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A mentor is someone who allows you to see the hope inside yourself. — Oprah Winfrey
Mentoring is Popular

• One of the most common methods to prevent, divert, and remediate youth engaged in delinquent behavior

• Thought to affect risk for such behavior and closely related problems such as:
  – school failure
  – aggression
  – drug abuse

• For example, over 5000 programs / agencies using in US alone

• It is the centerpiece of the work of the Big Brothers, Big Sisters Clubs of America one of the largest youth serving agency
Mentoring has been Focus of Reviews

- Considered in several reviews
  - Youth development (DuBois et al., 2003)
  - Delinquency intervention (Lipsey et al., 1998)
  - Prevention of adolescent problems

- Of considerable interest to
  - Communities
  - Policy makers
  - Service Managers and Providers
Great Deal of Interest in Using Mentoring and Having Evidence “It Works”

• In 1994 in first review of What Works for Youth Violence Prevention, recognized as having empirical evidence of benefits

• But, also criticized for lack of clarity about:
  – What characterizes mentoring
  – What actually was done in most programs having effects
What Is Mentoring?
Examples of Mentoring Programs

• Converse & Lingugaris/Kraft (2009)
  – High School Students
  – Mentored by Faculty at School
  – 18 week program
  – Relationship Building, Emotional Support. Academic Goals
Examples of Mentoring Programs

• Davidson et al. (1988-1996)
  – Local Youth referred by Court
  – College Students Mentor- Class
  – Match on Gender, Ethnicity, Interests (2 semesters+)
  – Relationship Building, Behavioral Contracting, Community/Criminal Justice Advocacy
Defining Mentoring?

• Provision, through one-to-one relationship
  – T eaching
  – E motional Support
  – A dvocacy
  – M odeling

• These lead to changes in
  – Self Image
  – Attitudes
  – Goals
  – Behavior

• That Then Prevent/Stem Risk
• Mentoring Differs From:
  Psychotherapy
  Skills Building
  Behavioral Training
  Informal Care
  Tutoring

• Paraprofessional or Volunteer
• Limited Training in Formal Skills
• Varies in Length but Usually Year Plus
Determining The Promise of Mentoring for Delinquency and Associated Outcomes

- Substantial number of valid evaluations to consult
- Some writing about what is key processes, important characteristics
- Much practitioner input on how to understand
- Substantial variation in what has been evaluated, albeit with little description to make it clear just what was done
- Limited connection to intervention evaluation knowledge
Systematic Review

- Survey for all published and unpublished studies
- Basic evaluation design- valid comparisons
- Can determine effect size or relative amount of difference made- 0-1+
- Can consider negative effects
Selection of Mentoring Studies

Sources Reporting Research Results
N = 164

Studies with Data on Target Outcomes
N = 46

- Delinquency
  N = 25
- Aggression
  N = 7
- Academic Achievement
  N = 25
- Drug Use
  N = 6

Note: some studies have data on multiple outcomes
Review of Studies

• Quasi-Experimental or Experimental Design Only. QE had to have pretest and some accounting for potential initial differences

• Effects are for Post-test. Follow-up not calculated (few studies)

• Sample Distinctions and Dose Characteristic Effects not Addressed in these Analyses
Coding of Mentoring Components

• When possible, studies were coded for the key processes of mentoring:
  – Teaching
  – Emotional Support
  – Advocacy
  – Modeling

• Evaluations were coded for:
  – Selectivity of Recipients
  – Presence of additional (i.e., non-mentoring) components
  – Monitoring of fidelity
  – Motivation of Mentor (profession or not)
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## Results: Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
<th>Heterogeneity (Q)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size Weighted</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>0.17 - 0.25</td>
<td>102.93***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+$ p < .10$; $* p < .05$; $** p < .01$; $*** p < .001$

Notes: $Q$ is distributed as a chi-square.

Random Effects Models

**Effects range from -.25 to 1.73**
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## Evaluating Moderated Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>SMD PRESENT – SMD ABSENT</th>
<th>Z-test for Moderation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Risk</td>
<td>0.23 – 0.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Risk</td>
<td>0.23 – 0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling/Identification</td>
<td>0.32 – 0.24</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td><strong>0.39 – 0.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.53</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td><strong>0.32 – 0.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.49</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>0.29 – 0.12</td>
<td>1.31+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Interventions</td>
<td>0.31 – 0.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations of Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>0.22 – 0.24</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.42-0.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.94</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Fidelity Checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Check</td>
<td>0.21 – 0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Check</td>
<td>0.29 – 0.20</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p < .10 \] \[ * p < .05 \]
What Makes a Difference?

• Emphasis on Key Processes
  • Emotional Support = Larger Effects
  • Advocacy= Larger Effects
  • Teaching?
  • No Difference for Modeling

• Mentor Motivation is Professional
• Not Different by
  • With Other Interventions
  • Fidelity Monitored
Creating a Mentoring Process Scale

- Set of Items to Measure 4 domains
  - Search of other scales from mentoring, interviews, solicitations
  - Consider other Process Scales
  - Need for Activities Together

- Conceptual Boundaries:
  - Q-Sort
  - Specificity

- Online Survey
- Collaboration with Large Mentoring Organizations
- Validation??
Need Well Designed Studies

- Random Assignment, Growth Measurement over Time
- Protocol Driven Activities, Approach
- Study Focus
  - Part of Program vs. Stand Alone
  - Mentoring vs. Other Efficacious Programming
- Measure
  - Mentor Training
  - Fidelity or Inclusion of Key Activities
  - Mentor Motivation
  - Matching
  - Key Processes

http://campbellcollaboration.org/lib/project/48/