

Mentoring: A Critical Review in the Context of Higher Education in Bangladesh

a. Md. Asirul Haque, Ph.D
Professor, Department of Political Science
Murari Chand College &
MT Nottingham Associate
University of Nottingham, Malaysia CEDP
E-mail: asirul@gmail.com

b. Salauddin Mohammad Forhad
Lecturer, Department of Public Administration
National University, Gazipur, Bangladesh

Abstract: Mentoring is recognized as a useful system for the betterment of students and faculties alike to cushion fall short of the promise of educational institutions. This review study analyzes the literature on mentoring and, by taking evidence from two studies - a formal and another informal mentoring - argues that despite some uncertainty in organizational outcomes, limitations in implementation, and even negative impact on both mentor and mentee, a formal mentoring system by nature and mixture of formal and informal by characteristics could provide greater benefit for teachers' development in the college education of Bangladesh.

Keywords: Mentoring; mentoring for teachers; formal mentoring; informal mentoring; college education

1. Introduction

The growing number of students in higher education institutions and changing the teacher-student relationship from controlling to supporting (Spilt et al., 2012) emphasizes the need for a mentoring system to take the challenge of the new education landscape. Mentoring is a process that influences the student's academic development and staff's career aspirations (Darwin & Palmer, 2009) and is regarded as a vital tool for improving the performance of students, mentors, instructors (Colvin & Ashman, 2010), and novice teachers (Mcnally & Martin, 1998) alike. Some statistics find that the benefits of the mentoring system are many, as 75 % of the top executives of the USA have been mentored and they got 28% extra salary from those who did not have mentors (Roch, 1979). Mentoring in education is even more beneficial as it facilitates teachers' quality, efficiency, effectiveness, skill, and productivity (Ehrich et al., 2004). That is why a growing number of nations include mentoring programs in their educational institutions, including the UK, USA, Canada, and developed European countries. However, there are many developing countries where the mentoring system is yet to include formally in the education system such as Bangladesh.

In this background, the study critically reviews the existing literature on mentoring and its impact on novice teachers. It evaluates two case studies of mentoring systems implemented in educational institutions and demonstrates how the lessons from the best practices can be implemented in the context of higher education institutions in Bangladesh. Importantly, the study argues that despite some uncertainty in organizational outcomes (Blake-Beard et al., 2007) and limitations in implementing (Douglas, 1997), even negative impact on both mentor and mentee (Long et al., 2012), a formal mentoring system by nature and a mixture of formal and informal mentoring aspects by characteristics could provide greater benefit for teachers' development in the college education system of Bangladesh.

Following the introduction, the study critically reviews the mentoring literature and evaluates its impact on the professional and self-development of novice teachers followed by analyzing two case studies of mentoring in higher education institutions. Finally, the study demonstrates how the lessons from the best practices of the case studies can be implemented in the college education settings in Bangladesh.

1.1 Background of mentoring: A tool for leading learning

There is nearly unanimous consent among scholars that the word 'mentoring' has originated from the epic Greek tragedy, the 'Odyssey' of Homer (Luna & Cullen, 1995). Following the notable work by Kram (1988), the mentoring system was initiated in the field of business and industrial organization, later on, academic institutions were inspired by the remarkable work of Daloz (1986). Historically, mentoring is regarded as a popular means of transferring knowledge and expertise from a wise and experienced person to an inexperienced and unskilled person. It is believed that mentees are the prime beneficiaries of the mentoring process and mentors help mentees without expecting any reciprocation (Eby et al., 2008). Some studies, for example, Scandura et al. (1996) explore that the mentoring system is beneficial for the mentors, mentees, and organizations alike, i.e. for all stakeholders involved.

Mentoring is particularly involved with individual professional skill development and has gained much attention recently from academics as a vital tool for promoting novice teachers as leader educators. Mentoring is related to instructional leadership (Martin et al., 2016) and is uniquely positioned at the juncture between students' well-being by nursing their inherent potential and teachers' career aspirations by guiding them through professional development which facilitates developing teachers' leadership qualities. The challenges teachers face at the beginning of their career could be cushioned with a collaborative effort of sharing knowledge and ideas (Kumi-Yeboah & James, 2012) and could be facilitated by coping with organizational cultures (Viator, 2001) to gain an understanding of professionalism in teaching and flourishing the qualities of classroom management as a leader. Mentoring, therefore, is a favored notion in the academic arena, both for teachers'

professional development and students' well-being, and has been included in the education policy framework of many countries.

1.2 Methodology

The study uses a structured evaluation of literature from the education discipline to reach an understanding of the mentoring paradigm. The criteria for selecting literature were, firstly, published in a recognized peer-reviewed journal and, secondly, the relevance of the mentoring concept in educational settings for example schools, colleges, or universities. Literature was collected from online databases including, Science Direct, Springer Link, JSTOR Education, Wiley, SAGE Journals, ELSEVIER, ERIC, EBSCO, and Emerald. Besides, some books, in particular book chapters, and works outside the educational settings were consulted to enlarge and justify the understanding of mentoring concepts. The study consulted nearly 150 articles and identified 104 that were relevant to the theme of the study.

The literature was evaluated and coded according to the objectives and aims of the study. The positive and problematic factors, both for mentors and mentees have been analysed. All the findings from the literature regarding mentoring systems, have been highlighted and presented in the study in an accepted scholarly manner.

2. Literature Review: Mentoring- A critical discussion

2.1 Conceptualizing mentoring

Darwin and Palmer (2009) note that the academic landscape has changed rapidly over the past few decades and formal mentoring programs have gone far beyond their starting point in 1990. The traditional mentoring system has been recognized as paternalistic, unstructured, and limited to transforming knowledge from a superior and idealistic person to inferior and novice persons, in contrast, nowadays "formal mentoring programs are planned, structured, and coordinated interventions within an organization's human resource policies ... mentors and mentees are well matched, and that organizational support and commitment are evident" (Ehrich et al., 2004). In higher education institutions, mentoring reinforces teachers' learning process and develops teaching efficacy through formal institutional set-up to ensure professional standards.

Conceptualizing mentoring in a single frame is, to some extent, difficult since it revolves around many related aspects such as nursing, guiding, coaching, tutoring, problem-solving, and torching and involves three concerned parties – mentor, mentee, and organization as Colley (2002) mentioned. Some author concentrates on mentoring from students' points of view and take mentees as peer students, such as Crisp and Cruz (2009), Heirdsfield et al. (2008), and Tremblay and Rodger (2003). However, most authors conceptualize mentoring from the teachers' perspective and take novice teachers as mentees. For example, Schatz-Oppenheimer (2017), Clark and Byrnes (2012), Iancu-Haddad and Oplatka (2009), and Luna and Cullen (1995), in this paradigm, some analyze roles, perceptions, and benefits of mentors in the

mentoring process. A large number of authors (Clark & Byrnes, 2012; Hobson et al., 2009; Danielson, 2002; & Stanulis et al., 2002) have explored it from the mentees' viewpoint and emphasized mentees' benefits. Besides, some see it from both mentors' and mentees' points of view, for example, Shwartz and Dori (2016) and Van Ginkel et al. (2016).

In the study, peer students' mentoring aspects are excluded from the analysis because the focus of the study is to evaluate teachers' mentoring programs and explore their benefits mainly for novice teachers and partly for education institutions. For the same reason, the study has paid little attention to mentors' roles and perspectives in the critical analysis.

2.1.1 Mentoring for novice teachers

From the perspective of mentees' benefits, Clark and Byrnes (2012) explore that a 'common planning time' for both mentors and mentees in mentoring activities is the most beneficial for mentees. They find that mentees prefer to get help from mentors for their immediate needs without going deep to reflect on or evaluate themselves. They confirm that novice teachers rated the mentoring program mostly useful, especially the listening, socializing, and encouraging parts from mentors which enable them to familiarize themselves with the settings and environment of the institution. This argument previously is being addressed by Schrodt et al. (2003) and Löffström & Eisenschmidt (2009) in their analysis. We do believe that usually novice teachers need help with their instant problems and the mentoring system could provide the remedy of the problems with great confidence as Kajs (2002) confirms.

Some author argues that effective mentoring depends on the appropriate selection of mentor which of the benefits, whereas minimizes the costs, for example, Van Ginkel et al. (2016) evaluate the matching criteria for mentor and mentee in the successful mentoring process in the context of the Netherlands. They show that mentoring is a reciprocal process as, during the training to teach, novice teachers develop their teaching skills by adapting various intrinsic and extrinsic sources of learning and understanding while mentors support mentees by sharing their own experiences, encountered problems, and reflections on meaning-oriented learning. I find that this argument addresses the pragmatic features of mentoring aspects and is being supported by various authors, for example, sharing mentors' experience (Lindgren, 2005), sharing their problems (Ambrosetti et al., 2010), and meaning-oriented learning (Godshalk & Sosik, 2003).

Others have explored mentoring programs from disciplinary perspectives, such as Shwartz and Dori (2016) emphasize the importance of a mentoring program for science, technology, and engineering disciplines due to the shortage of expert teachers in these disciplines all over the world. They analyzed the mentoring program by employing a theoretical model and emphasized that 'discipline-based' and 'subject-knowledge' based matching between mentor and mentee is crucial for the effectiveness of the process. It is believed that their model and findings

have enriched the mentoring paradigm and should be fruitful if implemented in other educational disciplines apart from science and technology.

2.1.2 Professional development of novice teachers

Scholars have linked mentoring to various aspects of the professional development of novice teachers, such as career development (Hobson et al., 2013; Eastman & Williams, 1993; Kram & Isabella, 1985), self-satisfaction (Schrodt et al., 2003; Dutton, 2003), and self-confidence (Ehrich et al., 2002). Professionally, mentoring provides an important knowledge resource and valuable experience support that enriches novice teachers which eventually benefits the students and ultimately the institution itself. Also, mentoring facilitates faculty collaboration and professional learning which are not easily available without involving in this process.

Career development: Career development is the most favored concept in this aspect and many authors explore this issue rigorously. Mentoring provides a unique opportunity for young faculties to furnish their career by guiding them in each stage of professional advancement and problem-solving strategies that fit the specific problem (Perna et al., 1995). As a tool of instructional leadership, mentoring supports novice teachers to collaborate with senior faculties to develop skills needed for teaching efficacy which boosts enthusiasm for learning (Martin et al., 2016) and prevents them from leaving the teaching profession (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). I believe that this argument has a high level of validity because the rate of leaving the teaching profession is very high for newcomers; a study indicates that nearly 50% of new entrants leave this career within five years from the entry point (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003) and mentoring and teachers' induction program could be the best solution to this problem (Martin et al. 2016).

Self-satisfaction: The mentoring process helps to boost self-satisfaction for novice teachers eventually developing professional growth (Ehrich et al., 2004; Schrodt et al., 2003). Scholars have explored how mentoring provides opportunities for increasing self-satisfaction in teaching and boosts enthusiasm for tackling new challenges. Schrodt et al. (2003) show that through the mentoring process, mentees get a feeling of ownership and a sense of connectedness to the institution since mentees become socialized to the institutional environment, know the promotional procedures, get the research funding sources, and become acquainted with teaching techniques with greater confidence. Therefore, this process is beneficial for a mentor, mentee, and institution in a reciprocal manner. In line with some authors, I value the notion that the mentoring process certainly increases self-satisfaction, for example, in the context of Latino students, Santos and Reigadas (2002) show how mentoring increases students' satisfaction with the college education. Similarly, some, for example, Ingersoll and Kralik (2004), explores how the mentoring process keeps the retention of teachers in teaching through enhancing self-satisfaction.

Self-confidence: Self-confidence is another important benefit that mentees get into the mentoring process (Hobson et al., 2013; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Ehrich et al., 2002). Mentoring enables novice teachers to overcome difficult situations and boosts their confidence by improving problem-solving capacities eventually which increases job satisfaction. Enrich and his colleagues (2002) explore by reviewing the mentoring literature that along with many supports, gives a feeling of self-esteem or self-confidence to both mentees and mentors. Similarly, some studies have reported mentoring increases collaboration among faculties and increases confidence in teaching which gives a feeling of socialization or acceptability to fellows (Davies et al., 1999). The argument of self-confidence of novice teachers through the mentoring process is also reinforced by many scholars (see, for example, Humphrey, 2003; King et al., 2002; Bobek, 2002).

2.2 Factors of Mentoring

Studies have reported that without ideal conditions and settings, the mentoring process may not produce the expected results for mentees. Scholars have mentioned that certain factors facilitate the mentoring process to be successful, such as the allocation of resources, ideal pairing between mentors and mentees, mentors' gender, and collaborative settings of the institution. These factors are exemplified in the following discussions.

Resources play a significant role in the mentoring process. Ehrich and his colleague (2004) explore that if resources, in terms of a human and organizational setup, are not employed carefully, mentoring even could produce negative results as 'poor mentoring can be worse than no mentoring at all' (Ehrich et al., 2004). Darwin and Palmer (2009) show that not everybody is an ideal mentor and a mentor-mentee relationship is not guaranteed to be successful always. Generally, a mentor is regarded as a father figure who influences the outcomes, thus, the mentoring process predominantly needs a mentor who has the experience, professional expertise, motivational qualities, authority, and trustworthiness (Allen & Poteet, 1999) and has similarities with the mentee in personality and discipline (Hobson et al., 2013) Therefore, the selection of a mentor is important as well as matching the appropriate mentee.

In this aspect, 'paring and matching' emerges as a vital factor in the mentoring process. Hobson et al. (2013) have posted a significant argument that can be called 'pairing' between mentor and mentee. According to their views, matching between provider and receiver in terms of subject specialization, the common perception about classroom practice, similar personality and professional interest, and interest in involvement in the mentoring process are the preconditions for successful mentoring. This dimension of arguments is also supported by various scholars, for example, subject specialization (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Rothera et al., 1995), perception in classroom management (Simpson et al., 2007; Evertson & Smithey, 2000), similar personality and academic interest (Ehrich et al., 2004), and willing to involve in the

process (Rippon & Martin, 2006; Kennedy, 2005). Some scholars have been cautious about its implication in the academic sphere, for example, Hobson and his colleagues (2009) argue that even though mentoring provides a lot of benefits for all parties, its usefulness is often unrealized and even does harm to mentees. Therefore, effective conditions – ideal pairing or matching – for successful mentoring should be ensured to get the best results from this process.

Scholars have addressed another factor, mentors' gender, that has an impact on mentoring relationships and outputs. Day (2000) reports that there is a difference in outputs depending on the mentors' gender. Some study also indicates so, such as Ragins and Cotton (1999) claim that male mentors have a greater role and impact on mentees than female mentors. However, I differ in this perspective that gender roles should not have a decisive, or if have very insignificant, impact on mentees' outputs as many studies acknowledge this fact (Kao et al., 2014; Scandura & Ragins, 1993). In particular, Kao et al. (2014) explore that same-sex mentoring has an impact on mentoring outcomes, however, cross-sex has no observable effects. Similarly, examining the cross-sex mentoring relationship, Scandura and Williams (2001) confirm that sex has no relation to mentoring outcomes.

The institutional setting is another factor that facilitates the effective mentoring process by setting up a formal relationship between mentors and mentees. Historically, mentoring is regarded as a spontaneous and informal relationship (Baugh and Fagenson-Eland, 2007) between a troubled person and a wise father figure who is involved in this process to unfold the particular issue. Whereas, studies have revealed that organized and formal mentoring provides significant benefits to mentees through institutional set-up (Tong & Kram, 2012; Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007) by assigning mentors to the mentees on specified days and times and in a structured format. In the educational paradigm, formal mentoring programs address various aspects related to teaching, institutional needs, and even problematic issues encountered by novice teachers early in their careers. Through this process, novice teachers become well off in academic aspects and get support in professional development in an organized manner.

3. Findings and Discussions

3.1 Mentoring: Two Case Studies

This section analyzes two case studies of mentoring programs applied in higher education institutions globally to unfold how they provide benefits to novice teachers and institutions. The first case study is on an informal mentoring process proceeding in a Caribbean university and the latter one is a formal mentoring program launched in a mid-western USA university. The study has chosen these two different kinds of mentoring programs, formal and informal, to unveil if different mentoring process yields different results and, if so, to what extent and which aspects of mentoring would be best suited in the context of college education in Bangladesh.

3.1 1 Case Study 1

In their study, Carmel and Paul (2015) evaluate the informal mentoring process in the context of a renowned university in Jamaica called University X. It had 11,000 students and 420 permanent faculties in 2012 and offered 70 programs. The university did not have any established formal mentoring programs to support its academics, however, recognizing the need for professional advancement, it assists academics to get a higher degree. Consequently, the faculties of the university started the informal mentoring process by senior faculties to novice teachers to increase academic growth and cushion shortcomings.

Carmel and Paul (2015) have taken a case study of informal mentoring to assess the impact of this process on the mentee. Within one year of the mentor-mentee relationship in this case study, the authors have evaluated the results in the five broad themes, 'career advancement and expanded thinking', 'increased scholarly confidence', 'collaborative working', 'skill development', 'goal setting and action planning'. They claim that the mentee got benefits from these five themes of career and professional development as scholars have indicated mentoring may yield these kinds of benefits for the mentee. In the end, the authors also claim informal mentoring produces better results because it takes place when the mentee needs so, and the mentee has the option to choose their mentor. In addition, this process provides boosted confidence in the subject matter, generating ideas, and sharing learnings for mentees because it is transformative by system and self-selecting by nature.

3.1.2 Case Study 2

Cawyer et al. (2002) have evaluated a formal mentoring program initiated at a USA university to facilitate relations between novice teachers and senior academics. The authors evaluate how mentoring programs socialize newcomers into a collaborative academic setting. The university has about 20,000 students and nearly 1000 permanent faculties and the Department of Communication, from where the case study was taken, has 850 undergraduate and 70 master level students. In the department, there is a formal mentoring program where mentors are veteran faculty members who support novice teachers in adjusting to the academic environment.

The authors have analyzed the results of the mentoring program in five broad aspects related to the socialization process of mentees. These aspects are, 'interpersonal bonding', 'social support', 'professional advice', 'History' (background and power structure of the organization), and 'accessibility'. They explored that the success of mentoring depends on the mentors' skills, in terms of physical and psychological accessibility. According to them, accessibility is a vital factor since it facilitates bonding with a mentor and develops a relationship with the mentee. If accessibility becomes problematic or not met properly, the other aspects of mentoring cannot produce the expected results. They confirm both formal and informal mentoring process has merits, however, to what extent they facilitate benefits to the mentee, depends on certain circumstances,

particularly, the mentors' willingness and accessibility. Moreover, rather than isolated mentoring one-to-one, faculty mentoring is more beneficial for mentees. Finally, the authors have ratified the need for formal mentoring in collaborative higher educational settings with some observations.

3.2 Case studies of mentoring: Implication in Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, the status of higher education is far more different and old-fashioned than that of Western developed countries, in terms of the education system and inter-faculty relations. The functionality of this system is controlled by the central bureaucracy (Hossain, 2017) as higher education institutes, graduate and postgraduate universities, are controlled by the Ministry of Education and looked after by the University Grant Commission. University colleges are controlled by the Ministry of Education and supervised by the National University (BANBEIS, 2015). Presently, there are 1623 university colleges in Bangladesh including government and private with 27,734 teachers affiliated with the National University (BANBEIS, 2016).

In the context of university colleges in Bangladesh, there is no formal mentoring program exists. Surprisingly, no issues of mentoring have been raised in the intellectual and academic spheres until now and there is no empirical study on the faculty mentoring process in the context of college education in Bangladesh, to the best of our knowledge. Considering this drawback, the study seeks help from the personal observation of the authors of the study. To be noted, from more than 26 years of experience as a faculty of five different university colleges in Bangladesh, the observation of the main authors of this study might serve as a considerable source of data on college faculty-related issues in Bangladesh.

In the following, the study recommends some best practices from the above case studies that should be implemented in the college education of Bangladesh to enhance the socialization process of novice teachers.

Firstly, in line with some scholars (Lumpkin, 2011; Allen et al., 2006; Darwin, 2000) it proposes that a formal mentoring program for novice teachers should be launched in the university colleges of Bangladesh. There are both merits and demerits for formal mentoring as highlighted in case study 1. It observes that faculty relationship is complex and bureaucratic in Bangladesh. Senior faculties often tend to neglect and ignore novice teachers in familiarizing the organizational norms and supporting teaching careers. There is no system to nourish novice teachers and even, surprisingly, no benchmark in teaching in terms of techniques and procedures in college education. Consequently, novice teachers, without having any idea how to teach, start teaching according to their wishes. In this circumstance, the study perceives that a formal mentoring program is necessary since it could bridge the gap between senior and junior faculties by gathering them into a common platform.

Secondly, the study suggests a self-selecting option for mentees to choose mentors to minimize the power threat of mentors in formal mentoring. In this

system, mentees could choose their mentors according to their preference from a panel of mentors. In this way, the influence of power and position of mentors might be minimized and the gap between mentors and mentees could be narrower as suggested by many authors (see for example. Searby, 2010; Wolffensperger, 2010; Buell, 2004).

Thirdly, it proposes a group mentoring program that might provide greater benefits for mentees and institutions alike (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Pierce, 1998). Through group mentoring, particular disadvantages of one-to-one mentoring e.g., power issues, bossing, and emotion could be minimized as suggested by Emelo (2011). According to the mentees' preference, a mentor could be assigned to a group of mentees from the same discipline. In the context of bureaucratic faculty relationships in Bangladesh, the study believes, inspired by Wasburn (2007), formal group mentoring would be best suited for college teachers in Bangladesh to reduce the superiority complex of mentors and maximize the opportunities for mentees.

Fourthly, the study perceives mentor-mentee matching would be a better option as many studies (Ghosh & Reio, 2013; Allen et al., 2006; Allen et al., 1999; Kram, 1985) suggest that perfect matching between mentors and mentees, in terms of interest, expertise, understanding, and accessibility, has a significant influence on mentees' performance (Karcher et al., 2005) and scholars have made the connection between mentoring relationships and the importance of matching (Allen et al., 1999). It believes matching would be particularly valuable for mentees since, in this strategy, a better understanding and relation between mentors and mentees would develop that could produce better results for mentees in the context of Bangladesh.

Finally, the study suggests that accessibility should be ensured in the mentoring process as Cawyer, Simonds, and Davis (2002) mentioned in case study- 2. Wasburn (2007) shows how accessibility emerges as a key factor for developing mentor-mentee relationships that provide greater opportunities to socialize with mentees in an organizational environment. Similarly, some study (Heirdsfield et al., 2008) explores that willingness and accessibility decrease mentees' stress and boost confidence. Likewise, a scheduling agreement between mentor and mentee (Kay and Hinds, 2005) develops a mentoring relationship. Therefore, in the mentoring programs for college faculties of Bangladesh, mentors should be accessible to mentees and their location-distance should easily be reachable.

In a nutshell, the study recommends a formal mentoring program that should be launched in every undergraduate and post-graduate college in Bangladesh. A group of mentors should be formed from each discipline by senior faculties, particularly by professors and associate professors, and lecturers and assistant professors will be a mentee and the principals of each college will supervise this. Where there is a lack of senior and expert faculties, there should be a panel of mentors from other colleges. Finally, to be practical, mentors should be provided

with a modest honorarium as found rational by some studies (Page, Loots, & du Toit, 2005; Mundt, 2001).

3.3 Challenges to the implementation of the formal mentoring program in Bangladesh

As it is noted that college-faculty relation is bureaucratic in Bangladesh, therefore, in the formal mentoring program, the power relation between mentor and mentee could emerge as a potential challenge in providing benefits to mentees which is addressed by many scholars (Garvey et al., 2017; Clutterbuck, 2014; Colley, 2001; Darwin, 2000). Clutterbuck (2014) explores that the power of mentors, either using or not, has a significant impact on the success of the mentoring program since mentors usually have greater power and position than mentees which affects their relationship, and mentees could feel threatened by mentors. However, the study believes that employing the 'self-selecting option of mentees' and 'group mentoring' choices should minimize the power threat of mentors in the context of Bangladesh.

Another challenge could be a lack of experienced mentors in the same discipline as mentees, particularly in the colleges located in the rural and remote areas of Bangladesh where two or three faculties are available in a department. In this situation, the formal mentoring program could backfire due to the scarcity of veteran mentors, inexperienced and unskilled faculty would-be mentors, and they impose their ideas and do bossing on novice teachers. To minimize this threat, the study believes, 'a panel of mentors' would be the best solution as recommended earlier. In this way, a lack of experienced mentors would be minimized and the drawback of bossing over mentees might be overcome.

Finally, the willingness and workload of mentors could be a threat to the formal mentoring program in Bangladesh. Lee and Feng (2005) explore how mentors have to bear unmanageable workloads during the mentoring program in addition to their usual duties. Likewise, Orland (2001) notice that mentors suffer from anxiety and nervousness during the mentoring process. This situation could be worse in the context of Bangladesh because of a huge number of novice teachers and a lack of senior veteran faculties. To minimize this threat, a panel of mentors could be an option. A group of mentors of the same discipline as mentees could divide the task of mentors and workloads of them might be lessened.

4. Conclusion

The study acknowledges some limitations in analyzing the mentoring paradigm. The study has taken some limited aspects of novice teachers' mentoring, though there are many other aspects that a novice teacher could experience, however, those are excluded from the analysis due to the limited scope of the study. Besides, due to the unavailability of extensive research on college-faculty mentoring in Bangladesh, the study had to depend on the personal observation of the author of the study on some aspects of the faculty status of Bangladesh that could give a partial focus on the issue. Moreover, this kind of analysis needs primary data, yet, due to the nature of the study, it could not be possible.

However, with the works of scholarly findings, the study attempted to overcome those shortcomings and validate the arguments.

The aim of the study was to examine the existing literature on mentoring, mainly its impact on novice teachers and partly on institutions, and by analyzing two case studies, to show how the best practices can be implemented in the collaborative college educational settings of Bangladesh. The study explores that novice teachers need support early in their careers to develop professionally and to familiarize themselves with the academic environment. Mentoring is one of the ways to ensure this support. Besides, teachers' teaching efficacy, self-satisfaction, and confidence could be boosted with this process. Higher education institutions also get benefits from this process since teachers' development ultimately provides benefits to the institution by uplifting its image and retaining its promise. The study perceived that formal mentoring programs are best suited for the college education settings of Bangladesh. However, some characteristics of informal mentoring should be incorporated into this system, in particular, the self-selecting option for mentees, group mentoring, and matching between mentors and mentees. Finally, to minimize, one of the drawbacks of formal mentoring, accessibility of mentors should be guaranteed. To ensure the development of the college faculties, the study believes mentoring is the best option that leads the college education system of Bangladesh to a better future.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., & Poteet, M. L. (1999). Developing effective mentoring relationships: Strategies from the mentor's viewpoint. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 48(1), 59–73.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). The relationship between formal mentoring program characteristics and perceived program effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(1), 125–153.
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 70–89.
- Ambrosetti, A., & Dekkers, J. (2010). The interconnectedness of the roles of mentors and mentees in pre-service teacher education mentoring relationships. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 42–55.
- BANBEIS. (2015). Survey report 2015. Retrieved from <http://data.banbeis.gov.bd/Survey2015.pdf>
- BANBEIS. (2016). Survey report 2016. Retrieved from <http://banbeis.gov.bd/data/images/chap01.pdf>
- Baugh, S. G., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (2007). Formal mentoring programs. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 249–271). Sage Publications.

- Blake-Beard, S. D., Murrell, A. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2007). Unfinished business: The impact of race on understanding mentoring relationships. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 223–247). Sage Publications.
- Bobek, B. L. (2002). Teacher resiliency: A key to career longevity. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 202–205.
- Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22(3), 157–179.
- Buell, C. (2004). Models of mentoring in communication. *Communication Education*, 53(1), 56–73.
- Carmel, R. G., & Paul, M. (2015). Mentoring and coaching in academia: Reflections on a mentoring/coaching relationship. *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(4), 479–491.
- Cawyer, C. S., Simonds, C. S., & Davis, S. (2002). Mentoring to facilitate socialization: The case of the new faculty member. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(2), 225–242.
- Clark, S. K., & Byrnes, D. (2012). Through the eyes of the novice teacher: Perceptions of mentoring support. *Teacher Development*, 16(1), 43–54.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2014). *Everyone needs a mentor: Fostering talent at work* (5th ed.). Kogan Page Publishers.
- Colley, H. (2002). A ‘rough guide’ to the history of mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28(3), 257–273.
- Colvin, J. W., & Ashman, M. (2010). Roles, risks, and benefits of peer mentoring relationships in higher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(2), 121–134.
- Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(6), 525–545.
- Daloz, L. A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences*. Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series.
- Danielson, L. (2002). Developing and retaining quality classroom teachers through mentoring. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 183–185.
- Darwin, A. (2000). Critical reflections on mentoring in work settings. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50(3), 197–211.
- Darwin, A., & Palmer, E. (2009). Mentoring circles in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(2), 125–136.
- Davies, M. A., Brady, M., Rodger, S., & Wall, P. (1999). Mentors and school-based partnership: Ingredients for professional growth. *Action in Teacher Education*, 21(1), 85–96.

- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581–613.
- Douglas, C. A. (1997). Formal mentoring programs in organizations. *Center of Creative Leadership*, 332(1), 1–40.
- Dutton, C. (2003). Mentoring: The contextualisation of learning--Mentor, protégé and organisational gain in higher education. *Education+ Training*, 45(1), 22–29.
- Eastman, K. & Williams, D. L. (1993). Relationship between mentoring and career development of agricultural education faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 34(2), 71–76.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 254–267.
- Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B. C., & Tennent, L. (2002). A review of mentoring in education: Some lessons for nursing. *Contemporary Nurse*, 12(3), 253–264.
- Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B. C., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: A review of the literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 518–540.
- Emelo, R. (2011). Creating a new mindset: Guidelines for mentorship in today's workplace. *Training and Development*, 6(1), 44–49.
- Evertson, C. M., & Smithey, M. W. (2000). Mentoring effects on protégés' classroom practice: An experimental field study. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(5), 294–304.
- Garvey, B., Stokes, P., & Megginson, D. (2017). *Coaching and mentoring: Theory and practice*. Sage.
- Ghosh, R., & Reio, T. G. (2013). Career benefits associated with mentoring for mentors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(1), 106–116.
- Godshalk, V. M., & Sosik, J. J. (2003). Aiming for career success: The role of learning goal orientation in mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 417–437.
- Heirdsfield, A. M., Walker, S., Walsh, K., & Wilss, L. (2008). Peer mentoring for first-year teacher education students: The mentors' experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(2), 109–124.
- Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 207–216.
- Hossain, M. (2017). Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments - The state of accountability in the education sector of Bangladesh: A critical overview. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002595/259542e.pdf>
- Humphrey, N. (2003). Facilitating a positive sense of self in pupils with dyslexia: The role of teachers and peers. *Support for Learning*, 18(3), 130–136.

- Iancu-Haddad, D., & Oplatka, I. (2009). Mentoring novice teachers: Motives, process, and outcomes from the mentor's point of view. *The New Educator*, 5(1), 45–65.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30–33.
- Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J. M. (2004). The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says. *ECS Research Review*, 1–24.
- Kajs, L. T. (2002). Framework for designing a mentoring program for novice teachers. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 10(1), 57–69.
- Kao, K. Y., Rogers, A., Spitzmueller, C., Lin, M. T., & Ko, C. H. (2014). Who should serve as my mentor? The effects of mentor's gender and supervisory status on resilience in mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(2), 191–203.
- Karcher, M. J., Nakkula, M. J., & Harris, J. (2005). Developmental mentoring match characteristics: Correspondence between mentors' and mentees' assessments of relationship quality. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2), 93–110.
- Kay, D., & Hinds, R. (2005). *A practical guide to mentoring: Play an active and worthwhile part in the development of others, and improve your own skills in the process*. How To Books.
- Kennedy, A. (2005). Models of continuing professional development: A framework for analysis. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 31(2), 235–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580500200277>
- King, K. A., Vidourek, R. A., Davis, B., & McClellan, W. (2002). Increasing self-esteem and school connectedness through a multidimensional mentoring program. *Journal of School Health*, 72(7), 294–299.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1), 110–132.
- Kumi-Yeboah, A., & James, W. (2012). Transformational teaching experience of a novice teacher: A narrative of an award-winning teacher. *Adult Learning*, 23(4), 170–177.
- Lee, J. C., & Feng, S. (2005). Mentoring support and the professional development of beginning teachers: A Chinese perspective. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 15(3), 243–263.
- Lindgren, U. (2005). Experiences of beginning teachers in a school-based mentoring program in Sweden. *Educational Studies*, 31(3), 251–263.
- Löfström, E., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2009). Novice teachers' perspectives on mentoring: The case of the Estonian induction year. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 681–689.
- Long, F., Hall, K., Conway, P., & Murphy, R. (2012). Novice teachers as 'invisible' learners. *Teachers and Teaching*, 18(6), 619–636.

- Lumpkin, A. (2011). A model for mentoring university faculty. *Educational Forum*, 75(4), 357–368.
- Luna, G., & Cullen, D. L. (1995). Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 3.
- Marable, M. A., & Raimondi, S. L. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of what was most (and least) supportive during their first year of teaching. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 15(1), 25–37.
- Martin, K. L., Buelow, S. M., & Hoffman, J. T. (2016). New teacher induction: Support that impacts beginning middle-level educators. *Middle School Journal*, 47(1), 4–12.
- McNally, P., & Martin, S. (1998). Support and challenge in learning to teach: The role of the mentor. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(1), 39–50.
- Mundt, M. H. (2001). An external mentor program: Stimulus for faculty research development. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 17(1), 40–45.
- Orland, L. (2001). Reading a mentoring situation: One aspect of learning to mentor. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 75–88.
- Page, B. J., Loots, A., & Du Toit, D. F. D. (2005). Perspectives on a South African tutor/mentor program: The Stellenbosch University experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 13(1), 5–21.
- Perna, F. M., Lerner, B. M., Yura, M. T., & Tannenbaum, F. M. (1995). Mentoring and career development among university faculty. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 177(2), 31–45.
- Pierce, G. (1998). Developing new university faculty through mentoring. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 37(1), 27–38.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 529.
- Rippon, J. H., & Martin, M. (2006). What makes a good induction supporter? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(1), 84–99.
- Roch, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review*, 57(1), 14–20.
- Rothera, M., Harris, S., & Hughes, J. (1995). The role of subject mentor in further education. In T. Kerry & A. Shelton Mayes (Eds.), *Issues in mentoring* (pp. 99–110).
- Santos, S. J., & Reigadas, E. T. (2002). Latinos in higher education: An evaluation of a university faculty mentoring program. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 1(1), 40–50.
- Scandura, T. A., & Ragins, B. R. (1993). The effects of sex and gender role orientation on mentorship in male-dominated occupations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 251–265.
- Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2001). An investigation of the moderating effects of gender on the relationships between mentorship initiation and

- protégé perceptions of mentoring functions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 342–363.
- Scandura, T. A., Tejada, M. J., Werther, W. B., & Lankau, M. J. (1996). Perspectives on mentoring. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(3), 50–56.
- Schatz-Oppenheimer, O. (2017). Being a mentor: Novice teachers' mentors' conceptions of mentoring prior to training. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(2), 274–292.
- Schrodt, P., Cawyer, C. S., & Sanders, R. E. (2003). An examination of academic mentoring behaviors and new faculty members' satisfaction with socialization and tenure and promotion processes. *Communication Education*, 52(1), 17–29.
- Searby, L. J. (2010). Preparing future principals: Facilitating the development of a mentoring mindset through graduate coursework. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(1), 5–22.
- Shwartz, G., & Dori, Y. J. (2016). Looking through the eyes of mentors and novice teachers: Perceptions regarding mentoring experiences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 228(June), 149–153.
- Simpson, T., Hastings, W., & Hill, B. (2007). I knew that she was watching me: The professional benefits of mentoring. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(5), 481–498.
- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681–714.
- Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2012). Dynamics of teacher-student relationships: Stability and change across elementary school and the influence on children's academic success. *Child Development*, 83(4), 1180–1195.
- Stanulis, R. N., Fallona, C. A., & Pearson, C. A. (2002). Am I doing what I am supposed to be doing?: Mentoring novice teachers through the uncertainties and challenges of their first year of teaching. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 10(1), 71–81.
- Tareef, A. B. (2013). The relationship between mentoring and career development of higher education faculty members. *College Student Journal*, 47(4), 703–711.
- Tong, C., & Kram, K. E. (2012). The efficacy of mentoring—the benefits for mentees, mentors, and organizations. In S. J. Zedeck (Ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring* (pp. 217–242). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tremblay, P. F., & Rodger, S. (2003). The effects of a peer mentoring program on academic success among first year university students. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 33(3), 1.

- Van Ginkel, G., Oolbekkink, H., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2016). Adapting mentoring to individual differences in novice teacher learning: The mentors viewpoint. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 22(2), 198–218.
- Viator, R. E. (2001). The relevance of transformational leadership to nontraditional accounting services: Information systems assurance and business consulting. *Journal of Information Systems*, 15(2), 99–125.
- Wasburn, M. H. (2007). Mentoring women faculty: An instrumental case study of strategic collaboration. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 15(1), 57–72.
- Wolffensperger, Y. (2010). Caring mentoring for academic literacy: A case study of a teacher education college in Israel. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(3), 249–267.