988). Issues in research in mentoring: Definitional and methodological. *International Journal of Mentoring*, 2(2), 9 – 13.
- Cartwright, M. (2012). Odysseus, Ancient History Encyclopedia. Retrieved on 2 May, 2018 from <https://www.ancient.eu/odysseus>
- Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1987). *Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing and mathematics*. (Technical Report No. 403). BBN laboratories, Cambridge, MA. Centre for the study of reading, University of Illinois.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*. 31(6) 874 – 900.
- Crow, G.M. (2001). School leader preparation: a short review of the knowledge base. *National College for School Leadership*.
- Dabiri, M. M., & Olurunleke, G. K. (2006). Implementation of mentoring programmes in Nigerian post primary schools. *Advances in Management a Journal of Business Administration, University of Ilorin*, 5(1), 277 – 288.
- Douglas, C.A. (1997). Formal mentoring programs in organizations: an annotated bibliography Greensboro: centre for creative leadership.
- Ehrich, L.S., Hansford, B., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: a review of the literature. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 518 – 540.
- Ekechukwu, R.O., & Horsfall, M. N. (2015). Academic mentoring in higher education: A strategy to quality assurance in teacher education in Nigeria. *European Journal of Research and reflection in Educational Sciences*. 3, (2) 37 – 45.

- Elegbuanya, A. (2012). Effects of coaching and mentoring on succession plan in organizations. (A study of JUHEL Nigeria limited, Enugu state) unpublished M.B.A project presented to the Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Nigeria, Enugu campus.
- Godshalk, V. M., & Sosik, J. J. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received and Job related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 21, 365 – 390.
- Handal, G., & Lauvas, P. (1983). *A strategy for teacher guidance*. Oslo: J. W. Cappelen.
- Hay, K. E., & Barab, S. A. (2001). Constructivism in practice: A comparison and contrast of apprenticeship and constructionist learning environments. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 10(3), 281 – 322.
- Henry, C., & Tally, V. (2008). Mentoring: The courage to cultivate new leaders. *AANA Journal*, 75(5) 14 – 23.
- Hobson, A.J., Maxwell, B., Stevens, A., Doyle, K., & Malderez, A. (2015). *Mentoring and coaching for teachers in the further education and skills sector in England*. Nottingham: Department for children, schools and families.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behaviour as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597 – 606.
- Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social Behaviour: its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt brace Jovanovich.
- Hoy, A.W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: *A Comparison on four Measures Teacher and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 343 – 356.
- Inzer, L. D., & Crawford, C. B. (2005). A review of formal and informal mentoring: processes, problems and designs. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 4(1), 31 – 50.

John chapter 14 verse 12 (1611). The Holy Bible. Authorized King James Version. Copyright 2003 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. [www.ThomasNelson.com](http://www.ThomasNelson.com)

Kolade, O.G. (2015). Mentoring as a competency tool for the development of the university teaching staff – A case study of Adekunle Ajasin University Akungba Akoko. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 277 – 288.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at Work*. Grenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Kytle, J. (1978). Social learning theory by Albert Bandura (review). *Contemporary Sociology*, 7(1) 7 -13.

Lankau, M.J. & Scandura, T.A. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: content, antecedents and consequences. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4) 22 -30.

Lauvas, P., & Handal, G. (2000). *Guidance and Practical Professional Theory*. Oslo: Cappelan Akademisk Forlag.

Leidenfrost, B., Strassnig, B., Schutz, M., Carbon, C., & Schabmann, A. (2014). The Impact of Peer Mentoring on Mentee Academic Performance: Is Any Mentoring Style Better than No Mentoring at All? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 26(1), 102 – 111.

Longe, O. (2017). Graduate unemployment in Nigeria: causes, consequences and remediable approaches. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 7(4) 63 – 73.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Meyer, G.W. (1994). Social information processing and social networks: A test of social influence mechanism. *Human Relations*, 47(9), 1013 – 1047.

- Mgbekem, S.J. (2004). *Management of University Education in Nigeria*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.
- Meijers, F., & Wardekker, W. (2005). Mentoring as a constructive learning process: how to realize role modeling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 30(4), 49 – 70.
- Metros, S. E., & Yang, C. (2006). The importance of mentors. Retrieved on 6 May 2018 from [www.educause.edu/research-and-p-ublications/books/cultivating-careers-professional-development-campus-it-chapter-5-importance-mentors](http://www.educause.edu/research-and-p-ublications/books/cultivating-careers-professional-development-campus-it-chapter-5-importance-mentors)
- Moon, T. M. (2014). Mentoring the next generation for innovation in today's organization. *Journal of Strategic Leadership*, 5(1), 23 – 35.
- National Universities Commission (2018). Approved Universities as at August 2018. Retrieved on 15 August 2018 from NUC Website: <http://nuc.edu.ng/nigerian-universities/federal-universities/>
- Nielsen, k., & Kvale, S. (1997). Current Issues of Apprenticeship. *Journal of Nordic Educational Research*, 17,130 – 140.
- Nnaji, E.S., Uko, E. S. & Nwafor, I. A. (2015). Enhancing professional competence of newly employed lecturers through mentorship: A focus on universities in cross river state. *International Journal of Research in Arts and Social Sciences*, 8(2), 236 – 246.
- Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personal psychology*, 41, 457 – 479.
- Ojokuku, R. M. & Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2015). Impact of mentoring on career development of academics in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Contemporary Education Research*, 4(5), 95 – 105
- Okurame, D.E. (2008). Mentoring in the Nigerian Academia: experiences and challenges. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 6(2), 45 – 56.

- Okurame, D. E., & Balogun, S. K. (2005). Role of informal mentoring in the career success of first – line bank managers: A Nigerian case study. *Development international*, 10(617), 512 – 521.
- Olasupo, G. (2011). *How does mentoring work?* In A. A. Olowu (Ed.). *Mentoring: A key issue in human resource management* (pp 114 – 121). Ile-Ife. The Ife centre for psychological studies.
- Olowookere, E. I. (2012). *Dysfunctional mentoring* in M.A. Oladeji (Ed.) *current thoughts in education* (pp. 179 – 197). Oyo society for promoting research, education and academic development (SREAD).
- Omale, S. A., Oguche, D., Duru, C. E. & Idodo, M. D. (2017). Impact of mentoring on staff retention through knowledge transfer. An empirical evaluation of four private universities in the North central zone of Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(2), 21 – 31.
- Payne, S. (2006). *Mentoring: a smart business decision*. Assessed 12 July, 2018 from <http://communications.tamu.edu/newsarchives/05/020705-10.html>
- Popoola, F., Adesopo, A., & Ajayi, M. (2013). Establishing effective mentoring culture among professional university administrators in Nigeria. *Public Administration Research*, 2(2), 134 – 148.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and information mentoring relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 529 – 550.
- Rao, V. S. P. (2010). *Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Excel Books.
- Raschdorf, T. K. (2015). *Informal mentoring relationships: A multiple case study of Novice music educators and their mentors*. Music education graduate thesis and dissertations/4.
- Rodriguez, Y. E., & Sjostrom, B. R. (2000). *Faculty of colour in teacher education: a multicultural approach to mentoring for retention, 2000 and beyond*. A paper presented at

- the 52<sup>nd</sup> annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago. February 26 – 29. ERIC, ED 440076.
- Rothwell, W. (2005). *Effective succession planning: Ensuring leadership continuity and building talent from within*. New York: American Management Association.
- Santamaria, J. O. (2003). Mentoring develops high – potential employees. *Asia Africa Intelligence Wire*.
- Scandura, T. A. & Pellegrine, E. K. (2007). *Workplace mentoring: theoretical approaches and methodological issues*. In T.D. Allen & L.T. Eby (Eds.), *Handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspective approach*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Skagen, K. C. (2004). *I veiledningens landskap*. Kristiansand: Hogskoleforlaget.
- Sola, M. A. (2018). Mentoring and its influence on career development of academic members of selected tertiary institutions in Oyo state, Nigeria. *Asian Research Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1 – 9.
- Sweeney, B. (2004). Ask the mentor mentors: A collection of answers to frequently asked questions. Retrieved on 6 June 2018 from <http://teachermentors.com/RSOD%20>
- Tanoli, M. F. (2016). Impact of training and mentoring on employee performance – empirical analysis of public and private universities’ staff members of Islamabad. Retrieved on May 30, 2018 from <https://mpra.ub.muenchen.de/74956/>
- Thambekwayo, M. A. (2012). Investigating mentoring as a form of social learning for school principals. Unpublished master of education thesis submitted to the university of Stellenbosch South Africa. Retrieved on June 8 2018 from Stellenbosch University <http://scholar.sun.as.za>.
- Tucker, C. M. (2007). Mentoring statement. Retrieved on June 20, 2018 from [people.clas.ufl.edu/cmtucker/mentoring-statement/](http://people.clas.ufl.edu/cmtucker/mentoring-statement/)

- Uddin, P. S. O., & Uddin, O. O. (2013). Causes, effects and solutions to youth unemployment problems in Nigeria. *Journal of emerging trends in economics and management sciences*, 4 (4) 339 – 402.
- Ukim, J. (2013). Mentoring and effectiveness of universities in south eastern states, Nigeria. *Journal of Education Management and Research*, 3(1), 130 – 145.
- Undiyaundeye, F. A., & Basake, J. A. (2017). Mentoring and career development of academics in colleges of education in cross river state, Nigeria. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(4), 98 – 104.
- University of Cambridge (2018). Types of mentoring. Retrieved 18 May 2018 from <http://www.ppd.admin.cam.ac.uk/professionaldevelopment/mentoring-university-cambridge/typesofmentoring>
- Wenger – Trayner, E., & Wenger - Trayner, B. (2015). Introduction to communities of practice: A brief overview of the concept and its uses. Retrieved on June 1 from <http://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/>
- Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The Mentor's Guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zachary, L. J. (2002). The role of teacher as mentor. *New directions for adult and continuing education*, 93.11-19.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

**Instruction:** Please tick as appropriate ( ✓ ). Thank you for your cooperation.

#### SECTION A (DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES)

1. **Sex:** Male ( ) ; Female ( )
2. **Age:** 18-24yrs ( ) ; 25-35yrs ( ) ; 36-45yrs ( ) ; 46-55yrs ( ) ; 56yrs & above ( )
3. **Marital Status:** Single ( ) ; Married ( )
4. **Highest Educational Qualification:** PhD ( ) ; Masters Degree ( ) ; B.Sc. ( )
5. **Years of Experience as an academic staff:** Less than 3 years ( ) ; 3-6 years ( ) ; 6-12 years ( ) ; above 12 years ( )
6. **Name of institution:** Uniben ( ) ; AAU ( ) ; Igbinedion University ( ) ; BIU ( )
7. **Rank:** Graduate Assistant ( ) ; Assistant Lecturer ( ) ; Lecturer 11 ( ) ; Lecturer 1 ( ) ; Senior Lecturer ( ) ; Associate Professor ( ) ; Professor ( )
8. **Have you ever been a mentor to a junior colleague?** Yes ( ) ; No ( )
9. **Were you ever mentored by a senior colleague?** Yes ( ) ; No ( )
10. **Are you currently involved in a mentoring relationship?** Yes ( ) ; No ( )
11. **If the answer to 10 above is yes, are you a Mentor ( ) or a Protégé ( )**
12. **Does your institution have a formalized mentoring system?** Yes ( ) ; No ( )

#### SECTION B

**Kindly select the options that most agree with your views by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below. Tick 5 if you strongly agree with the statement or tick 1 if you strongly disagree. Please note the meaning of the abbreviations: SD= Strongly Disagree (1), D= Disagree (2), U= Undecided (3), A=Agree (4) and SA= Strongly Agree (5)**

#### Questionnaire for junior academic staff

S/N		SA	A	U	D	SD
	<b>MENTORING ACTIVITIES</b>					
13	My mentor takes me to the classroom to observe him teach					
14	My mentor gives me personal tasks to encourage me embark on personal projects					
15	My mentor holds private sessions with me on a weekly basis					
16	My mentor does not advice me to attend conferences					
17	My mentor and I have not collaborated in any research work					
18	My mentor is not always available for me because of his tight schedule					
19	My mentor is eager to see me learn					
20	My Mentor is someone I can freely talk to concerning my problems					
21	My Mentor demonstrates professional integrity					
22	My Mentor demonstrates content expertise in my area of need					
23	My Mentor is supportive and encouraging					
24	My Mentor provides constructive and useful critique of my work					

25	My Mentor motivates me to improve my work product					
26	My Mentor is helpful in providing direction and guidelines on professional issues					
27	My Mentor answers my questions satisfactorily (timely response, clear comprehension)					
28	My Mentor acknowledges my contributions appropriately					
29	My Mentor suggests appropriate resources ( experts, electronic contacts, source material, textbooks etc)					
30	My Mentor challenged me to extend my abilities e.g. risk taking, a new professional activity, draft a section of an article etc.					
31	<b>ATTITUDE TO MENTORING</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
	Mentoring is important for new lecturers					
32	Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles					
33	Most new lecturers already have the skills they need to excel on the job					
34	Mentoring is a good way of building skills					
35	New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers					
36	I do not feel I have much to learn from the older generation as times have changed					
37	I do not have the time to be involved in a mentoring relationship					
38	I am sufficiently equipped to handle my duties as a new lecturer					
39	The procedures for handling my duties are so well spelt out that I do not need to be mentored					
40	I do not think that mentoring can be useful to my career development and advancement					
41	I do not believe younger academics need to be mentored for effective performance					
42	Mentoring in the University system should be formalized					
43	Senior academics are not current in their areas of specialization					
44	Senior academics are not interested in mentoring the younger ones					
45	Young academics do not seek mentoring					
46	The amount of work that young academics do makes mentoring challenging for them					
47	Young academics do not trust the older academics to give them right counsel in their career development					
48	There are not enough resources to successfully carry out mentoring					
49	Many young academics are arrogant and believe they do not need mentoring					
50	Many young academics over estimate their academic abilities					
51	Mentors are usually overbearing, lording it over protégés					
52	Many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities					
53	Mentors feel that their protégés do not know anything and hence do not seek their opinions					
54	Mentors usually turn protégés to mere errand boys					
55	Mentors usually gather protégés around themselves for political reasons					
56	Young academics flock around certain senior academics because of					

	their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored					
57	<b>CHALLENGES OF MENTORING</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
	Protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor					
<b>58</b>	Mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé					
59	Association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others					
60	The protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor					
61	Lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about his ideas and feelings					
62	Fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members					
<b>63</b>	Fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship					
64	Fear of being approached by the mentor for sexual relationship (sexual harassment)					
65	Inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say					
66	Lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor					
67	Young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains					
<b>68</b>	Mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing					
69	Mentors of the preferred gender are lacking					
70	Inadequate number of female mentors					
71	I would have preferred to be mentored by a mentor of the same gender					
72	There is someone I would have loved to be my mentor but he is unapproachable					
73	The mentoring relationship might become too personal for my liking					
74	Lack of Work – life balance makes mentoring difficult for me					

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR ACADEMIC STAFF

**Instruction:** Please tick as appropriate ( ✓ ). Thank you for your cooperation.

### SECTION A (DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES)

1. **Sex:** Male ( ) ; Female ( )
2. **Age:** 18-24yrs ( ) ; 25-35yrs ( ) ; 36-45yrs ( ) ; 46-55yrs ( ) ; 56yrs & above ( )
3. **Marital Status:** Single ( ) ; Married ( )
4. **Highest Educational Qualification:** PhD ( ) ; Masters Degree ( ) ; B.Sc. ( )
5. **Years of Experience as an academic staff:** Less than 3 years ( ) ; 3-6 years ( ) ; 6-12 years ( ) ; above 12 years ( )
6. Name of institution: Uniben ( ) ; AAU ( ) ; Igbinedion University ( ) ; BIU ( ) .
7. Rank: Graduate Assistant ( ) ; Assistant Lecturer ( ) ; Lecturer 11( ) ; Lecturer 1 ( ) ;  
Senior Lecturer ( ) ; Associate Professor ( ) ; Professor ( ) .
8. Have you ever been a mentor to a junior colleague? Yes ( ) ; No ( ) .
9. Were you ever mentored by a senior colleague? Yes ( ) ; No ( ) .
10. Are you currently involved in a mentoring relationship? Yes ( ) ; No ( )
11. If the answer to 10 above is yes, are you a Mentor ( ) or a Protégé ( )
12. Does your institution have a formalized mentoring system? Yes ( ) ; No ( ) .

S/N		SA	A	U	D	SD
	<b>MENTORING ACTIVITIES</b>					
13	I take my Protégé to the classroom to observe me teach					
14	I give my Protégé personal tasks to encourage him embark on personal projects					
15	I hold private sessions with my Protégé on a weekly basis					
16	I advice my Protégé to attend conferences					
17	My Protégé and I have not collaborated in any research work					
18	I am not always available for my Protégé because of my tight schedule					
19	My Protégé is eager to learn					
20	My Protégé can freely talk to me concerning his problems					
21	My Protégé demonstrates professional integrity					
22	My Protégé demonstrates potential for content expertise in his area of need					
23	I am supportive and encouraging to my Protégé					
24	I provide constructive and useful critique of my Protégé's work					
25	I motivate my Protégé to improve his work product					
26	I am helpful in providing direction and guidelines on professional issues to my Protégé					
27	I answer my Protégé's questions satisfactorily (timely response,					

	clear comprehension)					
28	I acknowledges my Protégé's contributions appropriately					
29	I suggests appropriate resources ( experts, electronic contacts, source material, textbooks, etc) to my Protégé					
30	I challenge my Protégé to extend his abilities e.g. risk taking, a new professional activity, draft a section of an article etc.					
	<b>ATTITUDE TO MENTORING</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
31	Mentoring is important for younger lecturers					
32	Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles					
33	Most new lecturers already have the skills they need to excel on the job					
34	Mentoring is a good way of building skills					
35	New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers					
36	I do not feel I have much to learn from the older generation as times have changed					
37	I do not have the time to be involved in a mentoring relationship					
38	I am sufficiently equipped to handle my duties as a new lecturer					
39	The procedures for handling my duties are so well spelt out that I do not need to be mentored					
40	I do not think that mentoring can be useful to my career development and advancement					
41	I do not believe younger academics need to be mentored for effective performance					
42	Mentoring in the University system should be formalized					
43	Senior academics are not current in their areas of specialization					
44	Senior academics are not interested in mentoring the younger ones					
45	Young academics do not seek mentoring					
46	The amount of work that young academics do makes mentoring challenging for them					
47	Young academics do not trust the older academics to give them right counsel in their career development					
48	There are not enough resources to successfully carry out mentoring					
49	Many young academics are arrogant and believe they do not need mentoring					
50	Many young academics over estimate their academic abilities					
51	Many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities					
52	Mentors are usually overbearing, lording it over protégés					
53	Mentors feel that their protégés do not know anything and hence do not seek their opinions					
54	Mentors usually turn protégés to mere errand boys					
55	Mentors usually gather protégés around themselves for political reasons					
56	Young academic flock around certain senior academics because of their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored					

	<b>CHALLENGES OF MENTORING</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
57	Protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor					
58	Mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé					
59	Association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others					
60	The protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor					
61	Lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about his ideas and feelings					
62	Fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members					
63	Fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship					
64	Fear of being approached by the mentor for sexual relationship (sexual harassment)					
65	Inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say					
66	Lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor					
67	Young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains					
68	Mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing					
69	Mentors of the preferred gender are lacking					
70	Inadequate number of female mentors					
71	I would prefer to mentor a protégé of the same gender as me					
72	There is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring					
73	The mentoring relationship might become too personal for my liking					
74	Lack of Work – life balance makes mentoring difficult for me					

## APPENDIX II

### RELIABILITY TEST

#### MENTORING ACTIVITIES

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.901	18

#### ATTITUDE TO MENTORING

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.683	25

#### ATTITUDE TO MENTORING (WHEN ITEM 40 IS REMOVED)

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.704	24

#### CHALLENGES OF MENTORING

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.888	18

### APPENDIX III

#### FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ITEMS

Q/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
13	I take my Protégé to the classroom to observe me teach	25 (15.8%)	62 (39%)	14 (8.9%)	32 (20.2%)	26 (16.4%)	159	3.18	1.362
14	I give my Protégé personal tasks to encourage him embark on personal projects	43 (25.8%)	68 (40.8%)	6 (3.6%)	35 (21%)	15 (9%)	167	3.53	1.316
15	I hold private sessions with my Protégé on a weekly basis	22 (13.2%)	34 (20.4%)	25 (15%)	64 (38.4%)	22 (13.2%)	167	2.82	1.272
16	I advice my Protégé to attend conferences	61 (37%)	44 (26.7%)	7 (4.3%)	26 (15.8%)	27 (16.4%)	165	3.52	1.517
17	My Protégé and I have not collaborated in any research work	14 (8.2%)	17 (9.9%)	14 (8.2%)	81 (47.1%)	46 (26.8%)	172	2.26	1.191
18	I am not always available for my Protégé because of my tight schedule	9 (5.4%)	24 (14.3%)	6 (3.6%)	68 (40.5%)	61 (36.4%)	168	2.12	1.203
19	My Protégé is eager to learn	52 (30.3%)	86 (50%)	20 (11.7%)	6 (3.5%)	8 (4.7%)	172	3.98	0.991
20	My Protégé can freely talk to me concerning his problems	89 (51.8%)	58 (33.8%)	12 (7%)	7 (4.1%)	6 (3.5%)	172	4.26	1.001
21	My Protégé demonstrates professional integrity	58 (34.2%)	81 (47.7%)	23 (13.6%)	4 (2.4%)	4 (2.4%)	170	4.09	0.883
22	My Protégé demonstrates potential for content expertise in his area of need	47 (27.4%)	94 (54.7%)	20 (11.7%)	4 (2.4%)	7 (4.1%)	172	3.99	0.924
23	I am supportive and encouraging to my Protégé	71 (41.3%)	75 (43.7%)	15 (8.8%)	9 (5.3%)	2 (1.2%)	172	4.19	0.885
24	I provide constructive and useful critique of my Protégé's work	73 (42.5%)	74 (43.1%)	14 (8.2%)	9 (5.3%)	2 (1.2%)	172	4.20	0.885
25	I motivate my Protégé to improve his work product	88 (51.8%)	59 (34.8%)	12 (7.1%)	9 (5.3%)	2 (1.2%)	170	4.31	0.904
26	I am helpful in providing direction and guidelines on professional issues to my Protégé	66 (38.4%)	80 (46.6%)	12 (7%)	12 (7%)	2 (1.2%)	172	4.14	0.907

Q/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
27	I answer my Protégé's questions satisfactorily (timely response, clear comprehension)	56 (32.6%)	85 (49.5%)	20 (11.7%)	6 (3.5%)	5 (3%)	172	4.05	0.919
28	I acknowledges my Protégé's contributions appropriately	55 (33.6%)	78 (47.6%)	23 (14.1%)	6 (3.7%)	2 (1.3%)	164	4.09	0.854
29	I suggests appropriate resources ( experts, electronic contacts, source material, textbooks, etc) to my Protégé	52 (30.6%)	91 (53.6%)	12 (7.1%)	10 (5.9%)	5 (3%)	170	4.03	0.939
30	I challenge my Protégé to extend his abilities e.g. risk taking, a new professional activity, draft a section of an article etc.	47 (28.7%)	87 (53.1%)	15 (9.2%)	13 (8%)	2 (1.3%)	164	4.00	0.900
31	Mentoring is important for younger lecturers	140 (81.9%)	25 (14.7%)	2 (1.2%)	2 (1.2%)	2 (1.2%)	171	4.75	0.652
32	Mentoring is a good way of helping new members understand their roles	132 (75%)	34 (19.4%)	6 (3.5%)	2 (1.2%)	2 (1.2%)	176	4.66	0.707
33	Most new lecturers already have the skills they need to excel on the job	21 (12%)	40 (22.8%)	10 (5.7%)	76 (43.2%)	29 (16.5%)	176	2.70	1.311
34	Mentoring is a good way of building skills	101 (58.4%)	61 (35.3%)	0 (0%)	8 (4.7%)	3 (1.8%)	173	4.44	0.858
35	New lecturers generally learn most skills from observing older lecturers	64 (36.4%)	79 (44.9%)	13 (7.4%)	15 (8.6%)	5 (2.9%)	176	4.03	1.019
36	I do not feel I have much to learn from the older generation as times have changed	2 (1.2%)	12 (7.2%)	18 (10.7%)	66 (39.1%)	71 (42.1%)	169	1.86	0.951
37	I do not have the time to be involved in a mentoring relationship	10 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	11 (6.3%)	95 (54%)	60 (34.1%)	176	1.89	0.953
38	I am sufficiently equipped to handle my duties as a new lecturer	21 (12.5%)	12 (7.2%)	16 (9.6%)	60 (35.8%)	59 (35.2%)	168	2.26	1.341

Q/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
39	The procedures for handling my duties are so well spelt out that I do not need to be mentored	8 (4.6%)	8 (4.6%)	12 (6.9%)	80 (45.5%)	68 (38.7%)	176	1.91	1.021
40	I do not think that mentoring can be useful to my career development and advancement	5 (2.9%)	6 (3.5%)	5 (2.9%)	76 (43.2%)	84 (47.8%)	176	1.70	0.903
41	I do not believe younger academics need to be mentored for effective performance	8 (4.6%)	5 (2.9%)	6 (3.5%)	63 (35.8%)	94 (53.5%)	176	1.69	1.001
42	Mentoring in the University system should be formalized	79 (45.7%)	55 (31.8%)	12 (7%)	18 (10.5%)	9 (5.3%)	173	4.02	1.191
43	Senior academics are not current in their areas of specialization	13 (7.4%)	13 (7.4%)	33 (18.8%)	77 (43.8%)	40 (22.8%)	176	2.33	1.129
44	Senior academics are not interested in mentoring the younger ones	18 (10.3%)	17 (9.7%)	33 (18.8%)	72 (41%)	36 (20.5%)	176	2.48	1.214
45	Young academics do not seek mentoring	27 (15.4%)	42 (23.9%)	36 (20.5%)	56 (31.9%)	15 (8.6%)	176	3.06	1.232
46	The amount of work that young academics do makes mentoring challenging for them	21 (12.1%)	44 (25.3%)	25 (14.4%)	66 (38%)	18 (10.4%)	174	2.91	1.237
47	Young academics do not trust the older academics to give them right counsel in their career development	8 (4.6%)	19 (10.8%)	43 (24.5%)	78 (44.4%)	28 (16%)	176	2.44	1.029
48	There are not enough resources to successfully carry out mentoring	30 (17.3%)	38 (21.9%)	15 (8.7%)	61 (35.1%)	30 (17.3%)	174	2.87	1.394
49	Many young academics are arrogant and believe they do not need mentoring	27 (15.4%)	43 (24.5%)	21 (12%)	66 (37.5%)	19 (10.8%)	176	2.96	1.293
50	Many young academics over estimate their academic abilities	42 (23.9%)	61 (34.7%)	29 (16.5%)	35 (19.9%)	9 (5.2%)	176	3.52	1.200

Q/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
51	Many older academics over estimate their academic capabilities	30 (17.1%)	45 (25.6%)	25 (14.3%)	63 (35.8%)	13 (7.4%)	176	3.09	1.262
52	Mentors are usually overbearing, lording it over protégés	18 (10.4%)	36 (20.7%)	31 (17.9%)	74 (42.6%)	15 (8.7%)	174	2.82	1.168
53	Mentors feel that their protégés do not know anything and hence do not seek their opinions	4 (2.4%)	20 (11.7%)	21 (12.3%)	99 (57.6%)	28 (16.3%)	172	2.26	0.947
54	Mentors usually turn protégés to mere errand boys	11 (6.3%)	41 (23.3%)	24 (13.7%)	79 (44.9%)	21 (12%)	176	2.67	1.144
55	Mentors usually gather protégés around themselves for political reasons	11 (6.4%)	25 (14.4%)	52 (29.9%)	58 (33.4%)	28 (16.1%)	174	2.61	1.110
56	Young academic flock around certain senior academics because of their perceived influence in the University and not because they want to be mentored	37 (21.4%)	71 (41.1%)	21 (12.2%)	34 (19.7%)	10 (5.8%)	173	3.53	1.194
57	Protégés are usually unable to measure up to the standards of the mentor	10 (5.7%)	35 (19.9%)	27 (15.4%)	80 (45.5%)	24 (13.7%)	176	2.59	1.123
58	Mentors are usually quite busy and are hence unable to pay adequate attention to the mentoring needs of the protégé	11 (6.3%)	59 (33.6%)	14 (8%)	69 (39.3%)	23 (13.1%)	176	2.81	1.213
59	Association with some senior colleagues may cause the young academic to be alienated by others	21 (12.2%)	58 (33.6%)	21 (12.2%)	57 (33%)	16 (9.3%)	173	3.06	1.235
60	The protégé may become a target by other senior colleagues who are opposed to the mentor	25 (14.2%)	65 (36.8%)	31 (17.6%)	37 (21%)	19 (10.8%)	177	3.23	1.236

Q/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
61	Lack of freedom and opportunities for the protégé to freely speak about his ideas and feelings	18 (10.2%)	55 (31.1%)	23 (13%)	59 (33.4%)	22 (12.5%)	177	2.93	1.246
62	Fear of being branded as the mentor's boy by peers and other faculty members	28 (15.9%)	62 (35.1%)	23 (13%)	47 (26.6%)	17 (9.7%)	177	3.21	1.264
63	Fear of being romantically linked to the mentor in a different gender mentoring relationship	26 (15.1%)	38 (22%)	39 (22.6%)	57 (33%)	13 (7.6%)	173	3.04	1.207
64	Fear of being approached by the mentor for sexual relationship (sexual harassment)	28 (15.9%)	41 (23.2%)	29 (16.4%)	60 (33.9%)	19 (10.8%)	177	2.99	1.281
65	Inability to spend quality time with the mentor because of what people will say	26 (14.7%)	41 (23.2%)	37 (21%)	59 (33.4%)	14 (8%)	177	3.03	1.215
66	Lack of reverence and respect by junior academic for the expertise and person of the mentor	24 (13.8%)	43 (24.8%)	20 (11.5%)	72 (41.4%)	15 (8.7%)	174	2.94	1.250
67	Young academics lack interest in anything that will not immediately yield financial gains	39 (22.1%)	44 (24.9%)	28 (15.9%)	48 (27.2%)	18 (10.2%)	177	3.21	1.331
68	Mentors unwillingness to introduce protégés to lucrative aspects of the job e.g. consultancy, book writing, adjunct lecturing	24 (13.6%)	40 (22.6%)	26 (14.7%)	70 (39.6%)	17 (9.7%)	177	2.91	1.244
69	Mentors of the preferred gender are lacking	25 (14.2%)	40 (22.6%)	56 (31.7%)	44 (24.9%)	12 (6.8%)	177	3.12	1.141
70	Inadequate number of female mentors	26 (15%)	54 (31.1%)	39 (22.5%)	43 (24.8%)	12 (6.9%)	174	3.22	1.178
71	I would prefer to mentor a protégé of the same gender as me	44 (24.9%)	30 (17%)	31 (17.6%)	45 (25.5%)	27 (15.3%)	177	3.11	1.424

Q/N	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
72	There is someone I would have loved to mentor but he rebuffed my attempts at mentoring	15 (8.5%)	24 (13.6%)	35 (19.8%)	62 (35.1%)	41 (23.2%)	177	2.49	1.225
73	The mentoring relationship might become too personal for my liking	14 (8%)	17 (9.7%)	28 (15.9%)	86 (48.6%)	32 (18.1%)	177	2.41	1.130
74	Lack of Work – life balance makes mentoring difficult for me	16 (9.2%)	39 (22.3%)	33 (18.9%)	68 (38.9%)	19 (10.9%)	175	2.80	1.174