# EVALUATION OF MENTORING STRATEGIES AMONG ACADEMICS: A SURE WAY TO QUALITY RESEARCH REPORTS

**DR. ELIZABETH I. D. OFFOR**

Senior lecturer in the faculty of education, Imo State University,

Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.

E-mail – lizoffor@yahoo.com– +2348037091426

## Abstract

*Qualities of research outputs by young academics in recent times in this country are less than expected. This could be as a result of extent to which young academics are mentored by the more experienced or exposed academics. This study therefore sought to evaluate/ascertain the status and strategies of mentoring young academics for research. This will expose whether there is need for policy decision making toward improvements. This evaluation study is aimed at ascertaining the current status and strategies involved in mentoring amongst academics. A sample of 160 participants (mentors and mentees) were drawn from 372 academics from 6 (six) out of 11 (eleven) faculties of Imo State University, Owerri using proportionate random sampling techniques. They were given a set of strategies to rate under a 4-point scale. The rating scale has 27 items clustered under four subheadings: general mentoring, research teaching, research supervision and research networking. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach alpha and found to be 0.694. The instrument was administered face to face and this enabled the researcher to augment the scale with oral interview in which the respondents were asked to express their personal views about mentoring in the university. Mean and standard deviation scores, z-test and ANOVA F-test were the methods of data analyses. Results show that the mentoring strategies were largely informal where the mentors and mentees are allowed to freely establish relationships which have inherent loopholes. It was recommended that there is need to strengthen mentoring through institutionalization.*

## Introduction

No one knows it all. Experience has shown that brilliant academic qualifications do not always equate directly to excellent practical performance on job. This is the reason employees are said to grow on the job over time. The growth entails increase in practical knowledge, skills and depositions (kds) which gradually accumulate over time. The rate at which the kds increase depend on the employee's environment, exposure and experience. Nevertheless, hardly can an employee's KSD improve without the assistance of people who were there before him/her, that is, the older (not in terms of age) and more experienced/exposed colleagues. This fact holds true amongst members of academia in universities in Nigeria. They are familiar with mentoring and are known for mentoring their younger and less experienced/exposed colleagues to foster and perpetuate excellence in research reports and general service delivery. Research reports are very crucial in individual and national development. They guide policies of government that impact positively

on the lives of the people. As a result of this, "no student is awarded a degree without having carried out research investigation and submitted reports" (Ijaiya 2013, p. 6). It has been observed that younger lecturers are now left to learn on the job whether good or bad (Ijaiya 2013). This raised a concern and informed this study which is meant to ascertain whether the poor quality of research reports submitted by the students are traceable to mentoring problems. Do academics in universities still insist on mentoring their younger ones who in turn supervise students' research works? What strategies do they use, the researcher is intrigued to ask?

It is apt at this point to undertake clarification of the major concepts as they relate to the study. Academics are teachers teaching in the universities. They are generally referred to as lecturers or teaching staff to distinguish them from non-teaching, administrative staff. Lecturers carryout three basic categories of functions which include teaching, research and community services (Nwana, 2008). Academics have culture that subsists in quality services. They teach people to acquire university education, advance knowledge through research findings and cause inevitable changes, improvements and modernity to occur in the society. Okpala (2012) had said that through evaluation research, lecturers get involved in the process of keeping the components (inputs, process and outputs) under the watchful care of the people who have stakes in education. Lecturers are insatiable with knowledge and quite sensitive to events in their environments leading to their usefulness in diverse community services. Mentoring is one of the ways academics achieve and maintain character of excellence in service delivery.

Literature is replete with expressed ideas about mentoring. Each writer saw mentoring as the process of stamping cordial relationships between different individuals/employees where one functions as mentor, godfather, godmother or rabbi while the other is the mentee, protégé (protogee for female) or apprentice. Mentoring is a professional relationship in which an experienced person (mentor) assists another (mentee) in developing specific skills and knowledge that will enhance the less experienced person's professional and personal growth ([http://www.management-mentors.com](http://www.management-mentors.com)). Uzonwun (2014) listed mentoring as one of the staff development programmes that promotes awareness and refinement for the individuals professional development by providing and recommending structured opportunities for reflection and observation. Kram was cited by Isiozor (2014) as describing mentor as a coach, counselor and sponsor who actively intervene, provides support and facilitates the development of the less skill/experienced/exposed staff. Ubulon (2008) opined that for the young faculty members to cope with the responsibilities, they require guidance from senior colleagues who can serve as their mentors and role models. Thus, mentoring creates environment that is supportive, non-competitive and non-judgmental. On the other hand, it fosters trust, facilitates sharing and mutual respect (Sodipe and Madukama 2013). Ogomaka (2013) posited that a mentor should be knowledgeable, skillful and of positive dispositions. He/she should be creative, flexible and fluent in ideas because the mentee can have other sources of information. The mentor should be patient, pathetic, empathic, approachable, outgoing and observant because he/she will not expect the mentee to always come to discuss his/her deficiencies with the mentor. Thus relationship between mentor and mentee should be that of mutual respect because they learn from each other. Isiozor (2014) observed that mentoring can be formal or informal. In the formal mentorship programme, the less experienced staff is paired with more experienced staff who have standing record of professional competence. This implies that the formal mentoring is institutionalized while the informal mentorship focus more on the ability of the younger staff

to initiate cordial relationships with the most senior colleagues and vice versa. That means that in informal mentoring both mentor and mentee found themselves. Activities of mentoring are structured around the following concepts;

(i)     **Teaching:** A mentor takes the mentee to class to observe the mentor teach. He/she is also free to observe the mentee teach with the view of giving professional advice (Ihekwaba and Nosike 2016).

(ii)    **Research:** Giving mentee research topic to develop and a research reports to critique.

(iii)   **Networking:** Linking the mentee to sites in the web for relevant professional association guidelines on research investigation and reports as well as attending conferences to enrich knowledge.

(iv)    **Supervision of students' research works:** The mentee is added as the second supervisor who will read the work first and transfer to the mentor for ratification among other assignments. Mentoring relationship whether formal or informal are neither time or space bound. This is the reason academics can jointly carry out research works across disciplines, faculties and universities. This study will help to ascertain the type of mentoring that strives in the university and the benefits and challenges of each type. However, mentoring helps to avert the initial mistakes of the young staff in trying to cope with the full range of instructional and paper work responsibilities (Ihekwaba and Nosike 2016).

Perhaps, it may be better to be a bit elaborate in this concept of mentoring   since it is not taught as a course in school and human persons differ in their pattern of relating with others. It is good to mention guidelines as reference point in order to cushion the effect of human differences in mentoring. Ogomaka (2013) provided some approaches which he called **logical working styles**. He believed that mentors can apply any of the approaches depending on the personality characteristic of the mentee.

1.     **Thinking style:** This is based on changing the thought processes in line with the demands of the job. The focus is to instill self-confidence, self-control and to deal with the feelings of inadequacy and doubt.

2.     **Try hard style:** This is to encourage the mentee to be thorough, search for more information and not to always settle for the convention. Such phrases as you can do better than this, look at this a second time, you are strong, go ahead, 'look for more information' are used. The mentee moves with renewed strength to do the needful and in the end achieves that which was seemingly impossible.

3.     **Hurry up style/approach:** This is used mainly on mentees that are slow in getting things done. He/she can be the procrastinating type. Give him/her regimented assignments with time frame to complete it. Phrases such as 'you have the ability to do this in a short period, you can achieve, move on' etc. The mentee gets challenged and works to impress the mentor and match up with mentors' description of him/her.

4.     **Stamped approach:** This exposes the mentee to the nature of the job. Lecturers are busy people and their functions require speed and accuracy and the mentee should learn this. Mental alertness is also essential to cope with accompanying challenges. The mentee is guided to work within and outside the official hours to complete assigned tasks as expected.

5.     **Perfect style/approach:** As the period of mentorship advances the mentee becomes more like the mentor. He/she can carry out higher tasks with less monitoring. The mentor expects perfection in the discharge of duties. The mentee can successfully represent the mentor outside the domain and render credible reports.

The ideas raised in the literature about mentoring can be articulated as follows;

- Mentoring is a staff development programme
- It consists of establishing cordial interpersonal relationships among staff of any organization. Such relationship can be horizontal, involving staff of the same level or status or vertical involving staff of different status.
- Mentoring provides a level playground for staff to learn from each other irrespective of seniority.
- Mentoring can be formal ie where it is entrenched and enforced as a policy or informal where mentoring is left to chance and individual decision.

The writer went this far in explaining mentoring because of the importance in maintaining quality in research. Given that other professional growth programmes may not come up as regularly as expected, academics resorted to mentoring which occurs on daily basis. To this end, mentoring programmes of the universities need to be evaluated at regular intervals to ascertain whether there is room for strengthening. Evaluation has to do with the determination of worth or worthlessness of something (Ogomaka 2016). It is the process of taking decision in the light of evidence. Its origin dates back to creation period when God created all things and looked back and assessed them and passed judgment that they are all good (Gen. 1:31), since then, humans learned to, at some points, assess their activities in order to determine the need for continuation, remediation or outright dropping of such activities for another. In the same way this study is meant to assess the current status of mentoring among academic staff to guide policy-making regarding mentoring as a tool for improving research.

It may not be necessary to go into full discussion of evaluation models because this is not intended. However, a brief mention of a few of them is possible. Robert Stake's model of evaluation seeks to establish whether there is congruency between what exists and what suppose to exist about a given programme. The Stufflebeam model recommends that the evaluation should examine the presage variables (inputs), context variables (operating environments), process variables (implementation) and product variables (nature of the output). Information obtained from each of the stages gives impetus to adequate decision-making about a given programme. This implies that if any of the preceding variables (inputs, context and process) is faulty, it automatically reflects on the final outcomes/products. In the similar manner, the plausible question would be, to what extent can poor research reports be attributed to weak mentoring.   To find answer to the question intrigued this writer into carrying out this study with the aim of ascertaining the strategies of mentoring among academic staff.

## Research Questions

1.     What are the mentoring strategies among academics as shown by the mean and standard deviation scores of their responses per section of the instrument?

2.      What are the mean rating scores of academics according to their status (mentor or mentee)?


## Hypotheses

$H_{01}$:      There is no significant difference between the mean rating scores of strategies by mentors and mentees ($p_{<0.05}$).

$H_{02}$:      The mean rating scores of mentoring strategies by the academics do not differ facultywise.


## Method

This is evaluation survey because surveys ascertain current status of things about a given population by obtaining information from either the entire members of the population or by using a representative sample of the population. This was done without any form of manipulation/alteration of the natural setting of the population. It is evaluation because result will guide policy decisions toward improvement. This study is also a case study because it involves a single social unit (Imo State University) among other social units (other universities). This is to enable in-depth study for which case studies are known. A sample of one hundred and sixty (160) academic staff (mentors and mentees) was drawn from a population of 372 academic staff of six (6) out of eleven faculties for the study.   A mini survey was carried out to ascertain the total number of academics and their ranks in each of the six randomly sampled faculties. The academics fall into categories in this work viz; Professors, Readers and Senior lecturers are designated as mentors while lecturer I, lecturer II, Assistant lecturers and graduate assistants belong to mentees. Proportionate cluster random sampling techniques were used to constitute the sample. The clusters are the faculties and the status of lecturers (mentor or mentee) which they indicated on answering the research instrument which is a 4-point rating scale. The instrument has the length of 27 items clustered under four sub-headings – general mentoring, teaching research, research supervision and research networking/synergy. Two academics who are experts in research vetted the instrument and their concerns were taken into consideration in the final draft. The instrument was trial tested using 50 (mentors and mentees) academics from Abia State University. Using Cronbach alpha, the reliability index of the instrument was found to be 0.694.

The instrument was administered face to face. The researcher supplemented the rating scale with oral interview in which the respondents were asked to express their general view of mentoring in the university. Since in evaluation studies there should be a standard based on which the result would be compared and the researcher can provide such reference standards where none exists, this writer used the expected mean scores as the reference point. This is based on the facts that if a given item is generally acclaimed as mentoring strategy practiced in the institution that item will have the maximum mean score of four (4) in a 4-point scale. When this is multiplied by the total number of items in the instrument cluster it gives the cluster mean score as the standard by which the observed mean score is interpreted. Mean scores and standard deviation scores were used to answer research questions. Since randomization was used in constituting the sample size, it is expected that the data would be normally distributed; therefore the expected or criterion mean score of 2.50N was used, where N is the number of items which attained mean

score of 2.50 or above. Hypothesis one was tested using z-test of significant difference between two sample mean scores while ANOVA F-test was used to test hypothesis two.

## Results

Results are presented in tables in line with research questions and hypotheses.

**Table 1:** Results regarding mentoring strategies among academics according to sections of the instrument **Section A: General Mentoring**

**Table 1a: Mean and Standard deviation scores of responses concerning general mentoring**

| | Item Statement | $\overline{\text{x}}$ | Sd | Remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Young academics are mentored by their senior colleagues | 2.55 | 0.87 | Adopted |
| 2. | Mentees are officially assigned to their mentors | 1.52 | 0.79 | Not adopted |
| 3. | Mentors and mentees are left to find themselves | 3.16 | 1.01 | Adopted |
| 4. | Mentors cross-check the works of their mentees for quality compliance | 2.25 | 0.91 | Not adopted |
| 5. | Mentors encourage their mentees to feel free to consult them | 2.84 | 0.89 | Adopted |
| 6. | Mentors give guidelines on best practices with or without consultation by the mentees | 2.51 | 1.45 | Adopted |
| | Cluster mean score and sd | 14.83 (61.8%) | 2.87 | |

Four strategies were adopted out of six since they met the criterion mean score of 2.50 and above. In this segment the cluster mean score performance of academics regarding general mentoring is 14.83 out of 24 or 61.8%. The small magnitude of sd scores in each of the items and the cluster sd (2.87) indicate that the academics did not differ so much in their responses.

**Section B: Teaching research**

**Table 1b: Mean and standard deviation scores of mentoring strategies regarding the teaching of research**

| | Item Statement | $\overline{\text{x}}$ | Sd | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | There is team teaching involving mentors and mentees | 2.92 | 0.96 | Adopted |
| 2. | Mentors go to class with their mentees to teach | 2.14 | 0.99 | Not adopted |
| 3. | Young academics are mentored/guided to teach research at undergraduate level | 1.88 | 1.02 | Not adopted |
| 4. | Mentees are guided to teach research at Masters level | 2.70 | 0.87 | Adopted |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | Mentees are mentored before allowed to teach research at Ph.D level | 3.20 | 0.79 | Adopted |
| 6. | Mentors give their mentees course to teach and observe them teach for quality maintenance | 2.31 | 1.13 | Not adopted |
| 7. | Mentees are required to participate in the post graduate proposal/internal defence | 2.66 | 0.95 | Adopted |
| 8. | Mentees are allowed to clerk research defence for more knowledge | 2.86 | 0.97 | Adopted |
| 9. | My faculty organizes workshops/seminars based on research skills where the mentors deliver talks for mentees development | 1.85 | 1.34 | Not adopted |
| | Cluster mean score and sd | 22.52 (62.6%) | 3.04 | |

The data in table 1b show that five strategies out of nine are adopted as mentoring strategies by the academics. The cluster mean score which is 22.52 amounted to 62.6%. the cluster standard deviation (3.04) is noteworthy when compared with that of section A (general mentoring). The magnitude of sd score for section B (teaching research) is higher than that of general mentoring (2.87) indicating that the respondents differ more in the area of research teaching than in general mentoring. Can this connote lack of uniformity in mentoring regarding research teaching?

**Section C: Research Supervision**

**Table 1c: Means and standard deviation scores of respondents on research supervision**

| | Item Statement | $\bar{x}$ | Sd | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Young lecturers are mentored in research supervision before they are assigned undergraduate students to supervise | 2.15 | 1.05 | Not adopted |
| 2. | It is assumed that young academic can supervise undergraduate students without mentoring | 2.90 | 0.91 | Adopted |
| 3. | Mentors give their mentees research topic to develop and co-author research articles with their mentees | 2.60 | 1.24 | Adopted |
| 4. | Mentors give mentees research reports to critique and submit for scrutiny | 2.35 | 0.89 | Not adopted |
| 5. | Mentors monitor the mentees' supervision of students' research efforts | 2.10 | 0.96 | Not adopted |
| 6. | Mentees are guided through mentoring before they are assigned post graduate students to supervise | 3.10 | 0.98 | Adopted |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cluster mean score and sd | 15.20 (63.3%) | 2.27 | |

In the area of research supervision, three strategies are identified out of six. The cluster mean rating score is 15.20 out of 24 giving a percentage score of 63.3. Again the responses were somewhat similar resulting in a small standard deviation (sd) score of 2.27.

## Section D: Research Networking
**Table 1d: Results concerning mentoring in the area of research networking**

| | Item Statement | $\bar{x}$ | Sd | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Mentors encourage their mentees to register and become members of relevant network of professional research associations | 2.58 | 0.90 | Adopted |
| 2. | Mentors urged their mentees to attend academic conferences with them | 2.75 | 0.95 | Adopted |
| 3. | Mentees are encouraged by mentors to write papers and read at conferences | 3.25 | 1.01 | Adopted |
| 4. | Mentors expose their mentees to research linkages across institutions | 2.55 | 1.04 | Adopted |
| 5. | Mentors delegate mentees to represent them in sessions requiring paper presentations | 2.36 | 0.98 | Not adopted |
| 6. | Mentors expose their mentees to things required for research reports to be qualitative | 2.60 | 0.89 | Adopted |
| | Cluster mean score and sd | 16.09 (67%) | 2.36 | |

Five out of six strategies were adopted in table 1d. The mean score in this segment is 16.09 or 67.0%. The respondents scored the highest percentage in this cluster and the disparity in their responses is also small (2.36). For the whole length of the instrument with 27 items, seventeen (17) were adopted as mentoring strategies amongst the academic staff of Imo State University and their total mentoring performance stands at 63.6%. Thus, research question one was answered by the data 1a, b, c, and d.

**Table 1a to d: Summary of results according to sections of the instrument. Figures in bracket are percentages**

| Clusters | No. of items | Observed mean score | Sd | Expected mean score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| General mentoring | 6 | 14.83 (61.8) | 2.87 | 24.0 (100) |
| Teaching research | 9 | 22.52 (62.6) | 3.04 | 236.0 (100) |
| Research supervision | 6 | 15.20 (63.3) | 2.27 | 24.0 (100) |
| Research networking/synergy | 6 | 16.09 (67) | 2.36 | 24 (100) |
| Total | 27 | 68.64 (63.6) | | 108 (100) |

**Results of test of hypothesis one**

Table 2: Results of test of no significant difference between mean score responses according to status

| | $\bar{x}$ | Sd | N | $z_{cal}$ | $z_{crit.}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mentors | 46.8 | 11.99 | 82 | | |
| Mentees | 45.6 | 9.9 | 78 | 0.71 | 1.96 |

Since the $z_{cal} < z_{crit}$, the null hypothesis one is accepted, that there is no significant difference between the two mean scores. This answered also the research question two which seeks to ascertain the mean score responses of the two categories of staff. This means that the respondents do not differ in terms of status.

**Test of hypothesis two**

**Table 3: ANOVA test results of responses according to faculties**

| No. of Faculties | N | $\bar{x}$ | Sd | Sources of variation | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Squares | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 50 | 46.58 | 10.11 | Between groups | 1594.758 | 5 | 318.952 | 3.011 | .013 |
| 2 | 20 | 48.05 | 7.39 | Within groups | 16314.842 | 154 | 105.941 | | |
| 3 | 16 | 47.63 | 9.26 | Total | 17909.600 | 159 | | | |
| 4 | 26 | 40.35 | 8.44 | | | | | | |
| 5 | 30 | 41.03 | 12.51 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 18 | 47.78 | 12.51 | | | | | | |
| Total | 160 | 44.95 | 10.61 | | | | | | |

Since 0.013 is less than 0.05 the null hypothesis of no significant difference is not accepted, showing that responses differ according to faculty of the participants.

## Discussion

According to the analyses' results, mentoring amongst academic staff in the university stood at 63.6%. This could be described as encouraging but there are areas of blemishes that require improvement. It was found out that the methods of mentoring were largely informal where the mentor and mentee are left to initiate the mentoring relationships. This pattern of mentoring has inherent problems of promoting apathy in the sense that it will be difficult to hold any staff responsible should mentoring fails to exist. It also means one is free to be or not to be involved in it. Moreover when people are not happy due to poor condition of service they may become disinterested in mentoring especially when it is not mandatory. Results of interview with respondent lend credence to this idea. While mentees complained of selective mentoring by the senior colleagues, that is, they favour some young staff who are connected to them in some way leaving the others, the senior colleagues (mentors) complain that the younger staff behave as having known it all and therefore do not need mentoring. These accusations and counter accusations will not arise if mentoring is institutionalized. The situations at present projects the idea already put forward by Ijaiya (2013) that young academics are left to learn on the job anyhow. Interview results also reveal that there were inadequate number of very senior academics (mentors) to mentor the younger ones in some disciplines, making mentoring almost on-existent in such areas.

A cursory look at the identified mentoring strategies indicates the patterns of mentoring amongst the staff. Mentoring focus more on two major areas;
(i)The urge to write and read papers at conferences (ii) getting the young staff ready to function at post graduate level. This is the reason the respondents scored more points in the area of research networking than in teaching and supervision of research of the undergraduate students. This results in the poor quality of research reports submitted by the undergraduate students. If the quality of research reports are taken to be a representation of the supervisors' level of research knowledge one would appreciate the need to begin mentoring as soon as employment is given to a young academic. Undergraduate stage is a foundation level which makes it imperative that the research skills of students should be taken seriously because poor research foundation has multiplier effects in the entire educative process. Mentees are sufficiently informed to write and attend conferences because their promotion depends on their outputs but if they are left unaided they begin to make researches that are not novel, researching about the problems that the solutions are already found. Perhaps, this is the reason plagiarism is often traced to young academics. As a result of weak mentoring relationships, the mentor do not send their mentees to represent them in session requiring paper presentation because they are not sure of quality representation by the mentees. Sodipe and Madukama (2013) had advised that formal (institutionalized) mentoring removes individual considerations and creates environment that is supportive, non-competitive, non-judgmental and facilitates trust and mutual respect between both parties.

Organizing workshop/seminars based on research at faculty level which could have been a veritable avenue for mentoring young faculty members did not pass as a mentoring strategy among the staff. The assumption that a newly employed academic with masters or Ph.D degree can satisfactorily handle research programmes of the undergraduate students without mentoring should be made with some reservations. This is because there is always gap between theory and practice as well as individual differences in actual

performance. As a professional development programme (Isiozor 2014 and Uzonwun 2014) mentoring should be made to be inclusive of all aspects of the institutions' functionality to ensure uniform and quality delivery. Ubulon (2008) corroborated by adding that the young faculty members should be mentored by their role models who should provide necessary guidance. For this to happen, staff should be made to be responsible for the accomplishment. The small magnitude of the standard deviation (sd) scores in each of the item is an indication that the respondents did not differ much in their responses. The overall standard deviation score for the entire instrument is 10.61, still portraying little distance/disparity amongst the participants. In the same way, the participants' responses did not differ according to their status (mentor or mentee) but their responses differ according to faculty as indicated by the results of tests of hypotheses one and two. Lecturers are not the people to fake information on what exists. This is the reason both mentors and mentees responded in a similar way to the instrument. The disparity in responses according to faculties can be explained from the fact that mentoring is predominantly informal, each faculty handles it the way she deems fit leading to variations in strategies across faculties. Indeed, every faculty is at liberty to organize faculty-wide seminar/workshops for staff and students to acquaint them with uniform procedures of research. This is done especially when the faculty is not satisfied about the quality of research reports submitted by the students. This writer has participated in such seminar in her faculty.

Being present in research defence to learn from the corrections given by the most senior colleagues is one of the strategies but mentees who do not possess Ph.D degree are not allowed to benefit from Ph.D research defence. Since this method does not cut across all levels of mentees it is important that they are assigned individual mentors. Encouraging young academic to attend conferences is one thing, sponsorship is another thing. Poor/lack of sponsorship poses a serious limitation. Interview highlighted the fact that there is team teaching in some faculties but it only entails that both mentors and mentees teach same courses but go to class at separate periods. Since they do not go to class at the same time mentoring is not clearly discernible in this method.

The mentees are suppose to consult their mentors. This is normal but Ogomaka (2013) advised that mentors should also be observant to see where the mentees needed helps. This is because the mentee may not to always find it comfortable to appear before the mentor presenting his/her deficiencies.

## Summary and Conclusion

Mentoring is one professional growth programme that does not necessarily require extra charge/expenditure. It is an in-house management outfit which workers in an organization use to perpetuate their character and relevance to the outside world. It has human interpersonal relationship as its major attribute. Mentoring progamme appears to differ according to institution. Mentoring programmes of the institution in this study is stronger at the postgraduate than at the undergraduate levels. Much as mentoring is fairly adequate in the area of research network, linkages and synergy, it is below expectation in areas of research teaching and supervision. This is traceable to the fact the mentors and mentees are freely left to locate themselves. This finding was further attested to by the results of test of hypothesis two (2) which shows that mentoring is faculty variant. However, both the mentor and the mentees agree to this results as in test of hypothesis one (1). Mentoring in the institution is largely informal. Research is very technical, it

tasks individual to think 'outside the box', achieve creative solution to problems, avoid wastes, proffer useful policies and advance development of human persons and nation. These are possible if research results are not misleading. Academics whose duty it is to advance the course of research should not toy with mentoring because compromising research quality means to compromise national development. Supervision of undergraduate students' research should be given more impetus. Informal mentoring has obvious limitations of lack of commitment on both parties (mentor and mentee). If care is not taken, mentoring will gradually become extinct with passage of time with no individual to be held responsible.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings
1.    Mentoring should be institutionalized for quality assurance in research reports.
2.    There should be policies that will enable faculties to assign young staff to the most senior members of the faculty for purposes of mentoring.
3.    The mentor should scrutinize the mentees supervision of students' research efforts.
4.    Highly exposed staff should be employed in areas where mentors are lacking. Any employment of staff should have a good mix of mentors and mentees.
5.    There is need to strengthen mentoring through institutionalization to remove it from optional to mandatory lists of functions.

## REFERENCES

Christian Community Bible. Thirtieth Edition. Claretian Publications St. Pauls

Ihekwaba, C. N. & Nosike, M. C. (2016). Mentoring: An effective quality assurance strategy in teacher education process in Ukozor, F. I., Ekwonye, E. C. & Ihekwaba, C. N. (eds). Issues in Science Education Curriculum development, research and evaluation, A festschrift for Emeritus Professor Obioma Chima Nwana, pp. 58 – 68.

Ijaiya, N. Y. S. (2013). Quality supervision of higher degree theses. A lead paper presented at the annual national conference of Association of Educational Researchers & Evaluators of Nigeria (ASSEREN), Ilorin – July.

Isiozor, G. N. (2014). Professional growth and development of teachers in Okorie, N. C., Igwe L.E.B., Asodike, J. D., Onyeike, C. D. Anyaogu, R. O. (eds). Teachers, Schools and Society, Port Harcourt, Pearl Publishers pp. 54 – 70.

Nwana, O. C. (2008). *University academics in Nigeria memoirs of an Insider.* Lagos, Peacewise.

Ogomaka, P. M. C. (2013). Process of mentoring, development and observational skills. A paper presented at seminar organized by Faculty of Education Imo State University, Owerri for staff who were involved in the cluster training for Primary School teachers.

Ogomaka, P. M. C. (2013). Some learner assessment inequities in Nigerian schools: suggested remedies towards quality assessment. *Journal of Studies in Education,* vol. viii (1) October, ISSN 1115 – 1854.

Okpala, P. N. (2012). Educational research and evaluation as transformation tools. A keynote address presented at the 14th National Conference of Association of Educational Researchers and Evaluators of Nigeria ASSEREN.

Sodipe, O. D. I. & Madukoma, E. I. (2013). Mentoring and career success of academic librarians in selected Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. A Compendium of Nigerian Library Association 2013 Conference Papers at Calabar Cross River State, pp. 131 – 144.

Ubulon, W. J. (2008). Mentoring among academic staff of two Nigerian tertiary institutions, Nigerian Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation, vol. (8) 3 pp. 65 – 72.

Uzonwun, J. O. (2014). Staff development practices in Schools in Okorie, N. C., Igwe, L. E. B., Asodeke, J. D. Onyeike, V. C. & Anyaogu, R. O. (eds). Teachers, Schools and Society, Port Harcourt, Pearl Publishers.