The American Journal of Medical Sciences and Pharmaceutical Research
ISSN 2689-1026 Volume 08 - 2026

Mentorship, Intersectionality, and Equity in Academic Medicine: A Theoretically Integrated and Empirically Grounded Analysis of Professional Development, Power, and Belonging

[1] Daniel B. Rutherford

[1] Faculty of Medicine, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Received: 07th Dec 2025 | Received Revised Version: 29th Dec 2025 | Accepted: 27th Jan 2026 | Published: 01th Feb 2026

Volume 08 Issue 02 2026 |

Abstract

Mentorship has long been recognized as one of the most powerful determinants of professional development, career satisfaction, and scholarly productivity in academic medicine. Yet despite more than four decades of research documenting the benefits of mentoring relationships, academic medicine continues to face persistent inequities in recruitment, retention, advancement, and well-being, particularly among individuals who occupy marginalized or multiply marginalized social positions. This paradox suggests that mentorship cannot be fully understood or optimized without attention to broader social, cultural, and structural forces that shape how mentoring relationships are formed, enacted, and experienced. Drawing on a comprehensive body of scholarship on mentoring in academic medicine and integrating it with contemporary theories of intersectionality, cultural humility, cultural safety, and health equity, this article develops an original, theoretically unified, and empirically grounded framework for understanding mentorship as both a professional development mechanism and a site of power, identity negotiation, and institutional reproduction.

Using an integrative narrative synthesis approach grounded in the foundational mentoring literature of Roch, Palepu and colleagues, Pololi and colleagues, Allen and colleagues, Cameron and Blackburn, and others, alongside the intersectionality and equity-focused work of Collins, Crenshaw, Bowleg, Jones, Braveman, Curtis, Hook, and Wilkins, this study moves beyond a narrow focus on dyadic mentor–mentee relationships. Instead, it conceptualizes mentorship as a multilayered social process embedded within historically structured systems of race, gender, class, professional hierarchy, and institutional culture. The methodology involves a theoretically informed qualitative synthesis in which mentoring functions, roles, and outcomes identified in the medical education literature are reinterpreted through an intersectional lens to illuminate how advantages and disadvantages are differentially distributed.

The results of this analysis demonstrate that while mentorship consistently produces positive career outcomes, including increased productivity, career clarity, and professional confidence, these benefits are not evenly accessible. Informal mentoring networks, which are often the most powerful sources of sponsorship and career advancement, disproportionately favor those who already resemble institutional norms of authority and legitimacy. At the same time, mentees from marginalized backgrounds often experience mentoring relationships that are simultaneously supportive and constraining, shaped by cultural misunderstanding, implicit bias, and unequal power dynamics. The integration of cultural humility and cultural safety frameworks reveals that effective mentorship in diverse academic environments requires not only technical guidance but also a reflexive, justice-oriented orientation toward difference, power, and historical context.

In discussion, the article argues that mentorship must be reconceptualized as a form of institutional practice rather than merely an interpersonal relationship. Such a reconceptualization carries profound implications for faculty development, leadership training, and organizational accountability. By embedding intersectionality and equity into the design, evaluation, and everyday practice of mentoring, academic medical centers can transform mentorship from a mechanism that often reproduces inequality into one that actively disrupts it. The article concludes by outlining a set of theoretically grounded and empirically supported principles for building mentoring systems that promote both excellence and justice in academic medicine.

Keywords: Mentorship, Academic Medicine, Intersectionality, Health Equity, Cultural Humility, Faculty Development, Professional Identity

Cite This Article: Daniel B. Rutherford. (2026). Mentorship, Intersectionality, and Equity in Academic Medicine: A Theoretically Integrated and Empirically Grounded Analysis of Professional Development, Power, and Belonging. The American Journal of Medical Sciences and Pharmaceutical Research, 8(2), 1–7. Retrieved from https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajmspr/article/view/7350

1. Introduction

Mentorship occupies a unique and enduring place in the culture of academic medicine. From the earliest stages of medical education through the highest levels of faculty leadership, the presence or absence of meaningful mentoring relationships has been shown to shape how individuals learn, how they envision their futures, and how successfully they navigate the complex and often opaque pathways of academic careers. Early conceptualizations of mentoring in professional settings emphasized its role as a guiding, nurturing, and career-shaping force, with Roch's influential analysis highlighting the symbolic and practical centrality of mentors in shaping professional identity and opportunity (Roch, 1979). In the decades since, a substantial body of empirical research has documented the tangible benefits of mentorship for protégés, including enhanced career satisfaction, higher rates of promotion, greater research productivity, and stronger professional networks (Palepu et al., 1998; Allen et al., 2004; Cameron and Blackburn, 1981).

Within academic medicine in particular, mentorship has been framed not merely as a supportive relationship but as an essential investment in the future of the profession. Schapira and colleagues described mentoring as a form of collective stewardship, through which experienced physicians and scholars transmit not only knowledge and skills but also values, norms, and visions of what it means to be an academic physician (Schapira et al., 1992). Similarly, Ramanan and colleagues demonstrated that mentoring during residency training significantly influences career preparation, shaping whether trainees pursue academic careers and how confident they feel in their professional trajectories (Ramanan et al., 2006). These findings have been reinforced by qualitative studies showing that mentees often describe their mentors as central figures in their personal and professional development, providing encouragement, role modeling, and a sense of belonging in an often demanding and hierarchical environment (Jackson et al., 2003; Pololi et al., 2002).

Yet despite this robust evidence base, academic medicine continues to struggle with deep and persistent inequities. Faculty from historically marginalized racial and ethnic groups, women, and those at the intersections of multiple marginalized identities are less likely to be promoted, more likely to experience burnout, and more likely to leave academic careers altogether (Wilkins et al., 2021; Blackstock, 2020). These patterns suggest that mentorship, as it is currently practiced and institutionalized, may not function as an equalizing force. Instead, it may operate in ways that mirror and even reinforce existing power structures. Sambunjak and colleagues, in their comprehensive review of mentoring in academic medicine, noted that access to high-quality mentoring is uneven and often depends on informal networks and personal affinities that are themselves shaped by social similarity and institutional bias (Sambunjak et al., 2006).

The emergence of intersectionality as a dominant framework in social and health sciences offers a powerful lens for understanding this paradox. Intersectionality, originally articulated by Black feminist scholars, emphasizes that social identities such as race, gender, class, and professional status do not operate independently but interact to produce unique configurations of privilege and disadvantage (Collins, 1990; Cho et al., 2013; Collins and Bilge, 2020). In the context of academic medicine, this means that the experience of being a junior faculty member, a woman, or a racialized minority cannot be understood in isolation from one another. Rather, these identities combine to shape how individuals are perceived, how they are treated, and how they can access opportunities such as mentorship.

Public health scholars have further expanded the implications of intersectionality by linking it to health equity and institutional responsibility. Bowleg argued that intersectionality must move beyond analysis to action, requiring organizations to address the structural conditions that produce inequities (Bowleg, 2020). Jones and colleagues similarly emphasized that achieving equity requires attention both to the "whole," meaning overall population outcomes, and to the "hole," meaning the specific gaps and injustices that affect marginalized groups (Jones et al., 2019). In academic medicine, mentorship sits squarely at the intersection of these concerns, as it influences both aggregate outcomes, such as overall faculty productivity, and the distribution of those outcomes across social groups.

Despite the richness of both mentoring research and intersectionality theory, these literatures have rarely been fully integrated. Studies of mentoring in academic medicine have often treated identity as a demographic variable rather than as a dynamic, relational, and power-laden process. Conversely, intersectionality research has rarely examined mentorship as a specific institutional practice through which inequalities are reproduced or challenged. This gap limits the ability of academic institutions to design mentoring systems that are not only effective but also just.

The present article seeks to address this gap by developing a theoretically integrated and empirically grounded analysis of mentorship in academic medicine through the lens of intersectionality, cultural humility, and cultural safety. By drawing on classic and contemporary mentoring scholarship alongside critical theories of power, identity, and equity, the article aims to reconceptualize mentorship as a complex social process that can either reinforce or disrupt institutional hierarchies. In doing so, it responds directly to calls for academic medicine to ground its equity efforts in historical awareness, reflexivity, and structural change (Wilkins et al., 2021; Curtis et al., 2019).

2. Methodology

The methodological approach underpinning this research is a theoretically informed integrative narrative synthesis. Rather than treating the provided references as discrete empirical findings to be aggregated, this approach conceptualizes them as elements of a broader intellectual conversation about mentorship, professional development, and equity in academic medicine. Such an approach is particularly well suited to addressing complex social phenomena that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative meta-analysis alone, especially when the goal is to generate new theoretical insights rather than to estimate effect sizes.

The foundational mentoring literature included in this synthesis spans more than three decades and encompasses both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. For example, Allen and colleagues conducted a meta-analysis of mentoring outcomes across multiple organizational contexts, demonstrating consistent career benefits for protégés (Allen et al., 2004). Palepu and colleagues employed survey methods to examine how mentoring relationships influenced the professional development of junior faculty in U.S. medical schools, highlighting associations between mentorship and career satisfaction, productivity, and retention (Palepu et al., 1998). Jackson and colleagues used qualitative interviews to explore the subjective experience of mentoring, emphasizing the importance of "chemistry" and mutual understanding in successful relationships (Jackson et al., 2003). By synthesizing these diverse methodological traditions, the present study captures both the measurable outcomes and the lived realities of mentorship.

To this mentoring literature, the study adds a second body of scholarship focused on intersectionality, cultural humility, cultural safety, and health equity. This literature is itself methodologically diverse, encompassing theoretical treatises, conceptual frameworks, empirical studies, and policy-oriented analyses. Collins' foundational work on Black feminist thought provides a theoretical grounding for understanding how knowledge, power, and identity intersect in professional contexts (Collins, 1990). Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall's articulation of intersectionality as a field of study emphasizes its applicability across disciplines and its potential for praxis-oriented research (Cho et al., 2013). Bowleg's work in public health highlights the necessity of translating intersectional analysis into institutional action (Bowleg, 2020). Curtis and colleagues' review of cultural safety provides a framework for understanding how professional interactions can either perpetuate or challenge inequities (Curtis et al., 2019). Hook and colleagues' empirical studies on cultural humility offer tools for assessing openness and reflexivity in interpersonal relationships (Hook et al., 2013; Hook and Watkins, 2015).

The analytic process involved several iterative stages. First, key concepts related to mentorship were identified

across the medical education literature, including roles (such as advisor, sponsor, role model, and advocate), functions (such as career guidance, psychosocial support, and network access), and outcomes (such as promotion, productivity, and well-being) (Tobin, 2004; Cameron and Blackburn, 1981; Pololi et al., 2002). Second, these concepts were examined through the lens of intersectionality and equity theory to explore how they might operate differently for individuals occupying different social positions. For example, the concept of sponsorship, which involves actively advocating for a protégé's advancement, was analyzed in relation to research on informal networks and bias to understand how it might disproportionately benefit those who resemble existing leaders (Cameron and Blackburn, 1981; Collins and Bilge, 2020).

Third, reflexivity was incorporated into the analytic process in line with Finlay's emphasis on acknowledging the researcher's positionality and the socially constructed nature of knowledge (Finlay, 2002). Although this article is a conceptual and narrative synthesis rather than an empirical qualitative study, the principle of reflexivity remains relevant because interpretations of the literature are shaped by assumptions about merit, professionalism, and equity. By explicitly grounding the analysis in critical theories of power and identity, the study seeks to avoid reproducing the very hierarchies it critiques.

Finally, the synthesis was organized into a coherent theoretical framework that connects mentoring practices to broader institutional and societal dynamics. Rather than presenting isolated themes, the analysis emphasizes the relational and systemic nature of mentorship, showing how individual interactions are embedded within organizational cultures, historical patterns of exclusion, and evolving norms of professionalism. This methodological approach allows for a depth of interpretation that goes beyond surface-level description, enabling a more nuanced understanding of how mentorship can both support and constrain the pursuit of equity in academic medicine.

3. Results

The integrative analysis of the mentoring and intersectionality literatures reveals a complex and often contradictory picture of how mentorship functions in academic medicine. On one hand, there is overwhelming evidence that mentoring relationships, when present and effective, are associated with a wide range of positive outcomes. On the other hand, these benefits are unevenly distributed, and the processes through which mentorship operates are deeply shaped by social identities, institutional cultures, and historical inequalities.

One of the most consistent findings across the mentoring literature is that protégés who have mentors experience significant career advantages. Allen and colleagues' meta-analysis demonstrated that mentored individuals have higher levels of career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and compensation than those without mentors (Allen et al., 2004). In academic settings, these advantages translate into greater research productivity, more rapid promotion, and stronger professional networks (Palepu et al., 1998; Cameron and Blackburn, 1981). Importantly, these benefits are not limited to formal mentoring programs. Informal mentoring relationships, which often develop through shared interests, personal affinity, or chance encounters, are frequently even more influential because they tend to involve higher levels of trust, mutual investment, and sponsorship (Rose et al., 2005; Jackson et al., 2003).

However, the very informality that makes these relationships powerful also makes them exclusionary. Cameron and Blackburn's early work on sponsorship showed that career success in academia is strongly influenced by access to influential sponsors who are willing to advocate for a protégé's advancement (Cameron and Blackburn, 1981). Such sponsorship is rarely distributed randomly. Instead, it tends to flow through networks of similarity, in which senior faculty are more likely to mentor and promote those who share their gender, race, educational background, or professional style. From an intersectional perspective, this pattern reflects the operation of what Collins describes as the "matrix of domination," in which power is organized through interlocking systems of privilege and oppression (Collins, 1990; Collins and Bilge, 2020).

Qualitative studies provide rich insight into how these dynamics are experienced by individuals. Jackson and colleagues found that mentees often described the importance of "chemistry" with their mentors, a term that encompasses not only interpersonal rapport but also shared values, communication styles, and implicit understandings of what it means to succeed in academic medicine (Jackson et al., 2003). While such chemistry can facilitate deep and supportive relationships, it can also serve as a coded way of reproducing homogeneity, as those who do not fit dominant norms may be perceived as lacking fit or compatibility.

For faculty and trainees from marginalized backgrounds, mentoring relationships are often characterized by a mixture of support and strain. Pololi and colleagues reported that while mentors can help faculty realize their professional dreams, they can also inadvertently impose expectations that reflect dominant cultural and professional norms rather than the mentee's own goals and circumstances (Pololi et al., 2002). Intersectionality theory helps to explain why this tension arises. A woman of color in academic medicine, for example, may face expectations related to gendered caregiving roles, racialized stereotypes, and professional hierarchies simultaneously. A mentor who does not recognize these intersecting pressures may offer advice that is well intentioned but ultimately misaligned with the mentee's lived reality (Collins and Bilge, 2020; Bowleg, 2020).

The concept of cultural humility provides a critical lens for understanding how mentors can navigate these complexities more effectively. Hook and colleagues define cultural humility as an ongoing process of self-reflection, openness, and willingness to learn from others, particularly those from different cultural backgrounds (Hook et al., 2013; Hook and Watkins, 2015). In the context of mentorship, cultural humility shifts the focus from mastering a set of cultural facts to cultivating a stance of curiosity and respect. This is particularly important in academic medicine, where mentors often occupy positions of considerable authority and may be accustomed to having their perspectives treated as normative.

Closely related is the concept of cultural safety, which goes beyond individual attitudes to encompass the institutional and relational conditions that allow individuals to feel respected, valued, and free from discrimination (Curtis et al., 2019). Cultural safety requires not only that mentors avoid overt bias but also that they actively recognize and address the power imbalances inherent in mentoring relationships. When mentors create culturally safe environments, mentees are more likely to share their concerns, articulate their goals, and seek support without fear of being judged or marginalized.

The health equity literature further underscores the importance of these relational dynamics. Jones and colleagues argue that equity-focused strategies must attend both to overall outcomes and to the specific gaps that affect marginalized groups (Jones et al., 2019). In mentoring, this means that institutions cannot be satisfied with aggregate improvements in faculty productivity or satisfaction if these gains are not equitably distributed. Wilkins and colleagues' call for academic medicine to ground its equity efforts in historical awareness highlights how past and present patterns of exclusion continue to shape who has access to mentorship and how it is experienced (Wilkins et al., 2021).

Taken together, these findings reveal that mentorship is a powerful but double-edged instrument. It can open doors, build confidence, and foster professional growth, but it can also reproduce existing hierarchies and leave some individuals feeling unsupported or misunderstood. The integration of intersectionality, cultural humility, and cultural safety provides a framework for understanding and addressing these contradictions, pointing toward a more just and effective model of mentoring in academic medicine.

4. Discussion

The results of this integrative analysis have profound implications for how mentorship in academic medicine is conceptualized, practiced, and evaluated. At its core, the analysis challenges the assumption that mentorship is inherently benevolent or uniformly beneficial. Instead, it reveals mentorship as a socially embedded practice that reflects and reinforces the broader power structures of the institutions in which it occurs. Recognizing this reality does not diminish the value of mentorship; rather, it opens the possibility of transforming it into a more intentional and equitable tool for professional development.

One of the most significant theoretical implications of this work is the need to move beyond a dyadic model of mentorship. Traditional approaches often focus on the relationship between a single mentor and a single mentee, emphasizing interpersonal compatibility and individual skill development. While these elements are important, they obscure the fact that mentoring relationships are shaped by organizational cultures, professional norms, and historical patterns of inclusion and exclusion. Intersectionality theory makes it clear that individuals enter mentoring relationships with different social locations and different degrees of power, which in turn affect what they can ask for, what they are offered, and how their actions are interpreted (Collins and Bilge, 2020; Cho et al., 2013).

This perspective helps to explain why formal mentoring programs, though well intentioned, often fail to eliminate inequities. Formal programs can provide structure and

ensure that everyone is assigned a mentor, but they cannot by themselves dismantle the informal networks of sponsorship and influence that drive career advancement. Cameron and Blackburn's work on sponsorship demonstrates that career success is often determined by who is willing to put their reputation on the line for a protégé (Cameron and Blackburn, 1981). If these sponsorship relationships continue to be shaped by bias and homophily, formal mentoring programs may improve access to advice without improving access to power.

The integration of cultural humility and cultural safety into mentoring practice offers a pathway for addressing these challenges at the interpersonal level. When mentors adopt a stance of cultural humility, they acknowledge that their own experiences and perspectives are partial and that their mentees may navigate the academic world in fundamentally different ways (Hook et al., 2013). This stance encourages listening, reflexivity, and a willingness to adapt one's mentoring style to the needs of the mentee. Cultural safety extends this principle to the institutional level, emphasizing that it is the responsibility of those in power to create environments in which marginalized individuals can thrive (Curtis et al., 2019).

However, it is important to recognize that individual-level changes are not sufficient. The health equity literature emphasizes that structural problems require structural solutions (Jones et al., 2019; Braveman and Parker Dominguez, 2021). In academic medicine, this means that mentoring must be embedded within broader strategies for antiracism, gender equity, and organizational accountability. Wilkins and colleagues argue that academic medical centers must confront their own histories of exclusion and discrimination if they are to become truly equitable institutions (Wilkins et al., 2021). Mentorship programs that ignore this history risk perpetuating the very inequities they seek to address.

The experiences of Black faculty leaving academic medicine, as described by Blackstock, provide a stark illustration of what is at stake (Blackstock, 2020). When individuals feel that their contributions are undervalued, their identities are marginalized, and their career paths are blocked, mentorship alone cannot compensate for an inhospitable institutional climate. Yet mentorship can play a critical role in either exacerbating or alleviating these pressures. Mentors who recognize and challenge inequities, who advocate for their mentees in meaningful ways, and who use their influence to open doors can make a tangible difference in whether talented individuals stay and succeed.

This analysis also highlights important limitations and areas for future research. Because the present study is based on a narrative synthesis of existing literature, it cannot provide direct empirical estimates of how intersectional identities affect mentoring outcomes. Future research could build on this framework by conducting intersectionally informed quantitative and qualitative studies of mentoring in academic medicine, using the methodological tools outlined by Else-Quest and Hyde to capture complex identity interactions (Else-Quest and Hyde, 2016). Longitudinal studies could also examine how mentoring relationships evolve over time and how they interact with institutional changes in equity and inclusion.

5. Conclusion

Mentorship remains one of the most powerful and enduring forces shaping careers in academic medicine. Decades of research have demonstrated its capacity to foster professional growth, enhance satisfaction, and promote scholarly success. Yet this same body of evidence, when viewed through the lens of intersectionality and equity, reveals that mentorship is not a neutral or uniformly accessible resource. Instead, it is deeply embedded in social and institutional structures that distribute opportunity and recognition unevenly.

By integrating mentoring scholarship with theories of intersectionality, cultural humility, cultural safety, and health equity, this article has sought to reconceptualize mentorship as a site of both possibility and power. Such a reconceptualization calls on academic medical institutions to move beyond surface-level commitments to diversity and to engage in the deeper work of transforming how relationships, networks, and opportunities are structured. When mentorship is grounded in reflexivity, justice, and institutional accountability, it can become not only a tool for individual advancement but also a catalyst for collective change.

References

1. Allen, T.D.; Eby, L.T.; Poteet, M.L.; Lentz, E. Career benefits associated with mentoring for proteges: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology 2004, 89, 127–136.
2. Blackstock, U. Why Black doctors like me are leaving academic medicine. STAT 2020.

3. Bowleg, L. Evolving intersectionality within public health: From analysis to action. American Journal of Public Health 2020, 111, 88–90.
4. Braveman, P.; Parker Dominguez, T. Abandon "race." Focus on racism. Frontiers in Public Health 2021, 9, 689462.
5. Cameron, S.W.; Blackburn, R.T. Sponsorship and academic career success. Journal of Higher Education 1981, 52, 369–377.
6. Cho, S.; Crenshaw, K.W.; McCall, L. Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. Signs 2013, 38, 785–810.
7. Collins, P.H. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. Routledge: New York, 1990.
8. Collins, P.H.; Bilge, S. Intersectionality, 2nd ed.; Polity Press: Oxford, 2020.
9. Curtis, E.; Jones, R.; Tipene-Leach, D.; Walker, C.; Loring, B.; Paine, S.J.; Reid, P. Why cultural safety rather than cultural competency is required to achieve health equity: A literature review and recommended definition. International Journal for Equity in Health 2019, 18, 174.
10. Else-Quest, N.M.; Hyde, J.S. Intersectionality in quantitative psychological research: II. Methods and techniques. Psychology of Women Quarterly 2016, 40, 319–336.
11. Finlay, L. "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process and practice of reflexivity. Qualitative Health Research 2002, 12, 531–545.
12. Hook, J.N.; Davis, D.E.; Owen, J.; Worthington, E.L.; Utsey, S.O. Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology 2013, 60, 353–366.
13. Hook, J.N.; Watkins, C.E. Cultural humility: The cornerstone of positive contact with culturally different individuals and groups? American Psychologist 2015, 70, 661–662.
14. Jackson, V.A.; Palepu, A.; Szalacha, L.; Caswell, C.; Carr, P.L.; Inui, T. "Having the right chemistry": A qualitative study of mentoring in academic medicine. Academic Medicine 2003, 78, 328–334.
15. Jones, C.P.; Holden, K.B.; Belton, A. Strategies for achieving health equity: Concern about the whole plus concern about the hole. Ethnicity and Disease 2019, 29, 345–348.
16. Jones, C.P. Addressing violence against children through anti-racism action. Pediatric Clinics of North America 2021, 68, 449–453.
17. Kirsling, R.A.; Kochar, M.S. Mentors in graduate medical education at the Medical College of Wisconsin. Academic Medicine 1990, 65, 272–274.
18. Lee, J.M.; Anzai, Y.; Langlotz, C.P. Mentoring the mentors: Aligning mentor and mentee expectations. Academic Radiology 2006, 13, 556–561.
19. Palepu, A.; Friedman, R.H.; Barnett, R.C.; et al. Junior faculty members' mentoring relationships and their professional development in US medical schools. Academic Medicine 1998, 73, 318–323.
20. Pololi, L.H.; Knight, S.; Dennis, K.; Frankel, R.M. Helping medical school faculty realize their dreams. Academic Medicine 2002, 77, 377–384.
21. Ramanan, R.A.; Taylor, W.C.; Davis, R.B.; Phillips, R.S. Mentoring matters: Mentoring and career preparation in internal medicine residency training. Journal of General Internal Medicine 2006, 21, 340–345.
22. Roch, G.R. Much ado about mentors. Harvard Business Review 1979, 57, 14–20.
23. Rose, G.L.; Rukstalis, M.R.; Schuckit, M.A. Informal mentoring between faculty and medical students. Academic Medicine 2005, 80, 344–348.
24. Sambunjak, D.; Straus, S.E.; Marusic, A. Mentoring in academic medicine. JAMA 2006, 296, 1103–1115.
25. Schapira, M.M.; Kalet, A.; Schwartz, M.D.; Gerrity, M.S. Mentorship in general internal medicine: Investment in our future. Journal of General Internal Medicine 1992, 7, 248–251.
26. Tobin, M.J. Mentoring: Seven roles and some specifics. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine 2004, 170, 114–117.
27. Wilkins, C.H.; Williams, M.; Kaur, K.; DeBaun, M.R. Academic medicine's journey toward racial equity must be grounded in history: Recommendations for becoming an antiracist academic medical center. Academic Medicine 2021, 96, 1507–1512.