Mentoring for Faculty from Working-Class Backgrounds

George W. Towers, Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC)
Joan R. Poulsen, Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC)
Darrin L. Carr, Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC)
Aimee N. Zoeller, Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC)

Abstract

Faculty mentoring across gender, race, and culture is facilitated by formal mentoring programs. Mentoring across the cultural differences associated with social class, however, represents a largely unaddressed gap in the provision of formal faculty mentoring. Based on a pre-program needs survey, we designed and delivered a pilot program that served working-class faculty with mentoring on career self-efficacy. Assessment showed that working-class faculty mentees made gains in this important construct. Our concluding discussion reflects upon the role of mentoring in the experience of working-class faculty.

Keywords

Faculty mentoring, working-class faculty, career self-efficacy

Introduction

Faculty mentoring and cultural differences

> Mentoring is a process for the <u>informal</u> transmission of knowledge, social capital, and the psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development; mentoring entails <u>informal</u> communication, usually face-to-face and during a sustained period of time … (Bozeman & Feeney 2007, p. 731) (emphasis added)

The term 'informal,' which appears in each independent clause of this widely-cited definition of mentoring, provides a starting point for a discussion of the relationship between the provision of faculty mentoring and cultural differences among faculty. Informal faculty mentoring occurs as senior professors get to know their junior colleagues and gradually become their mentors. A governing aspect of social psychology, however, intervenes to limit informal mentoring. Broadly, similarities between people tend to predict interest and interpersonal attraction and positive relationships (Youyou et al. 2017), and this principle transfers to the context of mentoring. In a comprehensive guide to faculty mentoring, Johnson refers to this tendency for faculty mentors to select mentees who remind them of themselves as 'cloning' (2016, pp. 221-222). Age, appearance, ethnicity, gender, personality, race, sexual orientation, and social class are among the many interpersonal intersections that signal the affinity conducive to informal mentoring. For example, faculty cultures dominated by white males tend to leave female and minority faculty out of the

informal mentoring loop (Acker 2008; Ceci et al. 2014; Davis, Reynolds & Jones 2011; Kerlin 1995; Sadao 2003; Siefert & Umbach 2008; Stout, Staiger & Jennings 2007). Similarly, in middle- and upper-class academia, observers have remarked that faculty from working-class backgrounds often miss out on informal mentoring (Arner 2014; Beech 2006; Borkowski 2004; Bourdieu 1988, pp. 92-94; Fay & Tocarczyk 1993; Grimes & Morris 1997; Kennelly et al. 1999; Lang 1987; Springer 2012; Vander Putten 2015). We define working-class faculty to include those who grew up in blue-collar families and/or neighborhoods as well as those who were the first in their immediate families to earn a college degree. As roughly one-fourth to one-third of U.S. professors share these backgrounds[1], this informal oversight is significant and represents an area for improvement in faculty mentoring.

Formal mentoring counterbalances cloning by creating structured mentoring opportunities. Formal mentoring programs first became commonplace in the U.S. as the white-collar workforce was diversified in the 1970s and 1980s and informal practices predictably failed to provide mentoring for women and minorities. Corporate firms instituted formal mentoring programs to avoid workplace discrimination and reap the rewards of diversity (Gunn 1995, p. 64; Haynes & Petrosko 2009). Since that time, faculty developers have made the case for formalized faculty mentoring for women and minority professors (Boice 1993; Kennelly, Misra & Karides 1999; Marbley 2007; Turner & Gonzalez 2015; Zellers, Howard & Barcic 2008). Government and universities have responded with initiatives like the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE: Organizational Change for Gender Equity in STEM Academic Professions program 'to increase the representation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers, thereby contributing to the development of a more diverse science and engineering workforce' (National Science Foundation n.d.). ADVANCE especially encourages programming that benefits women from underrepresented minority groups. More than 100 colleges and universities have received ADVANCE funding and almost every grant involves a formal mentoring program (National Science Foundation n.d.).

Evidence that academic institutions independently share this important concern with providing mentoring for women and minorities comes from our review of the faculty mentoring literature. We expanded upon Fountain and Newcomer's (2016) literature review and sifted through reports on 52 faculty mentoring programs published between 1989 and 2018. Sixteen of the programs (31%) were designated exclusively for women and/or minority faculty (12 for women regardless of race and ethnicity, three for minority women, and one for minorities regardless of gender). None of the programs in our review, however, were intended to serve working-class faculty specifically. Therefore, our literature review appears to support the claims of working-class faculty that their specific mentoring needs tend to go unaddressed.

Social class and cultural differences

---

[1] In the early 1970s, approximately one-fourth of professors came from blue-collar backgrounds (Ladd & Lipset, 1975). As of 2016, this estimate was considered to have remained generally accurate (Arner, 2016, p. 63). In 2000, one-third of the faculty at U.S. research institutions were first-generation (Seifert & Umbach, 2008, p. 363). Based on this figure and recent data on the proportion of first-generation college graduates among new Ph.D. recipients, we estimate that a little less than one-third of today's faculty are first-generation. (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2019).

First-generation status and blue-collar origins can contribute to cultural differences between working-class faculty and their middle- and upper-class colleagues. Many working-class faculty auto-ethnographers describe these differences in terms of cultural capital (Arner 2014; Muzzati & Samarco 2006a; Ryan & Sackrey 1996; Warnock 2016). Cultural capital is generated by performing and personifying a culture's essential priorities, values and tastes. Cultural capital is redeemed as social capital, the power to profit from in-group social relations. For example, returns on social capital include opportunities and resources channeled through social networks and the psychosocial reward of belonging (Bourdieu 1988; Lin 1999). While cultural capital can be employed to better understand any group of people that share a worldview, Pierre Bourdieu, the social theorist most widely cited for conceptualizing cultural capital, demonstrated its relevance to faculty culture by using the professoriate to illustrate cultural capital in his book, *Homo Academicus* (Bourdieu 1988).

The prestige-value system theory demonstrates how prestige comprises a highly prioritized category of cultural capital in academia. The theory posits that prestige-maximization supplements and often supplants income-maximization in individual decision-making regarding higher education destinations (Caplow & McGee 2001; Morrison et al. 2011). For example, many affluent, college-educated parents go to great lengths to help their children gain admittance to prestigious universities and then pay ever-steepening tuition rates for them to attend (Delbanco 2012, pp. 102-124; Tough 2019). Upon graduation, the aspiring faculty among these students compete for admission to the most prestigious graduate departments. Once accepted, they seek to enlist their department's leading faculty members as mentors. When they finally enter the academic job market, departmental prestige influences where they apply. Their evaluators on faculty hiring committees weigh the prestige of candidates' degrees and mentors heavily in their hiring decisions (Arner 2014; Arner 2016). Since this competition for prestigious associations confers recruiting and fundraising advantages upon highly ranked departments, these elite programs can select top performers and provide them ample support (Headworth & Freese 2016). In this system, therefore, prestige accrues value, recreating and regulating the status hierarchy that defines American colleges and universities.

Working-class faculty are relatively unlikely to have accumulated the currencies of cultural capital valued in the academy during their student careers (Foiles-Sifuentes 2017; Pascarella et al. 2004). Unaware of the impending importance of academic prestige, working-class faculty often chose their undergraduate campuses and graduate schools according to more immediate concerns like affordability and proximity to family (Beech 2006; Engle & Tinto 2008; Hinz 2016; Kauzlarich 2006). Similarly, outsiders to the world of higher education have not been trained to network and do not feel entitled to demand personal attention from authority figures like professors (Lareau 2003). Instead, coming from the working class, these faculty are socialized to prize humility and eschew self-promotion (Lubrano 2004; Rothe 2006; Wilson 2006). Thusly inclined to hang back in the classroom and thoroughly disinclined to hang out in faculty offices (Lang 2016, p. 102; Nelson 2015), future working-class faculty unknowingly fail to build the mentoring networks that are foundational to faculty careers.

Cultural capital also includes culturally specific values and tastes. Huxford claims that higher education is 'that most upper-middle class of social institutions' (2006, p. 207), a position supported by our estimate that two-thirds to three-fourths of professors come from the middle and

upper classes. In response to a workplace culture dominated by middle- and upper-class styles of speech, dress, food, and entertainment, working-class faculty auto-ethnography expresses the outsiders' perspective (Brook & Michell 2012; Warnock 2016). This tradition began with the 1984 publication of Ryan and Sackrey's *Strangers in paradise: academics from the working class.* Echoed in subsequent titles, their anguish of otherness remains relevant: *Women in the academy: laborers in the knowledge factory* (Fay & Tokarcyzk 1993), *This fine place so far from home: voices of academics from the working class* (Dews & Law 1995), *Those winter Sundays: female academics and their working-class parents* (Welsch 2005), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working class experience in academe* (Muzzati & Samarco 2006a), *Resilience: queer professors from the working class* (Oldfield & Johnson 2008), *Special issue on working class academics: still unbroken* (Siegel 2014), *Working in class: recognizing how social class shapes our academic work* (Hurst & Nenga 2016), and *Academic poverty special issue* (Chapple et al. 2017). Consequently, many working-class faculty report suppressing their cultural identity at work (Baker 2006; Cannon 2006; Huxford 2006; Langston 1993; Rothe 2006).

LeCourt and Fedukovich, however, warn against the impression created by their fellow working-class faculty auto-ethnographers that they must unhappily perform middle-class culture to sustain an academic career (Fedukovich 2009; LeCourt 2006). Indeed, they charge that this dilemma is not only false but rests on a harmful view of social class. That is, envisioning social class as a stair-stepped progression of fixed positions legitimizes existing power relationships. Ironically, the very existence of working-class faculty gives life to the meritocratic myth that normalizes class-based disadvantage (Muzzati & Samarco 2006b, p. 71). 'This definition of social mobility forms the cornerstone of tried-and-trite American Dream politics: even daughters of heavy machinery mechanics can achieve 'higher' social status' (Fedukovich 2009, p. 141). While Fedukovich and LeCourt recognize that the academy reflects class divisions, they stress that our workplace is also the site for creating class identity (Fedukovich 2009; LeCourt 2006). They emphasize our agency to reform faculty class relations instead of the expectation to conform to alienating class roles. In this spirit, we will consider the potential of mentoring for working-class faculty.

Case study

Program goals

The only mentoring program that we know of that includes an emphasis on mentoring working-class faculty is one that we organized at Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC), a school of Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). IUPUC is a commuter campus serving 1,400 students from Columbus and surrounding communities in south-central Indiana. IUPUC employs 64 full-time faculty members and offers 14 undergraduate and graduate degree programs in business, education, engineering, humanities, nursing, science, and social science disciplines.

In 2014, IUPUI initiated a grant competition among its 17 schools to develop proposals for pilot programs designed to meet the unique mentoring needs of faculty in each school. We received funding for a pilot program for mentoring pre-promotion faculty from under-represented groups

on career self-efficacy[2]. We defined under-represented faculty to include women, racial and ethnic minorities, and working-class faculty. In turn, we identified first-generation college graduates as working-class faculty. Our focus on under-represented faculty reflected their relatively strong representation at IUPUC and our assessment of their mentoring needs. For example, in 2014-15, first-generation college graduates were 48% of IUPUC faculty, a proportion one-and-a-half times greater than their approximately one-third share of the U.S. faculty at that time. Women comprised 58% of IUPUC faculty, one-and-a-quarter times greater than their 47% share of the U.S. faculty (McFarland et al. 2017). Minorities were 24% of IUPUC faculty, equivalent to their 23% share of the U.S. faculty (McFarland et al. 2017).

The pilot program's emphasis on pre-promotion underrepresented faculty was also in response to their desire for mentoring. During the 2014-15 academic year, we surveyed full-time IUPUC faculty regarding mentoring satisfaction and needs. Dissatisfaction with mentorship among under-represented faculty is indicated by results from three survey questions about the adequacy and amount of mentorship. We used the three questions to create a satisfaction variable scored from 3 (strong dissatisfaction) to 15 (strong satisfaction) with a midpoint value of 9 (neutral). Under-represented faculty averaged 7.8 and 63 percent scored below the midpoint value of 9. In contrast, white male continuing-generation faculty averaged 11.3 and none scored below 9.

In this survey, we also asked about 13 mentoring needs ranging from those specific to an academic career - research, teaching, service, and tenure/promotion - to general concerns including work-life balance and time management (Bland et al. 2009). Respondents rated mentoring on the three career-specific issues of research, teaching, and tenure and promotion as much more important than any of the other 10 items. Thus, faculty at IUPUC, particularly under-represented faculty, sought guidance in areas directly related to career success. These findings led to our focusing mentoring efforts on career self-efficacy. The concept of general self-efficacy is based in Bandura's social cognitive theory,

> Self-efficacy depends on the individual's belief that he or she can cause an intended event to occur and can organize and carry out the course of behavior necessary to deal with various situations (Rodin 1990, p. 2).

Career self-efficacy is a well-established construct that refers to the ways in which general self-efficacy applies to career development (Hackett & Betz 1981). For example, career self-efficacy addresses the role of self-efficacy in vocational choice and career decision making. By the 1990s, interest in career self-efficacy led to the development of social cognitive career theory. Social cognitive career theory contextualizes career self-efficacy to better understand opportunities and obstacles to career development (Gainor 2006).

Like their counterparts in other career fields, professors' general self-efficacy influences their choices, efforts, resilience, and anxiety levels. Indeed, general self-efficacy is a stronger predictor of faculty success than knowledge, skills, and prior accomplishments (Zeldin & Pajares 2000). Accordingly, several faculty mentoring programs identify augmenting general self-efficacy as a

---

[2] The faculty mentoring program was supported with a grant from the IUPUI Mentoring Academy. The research resulting from program assessment involved the use of human subjects and was reviewed and approved by the Indiana University IRB (#1507298098).

programmatic goal (Berrett, Nisbett & Lowe 2016; Feldman et al. 2010; Garman, Wingard & Reznik 2001; Varkey et al. 2012; Wingard, Garman & Reznik 2004; Zeldin & Pajares 2000). We were not able, however, to locate a published account of a faculty mentoring program that intentionally sought to bolster career self-efficacy. Therefore, this report contributes to the faculty development literature not only by focusing on the mentoring needs of working-class faculty but also by identifying career self-efficacy as a goal for faculty mentoring programs.

Program delivery

Our pilot program consisted of a preparation phase in spring and summer 2015 and program implementation over the course of the 2015-16 academic year. Towards the end of the spring 2015 semester we invited eligible faculty to apply to be mentees. Since we had determined that a cohort of ten mentees would be appropriate given the size of the IUPUC faculty and the amount of available resources and we received ten applications from prospective mentees, all ten applicants were accepted. The ten mentees included nine from working-class backgrounds. Eight were first-generation college graduates, and one was raised in an urban working-class neighborhood. The nine working-class mentees included five white females, one minority female, two white males, and one minority male. The continuing-generation mentee from a middle-class background was a minority male.

We asked veteran faculty who had demonstrated excellence in teaching, service, or research to consider applying to serve as mentors. In recognition of their service, mentors were awarded $250 in faculty development funds. Mentor training took place in summer, 2015 and consisted of self-study and group sessions. For self-study, mentors were given two 'how-to' books, Zachary's all-purpose *The mentor's guide* (2nd Ed.) (2012) and the first edition of Johnson's *On being a mentor: a guide for higher education faculty* (2006). In reference to our program's specific emphases, mentors received Muzzatti and Samarco's (2006) edited volume, *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks*, for background on, as the book's subtitle puts it, 'class, identity, and the working class experience in academe.' We also gave mentors *Overwhelmed: coping with life's ups and downs* (Schlossberg 2008) which speaks to the self-efficacy challenges involved in a variety of life transitions such as launching an academic career. In the summer of 2015 we held mentor training sessions. Training drew upon the readings to address mentors' motivations, expectations, and responsibilities. Project leaders and mentors discussed roles and relationship boundaries, goals and accountability, and evaluating progress and results. In the concluding session, mentors built skills through the review of case studies and role-playing.

Matching mentors and mentees poses a long-recognized challenge for faculty mentoring programs (Boice & Turner 1989). Our commitment to finding matches for all participants produced two dilemmas. First, as the participants represented academic disciplines spread across four academic units, most mentees could not be matched with a mentor in their field. Second, mentors and mentees were matched based on their prioritized interest in mentoring on teaching, research, service, and university culture instead of being encouraged to pair off on their own. This decision heeded Johnson's warning that when mentors recruit mentees, they tend to pick 'clones' and those who do not fit mentors' profiles may be rejected (Johnson 2006, pp. 170-171). Two matches were made, however, based on faculty members petitioning to work together. Thus, the matching

process was also informed by research indicating that mentee and mentor input to selection criteria produces better matches (Nick et al. 2012).

The pilot program was launched with a retreat that brought mentors and mentees together. Our goals for the retreat included reinforcing the overarching program goal of increasing career self-efficacy and creating a shared sense of purpose and identity. We also focused on the elements of mentoring relationships. Mentors and mentees had the opportunity to chat informally at the retreat and to continue their conversations at a subsequent social event. During the 2015-16 academic year, mentoring pairs met separately each month and all participants were convened for regular program meetings to build relationships and provide informal feedback.

Statistical program assessment

Program assessment included measurement of mentees' gains in career self-efficacy and longitudinal tracking of protégés' careers. Well-established measures of general self-efficacy and factors influencing career transitions were distributed to faculty at the start of the pilot program. Together, these instruments assess changes in career self-efficacy. The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) (Schwarzer & Jerusalem 1995) is a ten-item measure of one's belief in their ability to cope with a wide variety of life stressors and problems. Responses are measured using a four-point Likert scale resulting in a range of scores between 10 and 40 with higher scores indicating greater general self-efficacy. Internal consistency of the GSE has been reported with Chronbach's alphas between .75 and .91 with a test-retest reliability of $r = .55$ to $r = .75$ (Scholz et al. 2002). There is also evidence of convergent validity with several other measures of mood and personality (Schwarzer 2014). For this study, the baseline GSE measure produced $\alpha = .85$ and a mean score of 33.78 ($SD = 4.265$). Test-retest reliability for the GSE was $r = .80$, $p < .05$ over a nine-month interval. The sample size was quite small (n = 7 mentees who completed both measures), constraining the usefulness of traditional statistical techniques. Using effect sizes and qualitative findings from focus groups helped to frame findings. First, mentees experienced an overall increase in GSE ($t(6) = 1.67$, *ns*, $d = 0.48$). The effect size suggests a moderate impact on trait-level self-efficacy, and evidence from focus groups supports this finding. Several mentees expressed feeling more confident.

Schlossberg's '4 S' model provides a framework for successfully navigating life transitions such as beginning a new faculty appointment and forms a useful scaffold for mentoring activities (Schlossberg 2008). This systemic model includes:
- *Situational* variables that capture external factors (e.g., concurrent stressors) which influence the individual's acquisition of a new role;
- *Social Supports* which are important for emotional coping and rational coaching and are typically disrupted by the transition from one role to the next;
- *Strategies* for coping with stress that are vital in making successful transitions; and,
- *Self* variables which include one's outlook on the transition into the new role which will vary, in-part, upon individual self-efficacy.

The Transition Guide & Questionnaire Modified (TGQ-M) (Schlossberg 2008) is a reliable measure of Schlossberg's '4 S' model. This 56-item measure is responded to using a five-point Likert scale. Higher scores are assumed to represent greater coping resources for managing

transitions. For this study, internal consistencies (Chronbach's α) of the initial administration of the four subscales of *Situation, Social Supports, Strategies,* and *Self* variables were .86, .72, .91, and .81 respectively which are similar to past findings (McAtee & Benshoff, 2006). Test-retest reliability of the four scales were $r = 0.72, p < 0.001$; $r = 0.90, p < 0.001$; $r = 0.67, p < 0.01$; and $r = 0.58, p < 0.05$ respectively over a nine-month interval. Baseline GSE scores were moderately to strongly correlated with the TGQ-M *Situation, Self,* and *Strategies* scales ($r = 0.79, p < 0.05$; $r = 0.87, p < 0.01$; and $r = 0.86, p < 0.01$ respectively) but not the *Social Supports* scale ($r = 0.66$, *ns*).

We examined if the mentees experienced a change in the '4 S's' from the beginning to the end of the program by comparing pre-test and post-test scores on *Self* variables (positive outlook on the transition); *Strategies* (coping techniques vital to making successful transitions); *Social Supports* (people that mentees can rely on to aid with the transition); and *Situation* variables (concurrent stressors to the central transition). Taken individually, mentees reported higher levels of *Self* variables at the end of the program ($t(6) = 1.16$, *ns*, $d = 0.26$). They reported having more *Strategies* available to them after the program ($t(6) = 1.88$, *ns*, $d = 0.38$), further supported during the focus groups in that many expressed feeling like they had a clearer plan to earn promotion. Mentees reported having more *Social Supports* at the end of the program ($t(6) = 1.93$, *ns*, $d = 0.37$) and echoed this sentiment during focus groups when they discussed the value of having a mentor and utilizing different people and offices around campus. Notably, given our small sample size, significance tests were inconclusive since a minimum sample size of n = 30 is recommended. However, in examining the effect sizes using Cohen's *d*, these indicate robust moderate effects of our program on participants in positive ways. Finally, aspects of the *Situation* were not altered during the program ($t(6) = 0.62$, *ns*, $d = 0.18$). In hindsight, this makes sense; our program was designed to provide the tools to better address the situation, but we did not actually intend to remove external stressors, or send participants through promotion this year. Among the '4 S's', *Social Supports* emerged as equally if not more highly valued than *Strategies* for success. In other words, this finding reflects on the relative importance of culture and strategy to organizational effectiveness.

Qualitative program assessment

Qualitative program assessment comes from two sources: participant focus groups convened upon the conclusion of the pilot program in spring 2016 and mentees' post-pilot program career trajectories between spring 2016 and spring 2020. Focus group feedback reconsidered the traditional dyadic mentoring model employed in the pilot program. Dyadic mentoring consists of a single mentor imparting accumulated wisdom or expertise to a mentee. In their focus group, several mentees pointed out that since their initial goals changed or became more focused as the year progressed, their mentors were not able to meet their needs as well as they had hoped. The focus group discussion converged on the idea of establishing a pool of mentors offering guidance on a range of skills. Their conversation echoed the discourse among faculty developers that a network of mentors delivering a diverse range of knowledge and skills is likely to prove more valuable than relying upon a single mentor (Beane-Katner 2014; de Janasz & Sullivan 2004; Rockquemore 2010; Rockquemore 2013; Rockquemore 2016).

Mentees also suggested incorporating peer mentoring into the program. Peer mentoring programs bring mentees together to learn from and support each other in a confidential, self-directed

environment. For individuals, peer mentoring builds trusting long-term relationships that instill belonging and increase career satisfaction. For institutions, peer mentoring may help identify challenges and facilitate change (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor 2002; Thomas, Bystydzienski & Desai 2015). Relevant to our program's emphasis on sensitivity to cultural differences among faculty, peer mentoring has been shown to be very valuable for under-represented and historically marginalized faculty including women and minorities (Davis, Reynolds & Jones 2011; Driscoll et al. 2009; Files et al. 2008; Mayer et al. 2014; Schmidt & Faber 2016; Varkey et al. 2012; Yun, Baldi & Sorcinelli 2016).

Informed by focus group feedback on the pilot program and the scholarly discourse on faculty mentoring, we redesigned the pilot program. The redesigned program, which has been in effect since fall 2016, has two elements. First, we provide networked mentoring through our 'mentor bureau' in which mentors offer guidance in their areas of expertise and mentees choose multiple mentors on topics of mutual interest. Second, program leaders arrange mentee-only peer mentoring meetings in which mentees set their own agenda and conduct mutually supportive, confidential conversations[3].

Mentees' post-pilot program career trajectories between spring 2016 and spring 2020 comprise an additional source of program assessment. In 2016, five of the nine working-class mentees were probationary tenure-track assistant professors, three were non-tenure track clinical assistant professors and one was a visiting lecturer. Of the tenure-trackers, two were in the third year and three were in the first year of their appointments. One of the third-year assistant professors has since been tenured and promoted to associate professor and now serves as a mentor in IUPUC's permanent faculty mentoring program. The other four tenure track mentees are no longer on our campus. Three of these four were first-year faculty in nursing, a discipline experiencing a pronounced faculty retention crisis due to the national shortage of nurses (Rosseter, 2019). Two of the three assistant professors of nursing left IUPUC to take tenure-track positions at other universities and the other is in private practice. The remaining tenure track mentee left academia to embark on a career in a profession related to his discipline. While this mentee did not achieve his original goals for his academic career, he demonstrated a remarkable degree of career self-efficacy by developing a parallel career plan, applying his academic expertise to develop the skills required in his new field, and securing a desirable position.

One of the clinical faculty co-authored a research article with her program mentor, became a tenure-track assistant professor, and will apply for promotion and tenure in the coming year. Another clinical faculty member was promoted to the directorship of a graduate program and has successfully raised funds to build a new clinic. The third clinical faculty member has retired. Since the expiration of her visiting lectureship, the final working-class mentee finished her doctoral degree and is now a tenure-track assistant professor at another institution. The lone middle-class mentee was an assistant professor during the pilot program who has since earned tenure and

---

[3] Our program redesign is consistent with developments in faculty mentoring. While dyadic mentoring is the standard model, its dominance is diminishing. Our review of reports published between 1989 and 2018 on faculty mentoring programs indicates that most programs follow the dyadic mentoring model. Among the 48 reports we examined that specified a mentoring model, 26 (54%) relied on dyads. Six additional programs (13%) combined dyadic mentoring with peer mentoring. Of the remaining 16 programs, 10 (21%) were based on peer mentoring and 6 (13%) on communities of practice. While 73% (11 of 15) of the programs reported upon between 1989 and 2008 depended solely upon dyadic mentoring, only 45% (15 of 33) of the programs reported upon since 2009 used dyads.

promotion to associate professor. Statistical measurement of immediate gains in career-self efficacy and subsequent career accomplishments indicate that working-class mentees augmented their career self-efficacy through their participation in the mentoring program.

Discussion

Mentoring matters for working-class faculty. For example, four-fifths of the working-class sociologists that Grimes and Morris surveyed had mentors who made a critically important difference in their academic careers (1997, p. 108). Working-class faculty auto-ethnographers support their finding with accounts of perceptive professors who saw their potential, became their mentor, and convinced them that they could become a professor themselves (Beech 2006; Cannon 2006; Kauzlarich 2006; Selman-Killingbeck 2006). We hope that our work will encourage further attention to the mentoring needs of working-class faculty and thereby lessen their feelings of marginalization in higher education.

Our mentoring needs survey identified the goal of increasing career self-efficacy for working-class faculty. A survey of the working-class faculty literature may have independently arrived at this objective. That is, anxiety over career self-efficacy is among the most consistent themes in working-class faculty auto-ethnography. Author after author describes the difficulty in transitioning from the working-class experience into an academic career. We invite program planners to train mentors and mentees on strategies for augmenting career self-efficacy.

A larger goal for mentoring programs is to support the overall experience of working-class faculty. First, we must be mindful that mentoring does no harm (Johnson 2016, pp. 121-134). For example, the faculty mentoring literature documents the biases that may seep into mentoring. Women and minority faculty report that sexism and racism often compromise counsel from white men (Cowin et al. 2011/2012; Driscoll et al. 2009; Maclean 2016; Moss, Teshima & Leszcz 2008; Schramm 2000; Turner & Gonzalez 2015). Similarly, working-class faculty are wary of patronizing middle-class mentors who view mentoring as a 'master-apprentice' relationship (Fish 1993, p. 181). Mentoring that encourages working-class faculty to assimilate into elite culture is problematic. This path leads to the pitfall of viewing social classes as fixed, hierarchically arranged positions. Implying that working-class faculty suffer a cultural deficit not only demeans the experience and values of most of the population but also, if internalized by working-class mentees, alienates them from their own identity. We urge mentors and protégés to consider LeCourt's application of Pierre Bourdieu's and Judith Butler's philosophical positions to faculty life. Simply, LeCourt reminds us that social class is a process of becoming, not being (2006, p. 38). Therefore, working-class faculty gain an enviably enlightened vantage point from their journeys back and forth across class divides (Lubrano 2004). Working-class faculty should be encouraged to add to, not abandon, their working-class identity in ways that are personally rewarding.

Celebrating working-class identity is also institutionally enriching. For example, the realization that working-class faculty are invaluable role models and mentors for first-generation undergraduates finds support from the media, higher education policy analysts, and working-class faculty auto-ethnographers and finds expression in initiatives at universities around the country (Cannon 2006; Flaherty 2017; Grimes & Morris 1997; Kniffin 2007; Lee & Maynard 2017; Nelson 2015; Oldfield 2010; Schademan & Thompson 2016; Springer 2012; Stephens et al. 2015; Young

2016). We invite formal mentoring programs to appreciate and promote the unique and essential contributions of working-class faculty to the future of higher education.

Acknowledgement

Author Bios

George W. Towers is a Professor of Geography and Head of the Division of Liberal Arts at Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus (IUPUC). His research publications address topics in political geography, cultural geography, geographic information systems, and faculty development.

Joan R. Poulsen is a social psychologist whose work focuses on understanding marginalized groups and persons, and the implementation and assessment of strategies for inclusion. She is an Associate Professor of Psychology and Assistant Dean for Academic and Student Affairs at IUPUC.

Darrin L. Carr is a Clinical Assistant Professor and Director for the Master of Arts in Mental Health Counseling program at IUPUC. A first-generation college student from a working-class family, Darrin teaches to improve mental healthcare services in South Central Indiana. As a licensed counseling psychologist, he focuses on the interaction of mental health and career concerns. Most recently, Darrin co-founded the Tom & Barbara Schoellkopf Community Counseling Center, a training clinic providing free or low-cost services to college students and community members.

Aimee N. Zoeller has taught sociology for 15 years and across the curriculum, from Sociology of Happiness to AIDS & Society to Music and Social Change. She is the Director of the Sociology Program and the Coordinator of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at IUPUC. Aimee serves on the Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) campus as one of three Forum fellows. In this role, she works to foster a sense of community among faculty and promote professional development in teaching. Her working-class heroes are her mother and Woody Guthrie.

Bibliography

Acker, J. 2008, 'Hopeful men and feminist support: more than double strangeness', *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 288-293.
Angelique, H., Kyle, K. & Taylor, E. 2002, 'Mentors and muses: new strategies for academic success', *Innovative Higher Education*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 195-209.
Arner, L. 2014, 'Working-class women at the MLA interview', *Rhizomes*, vol. 27.
Arner, L. 2016, 'Survival strategies for working-class women as junior faculty members', in

A. L. Hurst & S. K. Nenga (eds.), *Working in class: recognizing how social class shapes our academic work,* Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 49-64.

Baker, P. L. 2006, 'Trajectory and transformation of a working-class girl into an upper-middle class associate dean', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 197-206.

Beane-Katner, L. 2014, 'Anchoring a mentoring network in a new faculty development program', *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* vol. 22, no. 2.

Beech, J. 2006, 'Happy accidents: the unofficial story of how I became an academic', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 9-21.

Berrett, B., Nisbett, N. & Lowe, M. 2016, 'Effectiveness of a tenure track faculty mentoring program: reflections of a pilot project', *National Social Science Journal,* vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 5-13.

Bland, C. J., Taylor, A. L., Shollen, S. L., Weber-Main, A. M. & Mulcahy, P. A. 2009, *Faculty success through mentoring: a guide for mentors, mentees, and leaders,* Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD.

Boice, R. 1993, 'Early turning points in professional careers of women and minorities', *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol. 53, pp. 71-79.

Boice, R. & Turner, J. L. 1989, 'The FIPSE-CSULB mentoring project for new faculty', *To Improve the Academy,* vol. 166.

Borkowski, D. 2004, 'Not too late to take the sanitation test: notes of a non-gifted academic from the working class', *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 94-123.

Bourdieu, P. 1988, *Homo academicus.* Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Bozeman, B. & Feeney, M. K. 2007, 'Toward a useful theory of mentoring: a conceptual analysis and critique, *Administration & Society,* vol. 39, pp. 719-739.

Brook, H. & Michell, D. 2012, Learners, learning, learned: class, higher education, and autobiographical essays from working-class academics, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, vol. 34, pp. 587-599.

Cannon, J. A. 2006, 'White, working class, and feminist: working within the master's house and finding home again, in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 101-116.

Caplow, T. & McGee, R. J. 2001, *The academic marketplace,* 2nd edn, Routledge, London & New York.

Ceci, S. J., Ginther, D. K., Kahn, S. & Williams, W. M. 2014, 'Women in academic science: a changing landscape', *Psychological Science in the Public Interest,* vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 75-141.

Chapple, R. L., Gray, K. L., Long, L. & Ortiz, M. 2016, 'Academic poverty special issue editorial', *Journal of Working-Class Studies,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 3-4.

Cowin, K. M., Cohen, L. M., Ciechanowski, K. M. & Orozco, R. A. 2011/2012, 'Portraits of mentor-junior faculty relationships: from power dynamics to collaboration', *The Journal of Education,* vol. 192, no. 1, pp. 37-47.

Davis, D. J., Reynolds, R. & Jones, T. B. 2011, 'Promoting the inclusion of tenure earning

black women in academe: lessons for leaders in education', *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 28-41.

de Janasz, S. C. & Sullivan, S. E. 2004, 'Multiple mentoring in academe: developing the professional network', *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 263-283.

Delbanco, A. 2012, *College: what it was, is, and should be,* Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.

Dews, C. L. B. & Law, C. L. (eds.) 1995, *This fine place so far from home: voices of academics from the working class,* Temple University, Philadelphia.

Driscoll, L. G., Parkes, K. A., Tilley-Lubbs, G. A., Brill, J. M. & Bannister, V. R. P. 2009, Navigating the lonely sea: peer mentoring and collaboration among aspiring women scholars, *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 5-21.

Engle, J. & Tinto, V. 2008, *Moving beyond access: college success for low-income, first-generation students*, The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, Washington.

Fay, E. A. & Tokarczyk, M. M. 1993, 'Introduction', in M. M. Tokarczyk & E. A. Fay (eds.), *Working-class women in the academy: laborers in the knowledge factory*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp. 3-24.

Fedukovich, C. 2009, 'Strange imports: working-class Appalachian women in the composition classroom', *Journal of Appalachian Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1/2, pp. 140-154.

Feldman, M. D., Arean, P. A., Marshall, S. J., Lovett, M. & O'Sullivan, P. 2010, 'Does mentoring matter: results from a survey of faculty mentees at a large health sciences university', *Medical Education Online,* vol. 15, no. 5063.

Files, J. A., Blair, J. E., Mayer, A. P. & Ko, M. G. 2008, 'Facilitated peer mentorship: a pilot program for academic advancement of female medical faculty', *Journal of Women's Health,* vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 1-7.

Fish, C. 1993, 'Someone to watch over me: politics and paradoxes in academic mentoring', in M. M. Tokarczyk & E. A. Fay (eds.), *Working-class women in the academy: laborers in the knowledge factory,* University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp. 179-196.

Flaherty, C. 2017, 'First-gen faculty', *Inside Higher Ed,* 2 June, viewed 24 May 2020, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/06/02/university-california-plan-links-first-generation-students-similar-professors>.

Foiles-Sifuentes, A. M. 2017, 'Blockades, barricades, and barriers: accessing and navigating academia from a multi-marginalized positionality', *Journal of Working-Class Studies,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 108-119.

Fountain, J. & Newcomer, K. E. 2016, 'Developing and sustaining effective faculty mentoring programs', *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* vol. 22, pp. 483-506.

Gainor, K. A. 2006, 'Twenty-five years of self-efficacy in career assessment and practice', *Journal of Career Assessment*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 161–178.

Garman, K. A., Wingard, D. L. & Reznik, V. 2001, 'Development of junior faculty's self-efficacy: outcomes of a national center of leadership in academic medicine', *Academic Medicine,* vol. 76, no. 10, pp. S74-S76.

Grimes, M. D. & Morris, J. M. 1997, *Caught in the middle: contradictions in the lives of sociologists from working-class backgrounds.* Praeger, Westport, CT.

Gunn, E. 1995, 'Mentoring: the democratic version', *Training*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 64-67.

Hackett, G. & Betz, N. E. 1981, 'A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 18, pp. 326-339.

Haynes, R. K. & Petrosko, J. M. 2009, 'An investigation of mentoring and socialization among law faculty', *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 41-52.

Headworth, S. & Freese, J. 2016, 'Credential privilege or cumulative advantage? prestige, productivity, and placement in the academic sociology job market', *Social Forces,* vol. 94, pp. 1257-1282.

Hinz, S. E. 2016, 'Upwardly mobile: attitudes toward the class transition among first-generation college students', *Journal of College Student Development,* vol. 57, pp. 285-299.

Hurst, A. L. & Nenga, S. K. (eds.) 2016, *Working in class: recognizing how social class shapes our academic work*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD.

Huxford, L. 2006, 'Making the grade: impostors in the ivory tower', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 207-220.

Johnson, W.B. 2006, *On being a mentor: a guide for higher education faculty,* Psychology Press, New York.

Johnson, W. B. 2016, *On being a mentor: a guide for higher education faculty,* 2nd edn, Routledge, New York.

Kauzlarich, D. 2006, 'Personal, professional, and political paths to the study of crimes of the powerful', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 37-47.

Kennelly, I., Misra, J. & Karides, M. 1999, 'The historical context of gender, race, & class in the academic labor market', *Race, Gender & Class*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 125-155.

Kerlin, S. P. 1995, 'Pursuit of the Ph.D.: 'survival of the fittest,' or is it time for a new approach?', *Education Policy Analysis Archives,* vol. 3, no. 16, pp. 1-28.

Kniffin, K. M. 2007, 'Accessibility to the PhD and professoriate for first-generation college graduates: review and implications for students, faculty, and campus policies', *American Academic,* vol. 3, pp. 49-79.

Ladd, E. C. & Lipset, S. M. 1975, *The divided academy: professors and politics.* McGraw-Hill, New York.

Lang, D. 2016, 'Witnessing social class in the academy', in A. L. Hurst & S. K. Nenga (eds.), *Working in class: recognizing how social class shapes our academic work,* Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 101-108.

Lang, D. 1987, 'Equality, prestige, and controlled mobility in the academic hierarchy', *American Journal of Education,* vol. 95, pp. 441-467.

Langston, D. 1993, 'Who am I now? the politics of class identity', in M. M. Tokarczyk & E. A. Fay (eds.), *Working-class women in the academy: laborers in the knowledge factory,* University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp. 60-72.

Lareau, A. 2003, *Unequal childhoods: class, race, and family life*. University of California, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

LeCourt, D. 2006, 'Performing working-class identity composition: toward a pedagogy of textual practice, *College English,* vol. 69, pp. 30-51.

Lee, E. & Maynard, T. 2017, 'In class, sharing class: faculty members from low-socioeconomic backgrounds and status visibility', *Journal of Working-Class Studies,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 36-53.

Lin, N. 1999, 'Building a network theory of social capital', *Connections*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 28-

51.

Lubrano, A. 2004, *Limbo: blue-collar roots, white-collar dreams.* John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.

Maclean, K. 2016, 'Sanity, 'madness,' and the academy', *The Canadian Geographer,* vol. 60, pp. 181-191.

Marbley, A. F. 2007, 'Finding my voice: an African-American female professor at a predominantly white university', *Advancing Women in Leadership*, vol. 23.

Mayer, A. P., Blair, J. E., Ko, M. G., Patel, S. I. & Files, J. A. 2014, 'Long-term follow-up of a facilitated peer mentoring program', *Medical Teacher,* vol. 36, pp. 260-266.

McAtee, A. B. & Benshoff, J. M. 2006, 'Rural women in career transition: a look at Schlossberg's situation, self, support, and strategies', *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, vol. 30, pp. 697-714.

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., de Brey, C., Snyder, T., Wang, X., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Gebrekristos, S., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A., Barmer, A., Bullock Mann, F. & Hinz, S. 2017, *The condition of education 2017*. Publication NCES 2017144. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington.

Morrison, E., Rudd, E., Picciano, J. & Nerad, M. 2011, 'Are you satisfied? PhD education and faculty taste for prestige: limits of the prestige value system', *Research in Higher Education,* vol. 52, pp. 24-46.

Moss, J., Teshima, J. & Leszcz, M. 2008, 'Peer group mentoring of junior faculty', *Academic Psychiatry*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 230–235.

Muzzati, S. L. & Samarco, C. V. (eds.) 2006a, *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.

Muzzati, S. L. & Samarco, C. V. 2006b, 'Working class need not apply: job hunting, job interviews, and the working-class experience in academia', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 69-82.

National Science Foundation (n.d.), *ADVANCE at a glance*, viewed 24 May 2020, <https://www.nsf.gov/crssprgm/advance/>.

National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics 2019, 'Survey of earned doctorates. RTI special tabulations, 27 August.

Nelson, C. D. 2015, 'Relationship between first-generation college students' expectations for experiences with faculty members and students' success after the first year', Ph.D. thesis, University of South Florida, Tampa.

Nick, J. M., Delahoyde, T. M., Del Prato, D., Mitchell, C., Ortiz, J., Ottley, C., Young, P., Cannon, S.B., Lasater, K., Reising, D. & Siktberg, L. 2012, 'Best practices in academic mentoring: a model for excellence', *Nursing Research and Practice*, vol. 2012, pp. 1-9.

Oldfield, K. 2010, 'Our cutting edge isn't cutting it: why public administration should be the first discipline to implement a social-class based affirmative action plan for hiring professors', *Administration & Society,* vol. 41, pp. 1016-1038.

Oldfield, K. & Johnson, R. G. (eds.) 2008, *Resilience: queer professors from the working class,* State University of New York, Albany.

Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C. & Terenzini, P. T. 2004, 'First-generation college students: additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes', *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 75, no. 3, pp. 249-284.

Rockquemore, K. 2010, 'There is no guru', *Inside Higher Ed,* 19 April, viewed 24 May 2020, <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2010/04/19/there-no-guru>.

Rockquemore, K. 2013, 'A new model of mentoring', *Inside Higher Ed,* 22 July, viewed 24 May 2020, <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2013/07/22/essay-calling-senior-faculty-embrace-new-style-mentoring>.

Rockquemore, K. 2016, 'Why mentor matches fail', *Inside Higher Ed*, 3 February, viewed 24 May 2020, <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2016/02/03/most-mentoring-today-based-outdated-model-essay>.

Rodin, J., 1990, 'Control by any other name: definitions, concepts and processes', in J. Rodin, C. Schooler, & K. Warner (eds.), *Self-directedness: cause and effects throughout the life course,* Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 1-17.

Rosseter, R. 2019, 'Nursing faculty shortage', fact sheet, American Association of Colleges of Nursing, Washington, viewed 24 May 2020, <https://www.aacnnursing.org/Portals/42/News/Factsheets/Faculty-Shortage-Factsheet.pdf>

Rothe, D. 2006, 'A stranger to paradise: working-class graduate in the culture of academia', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 49-59.

Ryan, J. & Sackrey, C. 1984, *Strangers in paradise: academics from the working class,* South End Press: Boston.

Sadao, K. C. 2008, 'Living in two worlds: success and the bicultural faculty of color', *The Review of Higher Education*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 397-418.

Schademan, A. R. & Thompson, M. R. 2016, 'Are college faculty and first-generation, low-income students ready for each other?', *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice,* vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 194-216.

Schlossberg, N. K. 2008, *Overwhelmed: coping with life's ups and downs,* 2nd edn, M. Evans, Lanham, MD.

Scholz, U., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., Sud, S. & Schwarzer, R. 2002, 'Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? psychometric findings from 25 countries', *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 242-251.

Schmidt, E. K., & Faber, S. T. 2016, 'Benefits of peer mentoring to mentors, female mentees and higher education institutions', *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning,* vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 137-157.

Schramm, S. 2000, 'Thinking thrice: a feminist response to 'mentoring' that marginalizes', paper presented to the 2000 American Educational Research Association Conference, New Orleans.

Schwarzer, R. 2014, 'Everything you wanted to know about the General Self-Efficacy Scale but were afraid to ask', viewed 24 May 2020, <http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/faq_gse.pdf>

Schwarzer, R. & Jerusalem, M. 1995, 'Generalized self-efficacy scale', in J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, (eds.), *Measures in health psychology: a user's portfolio.* NFER-NELSON, Windsor, UK, pp. 35-37.

Seifert, T. A. & Umbach, P. D. 2008, 'The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction', *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 49, pp. 357-381.

Selman-Killingbeck, D. 2006, 'Can a working-class girl have roots and wings? white trash in the ivory tower', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 61-67.

Siegel, C. 2014, 'Introduction to Rhizomes 27: special issue on working class academics: still unbroken, *Rhizomes,* vol. 27.

Springer, M. E. 2012, 'The experiences of working-class college students who became university presidents', Ph.D. thesis, Indiana State University, Terre Haute.

Stephens, N. M., Brannon, T. N., Markus, H. R. & Nelson, J. E. 2015, 'Feeling at home in college: fortifying school relevant selves to reduce social class disparities in higher education. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, vol. *9, no.* 1, pp. 1-24.

Stout, P. A., Staiger, J. & Jennings, N. A. 2007, 'Affective stories: understanding the lack of progress of women faculty', *National Women's Studies Association Journal,* vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 124-144.

Thomas, N., Bystydzienski, J. & Desai, A. 2015, 'Changing institutional culture through peer mentoring of women STEM faculty', *Innovative Higher Education,* vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 143-157.

Tough, P. 2019, *The years that matter most: how college makes us or breaks us*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Boston & New York.

Turner, C. S. V. & Gonzalez, J. C. (eds.) 2015, *Modeling mentoring across race/ethnicity and gender: practices to cultivate the next generation of diverse faculty*. Stylus Publishing, Sterling, VA.

Vander Putten, J. 2015, 'Get in the truck: working-class faculty and intent to depart', paper presented to the 2015 Fighting Inequality Conference, Washington, DC.

Varkey, P., Jatoi, A., Williams, A., Mayer, A., Ko, M., Files, J., Blair, J. & Hayes, S. 2012, 'The positive impact of a facilitated peer mentoring program on academic skills of women faculty', *BMC Medical Education*, vol. 12, no. 14, pp. 1-8.

Warnock, D. M. 2016, 'Paradise lost? patterns and precarity in working-class academic narratives', *Journal of Working-Class Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 28-44.

Welsch, K. A. (ed.) 2005, *Those winter Sundays: female academics and their working-class parents.* University Press of America, Lanham, MD.

Wilson, J. L. 2006, 'Working-class values and life in academe: examining the dissonance', in S. L. Muzzati & C. V. Samarco (eds.), *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: class, identity, and the working-class experience in academe,* Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, pp. 159-169.

Wingard, D. L., Garman, K. A. & Reznik, V. 2004, 'Facilitating faculty success: outcomes and cost benefit of the UCSD National Center of Leadership in Academic Medicine', *Academic Medicine,* vol. 79, no. 10, pp. S9-S11.

Young, M. S. 2016, 'Navigating campus together', *The Atlantic,* 6 May, viewed 24 May, 2020, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/05/how-first-generation-faculty-can-help-first-generation-students-succeed/481617/>.

Youyou, W., Stillwell, D., Schwartz, H. A. & Kosinski, M. 2017, 'Birds of a feather do flock together: behavior-based personality-assessment method reveals personality similarity among couples and friends', *Psychological Science*, vol. 28, pp. 276-284.

Yun, J., Baldi, B. & Sorcinelli, M. 2016, 'Mutual mentoring for early-career and

underrepresented faculty: model, research, and practice', *Innovative Higher Education,* vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 441-451.

Zachary, L. J. (2012). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zeldin, A. L. & Pajares, F. 2000, 'Against the odds: self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers', *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 215-246.

Zellers, D. F., Howard, V. M. & Barcic, M. A. 2008, 'Faculty mentoring programs: re-envisioning rather than reinventing the wheel, *Review of Educational Research,* vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 552-588.