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Abstract

The paper synthesizes the academic research on mentoring and discusses its relevance for the design of labor market integration policies for migrants. The review covers several research fields, including education, management, organizational theory, psychology and economics. From each field, we discuss the outcomes that are potentially relevant to the design of mentoring as an instrument of job search assistance. We also review these results in terms of their contribution to the identification of outcome and control variables that should be accounted for in the evaluations of mentoring programs. In doing so, the paper shows that both specific features of the programs as well as the general context, including human, institutional, financing and political constraints, are relevant in limiting or enabling the effectiveness of mentoring as part of the overall design of migration policies.

1 We are grateful to E. Auriol, J. Bodson, F. Colautti, M. Dewatripont, M. Fourati, P. Francotte, L. Renier, S. Rousseau and R. Schlirf for useful discussions, comments and suggestions. Any misinterpretation or mistake should be blamed on us only.
1. Introduction

In many western countries, the share of migrants in the total population, i.e., people living in a country other than that of their birth, is not negligible. It is over 15% in North America and over 10% in at least half of the European countries. In many cities within these countries, this share is well over 30% (e.g., in Brussels, Berlin or Geneva). This is a recurring sensitive political issue. It has also become a recurring social issue. In Europe, for instance, in 2017, 41% of foreign born people were at risk of being poor. This was almost three times the rate recorded for nationals (15%).

The transitional costs associated with the absorption of large numbers of migrants and their fiscal costs are often perceived by the local population as excessive. They are also often misunderstood. For instance, most countries, media tend to emphasize the short term crisis but fail to explain the longer run payoffs to migration. They also fail to explain how the negative short term effects are often the result of ineffective design of migrants’ integration policies. One of the most obvious indicators of the policy failure is the difficulty of many migrants to join the labor market. In Europe, the 2017 unemployment rate for those born outside the EU was 6.4 percentage points higher than for the native-born population. Their employment rate was only 67% (vs. 73 % for the native-born population). A recent IMF working paper (Ho and Turk-Ariss 2018), on the experience of 13 European countries between 1998 and 2016, implies that the probability of being employed can be quite slow to converge to that of otherwise comparable natives. It can take up to almost a generation to achieve convergence. Moreover, the evolution differs across gender and country of origin, as well as across host countries.

Reconciling these stylized facts with theory should boil down to an explanation of the relevance of differences in the speed at which migrants can be integrated across countries and over time. These differences may be linked to variations in the relative importance of structural and temporary economic characteristics in each country, and sometimes across regions or cities within a country. Indeed, in theory, higher unemployment rates should only be a short term or transitional cost towards a longer term equilibrium situation in which migrants are integrated in society and contribute to the reduction of the risks associated with longer term negative demographic prospects of the host countries (i.e., aging population with longer life expectations,

3 See for instance e.g., Algan et al. (2010) and Alesina et al. (2016) for analytical discussions.
4 People are at risk of poverty is their equivalised disposable income (after social transfer) is below 60% of the national median.
5 The definition of integration can vary broadly across contexts and countries. However, migrant integration may be broadly defined as « The process by which migrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and as groups...[Integration] refers to a two-way process of adaptation by migrants and host societies...[and implies] consideration of the rights and obligations of migrants and host societies, of access to different kinds of services and the labor market, and of identification and respect for a core set of values that bind migrants and host communities in a common purpose (IOM, 2011, p.51). ». See also IOM, 2017.
underfunded pension and health systems and growing job market mismatches). And, in theory again, these transitional costs would be mitigated by well targeted transitional integration policies.

In practice, things are not working out that way. In most countries, the short term costs are often high and tend to become long term costs because national integration policies are failing, as evidenced by the higher incidence of poverty risks mentioned earlier. These policies tend to be slow to deliver labor market integration and too often fail to deliver social integration as well, although this varies across countries. In other words, the heterogeneity in convergence rates identified by Ho and Turk-Ariss (2018) also reflects differences in the design of national integration policies.

The policy failures, and in particular the failures of labor market integration policies, are widely recognized by international organizations. These are often more concerned with detailed institutional and legal dimensions of policy design than national governments. For almost a decade now, the European Commission, the International Labor Organization, the United Nations and the World Bank have been organizing regular events on the topic and produced many policy papers making the case for stronger national efforts to adopt more effective integration policies. Their efforts, and a growing volume of academic research, have produced a large number of policy suggestions to smooth labor market integration. These range from quite focused policies such as the fine tuning of visa status decision processes, the financing of language courses or access to training and professional skills development programs, to broader reforms such as changes in the social welfare system or employment entitlement rules.

In recent years, mentoring has been added to the policy options adopted to ease the integration of migrants. Many European countries, for instance, are considering or implementing, formally or informally, various forms of mentoring programs designed to help migrants as they look for jobs and these programs have been endorsed by the European Parliament. The activities supported by these programs are as diverse as preparing resumes, filling in application forms, coaching for interviews, helping with the follow up to interviews, providing psychological and administrative support, producing job search databases or

---

7 A recent IMF technical note (Jaumotte et al., 2016) quantifies the long term payoffs to migration and finds that finds that it increases the GDP per capita of host economies, mostly by raising labor productivity. A 1 percentage point increase in the share of migrants in the adult population of a country can raise its GDP per capita by up to 2 percent in the long run and the gains appear to be broadly shared. Both high- and low-skilled migrants contribute, in part by complementing the existing skill set of the population.


9 See European Commission (2014; 2019). In the context of refugee integration, see for instance The Adecco Group (2017)

10 For a recent policy oriented review, see Batsaikhan et al. (2018)

11 Recommendations by the OECD also point toward the same direction. They stress that mentoring is highly cost-effective for labor market integration, including through the role allowed to civil society to complement official public administration intervention (OECD, 2017a). Likewise, the UNHCR (2013) has included mentoring in the list of recommendations for the successful integration of refugees.

12 For instance, in 2016, the European Parliament published a study on the strategies and good practices of labor market integration of refugees. Mentoring was described as widely recommended as a way to overcome the obstacles that arise from the reliance of the job-matching process on informal networks that put an important disadvantage on migrants (Konle-Seidl and Bolits, 2016).
organizing targeted language and professional training sessions. Mentoring can thus be seen as just one more form of job search assistance. Although relatively new in the context of migrants’ integration efforts, mentoring has a long record in education (e.g., Wheeler et al., 2010; Wybra et al., 2018) or in workplace management (e.g., Beattie et al., 2014) for instance. This is why it has been analyzed by multiple disciplines, including organizational behavior, management, educational sciences, social psychology, and to a much lower extent, economics.\(^\text{13}\)

This paper has three main purposes. First, we review the large diversity of heterogeneous academic perspectives on the design of mentoring in the context of topics as different as education and workforce management. The discussion covers three dimensions in three separate sections. Section 2 discusses briefly the difficulty of coming up with simple definition of mentoring in view of the difficulty of coordinating the sometimes very different perspectives on mentoring. Section 3 shows how the differences in perspectives reflects differences in mentoring types. It summarizes the main types. Section 4 then takes stock of the diversity of outcomes and of success factors identified by the various research fields to conclude the big picture on what to think through when assessing mentoring from various angles. The second purpose of the survey is to address the policy implications of these studies relevant to the debates on migrants’ integration in the labor market. The emphasis is on the dimensions (i.e., outcomes and control variables) that may enhance or mitigate the impact of mentoring policies for migrants and refugees and should therefore be accounted for in more formal impact evaluations. This is done in Section 4 where we discuss many of the contributions of the various academic fields on mentoring in a synthetic approach highlighting the complementarity of their insights and their relevance to the design of migrants and refugees mentoring programs. The third and final purpose of the survey is to provide specific recommendations for a follow-up multi-disciplinary policy oriented research agenda on the design of mentoring programs focusing on the labor market integration of migrants and refugees.

2. On the challenges on coordinating multiple perspectives

Reconciling the various approaches demands a particular attention to details and context, including human, technical and institutional constraints. These tend to influence both the scope and the limits of mentoring, more so than sometimes recognized in high level policy debates. For example, research shows that mentoring is significantly more efficient when targeted to a vulnerable population (e.g., DuBois et al., 2011). Also, the accumulated evidence suggests that mentoring programs are not easy to export across countries (Preston et al., 2018). For instance, in the context of youth mentoring, several programs imported from the US proved to be largely ineffective in the UK (Green et al., 2014). Since the one-size-fits-all approaches to mentoring are unlikely to deliver value-for-money to authorities and NGOs aiming to help migrants and refugees, it is essential to identify the main contextual determinants of policy effectiveness.

Considering jointly the various approaches also points to the need to recognize that different groups may react differently to the same type of mentoring. Some forms of mentoring

\(^\text{13}\)The importance of including scientific research for the optimal design of mentoring has been recognized for some time. For instance, in the US, Portland State University created in 2010 the Center for Interdisciplinary Mentoring Research for all demographic categories with scholars from many different disciplines. An equivalent effort was recently made in Europe with the birth of the European Center for Evidence-Based Mentoring in 2016.
are more effective for the youth than for older mentees (Card et al., 2010; Caliendo and Schmidl, 2016). Similarly, some can be more effective for low-skilled than for the overall population (Escudero, 2018). Moreover, outcomes appear to be quite sensitive to management and implementation decisions details, such as program supervision or access to sufficient resources for program administration (Escudero, 2018). It is this diversity of insights from a diversity of contexts and outcomes that this survey aims at reconciling and synthesizing into a policy relevant checklist of enablers and impediments in the design of migrant mentoring policies.

In practice, this demands the adoption of a general definition of mentoring which is broad enough to account for all perspectives and which can be used to anchor a very heterogeneous set of concerns. To make the most of the various aspects, Eby et al. (2007) offered an early useful synthetic vision of all of the relevant dimensions from the educational, psychological and management literature. Those most relevant in the context of this survey include the fact that mentoring: (i) reflects a unique relationship between individuals; (ii) involves the acquisition of knowledge; (iii) is defined by the types of support provided by the mentor to the protégé and is outcome-oriented; (iv) is reciprocal, yet asymmetrical, and (v) involve a dynamic relationship, i.e., that evolve over time. From a stricter labor policy perspective, Bozeman and Feeney (2007) offer a useful complement from the organizational behavior research when they define mentoring as “a process for the informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and the psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development; mentoring entails informal communication, usually face-to-face and during a sustained period of time, between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor) and a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé)”.

We try to account for most of these insights while still keeping the concept manageable to analyze it in the labor market and migrants context. To keep our discussion focused on policy, we propose to adopt a definition of mentoring that highlights the main characteristics of mentoring on which policy has some leverage to achieve specific integration goals. More specifically, we define mentoring as “an interpersonal relationship of support, exchange and learning, in which one person (a mentor) invests his or her experience to help another person (the mentee) acquire skills and achieve professional goals, through regular meetings over a certain period of time”. We will use the term mentee as a synonym to protégé often found in some of the social and management literature.

3. How to categorize mentoring types?

To be able to discuss the policy insights provided by the literature on the drivers of success of mentoring and on the proper outcome measures, it is important to highlight the diversity of mentoring types identified by the literature. Each of these perspectives focuses on its own set of outcomes and on its own set of success drivers. While there is a fair amount of overlapping, there is also enough heterogeneity to start with a discussion of the diversity of focuses.

The literature distinguishes between four main types of mentoring of direct interest to labor market integration concerns: youth mentoring, academic mentoring, mentoring to work and
workplace mentoring. They reflect the different stages of a life cycle from the early stages of education up to the point an individual need to make decisions within the organization it is working in. This categorization is quite relevant to the characterization of migrants and refugee population and in particular in the view of the fact that the age distribution of migrants is quite peculiar in this dimension. For instance, according to Eurostat, in 2017, the median age of the total population of the EU-28 stood at 43.1 years, while it was 28.3 years for immigrants to EU-28 in 2017.14 If the payoffs to mentoring depend on age or on the stage of career development, this is an important dimension to account for.

Although it is essential to unbundle the insights from earlier studies of mentoring into these life cycle stages, it is also useful to recognize that there are many common elements to the design of mentoring across stages. Indeed, at each stage, there is a presumption that a supportive relationship between a mentor and a mentee can be designed to foster a positive outcome or to avoid or undo a negative one. Each developmental stage is covered by at least two disciplines which provide often very different but complementary perspective on the gaps that can be addressed by mentoring.

The following overview of the contributions made by researchers focuses on the policy insights only and only discusses methodological issues when they are relevant or raise uncertainty on the robustness of some of the results. The discussion is selective and omits many insights which may be less relevant to the design of migrant mentoring policies and programs than those included.

**Youth mentoring (YM).** A significant share of the literature on YM is anchored into a relatively simple underlying theoretical model. This model suggests that the positive impact of mentoring for a young mentee depends on the strength of the personal connection, which includes mutuality, trust and empathy allowed by YM process. Building trust, empathy and sympathy takes time and this should be factored into any effort to rely on mentoring as an integration tool as recently illustrated by Eddy et al. (2017) in their work on children at risk. This may be the first policy insight to be learned from the YM experiences and we will discuss it more broadly later when we discuss the relevance of the duration and intensity of mentoring in the following section.

The second set of policy insights on YM focuses on more specific process related drivers of program effectiveness. Once the connection between mentee and mentor is established, the positive impact on the development of the young person is likely to come from three inter-related processes but these meet very different mentees’ needs: (i) enhancing the youth’s social relationships and emotional well-being; (ii) improving the cognitive skills through instruction and conversation and (iii) fostering a positive identity development through role-modeling and advocacy (Rhodes, 2005; Rhodes et al., 2006). Each of these outcomes is potentially relevant to the ability of young migrants to integrate in the short and long run into the labor market and should be part of the checklist to be covered by both ex-ante and ex-post evaluations.

In 2011, the US counted over 5,000 programs serving an estimated three million young people (DuBois et al., 2011). There is a lot of informal and anecdotal evidence on their potential impact. However, despite the prevalent argument that mentoring relationships for youth can be

---

life-changing, empirical evidence suggest that the effects are much more moderate in magnitudes (DuBois et al., 2002, 2011; Eby et al., 2013; Tolan et al., 2014). More recent research increased the willingness to provide more robust evidence on this topic. A lot of this evidence is quite relevant to the long term labor market integration prospects in particular with respect to the lasting payoffs in terms of psycho-social dimensions of mentoring designs. For example, Kosse et al. (2016) have shown, through a randomized control trial (RCT), that a one-year mentoring program on elementary school children in Germany had a positive impact on pro-social attitudes such as trust, altruism and other-regarding behavior in everyday life. In Italy, a large-scale RCT providing tutoring and career-counseling to high ability immigrant students was implemented to study the educational choices of children of immigrants (Carlana et al., 2017). The program was successful in decreasing educational segregation. The authors also identified positive spillovers on immigrant’s classmates of treated student while there is no spillover on native classmates. The channel of this improvement seemed to be motivation and the resulting teacher’s recommendation rather than cognitive skills.

**Academic mentoring (AM).** Mentoring in academic and university programs is based on the apprentice model of education where both academic and non-academic support are provided outside the classroom by a more senior member (Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, 2007; Crisp and Cruz, 2009; Eby et al., 2013; Núñez et al., 2013; Crisp et al., 2017). Academic mentoring has recently attracted the interest of economists as well. Most of their research has provided robust confirmations of many of the results provided by the many case studies documented in other fields (e.g., Autor et al., 2016; Card and Giuliano, 2016; Carlana et al., 2017). They often emphasize the policies needed to minimize or correct the ethnic gap in achievement test scores and socioemotional abilities, as these can increase significantly during youth if they are not addressed by the education system. In the context of migrants, this impacts the odds of migrant children to benefit from the social ladder payoffs to education (e.g., Brunello and Checchi, 2007; Guyon and Huillery, 2012; Guyon et al., 2016).

This research shows that AM provides three main insights relevant to the labor market integration of migrants. First, the targeting of the mentoring is important and focusing on language first for instance may be quite rational and have lasting long term effects. For example, Núñez et al. (2013) show that a school-based mentoring program in middle school had a positive impact on academic outcomes such as mathematics and language achievement and an even higher impact on self-regulated learning outcomes (e.g., goal setting, planning, self-monitoring). Second, the nature of the support is important as well and AM can be used to deliver both career-support (such as direct training) and emotional support (such as encouragement). More recent research on AM provides a final insight on the relevance of efforts to rely on alternative forms of mentoring. For instance, Li (2018) and Benton et al. (2018) show that information and nudges can be quite effective approaches to mentoring as well. Behavioral economics, indeed, seems to have been omitted from this policy area despite the evidence of its potential in some related fields, notably education (e.g. Koch et al., 2015 and Damgaard and and Nielsen, 2018)

---

15 The Crisp et al. (2017) is particularly useful to understand the diversity of academic perspectives on a specific target of mentoring.
**Mentoring to work (MtW).** Mentoring to work represents relationships in which the mentor supports the mentee in his or her labor market integration. It generally focuses on migrants but is not restricted to this group. Despite the prevalence of mentoring to work and its growing adoption as a tool for migrant integration into the labor market in practice, its academic analysis is still very recent. However, it already provides a few insights relevant to the design of migrant mentoring. *First,* MtW is only one of many tools to be used in migrant integration efforts. Alone, it will not deliver integration. This is quite obvious from the study of Månsson and Delander (2017) who produce a quite effective review of the Swedish migrant mentoring experience even if not analytically very robust. Moreover, MtW may serve as a complement and not a substitute to existing public services by providing a targeted approach and some specific knowledge of the sector in which the mentee may want to work (Vandermeerschen and De Cuyper, 2018). This is not surprising but serves as a useful reminder to the limits of policy designs ignoring the complementarity of job search support mechanisms.

*Second,* not all MtW relationships work well and there are important success factors. Vandermeerschen and De Cuyper (2018) identified five success factors that are important for the outcomes of mentoring to work for high-skilled immigrants: (i) Matching of mentor and mentees based on the sector of activity; (ii) providing clear guidelines for both the mentor and mentee. This implies a trade-off between a strong framework and the specific needs of the mentee; (iii) a good and systematic follow-up of the relationship; (iv) supervising mentors through good screening and training and (v) knowledge of the target population.

Under these conditions, a mentoring relationship may support the mentee in enhancing different forms of capital. Cultural and informational capital are the most affected by MtW, followed by psychological and economical capital. Social capital is however harder to affect, and mentoring may not always provide the network ties expected by mentees (Vandermeerschen and De Cuyper, 2018).

Third, MtW may be particularly complementary to another specific form of integration policy: language learning. The knowledge of a language is a necessary but not sufficient condition to ease the labor market integration of migrants. Several studies have already assessed its importance. It not only affects the labor force participation (Lochmann et al., 2019), it also helps cut wage differences between migrants and locals (Bleakley and Chin, 2004; 2010) and have long-term impact in terms of labor market integration of the following generations (e.g., Beakley and Chin, 2008). Furthermore, combining language training with mentoring on other dimensions designed to ensure social integration increases the payoffs to language training. This is one of the early lessons for an experiment conducted in Germany and evaluated by Lange et al. (2017). Young male refugees were randomly assigned into participating to a (soccer) project designed to facilitate social and labor market integration. It combined mentoring and language courses and found at least some positive short-term integration effects.

**Workplace mentoring (WM).** WM provides assistance to the mentee in the orientation in the organization in which they work as well as in the socialization in the profession and terms of career advancement. This form of mentoring focuses on helping individuals keep a job and grow into a job. It appears to be as important as finding a job for a successful long run integration. Most of the relevant insights on WM come from organizational and management theory research and benefits from a long track record (see Eby et al., 2013 for an early stock taking).
And it has been analyzed within a wide range of organizations (e.g., in the context of medicine practice, see for instance, Sheri et al. (2018) for a review of the literature from 1990 to 2017).

The result of a meta-analysis of the large number of studies available provides two robust policy relevant insights for the design of labor market integration of migrants (Allen et al., 2004). First, both objective (e.g., compensation) and subjective (e.g., satisfaction) career outcomes need to be considered when measuring the performance of mentoring programs. Second, the evidence shows that objective and subjective career outcomes can be achieved through both career-oriented mentoring and psycho-social mentoring. There is however only mixed evidence on the matching of outcomes with the type of mentoring. In other words, contrary to what is sometimes concluded from anecdotal evidence, there is no solid statistical evidence of a stronger correlation between objective outcomes and career mentoring on the one hand and subjective outcomes and psycho-social mentoring on the other hand. Finally, how effective mentoring is depends on the mentor’s ability. Unless this ability is assessed, shaped and maintained, the payoffs to WM are unlikely to meet expectations.

4. On the diversity of expected mentoring outcomes and their drivers

Section 3 has shown that a large variety of academic disciplines cover the study of mentoring over a large variety of life-cycle stages. One feature they all have in common is that they consider both the outcomes on which mentoring may have an impact and which factors moderate or drive these effects. This section reviews these outcomes and drivers across all disciplines and mentoring types. It tries to synthetize the significant diversity of expected outcomes from mentoring also noted in large audience discussions of mentoring. This diversity of expectations is positive in many ways, but it also makes it hard to come up with an encompassing view of outcomes and at the possibility of trade-offs involved. For instance, improving the odds in labor market integration may imply having to give up on some other expectations.

Since the paper focuses on the migrants, we focus on the evidence available to support or question the hopes placed on various forms of mentoring for labor market integration. Not all of the evidence is as statistically robust as desirable but almost all of it is quite insightful in many other ways. We also try, to the extent possible, to categorize them into dimensions of the design of mentoring and control variables than may influence the outcomes. In doing so, we address psycho-social, technical and institutional factors. To keep the discussion to reasonable proportions, we focus only on the specific factors that seem to be driving the effectiveness of mentoring programs from a migration policy perspective.

To do justice to as much as possible to this very heterogeneous literature, we organize the synthesis as follows. We start with the mentees, the “demand side” of the mentoring market. We focus on the expected outcomes and on the mentee’s characteristics that can affect the mentoring effectiveness. This provides rich insights to a large extent because it has been covered by several disciplines which all take their own views of what mentees should expect from mentoring. The list of outcomes corresponds to the many ways in which mentoring can help individuals in general but it can relatively easily be extrapolated to the needs of migrants at

\[16\] e.g., Petrovic (2015)
various stages of their life. The diversity of vision is also quite useful from a policy perspective as it provides a more precise idea of the wide range of impacts mentoring can have but also of the difficulty of delivering on all of them with an excessively standardized approach to mentoring. Choices will have to be made and this will be more efficient and fairer when they are better informed by a diagnostic of needs based on a sound awareness of the list of possible needs.

To complement the demand side perspective, we summarize next the literature on the supply side: i.e., the mentors. We start by reviewing the more modest literature on the impact of mentoring on the mentors and on the way they see the role of mentoring. This highlights an often underestimated aspect of the effective design of mentoring programs. We then focus on the characteristics of the mentors that are important in the success of mentoring relationships. For analytical purposes, this provides an additional set of “control variables” when assessing the extent to which specific mentoring programs are leading to the desired outcomes for specific mentees.

The rest of this section discusses these demand and supply perspectives in that order. This is followed by a review of the relevance of two other main drivers of effective mentoring: i.e. the effective matching between mentors and mentees and the duration and the intensity of the mentoring relationship. The section concludes with a summary of some of the limitations noted on mentoring programs as well as possible substitutes. In each section, we try to organize the information into categories which can be useful to produce a checklist of dimensions to be considered in ex-ante and ex-post evaluations of mentoring programs.

4.1 The mentee’s perspective

The insights on mentee cover a broad range of mentee’s concerns. They include the expected outcomes but also a few important lessons on the relevance of the context and on personal characteristics of the individuals expected to benefit from mentoring. These insights can be classified into those relevant to expected outcomes and those characterizing the mentees.

With respect to expected outcomes, the first insight is that they can and should vary across mentees. Eby et al. (2008) take a cross-disciplinary perspective to suggest a number of outcomes types that could improve with mentoring at all stages of their educational, personal and professional development:

- **Behavior**: Enhance a positive behavior (including performance and achievement in tasks, helping others,...) or reduce a negative behavior (such as drop-out or substance use)
- **Attitudes**: Situational satisfaction, sense of commitment or career attitudes (such as expectations, satisfaction or perceived opportunities)
- **Emotional and health-related outcomes**: Psychological stress or self-perceptions.
- **Motivation**: e.g., aspiration, commitment, time spent on the pursuit of a goal...
- **Interpersonal relations**: e.g., trust, communication, relationship quality, positive peer relationships...
- **Career-orientation**: Skills development or career recognition and success.
Second, the number of outcomes types considered can itself influence the ex-ante and ex-post evaluations of the potential or actual impacts of mentoring. The omission of some outcomes may bias the conclusions of an assessment. For instance, Card et al. (2010) show that studies based on the duration of registered unemployment are more likely to find positive short-term impact than studies based on direct labor market outcomes such as employment or earnings.

Third, the effects of mentoring across outcomes are not homogeneous across mentees. Larger effects are found in the mentee’s attitudes than in behavior, health or career-outcomes. This may suggest that attitudes are features that change more rapidly. Indeed, many studies assess only the very short term impact of mentoring. Larger effect sizes were also found for AM and WM mentoring than for YM (Eby et al., 2008).

With respect to the importance of the mentee’s characteristics and of the context that need to be accounted for in the design of mentoring and evaluations, the following three characteristics seem to dominate the discussions and evaluations.

The first relevant dimension is the stage of the life-cycle of the mentee. The outcomes of mentoring for a mentee seem, indeed, to differ in a few essential ways across the various life stages. This reflects the evolution of the relative importance of specific forms of mentoring over time. Failing to target the outcomes of mentoring to match those corresponding to the expectations of a mentee at the stage he/she is at, an impact evaluation is likely to point to an underperformance. In other words, the measures of success in terms of specific outcomes should be different at each stage (Eby et al., 2008; 2013).

The second relevant dimension is the mentees’ psychological capital. This is clearly shown by Baraniik et al. (2018) in an overview of a large number of studies. This capital can easily explain the integration difficulties in countries as diverse as the Netherlands and Greece (Pajic et al., 2018). For many individuals, it is particularly important to also account for past and present exposures to risk, since the more an individual suffers from pre-existing difficulties, the more he/she will benefit from mentoring (DuBois et al., 2011). Similar conclusions emerge from the academic mentoring literature as well. For instance, Rodriguez-Planas (2012, 2017) analyzes a randomly designed program that offers mentoring (complemented with various group activities) during 5 years for high school students in the US, the Quantum Opportunity Program (QOP). This program is designed to provide an incentive to enroll to post-secondary education or training and to reduce risky-behavior. Students with the worse ex-ante bad peers’ networks were more likely to benefit from the program.

Third, the gender of the mentee may matter as well. Cheung and Phillimore (2016) find, in an analysis of the UK 2005-2007 Survey of New Refugees, that neglecting gender in integrations programs resulted in significant gender differences in outcomes. Refugee women in the sample were less well integrated among refugees in the UK in terms of language, self-reported health, ability to budget for household expenses and access to formal social network. A similar bias resulting from apparent gender neutrality was observed for Syrian refugees in Turkey by Knappert et al. (2018). These authors linked the de facto gender bias to a replication by the host countries of the gendered roles prevailing in the home country.

When these biases are anticipated, research has identified a number of dimensions and contexts along which female migrants may be benefiting more from mentoring than male
migrants: (i) female mentees are indeed more likely to benefit from investments in long lasting relationships. Blau et al. (2010) and Li (2018) show that mentoring can help female labor market prospects, closing gender gaps in labor market integration efforts. One explanation is offered by Rhodes et al. (2008) in YM when they show that girls reported more initial difficulties in the parental relationships confirming the importance of bad initial conditions notes by DuBois et al. (2011). In addition, the relationships of female mentees with mentor outlast those of boys and they are more sensitive to lasting relationships than boys; (ii) similarly, female mentees who did not experienced ex-ante difficulties do not necessarily benefit from reduced segregation as a result of mentoring. Carlana et al., (2017) show that, in Italy, a mentoring program increased the probability of male migrant students enrolling into an academic or technical high-school, compared to a vocational one and closed the gap with the natives in terms of grade retention. Female students were not affected, but they exhibited similar choices and performance of the natives in the absence of the program; and (iii) female mentees enjoy higher level of psycho-social support in an organizational context (O'Brien et al., 2010). However, these authors find no difference between men and women mentees in the reported impact of career-related support.

4.2 The mentor’s perspective

Mentoring can also impact the mentor. The meta-analysis produced by Ghosh and Reio (2013) points notably to the positive career benefits for mentors in organizations. Mentors are more satisfied with their jobs and committed to the organization. Moreover, specific types of mentoring have different impacts on these career prospects for mentors. For instance, career mentoring is more associated with career success, psycho-social mentoring with commitment to the organization and role modeling with job performance.

In addition, there are insights pointing towards specific mentor’s characteristics that will influence how the mentoring relationship may have an impact on the mentee. Any of these should be considered in the design of mentoring programs for migrants.

First, the awareness of the personal mentoring costs to the mentors may influence the intensity of their commitment to mentoring and hence to its effectiveness. Despite the potential career and more personal payoffs, mentors are also aware and concerned by the associated challenges (Billet, 2003). In a one-year long study in a large manufacturing plant some of the mentors reported important difficulties in finding the time for the tasks and the low level of support and acknowledgment by the management. Mentors’ reactions should not be ignored as they influence the type of mentoring they are willing to contribute to. Weinberg and Lankau (2011) show that mentors end up learning to use their time more efficiently to optimize the personal and organizational payoffs and this includes favoring psycho-social support and role modeling over vocational support.

Second, and related, the specific expected outcomes should influence the choice of mentors. Mentoring has differentiated impacts on mentees depending on the outcomes of interest. Plus, the effectiveness of mentoring depends on the specific mentors’ qualifications and this should be integrated in the recruitment of mentors. Organizational theory provides additional suggestions which may be important to control for, in both ex-ante and ex-post evaluations (Smith et al., 2005). First, it shows that mentors characteristics can influence the extent to which mentoring will be effective. The respectability sub-scale (honesty, integrity and high moral
standards) matters the most, followed by the sensitivity sub-scale (empathy, compassion, genuine) and wisdom is ranked as less important than the two previous scales in general. The results show that a same mentor characteristic can influence two outcomes in different ways. For instance, wisdom matters more in terms of skill development while sensitivity matters more for psycho-social support. Second, context matters. For instance, the specific characteristics of a mentor can influence the effectiveness in mentoring differently in different sectors. This is one of the conclusions reached by Smith et al. (2005) when they find that in the traditional armed forces, the sensitivity was ranked as least important compared to business and academic contexts. Matching the supply with demand is also essential in the mentoring market as discussed in more details in the next section.

Third, picking mentor according to their attitude and experience may also make sense in some contexts. In the context of YM, mentors with positive attitudes toward their mentees and mentors with successful assistance experiences have been more likely to establish strong relationships with their mentees. A high self-efficacy and the ability to model relevant behavior is also valued. Concerning previous mentoring experiences, there is no clear consensus since on the one hand it increases experience in the helping role but on the other hand, it can influence future expectations and lead to frustration or disappointment (Finnegan et al., 2010; Raposa et al., 2016).

Fourth, the gender of the mentor matters; men and women tend to be more effective with respect to different types of mentoring. Men, who are more likely to serve as mentor, are likely to be focusing more on career support while women provide more psycho-social support in workplace contexts (O’brien et al., 2010). Matching of genders may make a difference as well based on a meta-analysis of 70 programs (Raposa et al., 2019). For mentees populations dominated by male youth, a higher share of male mentors (or mentors with a helping profession background) has higher effects. Finally, differences in perspectives between migrants and host country population on gender issues can be reduced by relying on gender mixing in the staffing of mentoring teams. For instance, one component of a program aiming at preventing violence against adolescent girls was evaluated in a refugee camp in Ethiopia. It consisted of sessions with female mentors. By randomizing access to this program, Stark et al. (2018) show that, although the program had no direct effect on violence, it changed both gender attitudes and social support networks. The specific staffing of a mentoring program can thus make a difference to a key component of labor market integration for migrants.

Finally, the inherent skills or occupational background of an individual, of course, matter as well. But various studies show that these qualities can be enhanced through training and other forms of coaching and need to be sustained by a strong support system to the mentors as well as a proper supervision of the relationship (e.g., DuBois et al., 2002, 2011; Foster and Finnegan, 2014; Johnson and Gandhi, 2015; McDaniel and Yarbrough, 2016; Foreningen Nydansker, 2017, Kupersmidt et al., 2017). Accounting explicitly for the extent to which mentors have been trained, supported and supervised to deliver on their mandate should be accounted for in any evaluation.

Any of these general observations is relevant to the mentoring of migrants. In addition, the opportunity to work with migrants may provide other types of incentives to mentors and influence outcomes. For instance, Young et al. (2018) show that the behavior of nationals functioning as
mentors can be enhanced by the need to be involved in mentoring. Based on a quasi-experimental design testing diversified mentoring relationships between primarily white, management students' mentors and newly resettled refugees in the United States, they find that this type of mentoring, even of short duration, may be powerful in increasing cultural intelligence and empathy of mentors.

4.3 Matching mentees and mentors

Evidence also suggests that mentoring programs should not only account for the specific individual characteristics of the mentor and the mentee as individuals. This is where the matching between these two groups of actors intervenes.

DuBois et al. (2011) and DuBois and Karcher (2014) or MENTOR (2013) show that, generally, across mentoring types, matching mentors' and mentees' educational or occupational backgrounds can improve the effectiveness of a mentoring program in very different settings. This is well documented in the education literature (e.g., Izadinia, 2016, for a recent survey) and in the workplace literature (Singh et al., 2009; Ragins, 2012). And the importance of matching has also been documented in a work environment, for instance by Bimrose and McNair (2011) for an early, but still very relevant, stock-taking. Among these studies in organizations, Feeney and Bozeman (2008) find that same-gender relationships led to more network ties. Similarities also matter to the impact on youth with physical disabilities. Matching these young people with a disabled mentor rather a mentor with no disability makes a statistically significant difference (Sowers et al., 2017). But it can actually sometimes be harmful when matching based on physical abilities delivers matches that differ according to other important characteristics such as age, profession and expectations (Heppe et al., 2019).

In the case of migrants, Crul and Schneider (2014) find that mentoring of young students with an immigrant background by students in higher education with a comparable migrant background can further improve cognitive gains, self-esteem and self-reliance. But it seems that both cross- and same-culture mentoring show potential to promote positive acculturation and school engagement among first-generation of immigrants and refugee youth. The cultural understanding coming from same-culture relationships might lead to a stronger connection with the youth. However, cross-culture relationships might help the youth in adapting to new behavioral and institutional norms (Oberoi, 2016).

Unfortunately, at this stage, the overall evidence on the differences between same- and cross-culture or demographic relationships is too limited to draw general conclusions. In many cases trying to focus on the match between mentees and mentors according to cultural or background similarities was not effective. For instance, Kanchewa et al. (2014) cover a case in which gender-matching had no impact on mentoring for young boys. Gaddis (2012) confirms in that race-matching had no effect on mentoring outcomes for youth. Blake-Beard et al. (2011) describe a case in which matching mentees with mentors of their own gender or race for students in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) was only successful from an emotional perspective as mentees reported having received more help than without mentoring, especially for women and student of color. But this did not translate into better academic outcomes. Similar mixed results are observed in a workplace setting by Hilmer and Hilmer
They find no difference in initial job placement and early-career research productivity between female students working with female or male advisors among economics PhDs.

One possible explanation is that the relevant similarities may be more subjective than based on culture, race or demography (Mitchell et al., 2015). For instance, Neuwirth and Wahl (2017) evaluate the impact of a program providing mentoring for migrants in Austria. Their assessment, conducted through an online questionnaire, covers career functions, psycho-social functions, program satisfaction, quality of the received training and program efficiency. They find that even though, there was no correlation between objective similarity (i.e. racial or cultural) between mentor and mentees, the perceived subjective similarity (i.e. similarity of interests) positively and significantly affected the evaluation of the program by the mentees. Similarly, the perceived similarity within the match is found to increase self-efficacy among entrepreneurs (St-Jean et al., 2018).

Overall, the emerging picture is that the most obvious similarities (e.g., culture, age, education or race) are not enough to explain what drives effective matching. They may matter and often contribute to the effectiveness of mentoring but there are too many mixed results not to assume that some omitted dimensions may also matter to explain the observed mentoring effectiveness heterogeneity. The effort to come up with successful matching demands more detailed assessment of the relevant similarities. These assessments should go beyond basic demographic features such as gender, race or nationality. This is consistent with the case made for more detailed compatibility assessments made by DuBois et al. (2011). And it includes the need to consider that recent research on reducing discrimination in organizations shows that mentoring that put people of different backgrounds and identities into contact and ideally in collaboration with each other, leads to lower biases (Dobbin and Kalev, 2016; Dobbin et al., 2015). This also hints at the relevance of the fact that integration is a two-way street in which migrant workers and employers need to learn to live with their differences.

One way of identifying the missing dimensions to account for is to consider other ways in which mentees and mentors can feel similar. On this also, Eby et al. (2013) provide rich insights in their interdisciplinary survey. They suggest distinguishing between three concepts of similarities (i) surface-level similarity (e.g., gender or race); (ii) experiential similarity (e.g., education, job tenure or geographic location) and (iii) deep-level similarity (e.g., attitudes or beliefs).

Most of the experiments reviewed earlier in the paper focus on the first two types of similarities. But the third one may be just as important and may cover many of the omitted dimensions need to explain the heterogeneity of outcomes resulting from matching focusing on surface and experiential similarity only. For instance, deep-level similarity is associated with an increase in the perception of both psycho-social and instrumental (i.e. goal-oriented) support. This is largely about establishing trust. Betting on experiential and surface level similarities to design matching is less reliable on this dimension. This does not imply that matching on the other forms of similarities is ineffective. For example, experiential similarity is more likely to be useful to provide more technical, pragmatic or other forms of instrumental support rather than psycho-social support.

Finally, on top of the personality match between the mentor and the mentees, the mentoring program should also monitor the relationship. For instance, clear boundaries to the
relationship are important (Foster and Finnegan, 2014) and the goals of the relationship should be jointly agreed by both the mentor and the mentee (Rhodes and DuBois, 2006; Wise and Sait, 2008; Foster and Finnegan, 2014), keeping in mind that setting too many goals might lead to discouragement and giving-up by the mentee (KPMG, 2013).

4.4 Mentoring duration and intensity.

It should not be surprising that mentoring duration (total length of the relationship) and its intensity (the frequency and length of meetings during the relationship) influence both the mentoring program effectiveness and its costs. Their importance as success drivers can have budgetary and staffing implications which should be considered. Rationing on either dimension tends to have an impact as seen in evidence across mentoring types, but rationing may not be the only limiting factor since the frequency with which mentors and mentee can see each other and the availability of mentors also makes a difference. For example, in workplace mentoring, longer relationships are shown to increase both inside and outside network ties (Feeney and Bozeman, 2008). The evidence also suggests that the choices on duration and intensity need to account for a wide range of characteristics of the individuals involved to be as effective as they should be. For instance, the effects of gender, perceived similarity or mentoring type decrease with the duration of mentoring. In other words, specific characteristics matter less in longer relationships (Turban et al., 2002; Allen and Eby, 2003).

YM provides some of the most general insights of direct relevance to the design of mentoring for migrants to smooth their entry into the labor market. The evidence on the success drivers for YM has recently been reviewed by Crisp et al. (2017).\(^{17}\) On duration, for instance, Grossman and Rhodes (2002) provided early evidence that the effects on youth outcomes were progressively greater for longer relationships, and, conversely, relationships that terminated within 3 months had negative impacts on outcomes such as self-esteem. But increasing duration is not sufficient to deliver results. Raposa et al. (2019) actually find that for a sample of 70 programs that shorter meetings yielded larger payoffs.

The literature suggests that the expectation about duration may actually matter more than the duration per se. Indeed, if youths know ex-ante that the relationship is supposed to be short-term, they are prepared for it and depersonalize the relationship termination. This may reduce the duration needed for mentoring to be effective (DuBois et al., 2011; McDaniel and Yarbrough, 2016).

Although many assessments are not statistically very robust, as explained by Crisp et al. (2017), there is a growing volume of research relying on quite solid impact evaluations techniques. For instance, the Friends of the Children program was evaluated over the first 5 year of an ongoing RCT. The evaluation showed that providing children with professional mentors who were hired full time to take the time to build up relational skills delivered significant positive effects (Eddy et al., 2017). The authors show that these conclusions are similar to those reached in the volunteering literature.

\(^{17}\) This importance is also illustrated by its inclusion in MENTOR (2009), a hand-book of evidence-based elements for effective practice of youth mentoring and puts a strong emphasis on the importance of managing the closure of the relationship.
Many of these academic reviews already have a policy impact in some countries. The New Zealand Government (2016) produced its own survey of various meta-analysis that covered youth mentoring to show that if mentoring is given to a high risk group of young people, then for every 12 young people given mentoring, on average, one less will re-offend. Most show that the more successful programs were those in which the mentor and mentee spent the more time together at each meeting and who met at least once a week. However, longer duration did not lead to better outcomes maybe because of difficulties in recruiting high-quality mentor for a longer period (Jolliffe and Farrington, 2007).

Cross-disciplinary perspective confirms that interaction frequency matters but just as importantly, it shows that it is positively correlated with a wide range of payoffs to mentoring. This includes the mentee’s perception of instrumental support, psycho-social support and relationship quality. These payoffs tend to be higher for the frequency dimension than for the relationship duration (Eby et al., 2013). The combination of perceptions and duration matters in other ways as well. For instance, Neuwirth and Wahl (2017) looked at an Austrian program specifically aimed at labor market mentoring for migrants and evaluated mentored migrants’ perceptions in an online questionnaire. The perceived similarity between mentee and mentor is strongly correlated with a positive evaluation. The longer the relationship duration is, the higher is the payoffs in terms of several outcomes.

Ultimately, duration and intensity clearly are two dimensions to account for in both ex-ante and ex-post evaluations of mentoring programs. But the ways these are accounted for and the ways they are measured may influence the assessments since it seems that subjective individual perceptions tend to matter at least as much as objective measures.

4.5 Discussion

This large variety of research provide quite a specific set of (i) outcomes that can be improved by mentoring and (ii) dimensions that can influence the efficacy of mentoring interventions. Appendix A1 presents a list of different types of outcomes presented by different researchers. The different types of outcomes can be categorized as the acquisition of specific skills, the accumulation of certain types of capital or other realized outcomes. This classification is interesting in two main ways. First, it highlights that mentoring programs can achieve various purposes. It is therefore important for a program to explicitly define its goals. Program evaluations should also take this into account to provide outcome measures that are in line with the program objectives. For example, if a mentoring program aims at increasing the information and cultural capital of newly arrived migrants, evaluating its impact by the hourly wage of the individuals may fail capture potential payoffs. Second, both the acquisition of skills and capital might be seen as a first step in the causal chain toward the realization of a specific outcome. However, this step does not always need to be neither necessary nor sufficient. For example, if the final goal of a program is to improve career outcomes, targeting cognitive skills might be one way of doing so. However, for some individuals this may not be necessary, if they have cognitive skills but lack information capital for instance. In other cases, this may not be sufficient, for example if an individual would gain from improved cognitive skills but still faces other important barriers. All these considerations should be taken into account when setting up and evaluating a program and this may explain why targeting the mentoring to the specific needs of the individuals might lead to better outcomes.
Besides the emphasis on the outcomes achieved through mentoring, policy oriented research should clearly discuss the factors that influence the odds of achieving these outcomes with at least as much attention. Appendix A2 reviews the list of factors that have been raised in the literature to matter on the mentoring relationship. They are classified along six dimensions: (i) mentees’ characteristics, (ii) mentors’ characteristics, (iii) the matching between mentees and mentors, (iv) the mentoring relationship, (v) the mentoring program and (vi) integration policies in general. All these factors may influence the impact that the mentoring may have on the mentee. For example, the gender of the mentee may affect some outcomes. Other factors are necessary conditions for a program success, for example, setting up a good training for the mentors is a crucial factor of an effective mentoring. Some of these factors may even have an impact on the influence of these factors. For example, the length of the relationship is found to decrease the influence of other characteristics such as gender or perceived similarity between the mentor and the mentee (Turban et al., 2002).

In the design of mentoring programs, as well as in their evaluations, several of these factors should be accounted for to ensure the efficacy of mentoring interventions. They form the embryo of a checklist that could be used in the design of ex-ante and ex-post evaluations. These insights are summarized in Table 1. An “X” marks the cases for which we have identified at least a correlation between the desired effect and a specific design characteristic in the survey we have conducted. What the table may not reflect well enough is that the many detailed experiences covered by the survey also point to the need to remain realistic about the intensity of the impact that mentoring policies and programs as currently implemented can have. In some cases, there are opportunities for improving the quality and rigor of mentoring practices and in many others, mentoring may simply not as effective as possible, because mentoring may simply not be a sufficient tool. Labor market integration depends on many more legal, institutional, economic and political contextual dimensions which we have not addressed in the survey.

Despite its limitations, the table provides two additional types of insights. The first is that there are links for which the evidence is not yet available or not robust enough to be reported. This is what the many boxes in which there is no “X” reveal. These gaps define a fairly basic research agenda. A more thorough research agenda would also look into the degree of complementarity and substitutability between the various design options for the various intended mentoring outcomes. And it is likely that digging a bit further into the experience of mentees and mentors through more precise questionnaires would identify additional dimensions regularly omitted from many of the papers reviewed for this survey. Clearly, there is still some way to go to be able to rely on exhaustive program and policy evaluations in the context of mentoring programs for migrants, in particular in the context of labor market integration goals.

The second insights implied by Table 1 is that the diversity of dimensions that need to be accounted for in the design of mentoring is so broad that its effectiveness is likely to be strongly correlated with the extent to which the mentoring is individualized. This observation is increasingly well internalized by some of the countries trying to make the most of the potential payoffs to mentoring and willing to allocate enough budgets to have an impact. For instance, in Denmark, asylum seekers are set personal goals (such as language skills) and duties and job

---

18 See Appendix A3 for the methodology used to construct this table.
centers assessing whether it is relevant to provide a mentor to refugees on a case-by-case basis. Mentors give “personal, social and practical support in connection with virtually all forms of employment promoting activities, as long as it is deemed that the help of the mentor is crucial in order to obtain or retain employment”. Personal assessments of the needs and abilities of the person determine the number of hours of support that may be granted. The maximum length of support is generally six months, with the possibility of extension. In addition, several local NGOs provide mentoring schemes for refugees and asylum seekers. Mentorship schemes are one of the standard tools of Danish active labor market policies and are not only restricted to refugees (Madsen, 2016). Similar efforts were made in Sweden where the Establishment Plan (Etableringsplan) ensures that newly arrived migrants will receive individual guidance to help and support them in the job search and with questions related to studies, social issues or Swedish society in general (Anxo, 2016). In other countries, these insights are internalized by NGOs and other members of civil society instead and sometimes by the private sector even if most of these programs are still, at least partly, funded by the public sector (Petrovic, 2015). In Belgium, for instance, the mentoring is largely conducted by NGOs. For instance, the organization Duo for A Job matches youth between 18 and 33 years old with a migration background with volunteers over 50 on the basis of their professional sector. The main focus of the matching of this NGO is thus the assistance in the career path but in the process it deals with many of the other non-cognitive dimensions that need to be addressed to improve the odds of finding a job.

A notable gap in Table 1 is the discussion of budgetary allocation and of the costing of the mentoring compared to other options. This has been mostly addressed by international organizations (e.g., OECD; 2017b or Westerby; 2018, 2019) rather than by academic researchers so far. The diversity of experiences however suggests that different countries have very different perspectives on how much to allocate and as to how to use it. According to OECD (2017b), the cost for processing and accommodating asylum seekers is estimated around 10,000€ per application for the first year. But it can be much higher if integration costs are included. The differences across countries in budgetary allocations, netted out of the €10,000 common cost estimate provide a rough indication of the differences in the resources allocated to integration. For instance, in 2016, in Germany, the total allocation was about 18,000€, in Sweden 37,000€ while in the US it was about 20,000€ (22,000 US$). This means that a first order approximation of the per capita integration ranges from 8,000€ in Germany (where migrants have become a source of political tension) to 27,000€ in Sweden (which is considered to be best practice in terms of integration efforts).

More research is clearly needed on the actual costs of migrant integration and its various components. And it is particularly important to be able to assess the extent to which integration fails can be linked to underfunding. For instance, in some countries (or regions when integration policies are decentralized), the budgets allocated to learning the language are just enough to support a month of intensive training. Few individuals are likely to be able to learn a language well enough to be proficient in a work environment in only a month. In some countries, budgets have been allocated to improve the targeting of migrant mentoring at the individual level. This is the case in Denmark or Sweden for instance.
# Table 1: Existing evidence on interactions between between (a) mentoring program and policy design and (b) monitorable payoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design interventions</th>
<th>Monitorable payoffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and psychological state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the mentor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous mentoring experience</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal traits</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the mentee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on population at risk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the matching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived similarity</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface level matching</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender matching</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential matching</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural matching</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep-level matching</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching on the interest</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined goals</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined boundaries</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the mentoring program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit between the educational or occupational background of mentors and goals of the program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening the mentors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training the mentors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of the relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the target population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target and differentiate mentoring according to mentee type</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include psycho-social support</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On integration policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine mentoring with other forms of job search tools and reforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure program financial viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusions

The overview delivered by this paper points to an impressive diversity of detailed insights on mentoring produced by researchers across very different academic fields. But it also shows that this research suffers from a few limitations to guide the design of mentoring migrants to allow their better integration in the labor market of their host countries around the world. First, there is surprisingly very little statistically robust research focusing specifically on this policy concern. Second, a large share of the research on mentoring in other context has focused on the American experiences and most of it on youth or academic mentoring and to mentoring within organizations. Only a small proportion deals with the entry into labor markets. Since economic, social and political contexts and the matching of cultures are so important to the effectiveness of mentoring and integration, more research is needed on the experience of other regions, in particular Europe and Asia. Third, many, if not most, of the general insights on mentoring come from the identification of correlations rather than full impact evaluations focusing on causality between the specific characteristics of mentoring design and the outcomes observed and ignoring the relevance of many essential control variables. This reduces the reliability of policy conclusions that can be drawn from the available evidence. Fourth, very little of this research has focused on the value for money of the resources allocated to mentoring migrants and refugees has not benefited yet from significant evaluations. Since fiscal constraints continue to be an issue and the competition for public resources is likely to grow with other demographic changes (i.e. aging), the need to have a better sense of the drivers of the relative cost effectiveness of the various options for the design of mentoring should probably be included also in the research agenda.

The odds of being able to address those needs for additional research has recently increased as a growing number of databases are now available from various international organizations (e.g., the EU and the IMF) and various national governments (e.g., the UK, France, Germany, Sweden or the US) and as a large number of NGOs are now releasing data intensive annual reports on their experiences. This data has already allowed a few solid analytical assessments (e.g., the various IMF papers cited in this survey) but a lot more is possible to deliver formal tests of many of the partial conclusions reached in research less anchored in formal statistical evaluations of policy and program design options.

The policy payoffs to the investigation of the mechanisms around job search mentoring of migrants are hard to overestimate in the current political and social context described in the introductions. The poor integration of migrants and the need to address the associated policy failures deserve to become a priority in the agenda of national authorities in many countries, in particular in Europe. And this should add to the academic attractiveness of the research agenda.

This will not always be an easy exercise. Besides the variety of outcomes that need to be identified and sometimes ranked, there are other important factors that have been seen to matter in mentoring relationships. First, as emphasized in the survey, many of the key drivers are quite subjective and measuring requires surveys including questions which are typically not being asked as part of household or employer surveys for instance. Second, some dimensions quite be quite politically sensitive. For instance, asking people about their religion can be illegal in some countries, and yet discrimination against some religion can be a factor in some
countries and hence influence the odds and speed of convergence of unemployment rates between some migrants and that of the rest of the population. Third, each program has very specific characteristics, in terms of the target population, the objectives, the type and duration of mentoring, the integration with other forms of support, the size of the organization, the stakeholders or the funding opportunities. Little is known about the importance of each of these characteristics. Fourth, budgetary data is not always as transparent as it should be to ensure accountability and to allow assessments of value for money. And fifth, mentoring is only one many of the policies that can influence integration. Legal flexibility for instance may be just as important. The way visas are granted and the speed of naturalization may be just as important in some settings. For instance, a study of otherwise similar immigrants to Switzerland who narrowly won or narrowly lost their naturalization referendums shows that receiving Swiss citizenship strongly improved long-term social integration (Hainmueller et al., 2017).

The challenge should be stimulating as it can rely on multiple methodological approaches to produce different perspectives based on different ways of using data and sometimes generating new data. Natural or quasi-natural experiments are increasingly being used to identify ways in which there might be nudging into smoother cultural, social and labor integration. New data sets are making it easy to address identification issues in the econometric treatment of data. And new surveys are producing new case studies which can be treated more carefully to move from correlation to causality in the assessment of mentoring programs and policies. These approaches should make it easier from now on to generate more evidence on the impact of mentoring as a way to ease the labor market integration of people with a migration background.
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## Appendix

### A1. List of outcome variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Skills</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Human capital</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economical capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Others realized outcomes</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and psychological state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors, based on Eby et al. (2008); Rhodes et al. (2006) and Vandermeerschen and De Cuyper (2018).

### A2. List of control variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mentee</strong></th>
<th><strong>Matching</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mentoring program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Surface level: age</td>
<td>Mentor screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Surface level: gender</td>
<td>Mentor training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental stage</td>
<td>Surface level: other</td>
<td>Relationship supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td>Experiential level: migration background</td>
<td>Definition of goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Experiential level: education</td>
<td>Definition of boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor</strong></td>
<td>Experiential level: sector</td>
<td>Knowledge of the target population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Experiential level: other</td>
<td>Flexible mentoring depending on the mentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Deep-level: religion</td>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Deep-level: beliefs and attitudes</td>
<td>Type of support offered (instrumental vs psycho-social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Deep-level: other</td>
<td><strong>Integration policies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attitudes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Relationship</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other form of job search assistance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal traits</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Budget allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has previous mentoring experience</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Source: authors, based on the papers reviewed in Section 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3. Construction of Table 1

The paper included in the construction of Table 1 are:

Allen et al., 2004; Blake-Beard et al., 2011; Blau et al, 2010; Carlana et al., 2017; DuBois, 2011; Eby et al., 2013; Eddy et al., 2017; Konle-Seidl and Bolits, 2016; Feeney and Bozeman, 2008; Foreningen Nydansker, 2017; Gaddis, 2012; Heppe et al., 2019; Hilmer and Hilmer, 2007; Joliffe and Farrington, 2007; Kupersmidt et al., 2017; Lange et al., 2017; Li, 2018; Madsen, 2016; Mansson and Delander, 2017; McDaniel and Yarbrough, 2016; Mitchell et al., 2015; Neuwirth and Wahl, 2017; Oberoi, 2016; Raposa et al., 2016; Raposa et al., 2019; Rhodes and DuBois, 2006; Rodriguez-Planas, 2017; Sowers et al., 2017; St-Jean et al., 2018; Tolan et al., 2014; Vandermeerschen and De Cuyper, 2018; Wise and Sait, 2008

Notes:

- Social capital includes network ties,
- Health and psychological state includes perceived quality of mentoring,
- Experiential matching includes sectoral/field based matching.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design interventions</th>
<th>Monitorable payoffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and psychological state</td>
<td>Positive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the mentor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors with previous mentoring experience</td>
<td>Raposa et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal traits</td>
<td>Raposa et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the mentee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the matching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived similarity</td>
<td>St Jean et al., 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface level matching</td>
<td>Eby et al., 2013; Hespe et al., 2019; Blake-Beard et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender matching</td>
<td>Blake-Beard et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential matching</td>
<td>Eby et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep-level matching</td>
<td>Eby et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of the relationship</td>
<td>Eby et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined goals</td>
<td>Rhodes and DuBois, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined boundaries</td>
<td>McDaniel and Yarbrough, 2016; Crul, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the mentoring program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit between the educational or occupational background of mentors and goals of the program</strong></td>
<td>DuBois, 2011; Raposa et al., 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening the mentors</strong></td>
<td>DuBois, 2011; Raposa et al., 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of the target population</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target and differentiate mentoring according to mentee type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include psycho-social support</strong></td>
<td>DuBois, 2011; Eby et al., 2013; Tolan et al., 2014; St Jean et al., 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On integration policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combine mentoring with other forms of job search instruments and reforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure financial sustainability of such programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>