

2-24-2026

Effective Mentoring Strategies for Career Advancement for Mid- and Senior-Level Scientific Professionals in the Biotechnology Industry

Rachel Ayekor Hanson
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Management and Human Potential

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Rachel Ayekor Hanson

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Sandra Mohabir-McKinley, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business
Administration Faculty

Dr. Denise Land, Committee Member, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2026

Abstract

Effective Mentoring Strategies for Career Advancement for Mid- and Senior-Level

Scientific Professionals in the Biotechnology Industry

by

Rachel Ayekor Hanson

MS, University of Delaware, 2011

BS, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, 2008

Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

March 2026

Abstract

Leaders of biotechnology organizations struggle to retain and promote experienced scientific professionals, thereby weakening innovation and long-term competitiveness. Biotechnology leaders are concerned about the successful development and retention of mid- and senior-level professionals as they move from technical to leadership roles to improve innovation and long-term competitiveness. Grounded in Kram's mentoring theory and Ragins's diversity and inclusion framework, the purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry was to identify and explore mentoring strategies effectively implemented for biotech organization leaders, tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals, to promote career progression and contribute to organizational performance. The participants were six biotechnology leaders from mid-Atlantic organizations in Rockville, Maryland, who had successfully implemented mentoring programs to enhance leadership, retention, and collaboration. Through thematic analysis, six themes emerged: (a) mentoring models (formal and informal), (b) mentee ownership, (c) strategic matching, (d) soft skills and leadership prep, (e) organizational performance impact, and (f) program sustainability and leadership buy-in. A key recommendation is for biotech leaders to implement structured, adaptable mentoring programs backed by executive support and technology to maintain leadership continuity and facilitate knowledge transfer. The implications for positive social change include the potential for biotechnology organization leaders and human resource professionals to expand STEM-focused industry mentoring to reduce social inequities and increase workforce participation, supporting sustainable innovation and organizational stability.

Effective Mentoring Strategies for Career Advancement for Mid- and Senior-Level

Scientific Professionals in the Biotechnology Industry

by

Rachel Ayekor Hanson

MS, University of Delaware, 2011

BS, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, 2008

Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

March 2026

Dedication

This research project is for my amazing husband, Allen Hanson, and our wonderful children, Aidnan J. Hanson, Emre L. Hanson, and Phoebe M. Hanson. Your love, patience, and constant support kept me going throughout this journey. Allen, thank you for always supporting me and believing in my dreams. To my children, your laughter and curiosity remind me every day to keep pushing. This is as much yours as it is mine. Your presence has been a constant source of inspiration, fueling my determination to complete this academic endeavor. Thank you.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank God, the whisperer of peace, whose still voice calms the storms within. His grace, mercies, wisdom, and strength got me through all the ups and downs of this doctoral journey. Honestly, I could not have done any of this without Him and His purpose.

Huge thanks to my family for their constant love and support. To my husband, Allen Hanson, thank you for being patient, encouraging me, and always believing in me. You've been my rock and kept me going. To my amazing children, Aidnan, Emre, and Phoebe, your love, understanding, and happy spirits always inspire me to push forward and do my best. You remind me every day what's truly important in life.

I am deeply grateful to my mentors and academic committee, Dr. Sandra Mohabir-McKinley and Dr. Denise Land, for their invaluable guidance, encouragement, and wisdom throughout this process. Their expertise and dedication really helped me grow as a scholar.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to the participants who were kind enough to share their stories about mentoring. Your honesty, authenticity, and insights made this research project significantly richer and more meaningful. This research literally couldn't have happened without you sharing your journeys.

Finally, to my extended family, friends, and colleagues who've supported me along the way. A big thank you for your kindness, patience, and believing in my vision. Seriously, you all played a huge part in helping me get this done, and I'm super grateful.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
Section 1: Foundation of the Project.....	1
Background of the Problem	1
Business Problem Focus and Project Purpose	2
Research Question	3
Assumptions and Limitations	3
Assumptions.....	3
Limitations	4
Transition	4
Section 2: The Literature Review	5
A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature.....	5
Application to the Applied Business Problem	6
Conceptual Framework.....	6
Application of Kram’s Mentoring Theory	17
Kram’s Concept of Mentoring.....	21
Ragins’s Theory on Diversity and Inclusion of Mentoring	26
Literature Review Summary	31
Transition	32
Section 3: Research Project Methodology	33
Project Ethics	33
Nature of the Project	36

Population, Sampling, and Participants	37
Data Collection Activities.....	39
Interview Questions	41
Data Organization and Analysis Techniques	42
Reliability and Validity.....	43
Reliability.....	43
Validity	43
Transition and Summary.....	46
Section 4: Findings and Conclusions.....	47
Presentation of the Findings.....	47
Theme 1: Mentoring Models: Formal, Informal, and Hybrid Approaches.....	49
Theme 2: Mentee Ownership and Personalization	55
Theme 3: Strategic Matching.....	57
Theme 4: Soft Skills and Leadership Prep.....	60
Theme 5: Organizational Performance Impact.....	64
Theme 6: Program Sustainability and Leadership Buy-In.....	69
Business Contributions and Recommendations for Professional Practice	74
Implications for Social Change.....	78
Recommendations for Further Research.....	81
Conclusion	83
References.....	87
Appendix: Interview Protocol.....	112

List of Tables

Table 1. Number and Percentage of References Used.....	6
Table 2. Participant Demographics.....	48
Table 3. Summary of Thematic Synthesis	49

Section 1: Foundation of the Project

Background of the Problem

The biotechnology industry depends on skilled scientific professionals and their career growth (Gehr et al., 2020; Griffin, 2024; Lindburg et al., 2019). Leaders in innovative pharmaceutical companies face difficulties finding qualified biopharmaceutical scientists due to a talent gap and insufficient skills (Kusynová et al., 2023). However, research has shown that mentoring improves job satisfaction, boosts commitment, and increases employee retention (Banerjee-Batist et al., 2019). Mentoring is important for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) professionals, providing guidance, training, and networking. Despite the benefits of mentoring, many in STEM lack mentors, face isolation, and struggle with work–life balance, which can hinder career progress (Bahrami et al., 2023; Swafford & Anderson, 2020; Swanson, 2022). Effective mentoring supports professional identity and inclusivity; however, access remains limited, underscoring the importance of investing in mentorship programs (Dahlberg & Byars-Winston, 2019; Roy, 2024).

Biotech professionals at mid and senior levels often face career barriers due to insufficient tailored mentoring, which can lead to job dissatisfaction, higher turnover, knowledge loss, and reduced innovation (Jain, 2023). Although mentoring is necessary for career development, existing programs often fail to address the specific needs of experienced professionals navigating complex career landscapes (Hund et al., 2018). Addressing these challenges could create a sustainable mentorship framework that

supports mid- and senior-level professionals, improves retention, and fosters generational leadership.

Business Problem Focus and Project Purpose

The specific business problem was that some biotech organization leaders lack successful mentoring strategies tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance. Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry was to identify and explore effectively implemented mentoring strategies for biotech organization leaders tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance.

The target population consisted of biotech organization leaders in the biotech industry located in Rockville, Maryland who had successfully implemented mentoring strategies tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals. Purposive sampling was employed to select six participants for the research project, which included managers and directors who had successfully implemented mentoring strategies for scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry. Access to these participants was facilitated through professional associations and social networks, specifically LinkedIn. To collect data, I used semistructured interviews and publicly available mentoring data per IRB approval requirements.

The conceptual framework for this research project included Kram's (1983) mentoring theory and Ragins's (1989) diversity and inclusion theory, which provided a

comprehensive foundation for designing and implementing mentoring programs that supported career advancement and promoted diversity and inclusion in the industry.

Research Question

What successful mentoring strategies do biotech organization leaders tailor to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organization performance?

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

Assumptions are beliefs that are either assumed without evidence or tentatively accepted for hypothetical and theoretical purposes (Mascarenhas et al., 2024). I made four assumptions in this research project. First, I assumed that the participants would provide honest and accurate information about their experiences with mentorship in the biotech industry. Second, I assumed that the sample of participants would represent the target population of biotech organization leaders in the biotech industry who had successfully implemented mentoring strategies tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance. Third, I assumed that some biotech organization leaders had implemented successful mentoring programs or strategies to support the career advancement of their scientific professionals. Fourth, I assumed that effective mentoring strategies could be identified and explored through qualitative pragmatic inquiry and the use of semistructured interview data gathering.

Limitations

Limitations refer to factors or conditions that may constrain a study's findings' scope, generalizability, or applicability (Ross & Bibler Zaidi, 2019). The first limitation in this research project was that access to publicly available mentoring data served as an optional secondary source focusing on emerging leaders and their experiences as successful mentees. A second limitation was the limited access to professionals in the biotech industry for participant recruitment, which may have affected the generalizability of the findings. A third limitation was the difficulty in obtaining accurate and comprehensive data on mentoring programs and practices in the biotech industry, which may have limited the depth of analysis and understanding. Fourth, there were potential biases in participant selection because individuals who had positive experiences with mentoring may have been more willing to participate, skewing the results toward a more favorable perception of mentoring in the industry.

Transition

In Section 1, I provided the background for the problem, addressed the business problem focus and project purpose, and discussed the assumptions and limitations. In Section 2, I review professional and academic literature. Section 3 includes discussions on project ethics, the nature of the project, data collection and analysis activities, and reliability and validity. In Section 4, I discuss the findings and the implications for business practice, social change, and further research.

Section 2: The Literature Review

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

The following literature review includes peer-reviewed research on mentoring strategies for career progression in the biotechnology industry, the organizational and individual benefits of mentoring, and relevant theoretical frameworks. Several databases were utilized for this review, including ProQuest, Emerald Management Journal, SAGE Premier, EBSCOhost, ABI/INFORM, and Academic Search Complete. Keywords and phrases used in the search criteria included *career development*, *mentoring strategies*, *biotechnology industry*, *employee retention*, *talent management*, *workplace culture*, *mentorship theory*, *science sectors*, *job satisfaction*, *training programs*, *Kram mentoring theory*, and *Ragins diversity and inclusion theory*.

This literature review consisted of 163 sources, with 132 published within 5 years of the onset of the research project to ensure a focus on recent research. The sources included peer-reviewed scholarly articles, dissertations, and books (see Table 1). The review was organized into sections that explored Kram's mentoring theory, Ragins's extension on diversity and inclusion, mentoring strategies for professionals, the role of mentors and mentees in the biotech industry, and the broader organizational benefits of mentoring programs. Additionally, I examined the practical applications of mentoring in the biotechnology industry, focusing on fostering career progression, enhancing job satisfaction, and improving organizational performance.

Table 1*Number and Percentage of References Used*

Reference type	No. of references	No. peer-reviewed	% peer-reviewed	No. <5 years	% <5 years	% >5 years
Journals	143	143	88%	132	81%	19%
Books	8	0	0%	2	25%	75%
Dissertation/thesis	2	0	0%	1	50%	50%
Other	9	0	0%	5	55%	44%
Total	162					

Application to the Applied Business Problem**Conceptual Framework**

In this research project, I used a composite conceptual framework, drawing on Kram's (see 1983) mentoring theory and Ragins's (see 1997a, 1997b) work on diversity and inclusion, to explore mentoring strategies for mid- and senior-level scientific professionals in the biotech industry. Kram's theory provided the foundation for understanding the roles and functions in mentoring relationships, emphasizing career development and psychosocial support. Ragins's work extended Kram's theory by highlighting how diversity and inclusion influenced mentoring outcomes, particularly in environments with traditional power dynamics and systemic barriers that could hinder career advancement. By combining Kram's and Ragins' theories, the research project created a framework to explore how mentorship promoted career progression and enhanced organizational performance. The framework guided the research project by examining the structure of mentoring relationships and the broader effect of inclusivity in career development, ensuring a thorough analysis of mentoring strategies in the biotech sector.

Kram's Mentoring Theory

The conceptual framework for this research project was grounded in Kram's mentoring theory. A developmental relationship that had acquired significant attention in the career development literature was mentorship. Dahlberg and Byars-Winston (2019) defined *mentorship* as a collaborative learning relationship and working partnership, often between a more experienced and less experienced individual, based on intentional, responsive, and trusting interactions where both individuals share responsibility for the relationship and its effectiveness.

Literature consistently identified mentoring relationships as fundamental for skill development, performance improvement, and career advancement among professionals, especially in complex, knowledge-intensive fields. Mentorships, as highlighted in numerous studies, have been consistently shown to be pivotal in relationships that foster the development of essential skills and competencies, directly contributing to improved performance and career advancement (Chang et al., 2023; C. Deng & Turner, 2024; Diggs-Andrews et al., 2021; Manuel & Poorsattar, 2021). The enduring influence of Kram's (1983) mentoring theory provides a robust foundation for understanding the multifaceted nature of mentoring. Kram's framework not only shaped academic discourse but also offered practical insights into how mentoring impacts both individual growth and organizational effectiveness. Dahlberg and Byars-Winston (2019) further reinforced this perspective, defining mentorship as a collaborative learning partnership that is intentionally structured to deliver career-related and psychosocial support. Together, these sources underscored that mentorship is not merely informal guidance; rather, it is a

strategic process that integrates professional development and emotional support, thereby enhancing job satisfaction, adaptability, and long-term career success. This dual emphasis on skill-building and psychosocial functions affirms the critical role of mentoring in advancing the careers of mid- and senior-level professionals, particularly in complex fields such as biotechnology.

Core Components of Kram's Mentoring Theory

Arthur and Kram (1985) conceptualized mentoring as a developmental relationship with two key functions (career advancement and psychosocial support), which facilitate personal growth and professional progression. The career development function includes support, exposure and visibility, coaching, and challenging assignments, all of which help the protégé advance in their career (Chandler et al., 2011; C. Deng & Turner, 2024; Mann et al., 2023). C. Deng and Turner (2024) demonstrated that mentors who introduced protégés to influential stakeholders significantly enhanced protégés' career growth. Similarly, Mann et al. (2023) linked mentorship to increased job satisfaction and reduced workplace stress, underscoring its broader organizational advantages. Interaction with influential individuals enabled protégés to develop deeper insights into organizational hierarchies and power structures (Bahrami et al., 2023; C. Deng et al., 2022). Likewise, mentoring provided skill-building support and helped safeguard protégés from potential obstacles (C. Deng et al., 2022). These functions helped mentees prepare for professional advancement by facilitating learning and adaptation within their role (Yang et al., 2024).

H. Deng et al. (2022) corroborated prior findings by demonstrating the differential effect of career-oriented and psychosocial mentoring on newcomer socialization. Specifically, career mentoring significantly enhanced role clarity, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational fit, while psychosocial mentoring cultivated emotional security and social integration among protégés. Building on this, Bahrami et al. (2023) emphasized the role of mentoring in supporting work–life balance, particularly for women. Their research illuminated how mentoring facilitated effective role management, enabling women to better balance their professional and personal responsibilities. Although H. Deng et al. focused on the influence of mentoring on organizational acclimatization, Bahrami et al. argued that the benefits of mentorship extended beyond workplace integration, directly affecting well-being by reducing role conflict and enhancing resilience in the face of competing demands. These mentoring functions cultivated protégés’ professional development by enhancing their competence, resilience, and career preparedness (Yang et al., 2024).

Together, these career and psychosocial functions illustrate why Kram’s mentoring theory provides a robust foundation for examining mentoring as a strategic organizational practice. By supporting both performance and employee well-being, mentoring develops competent, resilient professionals ready for career advancement. The dual focus informs the present study, framing mentoring as a leadership strategy that advances individuals and organizations, while linking it to talent retention and leadership continuity in biotechnology.

Beyond career advancement, mentorship also provides important psychosocial support. Recent research by Sarabipour et al. (2023) highlighted the significance of mentor involvement in supporting mentee well-being and mental health, including promoting work-life balance, and raising awareness of available mental health resources. The Sarabipour et al. view was confirmed by Emilia et al. (2023), who emphasized the need for medical schools to focus on faculty development initiatives to foster positive role modeling and address potentially negative attributes observed by students. Furthermore, Chang et al. (2023) highlighted the importance of mentoring in enhancing subjective career success, particularly in navigating the challenges posed by the dynamic nature of the modern work environment. Interestingly, this same study by Chang et al. found that career adaptability partially mediated the relationship between proactive career orientation and subjective career success, a process that was further moderated by the presence of mentoring. These findings highlighted the interconnected nature of individual proactive behaviors, adaptability, and the supportive role played by mentorship.

The psychosocial function, conversely, included role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship, which enhanced the protégé's professional competence, identity, and effectiveness (Chandler et al., 2011; Chang et al., 2023; Emilia et al., 2023; Mann et al., 2023). Role modeling involved the mentor demonstrating effective behaviors and attitudes that the protégé could emulate (Kenny et al., 2003; Yang et al., 2024). Acceptance and confirmation involved the mentor providing support, encouragement, and validation to the protégé, which enhanced their sense of self-worth and confidence (Mantzourani et al., 2022; Rohrich & Durand, 2020). Counseling

provided a safe space for the protégé to openly discuss personal and professional concerns (Black et al., 2004). Friendship denoted the development of a close personal bond between the mentor and protégé beyond the formal mentoring relationship (C. Deng et al., 2022). Some researchers, such as Verniers et al. (2024), argued that role modeling should be treated as a distinct mentoring function, as it directly teaches skills and shapes behavior rather than merely providing emotional support. Recognizing it separately clarified its effects on developing protégés' professional identity and confidence. Similarly, Banerjee-Batist et al. (2019) found that mentoring enhanced job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career advancement. However, Pedersen et al. (2024) emphasized that the depth of mentoring relationships, marked by intimacy and closeness, was key to effective protégé development. These findings clearly demonstrate that psychosocial mentoring constitutes a foundational pillar that goes far beyond mere support, fostering sustained engagement, commitment, and readiness for advancement, thereby solidifying its indispensable role in the organizational retention and leadership development strategies, which will be analyzed in this study project.

Beyond these core functions, Kram's mentoring theory acknowledged the changing nature of mentoring relationships, which progressed through four distinct phases: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition (Arthur & Kram, 1985). During the cultivation stage, the relationship deepened through active support, while the separation phase was characterized by increased autonomy. Eventually, the mentorship was transformed into a mutual partnership in the redefinition stage. Empirical evidence supported this staged progression, indicating that mentorship adapted to changing needs.

For instance, Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) observed that during the COVID-19 pandemic, effective mentorship adjusted to mentees' immediate challenges by incorporating more online and peer-based support mechanisms. These findings affirm that effective mentoring is not static but responsive to contextual and developmental changes. The ability of mentoring relationships to evolve enhances their relevance and effectiveness across different career stages and external disruptions. This flexibility highlighted the dynamic nature of mentorship, aligning with Kram's model in demonstrating the ability of effective mentoring to respond to changing contexts and individual needs.

Phases of Kram's Mentoring Theory

Kram (1983) mentoring framework highlighted the dynamic and mutually beneficial nature of the mentoring process, which can be divided into four distinct phases: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. During the initiation phase, mentors idealized their protégés, although the quality of this phase was contingent on the values held by the mentors. Research by Illies and Reiter-Palmon (2020) revealed that mentors with self-transcendent values fostered positive relationships, while those with self-enhancement values exhibited negative behaviors, underscoring the influential role of mentor values in shaping relationship quality. In the cultivation phase, mentors supported their mentees' career growth and confidence. However, as noted by Mantzourani et al. (2022), disengaged mentees and power imbalances hindered the effectiveness of the cultivation phase, emphasizing the need for clear goals and mutual commitment.

Hence, mentors and mentees need to be committed and have explicit goals to succeed in the cultivation phase.

As mentees gained independence, the separation phase commenced according to Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023). While Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) described the separation phase as a shift toward autonomy, Yang et al. (2024) found that mentoring fostered proactive career behaviors, suggesting that a well-executed separation phase enhanced motivation and strategic planning. Finally, the redefinition phase transformed the relationship into a peer-like dynamic founded on mutual respect and support, according to Yang et al. (2024). Therefore, clearly defined expectations and values early on improved mentorship success.

Kram's framework significantly shaped research on communication and relational dynamics inherent to mentorship. In a study, O'Brien et al. (2025) found that mentor-protégé matching based on communication styles enhanced career satisfaction and organizational commitment, reinforcing Kram's emphasis on the psychosocial functions of mentoring. Parallel to this, Daniel et al. (2019) and Hopwood and Bradbury (2021) highlighted the pivotal role of effective communication in mentoring, though from distinct perspectives. While Daniel et al. (2019) explored cross-cultural academic mentoring and revealed how cultural differences shaped dyadic interactions, Hopwood and Bradbury (2021) presented a four-phase model delineating mentor and mentee traits throughout the relationship's progression. Both studies stressed the dynamic nature of mentorship, with Daniel et al. (2019) demonstrating how transformational mentoring

fostered protégés' professional identity development, aligning with Hopwood and Bradbury's focus on the mentor's role in promoting growth.

Building on Kram's mentoring model, Godfrey and Benson (2023) and Wofford (2024) investigated mentoring through distinct perspectives. Godfrey and Benson (2023) argued that informal mentoring cultivated trust and authenticity, enhancing psychosocial and career support, whereas Wofford (2024) examined how power dynamics and social identities shaped STEMM mentoring relationships. While both studies aligned with Kram's phases, Godfrey and Benson (2023) critiqued the limited focus on mentoring initiation, whereas Wofford (2024) integrated Griffin's equity model, highlighting how social identities influenced relationship development. The studies' combined perceptions stressed that relational dynamics and equity considerations significantly affected mentoring effectiveness.

Gupta (2024) and Martin et al. (2024) developed alternative understandings were built on existing frameworks. Gupta (2024) research on Indian protégés demonstrated how they navigated Negative Mentoring Experiences (NME), transforming them into opportunities for career growth, revealing that even the typically constructive cultivation phase could encompass challenges that reshaped the mentoring relationship. In contrast, Martin et al. (2024) applied Mullen and Klimaitis's typology of nine mentoring approaches to the engineering education context, illuminating the intersections of formal and informal mentoring, power dynamics, and shared values (Mullen & Klimaitis, 2021). While not explicitly referencing Kram's model, their findings aligned with Kram's

emphasis on the psychosocial and career functions of mentoring, accentuating the fluid and adaptive nature of these relationships.

Together, these studies demonstrated that Kram's foundational mentorship framework required expansion to capture contemporary mentoring complexities. Also, their perceptions held practical implications for biotech mentorship initiatives, where aligning communication styles (O'Brien et al., 2025) and fostering informal mentoring cultivated stronger connections (Godfrey & Benson, 2023). Furthermore, Wofford (2024) equity lens informed diversity-focused mentoring strategies, and Gupta (2024) emphasized on overcoming NMEs highlighted the potential for growth through adversity. In fast-paced industries like biotech, reverse and peer mentoring models also provided support, facilitated knowledge exchange on emerging trends, and promoted collaborative learning.

Effect of Kram's Mentoring Theory on Career Advancement

Arthur and Kram (1985) mentoring theory highlighted the twofold functions of career development and psychosocial support, which shaped mentees' professional trajectories and facilitated their long-term growth. Research demonstrated that effective mentoring enhanced self-efficacy, career satisfaction, and proactive behavior, further substantiating Kram's conceptual framework (Higgins & Kram, 2001). According to H. Deng et al. (2022), career-focused mentoring improved mentees' task performance and self-efficacy, while psychosocial support enhanced their job satisfaction and social integration. H. Deng et al.'s findings corroborated Kram's assertion that self-efficacy mediated the effect of mentoring on career outcomes. Likewise, Pedersen et al. (2024)

found that perceived similarity, rather than demographic characteristics, determined the effectiveness of mentoring. Pedersen et al. (2024) showed that shared values and experiences fostered trust and relationship satisfaction, boosting academic performance and career commitment, validating Kram's emphasis on psychosocial support and role modeling.

Wuttke et al. (2024) extended Kram's mentoring theory by investigating vocational education and discovered that high-quality training and skilled trainers enhanced apprentices' vocational identity, with satisfaction serving as a mediating factor. Wuttke et al. (2024) work reflected the dynamic between mentors and mentees, where effective mentoring promoted career progression and professional identity development. Furthermore, Yang et al. (2024) built upon Kram's framework by applying the proactive motivation perspective, demonstrating that mentoring encouraged proactive behavior in new employees, with agreeableness moderating this relationship. Yang et al. (2024) findings emphasized that mentoring supported career advancement and fostered adaptability and initiative in individuals.

By demonstrating the importance of perceived similarity, these studies collectively validated Kram's mentoring theory, showing that mentoring promoted career advancement and psychosocial well-being by cultivating trust, self-efficacy, and proactive behavior. Research by Pedersen et al. (2024) and Wuttke et al. (2024) stressed the significance of perceived similarity and training quality in strengthening mentoring outcomes, while the work of Yang et al. (2024) highlighted the role of individual personality traits in moderating mentoring effectiveness. These studies revealed that

although Kram's original model emphasized career and psychosocial support, contemporary scholarship identified additional factors, such as perceived similarity and personality characteristics, which shaped the efficacy of mentoring relationships (Ragins & Kram, 2008, p. 680).

Therefore, applying Kram's framework strengthened modern mentoring programs, fostering career progress by cultivating trust, self-efficacy, and proactive conduct. Ranganathan and Englesbe (2024) recommended team-based mentorship models and contracts to prevent burnout and enhance efficiency. Their structured approach, aligned with Kram's principles, empowered organizations to scale mentoring initiatives, bolster mentee support, and advance long-term career success.

Application of Kram's Mentoring Theory

Institutional and Crisis

Kram (1983) mentoring theory demonstrated efficacy in institutional and crisis-driven contexts, promoting individual and organizational success. In structured settings, it cultivated career advancement, diversity, and adaptability, while in crises, it evolved to address emerging challenges through dynamic mentoring approaches. In a study, Nadder (2025) demonstrated how nurse faculty mentoring, underpinned by Kram's theoretical framework, enhanced student success by addressing their academic and psychosocial needs through role modeling and relationship-building. Similarly, Murray et al. (2024) research indicated that academic mentoring committees promoted diversity, provided structured support, and mitigated burnout, demonstrating how Kram's model addressed individual and institutional challenges. These studies collectively illustrated the capacity

of mentoring to cultivate self-efficacy, resilience, and inclusivity within educational environments.

In a crisis context, Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) revealed how the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted conventional mentoring approaches, leading to the adoption of alternative mentoring modalities, such as e-mentoring and peer mentoring. While traditional mentorship faced challenges due to remote constraints, Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) found that peer and reverse mentoring fostered greater equality and collaborative learning. Nonetheless, e-mentoring introduced obstacles, including misinterpretation from asynchronous communication and technical disparities. Despite these limitations, Haidusek-Niazy et al.'s (2023) study demonstrated the adaptability of Kram's mentoring framework, which evolved into more flexible, relationship-centered models to address the emerging challenges posed by the crisis.

These studies collectively illustrate the versatility of Kram's mentoring theory across different settings. Nadder (2025) and Murray et al. (2024) highlighted the theory's value in institutional contexts by promoting structured, supportive environments that fostered career growth and diversity. Conversely, Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) demonstrated how crises necessitated more dynamic, technology-enabled mentoring approaches. Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) found that while traditional mentoring principles maintained relevance, their application had to be adaptable, incorporating collaborative and peer-based methods to address evolving challenges. Therefore, applying Kram's mentoring framework demonstrated utility across institutional and crisis-driven settings, enabling mentorship programs to maintain effectiveness by

harmonizing structured and adaptive approaches (Diggs-Andrews et al., 2021). Within institutional contexts, applying tailored, committee-based mentoring models enhanced outcomes for faculty and students (Murray et al., 2024), while crisis-precipitated adaptations, such as e-mentoring, fostered continuity and resilience during periods of disruption (Haidusek-Niazy et al., 2023).

Mentoring in Entrepreneurship, STEM, and Health Care

Kram's mentoring framework was extensively utilized across entrepreneurship, STEM, and healthcare disciplines, driving innovation, skill acquisition, and professional development. Its focus on interpersonal dynamics, psychosocial support, and formalized mentorship cultivated individual and organizational progress. Research on entrepreneurship by Kankisingi and Dhliwayo (2022) and Kostyuk and Battisti (2025) demonstrated that mentoring enhanced venture performance through the transfer of knowledge, the development of skills, and the cultivation of trust. Both studies emphasized the importance of structured, long-term mentoring relationships, which aligned with Kram's emphasis on fostering individual and organizational growth. Similarly, in the field of STEM, the report *The Science of Effective Mentorship in STEMM* (2020) highlighted the role of mentoring in providing technical guidance, networking opportunities, and career navigation support for scientists, reinforcing the framework established by Kram.

In healthcare, research by Sobel et al. (2023) and Drossard and Härtl (2024) revealed limitations of one-on-one mentoring in emergency medicine (EM), advocating for the implementation of team-based mentoring models to better address the diverse

developmental needs of individuals. Sobel et al. (2023) and Drossard and Härtl (2024) emphasized the advantages of team-based mentoring models over traditional approaches, underscoring the value of collaborative strategies in healthcare. These findings aligned with Kram's emphasis on the importance of adaptable mentoring structures, which could be supported through peer or group mentoring approaches. Furthermore, Germeroth et al. (2024) demonstrated that while mentoring conferred benefits to allied health fields, its effectiveness was hindered by inconsistent practices. Germeroth et al. (2024) stressed the need for structured mentoring programs, reflecting Kram's focus on clear goals and effective communication within the mentoring relationship.

Cuddington et al. (2023) research in STEM education demonstrated that mentoring enhanced graduate students' self-assurance in quantitative abilities, underscoring the significance of role modeling and counseling in cultivating a growth-oriented mindset. Likewise, Atkins et al. (2020) revealed that mentoring promoted the development of scientific identity and a sense of belonging among underrepresented populations, aligning with the psychosocial support functions outlined in Kram's framework. Germeroth et al. (2024) and Atkins et al. (2020) showed the significance of structured, standardized mentoring programs to enhance outcomes across various disciplines. These studies collectively illustrated that Kram's mentoring theory provided a versatile framework applicable across diverse domains. In the entrepreneurial context, it fostered economic progress by cultivating skills and trust, while in STEM and healthcare fields, it strengthened technical proficiencies, self-confidence, and career development (Cuddington et al., 2023).

Moreover, Kram's mentoring theory demonstrated versatility in cultivating skills, confidence, and career progression across entrepreneurship, STEM, and healthcare. Therefore, organizations fostered innovation and diversity and sustained professional development within diverse industries by integrating structured, adaptable mentoring approaches.

Kram's Concept of Mentoring

Reverse Mentoring: Redefining Traditional Roles

Reverse mentoring, a conceptual expansion upon Kram and Isabella (1985) seminal work, reconceptualized conventional hierarchical relationships by enabling reciprocal knowledge exchange, cultivating cross-generational learning, and bolstering organizational adaptability. Gadowska-Lila's (2020) research indicated that reverse mentoring programs enhanced digital competencies, leadership capabilities, and intergenerational engagement. These structured initiatives were found to promote knowledge sharing, employee investment, and adaptability amid technological and cultural transformations, corroborating Kram and Isabella's (1985) view of mentoring's reciprocal career and psychosocial functions. Likewise, Cismaru and Iunius (2019) demonstrated the advantages of reverse mentoring in the hospitality sector, emphasizing how mutual knowledge transfer bolstered collaboration, retention, and innovation, reinforcing Kram's emphasis on bidirectional learning.

In contrast, Pandita et al. (2023) expanded the concept of reverse mentoring, emphasizing its potential to sustain organizational learning. Their model demonstrated how reverse mentoring leveraged the digital proficiency of Generation Z to bridge

generational divides, cultivate inclusive leadership, and reinforce psychological contracts. Pandita et al.'s (2023) perspective underscored reverse mentoring's capacity to drive technological adaptation and professional growth. Additionally, Dahlberg and Byars-Winston (2019), as well as Garg et al. (2021), highlighted that effective reverse mentoring required organizational support, engaged mentor-mentee relationships, and a culture of mutual respect, aligning with Kram's framework of reciprocal and personal mentoring dynamics.

These studies illustrated that reverse mentoring fostered organizational learning, leadership development, and intergenerational collaboration. Gadomska-Lila (2020) and Cismaru and Iunius (2019) also stressed the effect on developing skills and adaptability, while Pandita et al. (2023) highlighted its strategic role in driving digital innovation and inclusive leadership. The findings revealed that effective reverse mentoring programs necessitated structured support, cultural responsiveness, and reciprocal engagement, which were all aligned with Kram's emphasis on relational dynamics.

Integrating Kram's reverse mentoring model empowered organizations to bridge generational divides, facilitate knowledge exchange, and enhance organizational adaptability (Singh et al., 2021). However, implementing structured reverse mentoring programs cultivated sustainable organizational learning, reinforced leadership development, and supported talent management through collaborative growth and development.

Two-Way and Intentional Mentoring: Expanding Kram's Framework

Two-way and intentional mentoring approaches broadened Kram's conceptual framework by emphasizing reciprocal learning and structured support. These mentoring models cultivated mutual skill development, encouraged inclusivity, and reinforced long-term professional advancement (Blake-Beard et al., 2021). Recent mentoring scholarship has expanded Kram's traditional framework by emphasizing reciprocal, developmentally dynamic mentoring relationships that support shared learning, adaptability, and inclusivity. Chen and Chai (2023) research introduced a two-way mentorship model, highlighting the transition from traditional, hierarchical mentoring to reciprocal relationships. Chen and Chai found that mentors and mentees contributed unique skills, fostering shared learning and adaptability, particularly in the context of technological advancements. The Chen and Chai (2023) model was built upon Kram and Isabella's (1985) theory, emphasizing the' dynamic and evolving nature of mentoring relationships. Similarly, Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) and Murphy (2012) demonstrated that reciprocal mentoring effectively addressed digital literacy gaps among senior employees, thereby strengthening innovation and collaboration. Meanwhile, Blake-Beard et al. (2021) proposed a mentor development model with three key focal points: people and tasks, inclusive work across identities, and managing external perceptions. Blake-Beard et al.'s model incorporated self-reflection, standardized assessments, and peer support networks, promoting continuous mentor improvement and self-awareness.

These studies indicate that contemporary mentoring is increasingly characterized by mutual influence and continuous learning rather than unidirectional knowledge

transfer. Reciprocal mentoring enhances adaptability in rapidly changing environments, while structured mentor development models ensure that mentors themselves remain effective, inclusive, and self-aware (Chen & Chai, 2023). These approaches expand the functional scope of mentoring by integrating technological competence, inclusivity, and reflective practice into the mentoring process.

In a study, Shuler et al. (2021) and Broughton et al. (2019) also examined intentional mentoring approaches, which provided structured support for underrepresented populations. Shuler et al. (2021) findings indicated that clear objectives, personalized guidance, and institutional backing assisted mentees in navigating academic and professional hurdles. Similarly, Broughton et al. (2019) underlined that formalized mentorship programs, such as Werner-Washburne's initiative and the MCHC/RISE-UP program, promoted career advancement and a sense of belonging by addressing systemic barriers. Shuler et al.'s and Broughton et al.'s work aligned with Kram's theoretical framework by demonstrating how structured mentoring enhanced psychosocial support, self-assurance, and long-term professional success.

Collectively, these studies illustrated that two-way and intentional mentoring enhanced traditional mentorship frameworks by fostering mutual learning, inclusivity, and professional development. Expanding Kram's framework with two-way and intentional mentoring enhanced organizational adaptability, diversity, and talent development. These models fostered reciprocal knowledge exchange, formalized guidance, and encouraged self-reflection, thereby cultivating long-term professional development and amplifying the influence of mentorship across diverse sectors.

Mentoring Outcomes

Individual dynamics, professional networks, and organizational factors influenced mentoring outcomes (Singh et al., 2021). Successful mentorship cultivated involvement, flexibility, and fairness, yet its efficacy also hinged on structured support, mentor expertise, and inclusive approaches, according to H. Deng et al. (2022). In recent studies, Banerjee-Batist et al. (2019) and Deng and Turner (2024) found that mentoring programs helped mitigate gender and ethnic barriers by fostering inclusive networks in STEM fields. However, inconsistent mentoring quality inadvertently exacerbated disparities. Elovitz (2024) argued that for institutional interventions, there was a need for mentor training and funding to address sociocultural challenges. Similarly, Garg et al. (2021) found that reverse mentoring enhanced engagement by facilitating knowledge exchange and skill development, thereby reducing turnover. Deng and Turner (2024) supported this argument by showing that mentoring promoted critical thinking and confidence in STEM, boosting mentee engagement. These studies demonstrated that effective mentorship enhanced engagement, inclusion, and professional development by addressing individual and systemic barriers, enhancing diversity, and mitigating inequities. However, risks included inconsistent quality without proper preparation.

Conversely, Liu and Zhang (2022) and Yin (2024) studies highlighted the importance of mentors' paradox mindset in improving their engagement and mentoring quality, enabling them to navigate conflicts and stress. Rubbi Nunan et al. (2023) added that personality clashes and unclear expectations hindered effective mentoring, underlining the need for adaptable and resilient mentors. Cannon-Bowers et al. (2023)

and Germeroth et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of balancing process-oriented and outcome-focused mentoring approaches. Their findings confirmed Arthur and Kram's (1985) assertion that effective mentoring encompassed career development and psychosocial support. Similarly, Yang et al. (2024) demonstrated that mentoring promoted proactive behavior among new employees, with agreeableness and organizational support enhancing its efficacy. These research findings underscored that structured, engagement-driven mentoring cultivated adaptability and career advancement.

These studies demonstrated structured reverse mentoring, adaptable mentors, and a balanced approach. Integrating both process- and outcome-based strategies enhanced engagement, reduced burnout, and optimized career and psychosocial benefits. Applying Kram's theoretical model suggested that intentional, inclusive, and motivating mentorship fostered professional growth, adaptability, and equity. Therefore, organizations improved mentoring results by equipping mentors, championing diversity, and balancing career and personal support to optimize long-term effects.

Ragins's Theory on Diversity and Inclusion of Mentoring

Ragins's diversity framework underscored the complexities inherent in cross-cultural and cross-gender mentoring relationships, particularly regarding power dynamics and their effect on the overall effectiveness of these partnerships (Chandler & Ellis, 2011). Diverse mentoring relationships differed from homogeneous ones by facing challenges such as stereotypes, biases, and unequal power distributions (Ragins, 1999). Nonetheless, these diverse mentorships provided critical support for the career and psychosocial development of protégés, aligning with Kram's dual-function mentoring

model. Minority protégés often encountered heightened visibility paired with limited influence; however, implementing inclusive mentoring structures helped mitigate these barriers (Ragins, 1989). Building on this, Dwivedi et al. (2025) emphasized that the success of mentorship programs depended on institutional policies and advocacy, reinforcing Kram's conceptualization of mentoring as both a developmental and systemic mechanism. Similarly, Sarabipour et al. (2023) argued that mentoring outcomes were shaped by broader organizational and societal power dynamics, underscoring the critical need for structural inclusion efforts.

Extant research emphasized the significance of structured programs in mitigating gender-based inequities. Bear et al. (2025) indicated that gender-based stereotypes and biased assessments impeded women's access to leadership roles, yet comprehensive mentoring, sponsorship, and advocacy initiatives dismantled these barriers. Bear, Treviño, and Aguinis's study aligned with Ragins' (1989) proposition that diverse mentoring relationships expanded mentees' access to influential networks, thereby fostering inclusion. Furthermore, Sarabipour et al. (2023) also advocated structured mentorship programs to diminish bias and promote equitable career progression faced by minority groups.

Barriers to accessing mentorship due to racial discrimination, gender bias, and cultural differences were significant, especially for women of color, who often faced challenges in career advancement. Newman et al. (2025) indicated that microaggressions based on race adversely affected job satisfaction and career progression for these individuals. To address such disparities, Clawson and Kram (1984) advocated for

inclusive mentoring approaches that fostered resilience and expanded professional networks (Marshall et al., 2022). While cross-cultural mentoring relationships encountered challenges related to trust and communication, overcoming these obstacles enhanced the effectiveness of such programs and promoted greater inclusion in the workplace (Ragins, 1989).

Integrating Kram's mentoring theory and Ragins' diversity framework enhanced organizational learning. Kram's model provided a foundation for career and psychosocial support (Banerjee-Batist et al., 2019), while Ragins' framework highlighted how diversity shaped mentoring outcomes (Vargas et al., 2021). Effective mentors who navigated diversity-related challenges promoted the development of mentees, particularly those from underrepresented groups (Andrews et al., 2024; Murray et al., 2024). As Haidusek-Niazy et al. (2023) exemplified, traditional mentoring approaches frequently relied on hierarchical, dyadic structures, potentially overlooking the nuances of diversity. Blending Kram's and Ragins' conceptual frameworks allowed organizations to cultivate inclusive settings, promoting professional development for diverse employees (Murray et al., 2024; Ragins & Kram, 2008).

Mentoring for Professionals

Mentorship initiatives were instrumental in supporting professional growth, as they cultivated leadership skills, improved employee retention, and bridged the divide between academic preparation and industry-specific expertise (Murray et al., 2024). Practical mentorship approaches, especially in dynamic domains like biotechnology,

according to Langer (2020), necessitated adaptability and sensitivity to organizational requirements.

Research emphasized the advantages of formal and informal mentorship models, with hybrid approaches providing flexibility to accommodate evolving professional needs. In a study, Khatchikian et al. (2021) found that radiology mentees gained from multiple mentors specializing in research, career advancement, and work-life balance, which aligned with broader evidence on the efficacy of goal-setting and structured support. Similarly, McWherter et al. (2024) showed that the Farm Resilience Mentorship (FaRM) program enhanced technical capabilities, emotional resilience, and career development through adaptive mentor networks, underscoring the value of mentor versatility. These observations paralleled Clark et al. (2022) study on public health organizations, where tailored knowledge broker mentorship facilitated evidence-based decision-making, reinforcing the significance of context-specific program design. McGowan and Dawkins (2025), therefore, extended Clark et al. findings by revealing that mentorship programs designed to be culturally aware and responsive helped mitigate systemic obstacles faced by minorities, emphasizing the significance of inclusivity. Collectively, these studies underlined the necessity of adaptable, tailored mentorship approaches to address the diverse professional needs of individuals and advance equitable career progression.

Mentorship programs played an important role in bridging the gap between academic training and industry-specific competencies, particularly in rapidly evolving fields such as biotechnologies (Diggs-Andrews et al., 2021). For instance, Rifat and Sony

(2025) found that structured career mentoring in Bangladesh equipped students with job-seeking skills, while Diggs-Andrews et al. (2021) emphasized that inclusive mentoring networks in STEM, using tools like Individual Development Plans (IDPs), fostered long-term career success. Both studies stressed the need for adaptive, skills-based mentoring to prepare professionals for evolving career demands. In biotechnology, Delebecque and Philp (2019) and Gross and Sohl (2021) noted that while professionals possessed technical expertise, they often lacked business acumen and adaptability. Therefore, expanding educational programs to include regulatory compliance, risk assessment, and public engagement addressed this gap. Gross and Sohl guided inquiry activity also demonstrated how blending scientific expertise with business skills enhanced industry readiness. The biotechnology sector increasingly requires interdisciplinary competencies, merging technical and managerial skills.

Finally, Lee and Lim (2023) identified a growing demand for professionals with technical expertise in the biotechnology sector, while Blair (2025) argued that leadership capabilities had become more valuable than technical skills. McCray et al. (2024) similarly found that mentorship fostering research rigor and collaboration strengthened scientific environments, a necessity in biotech's high-stakes, capital-intensive landscape. Therefore, mentorship initiatives, particularly in dynamic fields such as biotechnology, necessitated adaptability, cultural sensitivity, and a dual emphasis on technical and leadership capabilities (Langer, 2020). Organizations strengthened professional development, employee retention, and overall organizational performance by customizing

mentorship to accommodate shifting industry needs and promoting evidence-based decision-making.

Literature Review Summary

The biotechnology industry faces significant challenges in developing and retaining skilled scientific professionals important for innovation and organizational growth. Studies confirm that ineffective mentoring strategies hinder career advancement, professional satisfaction, and long-term retention of mid- and senior-level professionals, leading to decreased innovation and productivity (Bahrami et al., 2023; Jain, 2023; Swafford & Anderson, 2020). These challenges encompass both structural and relational issues, such as limited access to mentors, inadequate inclusive support, and deficiencies in program design. Researchers have shown that well-structured mentoring programs, grounded in effective leadership, communication, and inclusion, are vital for organizational performance (Banerjee-Batist et al., 2019; Dahlberg & Byars-Winston, 2019; Roy, 2024). Drawing on Kram's mentoring theory and Ragins' diversity and inclusion framework, mentorship is understood as a developmental relationship fostering career growth and psychosocial support, while addressing diversity-related challenges that impede equitable advancement. Research also indicates that mentors offering guidance, visibility, and psychosocial reinforcement strengthen mentees' self-efficacy, motivation, and job satisfaction (Deng & Turner, 2024; Yang et al., 2024).

Effective mentoring requires innovation and adaptability, particularly in dynamic sectors like biotechnology. Models such as reverse, two-way, and intentional mentoring foster reciprocal learning, intergenerational collaboration, and digital competence,

supporting organizational sustainability (Blake-Beard et al., 2021; Pandita et al., 2023). Furthermore, inclusive mentoring practices help mitigate systemic barriers linked to gender, race, and power disparities, thereby strengthening organizational equity and innovation (Bear et al., 2025; Sarabipour et al., 2023). Therefore, effective mentoring in the biotechnology industry requires a shift from traditional hierarchical models to structured, inclusive, and adaptive strategies that foster leadership, knowledge sharing, and professional resilience. Biotechnology organizations should use frameworks to boost employee retention and satisfaction, which strengthens leadership and improves sector competitiveness and sustainability.

Transition

In this section, I reviewed relevant academic and professional literature and discussed its applications to the business problem. In Section 3, I describe the research methodology, including ethical issues, study design, data collection, analytic methodologies, and processes for ensuring reliability and validity. Section 4 will present the findings and discuss the implications for business practices, social change, and future research.

Section 3: Research Project Methodology

Section 3 outlines my research methods and explains why I chose them. I aimed to demonstrate that my work was rigorous and could be reproduced. I discuss the project's ethics and describe its nature, the population, sampling, and participants. I also explain how I collected, organized, and analyzed the data to answer my research question, and address reliability and validity.

Project Ethics

As the researcher, I managed the research process and gathered data systematically to address the research project's question on mentoring strategies for mid- and senior-level biotech professionals. My primary responsibility was coordinating the research, reducing the risk of methodological issues, and ensuring quality. I ensured my research included recruiting participants, conducting interviews, and analyzing data to provide meaningful insights (see Yin, 2018). I ensured that the research project was ethical and that participants felt comfortable sharing their experiences openly and honestly. I used appropriate methods, particularly the importance of communication and engagement, to build trust with participants and collect high-quality data. Gathering data was challenging, and if not done carefully, it could have affected the entire research project. To ensure ethical integrity, I followed The Belmont Report's principles of respect, beneficence, and justice (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2003). These principles, according to Taquette and Borges da Matta Souza (2022), guided my interactions with participants, prioritizing their autonomy, well-being, and fair treatment throughout the research project.

As the researcher, I had no prior relationship with the participants involved in this research project. However, my professional interest in mentoring strategies and workforce development in the biotech industry motivated my research exploration. Although I did not have direct affiliations with the participating organizations, my background in biomedical research provided me with relevant contextual knowledge that aided in formulating appropriate and meaningful research questions. To uphold the integrity and objectivity of this research project, I adhered to strict ethical standards. This ensured that participant selection, data collection, and analysis remained objective and impartial throughout the research process (see Taquette & Borges da Matta Souza, 2022). Furthermore, I remained mindful of maintaining neutrality to prevent the introduction of personal perspectives into the research project findings.

Before starting the data collection process, I obtained approval from the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB approval number for this research project was 05-19-25-1030384. The approval ensured that my research adhered to ethical guidelines and addressed potential risks to participants. Additionally, I required all participants to provide informed consent before participating in this research project. The informed consent process provided participants with detailed information about the research, including its purpose, procedures, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality measures, and their rights as participants. The informed consent process also confirmed that participants understood their participation was voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw from this research project without penalty (see Florea, 2023). I asked participants to sign a written consent form approved by the IRB. I reviewed the form with

them to ensure they fully understood their involvement in this research project. The form explained the interview procedures, confidentiality measures, and the fact that participation was voluntary. I explained to participants that they could withdraw at any time by providing verbal or written notice. Participants could communicate their withdrawal decision via email, text, or phone, and I would respect their choice without requiring an explanation.

To protect the confidentiality of participants, Uutela et al. (2020) suggested using pseudonyms or codes to identify them in the data and any resulting publications or presentations. Therefore, I protected participants' confidentiality by using coded identifiers (e.g., P1, P2, P3) instead of their names in all data, reports, presentations, and publications. Masking participant identities is essential for ethical research practices (Saunders et al., 2019). Any information that could have identified participants, organizations, or locations was hidden to ensure confidentiality. I also securely stored all research data, including interview transcripts, in a locked and secure location. I will retain the data for at least 5 years, as required by the IRB guidelines.

Research bias is a significant issue in qualitative studies because personal views, assumptions, and interpretations can affect data collection and analysis (Barroga et al., 2023). To reduce bias, I remained reflective by closely examining my assumptions and perspectives during the research process. Keeping a reflective journal helped me document my thoughts, decisions, and potential biases that could have influenced how I interpreted the data (see Clancy, 2013; Jamieson et al., 2023; Johnson et al., 2020).

Additionally, I undertook member checking and had participants review interview summaries to ensure I accurately represented their experiences and perspectives.

I anticipated potential ethical challenges, such as maintaining participant confidentiality and addressing power dynamics during the research (see McKee, 2024). To address these, I was transparent about the research project's goals, maintained professionalism, and upheld ethical standards (see Saunders et al., 2019). I also gave participants a small token of appreciation, such as a \$10 gift card, to acknowledge their time and contributions to this research project. By following these ethical standards, I ensured the integrity of my research and protected all participants.

Nature of the Project

I used a qualitative method to answer my research question. The qualitative approach was appropriate because I was able to explore and understand the mentoring strategies used to support career advancement for the biotechnology industry's mid- and senior-level scientific professionals. Qualitative inquiry captured the participants' experiences, perspectives, and insights (see Adnan et al., 2022; Bhangu et al., 2023), which were key to understanding how mentoring influenced career growth. The qualitative inquiry method enabled me to investigate complex, context-specific insights that quantitative methods may have missed (see Saunders et al., 2019).

My research design was a pragmatic approach to explore real-world mentoring practices and how individuals in the biotechnology industry applied these strategies to advance their careers. The pragmatic inquiry approach is valuable for business research because pragmatic researchers use this design for the analysis of practical solutions and

decision-making approaches in complex organizational settings (Kelly & Cordeiro, 2020). The pragmatic inquiry approach allowed me to uncover actionable insights and identify mentoring strategies that could be applied across different contexts (see Kelly & Cordeiro, 2020). Using a qualitative pragmatic inquiry, I captured the nuanced and dynamic nature of mentoring relationships, particularly in addressing diversity, inclusion, and power dynamics that might have affected career advancement. My research was inductive, allowing themes to emerge naturally from the data collected.

Population, Sampling, and Participants

The target population consisted of biotech organization leaders who served in manager and director roles in the biotech industry in the State of Maryland. Participants had to successfully implement mentoring strategies tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance. The eligibility criteria for participants included (a) successfully implementing mentoring strategies tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance; (b) holding a leadership role such as manager, director, or senior executive in a biotechnology organization; (c) having direct experience designing or overseeing mentoring programs; and (d) being actively involved in initiatives aimed at promoting career progression and organizational performance through mentoring. These criteria were appropriate for my research project as they ensured that the participants possessed relevant experiences and expertise in mentoring, which could

provide rich and meaningful insights into how mentoring strategies accelerated career advancement.

I used a purposive sampling approach to select at least six participants from the targeted population. The purposive sampling method was suitable for qualitative studies, allowing the researcher to choose participants who could intentionally provide detailed, relevant data to the research question (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022; Hyassat et al., 2023). I chose six participants from the targeted population because smaller sample sizes in qualitative research enabled a more in-depth exploration of context-specific phenomena (see Braun & Clarke, 2022; Hennink & Kaiser, 2022). Participant selection prioritized the availability and willingness of individuals to participate, as well as their capacity to communicate their experiences and perspectives in a clear, expressive, and engaged manner (Palinkas et al., 2015). I planned to collect data through iterative, semistructured interviews until no new themes or insights emerged to ensure data saturation. Data saturation was achieved after interviewing five participants, with an additional participant subsequently interviewed. Reaching data saturation was key in determining the final sample size, ensuring the collected data were comprehensive and complete (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022).

To find participants, I used professional networks like LinkedIn, biotech industry-specific groups, and alumni networks. Professional network platforms helped me connect with potential participants and build trust (Negrin et al., 2022). To recruit participants, I distributed an invitation to participate in the research project via email and professional networks. The invitation outlined the research project's purpose, participant eligibility

criteria, and details about the data collection process, including confidentiality and the voluntary nature of participation. I also asked participants to recommend others who met the requirements. I clearly explained the purpose of the research, data collection, and confidentiality to the participants to establish a good working relationship. I discussed the informed consent process and ensured participants understood their rights, such as voluntarily participating and withdrawing at any time. I also shared the interview protocol (see Appendix) to help them prepare. Building trust with the participants was important to get detailed information about the mentoring strategies used in the biotech industry (Saunders et al., 2019). After the initial contact, I continued communicating openly with participants through emails and face-to-face meetings to maintain connections and ensure participants felt comfortable throughout the process.

Data Collection Activities

As a researcher for this research project, I gathered data to answer my research question about mentoring strategies that helped mid- and senior-level biotech professionals advance their careers. According to Saunders et al. (2019), if data collection was not carried out systematically and without a clear objective, it was not considered valid research. Therefore, researchers have to manage all aspects of their research, including properly collecting data to address the research question (Borghi & Gulick, 2022; Saunders et al., 2019). I used semistructured interviews for my data collection, as these allow participants to share their experiences in detail and allow me to ask follow-up questions to explore new ideas (Saunders et al., 2019; Wakelin et al., 2024). Semistructured interviews are commonly used in qualitative research to gather rich, in-

depth data, which was well-suited for the exploratory nature of my research project (Saunders et al., 2019). The semistructured method helped me gain deeper insights into the nuances of mentoring strategies in the biotech industry, capturing both the contextual and subjective information that structured interviews might have missed.

I compiled and used an interview protocol to ensure consistency across participants and reduce bias (see Appendix). The interview protocol included scripted opening statements and a structured list of interview questions with prompts for probing and closing comments (Hunter, 2012). Clear, detailed steps were taken to ensure valid and reliable data collection (Turner, 2010; Yin, 2018). To improve the reliability and validity of my data collection, I audio-recorded the interviews and took detailed notes during each session. After each interview, I employed member checking, where I sent transcripts and summaries of my analysis of the initial interview data to participants to confirm that I had accurately captured their perspectives. Sending transcripts and summaries to participants for confirmation helped ensure the data reflected their experiences. During the data collection, I documented detailed field notes to capture my observations, personal reflections, and any contextual factors that might have influenced the data. The field notes were an important secondary data source that supplemented the interview transcripts (Xu, 2024). Using multiple data sources, including interviews and field notes, allowed for data triangulation, enhancing the trustworthiness of my research findings (Sangasubana, 2011; Xu, 2024). I also compared themes across multiple participants to identify patterns and differences.

Interview Questions

I conducted semistructured interviews to gather the data. The interview questions were:

1. How do you initiate and structure mentoring relationships for mid- and senior-level scientific professionals?
2. How are your mentoring strategies tailored to meet the specific needs of mid- and senior-level scientific professionals?
3. What mentoring strategies have most effectively facilitated career progression for mid- and senior-level professionals?
4. What resources (e.g., time, funding, technology) have been used to support mentoring programs?
5. In your experience, how do mentoring strategies influence overall organizational performance?
6. What challenges have you faced in implementing or managing mentoring programs for mid- and senior-level professionals?
7. How do you measure the success of mentoring programs?
8. How does your mentoring program address diversity, inclusion, and the transition of mentees into future mentors?
9. Can you share an example of a mentoring relationship that significantly affected both the mentee and the organization?
10. What additional insights would you like to share about mentoring strategies?

Data Organization and Analysis Techniques

I systematically organized and analyzed the data collected during the semistructured interviews. First, I transcribed the audio recordings and cleaned the interview transcripts to remove any identifying information (see Saunders et al., 2019). Then, I used NVivo software to manage the data and facilitate the coding and analysis process. I used Kiger and Varpio's (2020) six-phased thematic analysis approach to analyze the data collected through semistructured interviews. The thematic analysis enabled researchers to identify and explore recurring patterns or themes within the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Nowell et al., 2017; Sovacool et al., 2023). Kiger and Varpio's (2020) six phases of thematic analysis included familiarizing myself with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report.

For a deeper understanding, I read the transcripts multiple times, made notes and observations to acquaint myself with the data (see Kiger & Varpio, 2020). Next, I used a coding approach to generate initial codes that captured key concepts and ideas expressed by the participants (see Naeem et al., 2023). I then reviewed the codes and began to group them into broader themes that represented the underlying patterns in the data, as shown in Naeem et al. (2023). After identifying the preliminary themes, I carefully reviewed them to ensure they accurately reflected the data. I then defined and named the final themes, clearly describing each theme. In the final phase, I wrote the results, incorporating relevant excerpts from the interview data to support the key themes. I

documented my analytic decisions and reflections throughout the analysis in an audit trail to enhance my research's transparency, trustworthiness, and rigor (Nowell et al., 2017).

Reliability and Validity

Reliability

To enhance the reliability of my research, I took several measures. Firstly, I carefully documented the research procedures, including the interview protocol, data collection and analysis methods, and the rationale behind my decisions. Detailed documentation created an audit trail that allowed for external evaluation and replication of the research project (see Saunders et al., 2019). Secondly, I conducted a member-checking session by sharing data interpretations with participants to verify the accuracy of my interpretations. Member-checking helped identify potential biases, ensured consistency in the application of codes, and enhanced the reliability of the research project (Naeem et al., 2023). Triangulation also enhanced the credibility of the findings by incorporating diverse perspectives and reducing the influence of individual research bias (Saunders et al., 2019).

Validity

I employed several strategies to ensure the validity of my research findings. First, I conducted member-checking by providing participants with summaries of the preliminary findings and requesting feedback to confirm the accuracy of my interpretations. Member-checking ensured the authentic representation of participants' perspectives, mitigating researcher bias and bolstering credibility (Birt et al., 2016;

Goldblatt et al., 2011). Additionally, I conducted member checking to further reinforce the authenticity of the findings (Carlson, 2014).

To reduce bias and enhance consistency, I strove for data source triangulation by collecting data from multiple sources, including semistructured interviews, field notes, and organizational documents (if available). Data source triangulation allowed me to corroborate the findings and identify common themes, strengthening the research project's internal validity (Carter et al., 2014; Patton, 2015; Saunders et al., 2019).

To enhance the transferability, I provided comprehensive and detailed descriptions of the research context, participants, and results. This detailed contextualization equipped readers to evaluate the applicability of the conclusions to their settings (Korstjens & Moser, 2018; Shenton, 2004; Stokes et al., 2017). Specifically, I outlined the key demographic characteristics of the participants, industry-specific factors, and the organizational environment in which the mentoring strategies were implemented. For example, I offered in-depth descriptions of the distinctive challenges faced by the biotech industry, such as regulatory demands and evolving skill requirements, enabling readers to assess the relevance of the findings to their organizations or sectors.

Additionally, I outlined the research project's boundaries and limitations, encompassing participant selection criteria, geographic scope, and contextual factors. Transparency enabled future researchers to assess the findings' applicability to diverse settings (Shenton, 2004; Sohu et al., 2024). Furthermore, I incorporated direct quotes from participants and illustrative examples to enhance the authenticity and contextual

relevance of the reported experiences, thereby enhancing the transferability of the results to a similar organizational environment (Korstjens & Moser, 2018; Stokes et al., 2017).

To establish confirmability, I implemented several strategies to minimize researcher bias and foster impartiality. First, I maintained a comprehensive record of the research process, documenting all methodological choices, coding procedures, and data interpretation steps. The transparent documentation enabled external reviewers to trace the research project's progression, ensuring that the findings were grounded in the data rather than my interpretations (Bowen, 2009; Sibisi et al., 2024).

Additionally, I engaged in reflexive practices throughout the research process, documenting my personal biases, assumptions, and thought processes in an audit trail (Anderson, 2010; Byrne, 2022). Engaging in reflexive practices helped me identify and mitigate the influence of my preconceptions on data interpretation (Berger, 2015). I engaged external peer reviewers to provide feedback during the data analysis phase. By obtaining input from independent researchers, I mitigated the risk of my perspective unduly influencing the interpretations, thereby promoting objectivity and confirmability.

To ensure data saturation, I continued collecting data until no new themes emerged from the interviews. I reached data saturation after interviewing five participants and interviewed one additional participant. Saturation materialized when further data collection ceased to yield additional information, signifying that the principal themes had been comprehensively captured (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Also, I engaged in iterative coding and thematic analysis to monitor data saturation. I continuously reviewed and compared the collected data to identify recurring patterns, tracked records of identified

themes, and provided transparent documentation that data saturation had been attained. Once no further insights emerged, I concluded that data saturation had been attained, confirming my research findings' trustworthiness and credibility.

Transition and Summary

In this section, I explored biotech organization leaders' mentoring strategies that tailor to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression within the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance. I stated the problem and purpose of the research project and described the nature of the project, including the qualitative methodology and pragmatic inquiry design. I used Kram's Mentoring Theory and Ragins' Diversity and Inclusion Framework as the conceptual foundation for this research. Additionally, I addressed assumptions, limitations, and ethical considerations, explained the significance of the research project, and reviewed relevant professional and academic literature. In Section 4, I will present the findings and discuss their implications for business practices, social change, and future research. The research project will conclude with recommendations for implementing effective mentoring strategies and reflections on the research process.

Section 4: Findings and Conclusions

Presentation of the Findings

The purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry was to identify and explore effectively implemented mentoring strategies for biotech organization leaders tailored to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance. The research question guiding this research project was the following: What successful mentoring strategies do biotech organization leaders tailor to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression in the biotech industry and contribute to organizational performance? The population consisted of six scientific professional leaders serving in a manager or director role in the biotechnology industry who had participated in mentoring programs that contributed to either their own or others' career advancement (see Table 2). Data were collected through semistructured interviews and a review of publicly available organizational documents related to a mentoring program. Kram's (1983) mentoring theory and Ragins's (1989) diversity and inclusion extension formed the composite conceptual framework for this research project. Data analysis followed Kiger and Varpio's (2020) six-phased thematic process and was facilitated by NVivo 15 software to identify patterns, code responses, and develop predominant themes.

Table 2*Participant Demographics*

Participant	Gender	Experience (years)	Current position	Mentoring experience
P1	Male	20+	director, cross-functional operation	Formal leadership programs, cross-departmental mentoring.
P2	Female	25+	director, R&D	Informal, ad hoc mentoring of peers and junior scientists.
P3	Male	12	associate director, MSAT	Departmental leadership mentoring, onboarding programs.
P4	Female	18	director, technical operations	Technical skill mentoring, soft skills coaching.
P5	Female	14	associate director, manufacturing	Mentorship for leadership pipeline, cross-functional rotations.
P6	Female	22	director, quality	Quality mentorship program leadership, inclusive team mentoring

Six core themes emerged from the analysis: (a) mentoring models (formal and informal), (b) mentee ownership and personalization, (c) strategic matching, (d) soft skills and leadership prep, (e) organizational performance impact, and (f) program sustainability and leadership buy-in. These themes, along with their subthemes, are shown in Table 3.

Table 3*Summary of Thematic Synthesis*

Core theme	Key subtheme	Participant
Mentoring models (formal & informal)	Software platforms and structured programs, informal/manager-initiated mentoring, and hybrid models as a comprehensive approach	All
Mentee ownership & personalization	Mentee-driven and tailored development goals	All
Strategic matching	Personality match, compatibility pairings	P1, P3, P4, P5, P6
Soft skills & leadership prep	Visibility, team leadership, and strategic thinking	All
Organizational performance impact	Retention, knowledge transfer, and cross-functional collaboration	All
Program sustainability & leadership buy-In	Executive support, structured pathways, succession planning	P1, P3, P4, P5, P6

Theme 1: Mentoring Models: Formal, Informal, and Hybrid Approaches

All participants indicated that effective mentoring in biotechnology organizations relies on a combination of structured programs, informal relationships, and hybrid models that merge both approaches. Formal mentoring initiatives such as the emerging leaders program, software-assisted platforms like Chronus, and institutionalized mentoring frameworks offer systematic support for mentees by providing oversight, accountability, and alignment with organizational goals. Informal mentorships, often arising organically from shared interests or proximity, provide flexibility, personalized guidance, and authentic relationship-building opportunities. A common strategy across organizations involved hybrid models that encouraged voluntary participation in structured initiatives

while simultaneously promoting peer-to-peer mentoring and manager-initiated interactions. This flexibility allows organizations to address diverse professional development needs while fostering a supportive environment that promotes career progression and knowledge transfer (Abdollahi & Nabavi, 2022).

Current participants agreed that neither formal nor informal mentoring alone meets the complex needs of biotechnology professionals. Formal mentoring ensures stability and equal access but can be rigid, while informal mentoring builds trust and flexibility but lacks consistency and scale (see O'Brien et al., 2025). Current participants reported a preference for hybrid models, which blend the strengths of both by combining voluntary structured programs with peer mentoring, manager interactions, and spontaneous relationships. This accommodates diverse career stages, specializations, and aspirations while aligning with organizational goals and knowledge transfer.

As Swanson (2022) also emphasized, combining the accountability of formal systems with the adaptability of informal relationships creates comprehensive mentoring frameworks that enhance skill development and career trajectory planning. Current study findings align with Stoeger et al. (2021), who demonstrated that integrated mentoring structures connect varied expertise and networks, thereby reinforcing strategic professional growth. Similarly, Alston (2021) found that the effectiveness of these models is amplified when supported by an organizational culture in which leadership actively endorses and participates in mentorship. Collectively, the evidence suggests hybrid mentoring models provide contextually adaptive solutions in biotechnology organizations, characterized by rapid innovation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and

evolving career paths. Leadership support legitimizes mentoring as a strategic practice rather than an optional development. This theme portrays mentoring as a multidimensional system that works best through intentional integration of formal structures, informal relationships, and cultural endorsement.

Software Platforms and Structured Programs

Current participants described how biotechnology organizations employ formal mentoring programs, often supported by digital platforms, to streamline mentor–mentee matching, monitor developmental progress, and provide standardized resources. P3 explained “we use Chronus to match mentors and mentees. But honestly, some of the most impactful relationships happen outside the system.” This observation highlighted both the utility and limitations of structured, technology-assisted mentoring. Platforms such as Chronus enhance logistics and scalability by helping “track participation, meeting frequency, and feedback” (P3), which often yield deeper effects. Participants noted that these software platforms provide not only matching mechanisms but also centralized repositories of training materials, professional development resources, and best practices.

Current documents associated with a Mentor Program confirmed participants’ descriptions. They detailed a structured mentoring framework using the Chronus platform (Chronus, 2025). Standardized processes also included registration, algorithm-based matching, S.M.A.R.T. goal setting, meeting agendas, mid-term assessments, post-program surveys, and long-term tracking of participation and outcomes. The Chronus platform also centralized training resources, soft-skills courses, communication tools, and progress dashboards to ensure consistent experiences across cohorts. Participant

testimony and organizational documents showed that software platforms enabled mentoring but do not primarily drive its effectiveness. Participant 3 also noted that platforms like Chronus improved logistics by tracking participation, meetings, and feedback, which eased administrative tasks and boosted program access.

These findings aligned with Murray et al. (2022), who noted that such digital systems strengthen the sustainability of mentoring initiatives in large organizations by ensuring quality and consistency across diverse relationships. However, program data from the Chronus platform confirmed Murray's assertions, with outcomes including higher participation rates, high mentor–mentee satisfaction, strong goal achievement, and sustained engagement. Although technology solutions play a strategic role in expanding access to mentoring opportunities, participants stressed that the strongest mentoring relationships often went beyond the platform, emphasizing deep personal bonds and informal interactions

Informal and Manager-Initiated Mentoring

In addition to structured initiatives, current participants emphasized the value of informal mentorships, which often emerge spontaneously and provide highly personalized guidance. These relationships allow mentors and mentees to tailor interactions to immediate developmental needs. P6 shared: “I always tell my team my door is open. If you want mentorship or coaching, come talk to me.” The open-door approach reflects the importance of accessibility and self-advocacy in fostering informal mentoring connections.

Mentor Program documents reinforced current participants' views by promoting autonomy in relationships, voluntary engagement, and interactions driven by the mentee. Program materials stressed mentees' responsibility for scheduling meetings, developing goals, and initiating conversations, while encouraging mentors to remain accessible and supportive beyond formal sessions (Chronus, 2025). The program's focus on confidentiality, transparent communication, and trust also enabled informal mentoring alongside formal meetings. The alignment between participant experiences and program documents indicates that informal and manager-initiated mentoring effectively complemented formal mentoring programs. Current participants valued informal mentoring for its ability to enable real-time problem-solving, provide contextualized advice, and foster deeper relational trust. Program documents further supported these findings by emphasizing the importance of maintaining flexible mentoring practices, encouraging open communication between mentors and mentees, and ensuring leaders remain accessible, rather than strictly adhering to rigid or formalized structures.

Current findings, however, suggest that informal mentoring flourishes when organizations foster psychological safety and empower leaders to engage in developmental conversations beyond formal assignments. Current data are consistent with Treasure et al. (2022), who found that Informal mentorships often thrive in organizational environments where leaders encourage initiative and cultivate a culture that supports proactive engagement. Current participants, therefore, underscored that these organic relationships often deliver long-term career benefits due to their adaptability and authenticity. As such, while formal programs establish structure and

equity of access, informal mentoring provides the flexibility needed for individualized support.

Hybrid Models as a Comprehensive Approach

Current participants agreed that hybrid mentoring models, which combine elements of formal and informal systems, represent the most effective approach for mid- and senior-level professionals in biotechnology. Successful hybrid mentoring models, as revealed by the research project, frequently integrate the structured elements of formal programs, such as regular progress reviews and defined goal-setting, with the adaptive capacity to respond to mentee-initiated questions and to nurture the personal relationships inherent in informal mentorship (Blanco & Audia, 2020). P1 echoed, “We have structured programs, but I also encourage informal mentoring. The combination works best because not everything fits into a box.” The sentiment was supported by P4, stating that “formal programs give a foundation, but informal mentoring builds trust and flexibility. You really need both.”

Mentor Program documents demonstrated the implementation of the hybrid approach through a structured yet flexible mentoring framework. Program materials described the Chronus platform’s role in algorithm-based matching, S.M.A.R.T. goal setting, standardized agendas, mid-term assessments, and evaluations, while stressing voluntary participation, mentee-driven scheduling, confidentiality, and adaptable conversations (Chronus, 2025). The documentation outlined mentoring formats, including 1:1, peer, and reverse mentoring, enabling participants to choose relationships that match their developmental needs and expertise, thus reinforcing the hybrid model.

Hybrid models, however, ensure that employees benefit from structured oversight while also engaging in organic, trust-based relationships that adapt to emerging professional challenges. Therefore, by integrating a hybrid approach, organizations create environments that facilitate skill development, knowledge exchange, and career advancement while maintaining inclusivity and adaptability.

Theme 2: Mentee Ownership and Personalization

All current participants emphasized that the effectiveness of mentoring in biotechnology organizations depends heavily on the extent to which mentees take ownership of the process. Mentees who proactively establish agendas, articulate developmental objectives, and steer discussions with their mentors tend to experience greater professional growth and targeted skill development. This tailored approach provides customized guidance, ensuring that mentoring is aligned with the specific career trajectories and developmental goals of the mentee (Deng et al., 2024). Rather than relying solely on mentor-driven direction, successful mentoring relationships were characterized by active participation from the mentee, which transformed the process into a collaborative, goal-oriented partnership. Participants consistently indicated that personalized mentoring, grounded in the mentee's priorities, maximized the relevance and long-term effects of the relationship.

Current participants highlighted that mentee-driven engagement shifts mentoring from a one-way reception of advice to a collaborative exchange, particularly for mid- and senior-level scientific professionals who often face highly specialized and advanced career challenges. P5 highlighted the importance of mentees articulating their specific

objectives at the outset of the relationship, stating: “The first thing I ask is, what do you want to achieve? Only then can we chart a path forward.” This statement underscores that when mentees clearly define their goals, mentors can provide highly tailored and actionable guidance. Similarly, P4 stressed the importance of preparation and initiative, noting: “You get out of mentoring what you put into it. I expect mentees to come prepared and take the lead.” Both accounts demonstrate how active mentee participation not only enhances the effectiveness of mentoring sessions but also promotes accountability for professional growth.

Mentor Program documents aligned with participant experiences by embedding mentee ownership in the design. Program materials required mentees to set S.M.A.R.T. goals, schedule meetings, prepare agendas, and track progress via individualized Connection Plans in Chronus platform (Chronus, 2025). Agenda templates require mentees to identify their priorities and specific action items before meetings, promoting thorough preparation and a focused approach to each session. Agenda templates also positioned mentees as drivers of their development, holding mentors accountable as facilitators, rather than directors of growth.

Current findings align with those of Chang et al. (2023), who concluded that when mentees take a proactive role, mentoring efforts are more closely tailored to their individual goals and deliver the greatest developmental impact. By assuming responsibility for their growth, mentees transform mentoring from a passive process into a strategic, collaborative endeavor, thereby personalizing outcomes and strengthening the mentor-mentee dynamic.

Theme 3: Strategic Matching

Strategic matching and compatibility emerged as a central driver of mentoring effectiveness across biotechnology organizations. Current participants consistently emphasized that the process of selecting mentors and mentees required careful alignment of expertise, experience, and professional goals to foster productive and mutually beneficial relationships. Importantly, effective pairings were not limited to technical expertise; they also required consideration of personality traits, communication styles, and shared values. Such deliberate alignment helped cultivate trust, respect, and long-term compatibility, which in turn enabled meaningful knowledge transfer and enhanced professional growth (Giacumo et al., 2020). Current participants further noted that intentional matching is not a one-time process but rather an evolving effort that requires periodic reassessment to ensure sustained relevance and adaptability as mentees' developmental needs shift over time.

Personality Match

Matching mentors and mentees based on interpersonal compatibility has been highlighted as a critical, yet often overlooked, aspect of successful mentorship. In the biotechnology sector, where collaboration across functions is essential, shared values and complementary approaches to problem-solving can be as important as technical alignment. P3 emphasized this point, noting: "We don't just match people based on function. Sometimes a finance leader mentors a scientist. It's about perspective." P3's sentiment illustrates how diverse pairings, when grounded in interpersonal compatibility, can broaden perspectives and foster creativity.

Likewise, P5 emphasized that strong personal connections are crucial for successful mentoring relationships, stating, “I look for mentors who can adapt to the mentee’s personality—whether they’re introverted, outspoken, or somewhere in between.” P5 explained that mutual trust and respect often hold greater importance than purely functional alignment. Participants, however, considered personality alignment important for open communication, psychological safety, and sustained engagement.

Mentor Program documents detailed a matching process driven by current participants’ goals and preferences, facilitated through the Chronus platform. Both mentees and mentors completed questionnaires covering development objectives, interests, and personal preferences. The platform’s matching algorithms then generated suggested pairings that went beyond organizational hierarchy or job function (Chronus, 2025). Importantly, these recommendations were not mandatory—participants retained the option to accept or decline matches, ensuring individual autonomy and supporting strong, compatible partnerships.

Current findings are consistent with those of C. Deng et al. (2022), who argued that effective matching should go beyond surface-level attributes to include deeper characteristics such as values, communication styles, and interpersonal dynamics. Both current participant accounts and organizational documents indicated that matching based on personality significantly enhances relational quality, fosters cross-functional learning, and leads to stronger mentoring outcomes. Integrating these elements into formal matching processes can substantially improve the quality of relationships and the overall effectiveness of mentoring programs.

Compatibility Pairing

Beyond personality, current participants emphasized that the most effective mentor–mentee pairings involved alignment in professional ethics, values, and long-term aspirations. Such similarity fostered synergy, enabling mentors to not only share expertise but also challenge and guide mentees in ways that resonated with their thinking and goals. P5 explained: “Fit matters. You need a mentor who challenges you but also gets how you think.” P5’s perspective reflects a balance between compatibility and growth, ensuring that the mentoring relationship is both supportive and developmental.

Mentor Program documents reinforced compatibility by outlining a participatory, preference-based pairing process. Program materials described how mentees and mentors completed questionnaires on development goals, interests, and preferences, which generated algorithm-driven match suggestions on the Chronus platform (Chronus, 2025). Program documentation also stressed mentees’ agency to accept or decline matches, prioritizing goal and expectation alignment over mere functional similarity. This promoted mentor commitment, mentee ownership, and sustained engagement.

Both participant perspectives and organizational documentation indicated that compatibility-based pairing significantly enhances the quality of mentoring relationships by strengthening trust, relational quality, and the perceived relevance of knowledge exchange. These current results are consistent with the findings of Giacumo et al. (2020), who identified rapport, trust, and mutual understanding as essential for mentoring success, as well as with C. Deng et al. (2022), who emphasized that matching complementary skills and developmental needs leads to more effective learning

experiences and outcomes. Furthermore, allowing mentees to play an active role in the selection process fosters a sense of ownership, increases mentor commitment, and bolsters the overall quality of the mentoring relationship. Consequently, deliberate and participatory pairing strategies greatly increase the likelihood of establishing long-lasting, productive mentorships that are vital for career advancement in biotechnology.

Theme 4: Soft Skills and Leadership Prep

Current participants consistently described mentoring as a critical platform for developing the soft skills and leadership competencies necessary for career advancement in the biotechnology industry. Beyond technical expertise, mid- and senior-level professionals must develop skills in communication, influence, conflict management, and team leadership to transition into higher organizational roles. Mentorship provided both direct experience and reflective practice opportunities, enabling mentees to navigate complex interpersonal challenges, build emotional intelligence, and strengthen strategic communication. As Deng and Turner (2024) emphasized, these competencies are essential for succeeding in interdisciplinary collaborations and dynamic organizational environments. Importantly, mentoring relationships created safe spaces for practicing leadership skills—allowing mentees to experiment with approaches to team motivation and stakeholder engagement without the immediate risks associated with high-stakes corporate settings.

Visibility

Current participants emphasized that mentorship enhances a professional's visibility within both the organization and the broader biotechnology industry, often

serving as a gateway to leadership opportunities. Mentors acted as advocates by introducing mentees to influential networks, securing roles on strategic projects, and facilitating exposure to high-impact initiatives. P2 explained that although most scientists are proficient in technical tasks, their professional advancement is frequently impeded by a lack of confidence and ineffective self-presentation. This perspective highlights how mentorship enhances executive presence and strategic communication skills, which are often more decisive in determining leadership readiness than technical competence alone.

Mentor Program documents emphasized visibility through structures that expanded mentees' organizational exposure. Program materials described cross-departmental mentor–mentee pairings, cohort participation across functional areas, and mentees' interactions with non-direct leaders via structured meetings, goal-driven projects, and networking events such as launch and end-of-term gatherings (Chronus, 2025). Program documents also noted that mentors encouraged mentees' involvement in presentations, stretch assignments, and organizational initiatives, thereby enhancing their professional presence and recognition.

The integrated focus on advocacy and exposure supports Blanco and Audia 2020, showing that mentor sponsorship enhances professional reputation and signals readiness for advanced roles. Similarly, Clynes et al. (2019) demonstrated that mentors also created opportunities for mentees to present at conferences or participate in organizational initiatives, expanding their sphere of influence and accelerating progression into senior positions. Therefore, mentorship, as demonstrated across participant accounts and organizational documentation, is important for transforming technical expertise into

visible leadership potential. The process enabled scientific professionals to gain recognition, confidence, and access to opportunities vital for career advancement in biotechnology.

Team Leadership

Mentorship also played a pivotal role in cultivating effective team leadership skills, enabling professionals to move from individual contributors to leaders capable of guiding multidisciplinary teams. P1 noted, “People management is a skill set we actively develop through mentorship. It’s not just about being good at your job anymore.” This statement reflected a shared view among participants that technical expertise alone was insufficient for leadership advancement and that mentoring was necessary for cultivating interpersonal and managerial competencies. Current participants described mentees developing capabilities in delegation, conflict resolution, and fostering collaboration, which are all important for leading complex scientific initiatives.

Mentor Program documents also confirmed these views by detailing components for leadership development. Materials highlighted soft-skills training, reflection, and feedback agendas, as well as goals for leadership presence, communication, and team dynamics (Chronus, 2025). The program documentation also noted mentees’ opportunities to observe mentors leading, discuss people-management challenges, and refine approaches via iterative feedback in sessions. These flexible structures enabled mentees to practice leadership with guidance.

The combined emphasis on experiential learning and reflective practice aligns with Deng et al. (2024), who noted that psychological safety and collaborative leadership

are crucial in research-intensive organizations. Mentoring relationships serve as a foundation for developing these skills. Both participant accounts and organizational records demonstrate how mentoring enables emerging leaders to gain confidence, navigate interpersonal challenges, and apply leadership strategies in real-world situations. By embedding leadership development within mentoring, organizations help scientific professionals become effective team leaders who promote collaboration and drive innovation.

Strategic Thinking

In addition to interpersonal competencies, participants emphasized that mentorship fosters strategic thinking, helping biotechnology professionals expand their perspective from technical tasks to organizational strategy. Mentors guided mentees in anticipating industry trends, evaluating market forces, and developing solutions aligned with broader business objectives. P1 highlighted how empowering mentees to share their insights can drive meaningful organizational change. P1 recounted an example where a mentee, after being encouraged to speak up and consider issues beyond their direct responsibilities, identified a critical problem with the delivery process. “That happened because we gave them a voice,” P1 explained, emphasizing the value of fostering open communication and encouraging broader thinking among mentees. Such examples illustrate how mentorship promotes both innovation and leadership by empowering mentees to contribute to strategic problem-solving and decision-making.

Mentor Program documents highlighted a strong emphasis on strategic development, detailing specific mentoring goals and resources designed to strengthen

business acumen, critical thinking, and cross-functional awareness. According to Chronus (2025), program materials incorporated structured goal setting to ensure alignment with organizational priorities, as well as agenda templates to encourage reflection on broader impacts, key stakeholders, and advanced responsibilities. In addition, cross-departmental pairings and soft-skills training were included to help participants expand their perspectives beyond technical expertise and foster strategic insight.

These current findings are consistent with those of Hopwood and Bradbury (2021), who observed that mentoring fosters foresight, adaptability, and the competencies necessary to navigate regulatory complexity and market competition in the biotechnology sector. Likewise, Bashir (2024) emphasized that strategic thinking, the ability to influence others, and the management of cross-functional teams are essential skills for professionals moving into leadership positions. As such, mentoring acts as a vital developmental tool for building these capabilities and preparing individuals for expanded leadership responsibilities.

Theme 5: Organizational Performance Impact

Current participants consistently associated mentoring with tangible organizational benefits, including increased staff retention, a strengthened leadership pipeline, effective knowledge transfer, and enhanced cross-functional collaboration. These results highlight the close connection between individual professional development and overall corporate performance in the competitive biotechnology industry (Alston, 2021). By investing in mentoring, organizations not only boost employee loyalty and reduce turnover but also build a reputation as preferred employers, attracting top

scientific talent (Kellerer & Süß, 2025; Yang et al., 2024). Furthermore, cultivating a robust mentoring culture enables organizations to respond effectively to technological changes and market disruptions, supporting long-term resilience (Yang et al., 2024).

Retention

Current participants consistently linked effective mentoring programs to increased staff retention, especially among mid- and senior-level scientific professionals who valued clear career paths and organizational support for advancement. As P2 explained, “If mid-level scientists don’t see a path forward, they start thinking about leaving. Mentoring gives them that vision.” Likewise, P4 remarked, “We’ve had people who might have left for other opportunities, but through mentoring and cross-training, they found ways to grow within the company instead.” These insights illustrate how mentoring clarifies career progression and enhances employees’ confidence in future opportunities within the organization.

Mentor Program documents reinforced these perspectives by positioning mentoring as a key strategy for retaining talent and nurturing professional growth. The materials highlighted its effectiveness in increasing employee engagement, providing clear career pathways, and supporting succession planning. Metrics demonstrated consistent participation across multiple cohorts and a strong intention among participants to re-enroll. Additionally, workforce data and return on investment (ROI) analyses revealed that mentoring contributed to lower turnover rates, preserved institutional knowledge, and delivered significant cost savings through decreased attrition and reduced onboarding expenses (Chronus, 2025).

Several participants further highlighted the organizational return on investment derived from mentoring. As P1 noted, “Mentoring isn’t just good for the mentee—it benefits the whole organization by building internal talent.” P6 reinforced this point, stating, “You keep your best people by helping them grow. If they don’t grow, they leave.” These perspectives are consistent with the findings of Alston (2021) and Thompson et al. (2025), who demonstrated that mentoring reduces turnover by enhancing job satisfaction, career clarity, and organizational commitment. Likewise, Blake-Beard et al. (2021) found that mentoring programs lower attrition rates and are especially effective in supporting diverse employee groups. Taken together, these insights underscore mentoring as a strategic tool for retaining critical scientific expertise, preserving institutional knowledge, and reducing recruitment and onboarding costs.

Knowledge Transfer

Mentoring also proved to be a vital channel for knowledge transfer, ensuring that essential scientific expertise and organizational practices are effectively passed on to the next generation of professionals. As P3 succinctly expressed, “Mentoring is how we pass down not just knowledge, but the way we do things—the culture.” This view was widely shared, highlighting the role of mentoring in maintaining operational excellence and preserving the organization’s identity.

Current participants further emphasized that mentoring plays a crucial role in preserving tacit knowledge when senior experts depart from the organization. As P2 noted, “Senior scientists possess a wealth of tacit knowledge. Without mentoring, much of this valuable insight is lost when they leave.” Likewise, P6 underscored the

importance of knowledge transfer, stating, “Sharing what we know is essential—otherwise, the organization ends up reinventing the wheel.” These accounts demonstrate how mentoring fosters organizational continuity by facilitating the transfer of accumulated wisdom, lessons learned, and practical problem-solving approaches through trusted interpersonal relationships, rather than relying solely on formal documentation.

Mentor Program documents reinforced participant perspectives by detailing structures that support continuous knowledge sharing. These included cross-departmental pairings, structured goal setting, agenda templates for reflecting on best practices, and opportunities to discuss real-world challenges and institutional processes (Chronus, 2025). The materials also highlighted reciprocal learning through peer and reverse mentoring, facilitating a two-way exchange of expertise across experience levels and functional areas.

The approach aligns with J. Deng et al. (2024), who emphasized the value of intergenerational learning in sustaining innovation within rapidly evolving industries, and Singh et al. (2021), who identify mentoring as a strategic asset for effective knowledge management. In line with Blanco and Audia (2020), mentoring acts as an informal yet highly effective method for preserving institutional memory, refining best practices, and embedding long-term strategic insights into everyday operations. Taken together, participant accounts and program documentation demonstrate that mentoring plays a role in safeguarding essential knowledge and supporting organizational learning in biotechnology.

Cross-Functional Collaboration

Beyond its impact on retention and knowledge transfer, mentoring was broadly recognized as a powerful driver of cross-functional collaboration within biotechnology organizations. Current participants emphasized that mentoring relationships frequently bridged departmental divides, enabling professionals to gain a deeper understanding of how various functions collectively contribute to organizational success. As P4 explained, “Cross-functional mentoring is critical. I might mentor someone in regulatory, even though I sit in technical operations. It gives them a bigger picture of the business.” This viewpoint highlights the interdisciplinary nature of biotechnology, where advancements rely on the seamless integration of expertise across regulatory, research, and manufacturing roles (Rida et al., 2023). Current participants also highlighted how mentoring expands professional networks, breaks down departmental silos, and accelerates project delivery. As P1 noted, “through secondments, we place someone from quality on a project team with R&D or manufacturing. That experience not only builds confidence but also enhances cross-functional understanding.” This exchange of perspectives enriches professional growth and significantly boosts the organization’s agility.

Mentor Program documents associated with Chronus (2025) supported participant perspectives by outlining features specifically designed to promote cross-functional engagement. These materials highlighted the use of multi-departmental cohorts, cross-departmental mentor–mentee pairings, and structured interactions such as scheduled meetings, collaborative goal-setting, and organized events. The program documentation

also described peer and reverse mentoring initiatives, which facilitate two-way learning across both functional and hierarchical boundaries, thereby strengthening organizational connectivity.

This dual emphasis aligns with findings from Bashir (2024) and McCray et al. (2024), who note that mentoring enhances collaborative problem-solving and organizational agility by improving communication and fostering mutual understanding across different functional areas. Both participant accounts and program documentation demonstrate that mentoring served as a catalyst for building a unified, interconnected culture—one in which diverse scientific expertise is integrated to achieve shared objectives. As a result, cross-functional mentoring not only supported individual career advancement but also strengthened organizational resilience and effectiveness within the complex biotechnology industry.

Theme 6: Program Sustainability and Leadership Buy-In

All current participants emphasized that the long-term success of mentoring programs in biotechnology organizations is fundamentally dependent on strong leadership support. Executive sponsorship, active involvement, and alignment with strategic objectives consistently emerged as essential drivers of program effectiveness. When leaders visibly champion mentoring, they ensure that critical resources—such as funding, dedicated personnel, and technological infrastructure—are allocated for the creation, implementation, and ongoing management of mentoring initiatives (Giacumo et al., 2020; Patterson, 2024). This clear commitment not only demonstrates the organization's prioritization of mentorship but also helps create a culture that values

knowledge sharing, talent development, and professional growth (Alston, 2021). As a result, mentoring becomes part of everyday organizational practices rather than an optional initiative, strengthening leadership pipelines and reinforcing long-term organizational performance.

Equally important, current participants highlighted that mentoring programs are unlikely to thrive without genuine leadership support. In the absence of authentic executive endorsement, these initiatives may be viewed as optional or peripheral, which can reduce engagement and threaten their sustainability. As Yang et al. (2024) observed, visible backing from senior leaders not only boosts participation but also elevates the credibility and perceived value of mentoring. Ultimately, executive commitment shifts mentoring from a discretionary activity to a strategic organizational priority, making it essential for long-term competitiveness and employee development.

Executive Support

Current participants consistently stressed that executive sponsorship is the single most important factor in embedding mentoring within an organization's culture. Visible support from senior leaders not only legitimizes mentoring initiatives but also ensures they are integrated into larger strategic objectives and provided with the necessary resources for long-term success. As P4 remarked, "Executive sponsorship matters. It shows mentoring isn't just a side activity but part of the culture." This perspective highlights how leadership visibility helps normalize participation in mentoring and sustains engagement across the organization.

Mentor Program documents reinforced participants' perspectives by demonstrating consistent executive involvement throughout the program (Chronus, 2025). These materials highlighted leaders' active participation in launch events, communications, program celebrations, and messaging that directly connected mentoring to talent development, succession planning, and employee engagement. Additionally, the documents underscored a tangible investment in mentoring through dedicated resources for software, training, administration, and evaluation, reflecting a commitment that extends well beyond simple endorsement.

Leadership engagement is important for the adoption and sustainability of organizational mentoring programs. When senior leaders actively endorse, resource, and participate in mentoring initiatives, they signal strategic importance, legitimize participation, foster a learning culture, and improve employee retention, performance, and innovation (Blake-Beard et al., 2021). P3 emphasized the critical role of leadership engagement, noting, "Chronus works well because leadership promotes it. If executives didn't back it, people wouldn't use it." This perspective is supported by findings from *The Science of Effective Mentorship in STEMM* (2020), which concluded that executive endorsement is pivotal for scaling mentoring initiatives. Likewise, Rida et al. (2023) and Kakyo et al. (2025) determined that corporate-level strategies and genuine executive involvement are essential for realizing the full benefits of mentoring programs. Together, these insights make it clear that leadership support is more than just symbolic—it offers the strategic direction, legitimacy, and resources required to make mentoring an institutionalized and sustainable practice.

Structured Pathways

In addition to executive support, participants emphasized that having structured pathways within mentoring programs is crucial for ensuring consistency, accountability, and measurable results. They regarded structure as vital for clearly defining roles, setting expectations, and creating a unified framework for feedback and ongoing development. P6 summarized this perspective, stating, “Structured mentoring programs are important because they make sure no one falls through the cracks—it’s a pathway that ensures consistency.” P4 agreed, explaining, “Formal programs give a foundation. Without structure, some people wouldn’t know where to start.” Together, these insights underscore a collective belief that structure promotes equitable access to mentoring and minimizes uncertainty for both mentors and mentees.

The Mentor Program documents feature comprehensive and well-structured components, including formal mentorship agreements, standardized meeting agendas, mid-term assessments, and post-program evaluations (Chronus, 2025). These materials outline clear expectations for meeting frequency, require documentation of S.M.A.R.T. goals, utilize Chronus for progress tracking, and establish regular feedback checkpoints to promote consistency and accountability in mentoring relationships. This structured approach effectively aligns individual development goals with broader organizational objectives.

This approach reflects Wofford’s (2024) emphasis on the importance of clear guidelines and structured processes for maintaining the effectiveness of mentoring programs. It also supports Mantzourani et al.’s (2022) argument that communication

protocols, goal setting, and regular evaluations are essential for strengthening relationships and fostering sustained engagement. In line with Yang et al. (2024), structured pathways facilitate talent identification and career advancement by preparing high-potential employees for leadership roles. Overall, current participant narratives and program documents consistently identify these pathways as essential foundations for reliable, scalable, and strategic mentoring in biotechnology organizations.

Succession Planning

Current participants also drew a clear connection between mentoring and succession planning, highlighting its essential role in preparing individuals for critical leadership and specialized positions. As P6 noted, “We use mentoring to build a leadership bench. That way, when retirements happen, we’re not scrambling. It’s succession planning in action.” By taking this proactive approach, organizations ensure continuity, safeguard intellectual capital, and maintain operational stability amid industry changes (Jooss et al., 2024). Similarly, P4 emphasized the deliberate nature of these practices, explaining, “Through mentoring, we intentionally develop people to fill gaps that we know are coming.” Current participants viewed mentoring as a systematic approach for identifying high-potential talent early, offering targeted development, and reducing risks associated with unexpected leadership transitions. Instead of depending on external recruitment, mentoring builds internal readiness and facilitates the transfer of valuable institutional knowledge.

Mentor Program documents further underscore the connection between mentoring and succession planning by presenting mentoring as a strategic tool for building a robust

talent pipeline. The materials highlighted a focus on leadership development, cross-functional experiences, and cohort-based progression, all designed to prepare participants for greater organizational responsibilities (Chronus, 2025). Additionally, program metrics—such as recurring participation, mentor re-engagement, and measurable skill development—demonstrated a sustained commitment to nurturing internal talent and supporting long-term organizational planning.

These synthesized insights are consistent with Patterson (2024), who identified mentoring as a fundamental component of human capital strategy, and Menezes et al. (2025), who highlighted its critical role in industries where specialized expertise drives innovation. Drawing from participant experiences and program documentation, integrating mentoring into succession planning enables biotechnology organizations to develop a well-structured pipeline of diverse and capable leaders, equipping them to navigate industry complexities and sustain long-term competitive advantage.

Business Contributions and Recommendations for Professional Practice

Findings from this research project offer significant guidance for leaders in the biotechnology sector aiming to enhance organizational effectiveness through mentorship programs specifically designed for mid- to senior-level scientific personnel. The research findings emphasize that hybrid mentoring frameworks, strategic pairings of mentors and mentees, and structured developmental pathways are instrumental in fostering professional advancement, enhancing employee retention, and maintaining a consistent leadership pipeline. By adopting these strategies, organizations can cultivate heightened

employee commitment, diminish attrition rates, and establish robust teams capable of propelling innovation.

The findings from this research project highlight the significance of technology-driven mentoring solutions in fostering both the scalability and sustainability of professional development initiatives. Platforms such as Chronus and other digital tools allow leaders to streamline mentor-mentee matching, track developmental goals, and enable cross-functional collaboration across geographically dispersed teams. These practices align with organizational learning and knowledge management theories, which highlight the role of systems and innovation in facilitating knowledge transfer and competitive advantage (Bashir, 2024). Organizations can enhance the efficiency of their mentoring programs, safeguard valuable institutional knowledge, and foster improved interdepartmental collaboration by utilizing these technological solutions.

Another critical recommendation is the integration of mentoring into succession planning and leadership development pipelines. Participants in this research project consistently emphasized that mentoring is important for preparing mid-level professionals for senior roles, ensuring continuity of leadership, and avoiding skill gaps during transitions. Leaders who adopt structured mentoring pathways not only safeguard organizational stability but also ensure that knowledge, skills, and cultural values are effectively transferred (Blake-Beard et al., 2021). Therefore, a combined formal and informal mentoring relationships yield the most comprehensive outcomes. A combined formal and informal mentoring relationship aligns with Kram and Isabella (1985) mentoring theory, which emphasizes both the career and psychosocial functions of

mentoring as necessary to foster professional growth. Mentorship was consistently identified by participants as an important factor in career trajectory guidance, the acquisition of leadership competencies, and the enhancement of soft skills, alongside the provision of psychosocial benefits, including enhanced self-assurance, encouragement, and a sense of belonging. Such dual benefits are needed for advancing mid- and senior-level professionals into leadership roles that directly influence business outcomes.

Equally important is the significance of executive endorsement, and visible sponsorship of mentoring initiatives cannot be overstated. Participants highlighted that consistent dedication from leadership is important for the successful implementation of mentoring programs. When executives participate as mentors or actively endorse mentoring programs, they signal organizational priorities, model desired behaviors, and embed mentoring into the company's culture (Deng & Turner, 2024). This creates a sustainable environment in which mentoring is not seen as optional but as a core element of business strategy.

The current findings also underline the importance of inclusiveness in mentoring practices, resonating with Ragins' theory on diversity and inclusion in mentoring (Ragins, 1997a). Participants in the research project stressed the importance of providing all employees with fair access to mentoring opportunities, irrespective of their personality, background, or career stage. As P6 noted, "Everyone deserves a mentor—whether they're introverted, quiet, or just starting out." Such inclusive approaches help to mitigate bias, advance fairness, and broaden the pool of potential mentors by motivating mentees to mature into mentoring roles themselves. These practices help organizations

address gaps in representation, foster innovation, and align talent development with corporate social responsibility objectives, according to Chen and Chai (2023). Furthermore, participants identified mentoring as a mechanism for organizational knowledge transfer and succession planning. As P3 reflected, “Mentoring is how we pass down not just knowledge, but the way we do things—the culture.” This finding reveals how mentoring serves as both a knowledge management strategy and a succession planning tool. The process of organizational knowledge transfer and succession planning, according to Chen and Chai (2023), guarantees the continuity of specialized knowledge, mitigates the loss of institutional memory, and equips organizations to navigate leadership transitions effectively.

Therefore, from a practical standpoint, biotechnology firms can optimize their results by implementing a holistic and strategic mentoring framework by following these recommendations: (a) implement comprehensive mentoring frameworks that integrate formal programs with informal relationships, (b) establish clear links between mentoring outcomes and key performance indicators like retention and leadership readiness, (c) utilize digital platforms to enhance reach and scalability, (d) incorporate mentoring into succession planning for leadership continuity, and (e) secure visible executive sponsorship to foster commitment and program sustainability.

The insights derived from this research project hold relevance for a diverse array of stakeholders within the corporate sphere. Senior leadership, human resources and talent management professionals, departmental managers, and line supervisors should all consider these findings, given the direct correlation between mentoring and workforce

engagement, internal career progression, and organizational robustness. Moreover, it is imperative that these results are disseminated broadly through professional networks. Presenting these findings at industry-specific conferences, leadership development seminars, and human resources training sessions can encourage wider adoption of effective strategies. Dissemination via peer-reviewed academic journals and professional publications specializing in leadership, organizational development, and human resources strategy will further amplify their influence. Internally, the findings can be communicated through institutional learning events, training modules, and leadership retreats. By adopting these evidence-based mentoring strategies, biotechnology firms can cultivate an environment of ongoing learning, enhance employee commitment, and achieve enduring business expansion. Furthermore, leadership-driven mentoring initiatives will empower biotech organizations to maintain their competitive edge, foster innovation, and build resilience within a dynamic industry.

Implications for Social Change

This research project explored mentoring strategies that biotechnology leaders use to support the progression of mid- and senior-level scientific professionals and has implications for positive social change. The research project identified effective mentoring approaches that foster career advancement, enhance organizational learning, and cultivate leadership development within the biotechnology industry. Mentoring significantly contributes to individual empowerment and collective success by facilitating professional growth, promoting inclusivity, and optimizing knowledge transfer across diverse organizational levels. The sustainable mentoring practices highlighted in this

research are anticipated to enhance employee engagement, improve retention, and elevate job satisfaction, ultimately leading to augmented organizational stability and innovation.

This research project's findings further elucidated the critical areas of leadership development and organizational sustainability. These represent strategic imperatives not only for biotechnology executives but also for a wider spectrum of stakeholders, encompassing human resource professionals, policymakers, educators, and institutions dedicated to professional development. The biotechnology sector stands as an indispensable catalyst for global innovation, propelling advancements across medicine, agriculture, and environmental sciences (Bashir, 2024). Through the adoption of evidence-based mentoring strategies, organizations can fortify leadership continuity, enhance knowledge retention, and increase their capacity for innovation (Treanor et al., 2021). Such outcomes may lead to novel discoveries, refined healthcare solutions, and increase global competitiveness, which collectively may yield substantive social and economic advantages.

While this research project focused on the professional advancement of scientists in biotechnology organizations, its implications are pertinent to related fields, including healthcare, pharmaceuticals, and academic institutions. Mentorship enhances not only the professional pathways of individuals but also the collective intellectual assets and organizational coherence (McCray et al., 2024). By promoting leadership development and knowledge sharing, mentoring supports the long-term sustainability of institutions and communities. The interconnected aspects of sustainability, which encompass economic, social, and institutional, are profoundly influenced by mentoring, which serves

as an important catalyst for progress in each. Specifically, it fosters social sustainability by nurturing ethically grounded leaders, promotes economic sustainability by ensuring talent retention, and institutional sustainability by cultivating adaptable and continuously learning organizational cultures (Jooss et al., 2024; Pandita et al., 2023).

This research project on mentoring strategies in biotechnology was inspired by the importance of promoting positive social change through relevant, high-impact research. Conducting problem-driven research to address organizational and societal challenges is important for shaping professional practices that enhance individual and collective outcomes (Bashir, 2024). The findings from this research project may influence organizations to establish mentoring as a core leadership function. This shift could empower professionals to create inclusive, collaborative, and resilient workplaces, thereby contributing to broader societal progress. The outcomes may also deepen the academic and professional understanding of mentoring practices, enabling scholars, educators, and organizational leaders to apply and disseminate this knowledge to future professionals. Therefore, this research project demonstrates that effective mentoring contributes to positive social change by acting as a social and organizational mechanism that advances human potential, supports equity, and strengthens communities. By fostering leadership development and inclusivity, biotechnology organizations can exemplify sustainable business practices that uphold the value and development of individuals and society.

Recommendations for Further Research

Exploring the longitudinal effects of the sustained effects of mentoring approaches on employee retention, leadership advancement, and organizational effectiveness to ascertain their viability and long-term advantages. Conducting longitudinal studies could provide valuable insights into how mentoring relationships evolve over time and their lasting effects on professional growth, succession planning, and knowledge transfer (Gupta, 2024). Future research might also examine how emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, could be integrated into mentoring platforms to enhance matching algorithms, track developmental outcomes, and scale mentoring programs across global biotechnology organizations. As digital transformation continues to shape organizational learning, understanding how businesses adopt these advancements can offer deeper insights into the scalability and adaptability of mentoring practices.

Investigating the interplay of cultural, social, and organizational factors is important for developing effective mentoring strategies (Patterson, 2024). By analyzing cultural dynamics, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the distinct challenges and opportunities encountered by diverse professionals in the biotechnology sector, especially those from underrepresented backgrounds. The understanding of cultural, social, and organizational factors in mentoring strategies can inform the creation of inclusive mentoring programs that cater to specific requirements and promote equitable access to leadership opportunities (Thompson et al., 2025). Also, comparative studies across industries, such as biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, information technology, and

healthcare, could identify universal best practices applicable to knowledge-intensive sectors. Research into global and cross-cultural mentoring methodologies may also contribute to the development of inclusive and adaptable mentoring frameworks.

Investigating the applicability of mentoring practices within specific biotechnology sub-sectors, such as clinical research, biomanufacturing, and regulatory affairs, can refine their relevance and effectiveness (Blake-Beard et al., 2021). Such an expanded research scope would yield tailored insights and strategic advice, addressing the unique challenges of each area and informing the development of more pertinent mentoring strategies. Ultimately, a nuanced understanding of these sector-specific dynamics can generate practical recommendations for industry leaders, human resources professionals, and policymakers, facilitating the adaptation of mentoring approaches to varied organizational environments.

Further investigation is needed to ascertain the efficacy of executive sponsorship and leadership endorsement on the results of mentoring initiatives (Grocutt et al., 2022). While this research project identified executive support as a vital element for success, subsequent research could quantify the influence of executive engagement on participation levels, mentee satisfaction, and the preparedness of the leadership pipeline. Moreover, to achieve a comprehensive perspective on the advantages and constraints of mentoring programs, it is important to mitigate potential selection bias by including feedback from individuals who have had neutral or negative mentoring encounters. Employing quantitative methodologies, such as extensive surveys or experimental

designs, could augment qualitative findings, thereby reinforcing the evidentiary basis for mentoring as a strategic business practice, according to Gupta (2024).

Future research could also investigate the contribution of mentoring to the advancement of innovation, knowledge transfer, and collaborative efforts across different departments. Examining how mentorship expedites problem resolution, promotes teamwork among diverse disciplines, and enhances organizational adaptability would illuminate its strategic importance for business outcomes (Kostyuk & Battisti, 2025). Further inquiry could also assess the effect of digital mentoring platforms and international collaboration tools on the transfer of knowledge across borders within global biotechnology enterprises.

Finally, ensuring that mentoring initiatives are aligned with succession planning is paramount for maintaining organizational resilience (Thompson et al., 2025). Future investigations should scrutinize the role of structured mentoring pathways in fostering leadership continuity during executive transitions, specifically assessing their measurable effect on leadership readiness, internal promotion rates, and the preservation of organizational culture. By establishing a direct link between mentoring and strategic human resource planning, researchers can equip organizations with data-driven insights to bolster their leadership pipeline and ensure sustained business stability.

Conclusion

This research project thoroughly assessed the mentoring strategies employed by biotechnology executives to facilitate the advancement of mid- to senior-level scientific professionals. The findings emphasize the important function of mentoring in advancing

employee growth, strengthening leadership pipelines, and boosting organizational performance. Strategies such as hybrid mentoring models, strategic mentor-mentee pairing, and structured pathways proved instrumental in nurturing professional progression, enhancing retention rate, and ensuring knowledge transfer. These approaches not only supported individual career advancement but also enabled organizations to remain competitive in a complex and innovation-driven industry. Research on mentoring emphasizes the significance of integrating developmental strategies into operational practices to cultivate adaptability, resilience, and sustained organizational excellence (Patterson, 2024; Yang et al., 2024).

The incorporation of technology proved to be a pivotal element in enhancing mentoring effectiveness. Digital platforms, including Chronus, Microsoft Teams, and other collaborative tools, enabled organizations to optimize the process of matching mentors with mentees, monitor developmental progress, and facilitate cross-functional collaboration. Furthermore, technology expanded access to mentoring programs to hybrid work settings, thereby ensuring scalability and inclusivity. These findings, according to Thompson et al. (2025), indicate that biotechnology organizations can strengthen their talent development infrastructure by adopting digital solutions that improve efficiency, broaden accessibility, and enrich the mentoring experience.

Leadership significantly affected the successful implementation of mentoring strategies, with executive support, visible sponsorship, and inclusive practices being important for program effectiveness. Leaders who actively participated in or endorsed mentoring initiatives not only modeled desired behaviors but also fostered a culture of

learning and development. This leadership involvement proved important for integrating mentoring with succession planning, promoting innovation, and preserving organizational culture, indicating that mentoring success, according to Kakyo et al. (2025), depends heavily on strong leadership champions committed to professional growth and long-term sustainability.

This research project contributes valuable insights into the intersection of mentoring, organizational development, and business strategy. By investing in structured yet flexible mentoring programs, leveraging technology for scalability, and fostering inclusive leadership, biotechnology organizations demonstrated their ability to prepare future leaders, retain top talent, and enhance organizational resilience. The integration of these strategies ensures long-term viability in an industry marked by rapid scientific and technological change. These findings reinforce the importance of continuous innovation, adaptability, and knowledge sharing in sustaining business success and maintaining a competitive edge.

This research offers significant contributions to understanding the interplay between mentoring, organizational progress, and strategic business planning. Through the implementation of structured yet flexible mentoring initiatives, the utilization of technology for scalability, and the cultivation of inclusive leadership, biotechnology firms will effectively prepare future leaders, retain key personnel, and enhance organizational resilience. The synergy of these approaches guarantees enduring viability within an industry characterized by swift scientific and technological change. These

conclusions underscore the importance of continuous innovation, flexibility, and knowledge sharing for maintaining business success and competitive advantage.

Moving forward, it is recommended that leaders within the biotechnology industry continue to explore advancements in digital mentoring platforms, particularly those leveraging artificial intelligence, to optimize the matching of mentors with mentees and to evaluate long-term sustainability. Human resource personnel and executive leaders are encouraged to support these mentor programs through the provision of funding, training, and policies that prioritize professional development and leadership continuity (Blake-Beard et al., 2021). Future research should focus on the long-term effects of mentoring strategies across diverse biotechnology sub-sectors and their applicability to related industries such as healthcare and pharmaceuticals. Addressing these areas will yield a deeper understanding of the effectiveness of mentoring as a business strategy and contribute to the sustainability of organizational success. Biotechnology leaders are demonstrating that mentoring, when strategically designed and supported at the executive level, is important not only for advancing individual careers but also for driving sustainable business growth. By adopting these practices, organizations are proactively shaping the future, establishing a significant precedent for leadership and innovation within the biotechnology sector.

References

- Abdollahi, M., & Nabavi, F. H. (2022). Mentoring as an appropriate strategy for medical faculty member development in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, *11*(1), 3–14.
<https://doi.org/10.30476/jamp.2022.97103.1740>
- Adnan, N., Bhatti, O. K., & Baykal, E. (2022). A phenomenological investigation on ethical leadership and workplace engagement from a multi-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, *11*(2), 206–234.
<https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2022.60327>
- Alston, A. M. (2021). *Mentoring strategies for enabling employees' career progression* (Order No. 28721904). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Walden University. (2572540553). <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/mentoring-strategies-enabling-employees-career/docview/2572540553/se-2>
- Anderson, C. (2010). Presenting and evaluating qualitative research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *74*(8), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7408141>
- Andrews, R., Hadley, F., & Hay, I. (2024). A follow-up study of an early childhood mentoring program: Sustaining impactful change for mentors and mentees. *Education Sciences*, *14*(10), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101131>
- Arthur, M. B., & Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*(3), 454.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2392687>
- Atkins, K., Dougan, B. M., Dromgold-Sermen, M. S., Potter, H., Sathy, V., & Panter, A.

- T. (2020). Looking at myself in the future: How mentoring shapes scientific identity for STEM students from underrepresented groups. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00242-3>
- Bahrami, P., Nosratabadi, S., Palouzian, K., & Hegedűs, S. (2023). Modeling the impact of mentoring on women's work-life balance: A grounded theory approach. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13010006>
- Banerjee-Batist, R., Reio, T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2019). Mentoring functions and outcomes: An integrative literature review of sociocultural factors and individual differences. *Human Resource Development Review*, 18(1), 114–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484318810267>
- Barroga, E., Furuta, A., Arima, M., Tsuchiya, S., Kawahara, C., Takamiya, Y., Izumi, M., & Matanguihan, G. J. (2023). Conducting and writing quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 38(37), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e291>
- Bashir, N. (2024). Knowledge identification for open innovation: A case study of biotechnology firms. *Business Process Management Journal*, 30(4), 1131–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-05-2023-0403>
- Bear, J. B., Treviño, L. J., & Aguinis, H. (2025). A star is born or not: Understanding the star emergence gender gap. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 0, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2858>
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219–234.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475>

Bhangu, S., Provost, F., & Caduff, C. (2023). Introduction to qualitative research methods – Part I. *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, 14(1), 39–42.

https://doi.org/10.4103/picr.picr_253_22

Birt, L., Walter, F., Scott, S., Cavers, D., & Campbell, C. (2016). Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1802–1811. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870>

Black, L. L., Suarez, E. C., & Medina, S. (2004). Helping students help themselves: Strategies for successful mentoring relationships. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01859.x>

Blair, B. (2025). Navigating talent acquisition in 2025: Biotech and pharma in focus. *GQR Life Sciences*. <https://www.gqr.com/blog/2025/01/navigating-talent-acquisition-in-2025-biotech-and-pharma-in-focus>

Blake-Beard, S., Shapiro, M., & Ingols, C. (2021). A model for strengthening mentors: frames and practices. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(12), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126465>

Blanco, M.-J., & Audia, J. E. (2020). Mentoring matters in drug discovery. *ACS Medicinal Chemistry Letters*, 11(3), 241–244.

<https://doi.org/10.1021/acsmchemlett.9b00638>

Borghini, J., & Gulick, V. A. (2022). Promoting open Science through research data management. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 4(3), 1–22.

<https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.9497f68e>

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal (RMIT Training Pty Ltd Trading as RMIT Publishing)*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis. *Qualitative Psychology*, 9(1), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196>
- Broughton, R. S., Plaisime, M. V., & Green Parker, M. C. (2019). Mentorship: The necessity of intentionality. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 89(3), 317–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000412>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke’s approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality and Quantity*, 56(3), 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Bowers, C. A., Carlson, C. E., Doherty, S. L., Evans, J., & Hall, J. (2023). Workplace coaching: A meta-analysis and recommendations for advancing the science of coaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1204166>
- Carlson, J. (2014). Avoiding Traps in Member Checking. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5), 1102–1113. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2010.1332>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545–

547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547>

- Chandler, D. E., & Ellis, R. (2011). Diversity and mentoring in the workplace: A conversation with Belle Rose Ragins. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 19(4), 483–500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2011.622082>
- Chandler, D. E., Kram, K. E., & Yip, J. (2011). An ecological systems perspective on mentoring at work: A review and future prospects. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 519–570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.576087>
- Chang, P. C., Guo, Y., Cai, Q., & Guo, H. (2023). Proactive career orientation and subjective career success: A perspective of career construction theory. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(6), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13060503>
- Chen, Y. C., & Chai, C. C. (2023). Development of a two-way mentorship scale focusing on next-generation core competencies. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02093-z>
- Chronus. (2025, August 19). *Beat mentoring drop-off: Tactics from companies driving sustained connection*. Chronus. <https://chronus.com/resources/beat-mentoring-drop-off>
- Cismaru, L., & Iunius, R. (2019). Bridging the generational gap in the hospitality industry: Reverse mentoring—an innovative talent management practice for present and future generations of employees. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010263>
- Clancy, M. (2013). Is reflexivity the key to minimizing problems of interpretation in phenomenological research? *Nurse Researcher*, 20(6), 12–16.

<https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2013.07.20.6.12.e1209>

Clark, E. C., Dhaliwal, B., Ciliska, D., Neil-Sztramko, S. E., Dobbins, M., & Steinberg, M. (2022). A pragmatic evaluation of a public health knowledge broker mentoring education program: A convergent mixed methods study. *Implementation Science Communications*, 3(1), 1–13.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-022-00267-5>

Clawson, J. G., & Kram, K. E. (1984). Managing cross-gender mentoring. *Business Horizons*, 27(3), 22–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813\(84\)90021-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(84)90021-1)

Clynes, M., Corbett, A., & Overbaugh, J. (2019). Why we need good mentoring. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 19(9), 489–493. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41568-019-0173-1>

Cuddington, K., Abbott, K. C., Adler, F. R., Aydeniz, M., Dale, R., Gross, L. J., Hastings, A., Hobson, E. A., Karatayev, V. A., Killion, A., Madamanchi, A., Marraffini, M. I., McCombs, A. L., Samyono, W., Shiu, S. H., Watanabe, K. H., & White, E. R. (2023). Challenges and opportunities to build quantitative self-confidence in biologists. *BioScience*, 73(5), 364–375.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biad015>

Dahlberg, M. L., & Byars-Winston, A. (Eds.). (2019). *The Science of Effective Mentorship in STEMM. The Science of Mentoring Relationships: What Is Mentorship?* National Academies Press (US). (pp. 33–50)

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK552775/>

Daniel, A., Franco, S., Schroeder, N. L., & Cenkci, A. T. (2019). Cross-cultural academic mentoring dyads: A case study. *Learning*, 27(2), 164–189.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2019.1611286>

Delebecque, C. J., & Philp, J. (2019). Education and training for industrial biotechnology and engineering biology. *Engineering Biology*, 3(1), 6–11.

<https://doi.org/10.1049/enb.2018.0001>

Deng, C., Gulseren, D. B., & Turner, N. (2022). How to match mentors and protégés for successful mentorship programs: A review of the evidence and recommendations for practitioners. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 43(3), 386–403. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2021-0032>

Deng, C., & Turner, N. (2024). Identifying key mentor characteristics for successful workplace mentoring relationships and programmes. *Personnel Review*, 53(2), 580–604. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2022-0535>

Deng, H., Wu, W., Zhang, Y., Yu, Z., Xu, H., & Wu, W. (2022). Exploring the differential effects of career and psychosocial mentoring on newcomer socialization. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–14.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.975064>

Deng, J. M., Ahmed, S. E., Awoonor-Williams, E., Banerjee, P., Barecka, M. H., Bickerton, L. E., Di Pietro, S. A., Dorn, S. K., Jablonka, K. M., Laudadio, G., Kreidt, E., Mannocho-Russo, H., Terra, J., Wilkins, O. H., Yerneni, S. S., & Yusuf, M. (2024). Prioritizing mentorship as scientific leaders. *ACS Central Science*, 10(2), 209–213. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscentsci.3c00500>

Diggs-Andrews, K. A., Mayer, D. C. G., & Riggs, B. (2021). Introduction to effective mentorship for early-career research scientists. *BMC Proceedings*, 15(2), 1–7.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12919-021-00212-9>

- Drossard, S., & Härtl, A. (2024). Development and implementation of digital peer mentoring in small groups for first-year medical students. *GMS Journal for Medical Education*, 41(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3205/zma001666>
- Dwivedi, P., Basuthakur, Y., Polineni, S., Paruchuri, S., & Joshi, A. (2025). A stakeholder perspective on diversity within organizations. *Journal of Management*, 51(1), 383–426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063241280718>
- Elovitz, M. A. (2024). Prioritizing mentorship. *Nature Microbiology*, 9(2), 309. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-024-01614-z>
- Emilia, O., Suhoyo, Y., & Utomo, P. S. (2023). Teacher as role model in developing professional behavior of medical students: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 14, 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.6443.ae49>
- Florea, M. (2023). Withdrawal of consent for processing personal data in biomedical research. *International Data Privacy Law*, 13(2), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipad008>
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408–1416. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2015.2281>
- Gadomska-Lila, K. (2020). Effectiveness of reverse mentoring in creating intergenerational relationships. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(7), 1313–1328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-10-2019-0326>
- Garg, N., Murphy, W., & Singh, P. (2021). Reverse mentoring, job crafting and work-

- outcomes: The mediating role of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 26(2), 290–308. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2020-0233>
- Gehr, S., Garner, C. C., & Kleinhans, K. N. (2020). Translating academic careers into industry healthcare professions. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38(6), 758–764. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0552-x>
- Germeroth, D., Murray, C. M., McMullen-Roach, S., & Boshoff, K. (2024). A scoping review of mentorship in allied health: Attributes, programs and outcomes. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 71(1), 149–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1630.12903>
- Giacumo, L. A., Chen, J., & Seguinot-Cruz, A. (2020). Evidence on the use of mentoring programs and practices to support workplace learning: A systematic multiple-studies review. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 33(3), 259–303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21324>
- Godfrey, M., & Benson, A. (2023). Seeds of doubt: How the source of mentorship initiation influences mentoring expectations. *Current Psychology*, 42(16), 13358–13368. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02573-y>
- Goldblatt, H., Karnieli-Miller, O., & Neumann, M. (2011). Sharing qualitative research findings with participants: Study experiences of methodological and ethical dilemmas. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 82(3), 389–395. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.12.016>
- Griffin, G. M. (2024). *Does Participation Matter? Exploring the Role of Participation in Corporate Leadership Development Programs on the Intent to Stay of High-*

Potential Employees in the Biotech Industry (Order No. 31147199). Available from ProQuest One Academic. (3037281297).

<https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/does-participation-matter-exploring-role/docview/3037281297/se-2>

- Grocutt, A., Gulseren, D., Weatherhead, J. G., & Turner, N. (2022). Can mentoring programmes develop leadership? *Human Resource Development International*, 25(4), 404–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1850090>
- Gross, S., & Sohl, C. D. (2021). Readyng students for careers in industry: A guided inquiry activity to prepare students for success in biotechnology and pharmaceutical industry positions. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education*, 49(3), 407–415. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bmb.21491>
- Gupta, A. (2024). Strategies for positive outcomes of negative mentoring experiences at workplace: Protege perspectives. *South Asian Journal of Human Resources Management*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23220937241301129>
- Haidusek-Niazy, S., Huyler, D., & Carpenter, R. E. (2023). Mentorship reconsidered: A case study of K-12 teachers' mentor-mentee relationships during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Social Psychology of Education*, 26(5), 1269–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09788-w>
- Hennink, M., & Kaiser, B. N. (2022). Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. *Social Science & Medicine*, 292, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523>
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A

- developmental network perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 264–288. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259122>
- Hopwood, D. G., & Bradbury, W. (2021). Critical considerations for mentoring relationships: A phase model approach. *Professional Safety*, 66(6), 31–37. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/critical-considerations-mentoring-relationships/docview/2537699891/se-2>
- Hund, A. K., Churchill, A. C., Faist, A. M., Havrilla, C. A., Love Stowell, S. M., McCreery, H. F., Ng, J., Pinzone, C. A., & Scordato, E. S. (2018). Transforming mentorship in STEM by training scientists to be better leaders. *Ecology and evolution*, 8(20), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4527>
- Hunter, M. (2012). Creating qualitative interview protocols. *International Journal of Sociotechnology and Knowledge Development*, 4(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.4018/jskd.2012070101>
- Hyassat, M., Al-Makahleh, A., Rahahleh, Z., & Al-Zyoud, N. (2023). The diagnostic process for children with autism spectrum disorder: A preliminary study of Jordanian parents' perspectives. *Children*, 10(8), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children10081394>
- Illies, M. Y., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2020). The effect of perceived values on negative mentoring, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and perceived career success. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 18(1), 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.24384/q242-8973>
- Jain, A. (2023). How knowledge loss and network structure jointly determine R&D

productivity in the biotechnology industry. *Technovation*, 119, 1–13.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102607>

Jamieson, M. K., Govaart, G. H., & Pownall, M. (2023). Reflexivity in quantitative research: A rationale and beginner's guide. *Social & Personality Psychology Compass*, 17(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12735>

Johnson, J. L., Adkins, D., & Chauvin, S. (2020). A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 84(1), 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7120>

Jooss, S., Collings, D. G., McMackin, J., & Dickmann, M. (2024). A skills-matching perspective on talent management: Developing strategic agility. *Human Resource Management*, 63(1), 141–157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22192>

Kakyo, T. A., Xiao, L. D., & Chamberlain, D. (2025). The role of motivation in the initiation and maintaining mentoring relationships among nurses and midwives. *International nursing review*, 72(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12977>

Kankisingi, G. M., & Dhliwayo, S. (2022). Rewards and Innovation Performance in Manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031737>

Kellerer, M., & Süß, S. (2025). Implications of multiple commitment targets for turnover intentions and actual turnover: A systematic literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00500-0>

Kelly, M. L., & Cordeiro, M. (2020). Three principles of pragmatism for research on organizational processes. *Methodological Innovations*, 13, 1–10.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2059799120937242>

- Kenny, N. P., OC, M., Mann, K. V., & MacLeod, H. (2003). Role modeling in physicians' professional formation: Reconsidering an essential but untapped educational strategy. *Academic medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 78, 1203–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200312000-00002>
- Khatchikian, A. D., Chahal, B. S., & Kielar, A. (2021). Mosaic mentoring: finding the right mentor for the issue at hand. *Abdominal Radiology*, 46(12), 5480–5484. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00261-021-03314-2>
- Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical Teacher*, 42(8), 846–854. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030>
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *The European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092>
- Kostyuk, A., & Battisti, M. (2025). The effects of entrepreneurial mentoring on venture performance: A synthesis and conceptual model. *Small Enterprise Research*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13215906.2025.2452641>
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 608–625. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255910>
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1),

110–132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256064>

Kusynová, Z., van den Ham, H. A., Leufkens, H. G. M., & Mantel-Teeuwisse, A. K.

(2023). Pharmaceutical scientists' perspectives on capacity building in pharmaceutical sciences. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *112*(7), 1997–2003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2023.04.015>

Langer, L. J. (2020). Seven Characteristics of Successful Biotechnology Leaders. In *Biotechnology Entrepreneurship* (pp. 37–45). Academic Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815585-1.00004-8>

Lee, S. & Lim, W. (2023). A needs analysis of educational content for overseas job applicants in the digital bio-health industry. *Physical Therapy Korea*, *30*(3), 230–236. <https://doi.org/10.12674/ptk.2023.30.3.230>

Lindburg, L., Bozinovic, L., & Susek, R. (2019). As the life science industry evolves, so do its talent needs. *Nature Biotechnology*, *37*(4), 481–483.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0091-5>

Liu, Y., & Zhang, H. (2022). Making things happen: How employees' paradox mindset influences innovative performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1009209>

Mann, K. J., Roach, K. N., & O'Brien, K. E. (2023). Mentoring as an investment: A quantitative review of mentoring and well-being for the protégé. *Journal of Career Development*, *50*(2), 465–481.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453221104493>

Mantzourani, E., Chang, H., Desselle, S., Canedo, J., & Fleming, G. (2022). Reflections

of mentors and mentees on a national mentoring program for pharmacists: An examination into relationships, personal and professional development. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 18(3), 2495–2504.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2021.04.019>

Manuel, S. P., & Poorsattar, S. P. (2021). Mentoring up: Twelve tips for successfully employing a mentee-driven approach to mentoring relationships. *Medical teacher*, 43(4), 384–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1795098>

Marshall, A. G., Vue, Z., Beasley, H. K., Crabtree, A., Vang, L., Dal, A. B., Shao, B., Alexander, S., Vang, N., Vue, N., Vue, M., Spencer, E. C., Hinton, A., Palavicino-Maggio, C. B., Neikirk, K., Garza-Lopez, E., Murray, S. A., Martinez, D., Conley, Z. C., ... Shuler, H. D. (2022). The role of mentoring in promoting diversity equity and inclusion in STEM Education and Research. *Pathogens and Disease*, 80(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femspd/ftac019>

Martin, J. P., Suresh, D. E., & Jensen, P. A. (2024). Using collaborative autoethnography to investigate mentoring relationships for novice engineering education researchers. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 11(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00473-8>

Mascarenhas, O. A., Thakur, M., & Kumar, P. (2024). *On Assumptions, Presumptions, Suppositions, and Presuppositions. In A Primer on Critical Thinking and Business Ethics* (pp. 223–253). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83753-346-620241008>

McCray, A. T., Van Vactor, D., Gould, J., Li, X., Patnogić, J., Shamu, C., & Walsh, M.

C. (2024). Research culture in biomedicine: What we learned, and what we would like to do about it. *Communications Biology*, 7(1), 1–5.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-06237-y>

McGowan, B. S., & Dawkins, V. B. (2025). Bridging the leadership gap: The role of mentorship in advancing African American librarians in health sciences. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 51(1), 1–10.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2024.103000>

McKee, K. R. (2024). Human participants in AI research: Ethics and transparency in practice. *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society, Technology and Society, IEEE Transactions on, IEEE Trans. Technol. Soc*, 5(3), 279–288.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/TTS.2024.3446183>

McWherter, B., Sherren, K., & Hunar, A. (2024). From learner to leader: Exploring learning, motivations, and roles of regenerative grazing mentors. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2024.2445741>

Menezes, D. B. S., Gumashivili, M., & Kanokon, K. (2025). The role of talent management in enhancing employee retention: Mediating the influence of psychological empowerment. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 17(7), 1–22.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/su17073277>

Mullen, C. A., & Klimaitis, C. C. (2021). Defining mentoring: A literature review of issues, types, and applications. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1483(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14176>

Murphy, M. W. (2012). Reverse mentoring at work: Fostering cross-generational learning

and developing millennial leaders. *Human Resource Management*, 51(4), 549–573. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21489>

Murray, D. D., Williams, C. R., Gaddy, J. A., Rogers, C. D., Kirabo, A., Santisteban, M. M., Wanjalla, C. N., Williams, E. M., Sweetwyne, M. T., Damo, S. T., Murray, S. A., Stokes, D., & Hinton, A., Jr. (2024). The power of junior faculty mentoring committees. *Journal of Cellular Physiology*, 239(7), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcp.31360>

Murray, S. A., Shuler, H., Spencer, E. C., & Hinton, A. (2022). Mentoring future science leaders to thrive. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 43(6), 457–460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2022.03.012>

Nadder, H. M. H. (2025). Nurse faculty mentoring of students to optimize student success: A basic qualitative study. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 20(1), e27–e33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2024.07.021>

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>

Negrin, K. A., Slaughter, S. E., Dahlke, S., & Olson, J. (2022). Successful recruitment to qualitative research: A critical reflection. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221119576>

Newman, A., Chrispal, S., Dunwoodie, K., & Macaulay, L. (2025). Hidden bias, overt impact: A systematic review of the empirical literature on racial microaggressions

at work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-05924-y>

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>

O'Brien, K. E., Mann, K. J., & Woody, B. A. (2025). Mentor–protégé matching regarding communication relates to career attitudes. *Journal of Career Development*, 52(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453241298651>

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>

Pandita, D., Agarwal, Y., & Vapiwala, F. (2023). Fostering the sustainability of organizational learning: Reviewing the role of Gen-Z employees. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 55(3), 375–387. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-09-2022-0064>

Patterson, C. A. (2024). Mentoring programs: Characteristics within HRD and higher education contexts. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 26(1), 56–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15234223231213993>

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Pedersen, R., Woodcock, A., Schultz, P. W., & Hernandez, P. R. (2024). When perceived

- similarity overrides demographic similarity: Examining influences on STEM students' developmental mentor networks. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 11(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00480-9>
- Ragins, B. R. (1989). Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma. *Human Relations*, 42(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678904200101>
- Ragins, B. R. (1997a). Antecedents of diversified mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 90–109. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1590>
- Ragins, B. R. (1997b). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 482–521. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259331>
- Ragins, B. R. (1999). Gender and mentoring relationships: a review and research agenda for the next decade. In G. N. Powell (Ed.) *Gender and mentoring relationships: A review and research agenda for the next decade* (pp. 347–370). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231365>
- Ragins, B., & Kram, K. (2008). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976619>
- Ranganathan, K., & Englesbe, M. (2024). How to mentor more people -- and not get burned out. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, 1–6. <https://hbr.org/2024/01/how-to-mentor-more-people-and-not-get-burned-out>
- Rida, P., Karalis Noel, T., & Miles, M. L. (2023). STEM postdoc mentoring: A social exchange theory-based conceptual framework. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 31(2), 208–227.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2023.2178708>

- Rifat, A. H., & Sony, S. F. (2025). Career aspirations, preparedness, and skill development: A study among the university students in Bangladesh. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 15–35.
- <https://doi.org/10.56916/ijess.v4i1.779>
- Rohrich, R. J., & Durand, P. D. (2020). Mentors, leaders, and role models: Same or different? *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, 145(4), 1099–1101.
- <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000006702>
- Ross, P. T., & Bibler Zaidi, N. L. (2019). Limited by our limitations. *Perspectives on medical education*, 8, 261–264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-00530-x>
- Roy, M. V. (2024). Investigating the impact of mentorship in leadership development. *Leadership Studies*. 4, 1–52.
- <https://digitalcommons.usm.maine.edu/leadershipstudies/4>
- Rubbi Nunan, J. L., Ebrahim, A. B., & Stander, M. W. (2023). Mentoring in the workplace: Exploring the experiences of mentor–mentee relations. *SAJIP: South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 49, 1–11.
- <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v49i0.2067>
- Sangasubana, N. (2011). How to conduct ethnographic research. *Qualitative Report*, 16(2), 567–573. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2011.1071>
- Sarabipour, S., Ibrahim, A., Clark, K., Niemi, N. M., Burgess, S. J., Smith, C. T., & Bisson Filho, A. W. (2023). The faculty-to-faculty mentorship experience: A survey on challenges and recommendations for improvements. *Proceedings of the*

Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 290(2013), 1–12.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.0983>

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education Unlimited.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.3233/efi-2004-22201>

Shuler, H., Cazares, V., Marshall, A., Garza-Lopez, E., Hultman, R., Rolle, T., Byndloss, M. X., Starbird, C. A., Hicsasmaz, I., AshShareef, S., Neikirk, K., Johnson, P. E. C., Vue, Z., Beasley, H. K., Williams, A., & Hinton, A., Jr. (2021). Intentional mentoring: Maximizing the impact of underrepresented future scientists in the 21st century. *Pathogens and Disease*, 79(6), 1–9.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/femspd/ftab038>

Sibisi, N. N., Mpofu, Z. F., & Sibisi, N. T. (2024). Preventative strategies to curb school violence: A case study of selected schools in Hhohho District of Eswatini, Mbabane. *Social Sciences*, 13(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13020079>

Singh, S., Thomas, N., & Numbudiri, R. (2021). Knowledge sharing in times of a pandemic: An intergenerational learning approach. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 28(2), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1669>

Sobel, J., Hayden, S. R., & Wardi, G. (2023). The knowledge gap: Mentorship in emergency medicine residency. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 82(1), 47–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2023.01.026>

- Sohu, J. M., Hongyun, T., Akhtar, S., Junejo, I., Ejaz, F., Dunay, A., & Hossain, M. B. (2024). Driving sustainable competitiveness: Unveiling the nexus of green intellectual capital and environmental regulations on greening SME performance. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 12*, 1–14
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2024.1348994>
- Sovacool, B. K., Iskandarova, M., & Hall, J. (2023). Industrializing theories: A thematic analysis of conceptual frameworks and typologies for industrial sociotechnical change in a low-carbon future. *Energy Research & Social Science, 97*, 1–36.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.102954>
- Stoeger, H., Balestrini, D. P., & Ziegler, A. (2021). Key issues in professionalizing mentoring practices. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1483*(1), 5-18.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14537>
- Stokes, Y., Jacob, J. D., Gifford, W., Squires, J. E., & Vandyk, A. (2017). Exploring Nurses' Knowledge and Experiences Related to Trauma-Informed Care. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research, 4*, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23333393617734510>
- Swafford, M., & Anderson, R. (2020). Addressing the gender gap: Women's perceived barriers to pursuing STEM careers. *Journal of Research in Technical Careers, 4*(1), 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.9741/2578-2118.1070>
- Swanson, H. I. (2022). Mentoring and supporting our next generation of women toxicologists. *Frontiers in Toxicology, 4*, 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/ftox.2022.920664>

- Taquette, S. R., & Borges da Matta Souza, L. M. (2022). Ethical dilemmas in qualitative research: A critical literature review. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221078731>
- The Science of Effective Mentorship in STEMM. (2020, February). *Library Bookwatch*. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A710236401/EAIM?u=minn4020&sid=ebsco&xid=0fb6c0df>
- Thompson, E. L., Syed, T. A., Latif, Z., Stinson, K., Javier, D., Saleh, G., & Vishwanatha, J. K. (2025). Examining educational and career transition points among a diverse, virtual mentoring network. *Journal for STEM Education Research*, 8(1), 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41979-024-00119-y>
- Treanor, L., Noke, H., Marlow, S., & Mosey, S. (2021). Developing entrepreneurial competences in biotechnology early career researchers to support long-term entrepreneurial career outcomes. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 164, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120031>
- Treasure, A. M., Hall, S. M., Lesko, I., Moore, D., Sharan, M., van Zaanen, M., Yehudi, Y., & van der Walt, A. (2022). Ten simple rules for establishing a mentorship programme. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 18(5), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010015>
- Turner, D. W., III (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 754–760. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2010.1178>
- United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2003). The Belmont Report:

Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research.

Manual for Research Ethics Committees, 126–132.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511550089.028>

Uutela, A., Helanterä, I., Aberg, F., Makisalo, H., Nordin, A., Lempinen, M., Sallinen, V., Lemstrom, K., Syrjala, S., & Passov, A. (2020). Randomised sham-controlled double-blind trial evaluating remote ischaemic preconditioning in solid organ transplantation: A study protocol for the RIPTRANS trial. *BMJ Open*, *10*(11), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-038340>

Vargas, J. H., Saetermoe, C. L., & Chavira, G. (2021). Using critical race theory to reframe mentor training: Theoretical considerations regarding the ecological systems of mentorship. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, *81*(5), 1043–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00598-z>

Verniers, C., Aelenei, C., Breda, T., Cimpian, J. R., Girerd, L., Molina, E., Sovet, L., & Cimpian, A. (2024). The double-edged sword of role models: A systematic narrative review of the unintended effects of role model interventions on support for the status quo. *Review of Research in Education*, *48*(1), 89–120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X241261310>

Wakelin, K. J., McAra-Couper, J., & Fleming, T. (2024). Using an online platform for conducting face-to-face interviews. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241234183>

Wofford, M. A. (2024). They say goodbye, we say hello: Understanding the relational

phases of equity-minded STEMM graduate-undergraduate mentorship. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 32(2), 184–205.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2024.2323476>

Wuttke, E., Heinrichs, K., Koegler, K., & Just, A. (2024). How training quality, trainer competence, and satisfaction with training affect vocational identification of apprentices in vocational education programs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1–10.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1200279>

Xu, B. (2024). What does good qualitative research look like? How to do it?

Contemporary Sociology, 53(2), 93–98.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00943061241227330>

Yang, W., Wang, Y., Choi, M., & Li, Y. (2024). Influence of mentoring on the proactive behavior of new employees: Moderated mediation effect of agreeableness.

Frontiers in Psychology, 15, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1370815>

Yin, J. (2024). The role of mentors' paradox mindset on career mentoring: application of attachment theory. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 48(3/4), 407–

421. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-07-2022-0083>

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.).

Sage.

Appendix: Interview Protocol

Primary Business Research Phenomenon Under Research Project and Overarching Research Question

The topic for my research project is *Effective Mentoring Strategies for Career Advancement for Mid-and Senior-Level Scientific Professionals Within the Biotechnology Industry*. The overarching research question is *What successful mentoring strategies do biotech organization leaders tailor to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression within the biotech industry and contribution to organization performance?*

Primary Research Goal to Achieve from This Interview

The purpose of this interview is to identify and explore effectively implemented mentoring strategies biotech organization leaders tailor to mid- and senior-level scientific professionals to promote their progression within the biotech industry and contribute to organization performance.

Introduction

1. Thank you for participating in this research project. Your participation in this educational project on mentoring strategies in the biotechnology industry is important. It will help better understand how to support career development and enhance organizational performance through effective mentoring.

2. I will be interviewing you and several other leaders in the biotechnology industry. Together, I hope to gather sufficient information for this research project. Before we begin, I would like to review a few important points with you.
3. First, you should know that your participation is entirely voluntary. If I ask a question that you prefer not to answer or if you need to stop the interview at any time, please let me know.
4. With your permission, I will audiotape the interview and take notes. Later, I will provide you with a transcript of the audiotape and my notes so you can review them and confirm their accuracy. You may make corrections as needed to ensure your responses are captured correctly.
5. This research project may be shared with faculty members, colleagues, and academic publications. However, your identity will remain confidential. Even if I use direct quotes, pseudonyms will be used to protect your anonymity. The information will also be securely stored for five years and then destroyed as per ethical research standards.
6. Do you have any questions about the process?
7. As agreed, we have set aside 60-90 minutes for this interview. Does that still work for you?
8. Is audiotaping the interview still work for you?
9. Ready to begin?

Let us get started, then!