



**Big Brothers Big Sisters
of America**

ONE-TO-ONE MENTORING

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prepared by Keoki Hansen, Director, Research and Evaluation
March, 2007

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	2
CBM Impacts	
General.....	2
Academic Impacts.....	5
Behavioral.....	5
Social Emotional.....	6
Special Populations.....	6
SBM Impacts	
General.....	7
Academic Impacts.....	10
Behavioral.....	10
Social Emotional.....	11
Special Populations.....	11
Effective Practices	
General.....	13
CBM.....	16
SBM	18
Special Populations.....	19
References.....	22

Introduction¹

The following is a review of research related to one-to-one mentoring in community-based mentoring (CBM) and school/site-based mentoring (SBM) programs in both Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) and non-BBBS programs. The report is separated into six different sections: CBM Impacts; SBM Impacts; General Effective Practices; CBM Effective Practices; SBM Effective Practices; and Effective Practices in Special Populations. The review includes reports published in peer review journals, edited chapters, dissertations and unpublished program reports. The type of report is noted in each summary: PR-peer reviewed, D-dissertation, BC-Book Chapter, PE-program evaluation report and UP-unpublished manuscript.

This literature review reflects the increasing amount of mentoring research that has been carried out in the past 10-15 years. The studies consistently find a broad range of positive outcomes from both community-based and school/site-based mentoring. Outcome areas include attitudes, academics and socio-emotional behaviors with various youth populations. The literature continues to explore the extent and depth of these outcomes, though it is clear that programs using identifiable positive program practices regularly yield higher outcomes in the youth than programs that are not well-run.

This report is intended as a tool to provide a better understanding of the mentoring research literature, to help improve program practices and to better make the case for BBBS mentoring to supporters. The review is a working document and will be regularly updated to include recent reports on mentoring programs. Any questions concerning the review or the research articles cited should be addressed to Keoki Hansen, keoki.hansen@bbbs.org.

I. CBM Impacts

Key Findings:

- Improvements/increases in:
 - Academic Performance
 - Positive attitude toward school
 - Parental Relationships
 - Relationships with Peers
 - High school graduation

- Decreases in:
 - Alcohol and drug use
 - Hitting
 - Skipping school

¹ A special thank you to Sara Blanchard and Tanya Sorensen who worked diligently as work study students, assisting in the gathering and summarizing of the research articles in this summary. In addition, several people reviewed this literature review and provided feedback, thanks to Dale Blyth, Joyce Corlett, Barbara Kimmel, Joseph Radelet, John Schwoebel, and Marc Wheeler.

➤ Dropping out of high school

Article Summaries:

General CBM Impacts

- Tierney, Grossman, and Resch (1995). The most extensive and widely known mentoring impact report was conducted by Public/Private Ventures (PPV) in the 1990's. The study resulted in four main reports—an analysis of program practices; volunteer recruitment and screening; building relationships in youth programs; and impacts of the BBBS CBM program. This randomized, nationwide study involving over 1,000 youth found that Little Brothers and Little Sisters, compared to controls were 46% less likely to begin using illegal drugs; 27% less likely to begin using alcohol; 52% less likely to skip school; and 37% less likely to skip class. Another way to state the findings is that they found for every 100 youth between the ages of 10-16 who start to use drugs, only 54 similar youth who have a Big Brother/Sister will start using drugs, or, for every 100 youth between the ages of 10-16 who skip school, only 48 similar youth who have a Big Brother/Sister will skip school. Additionally, they found that Little Brothers/Sisters, compared to the control group, were more confident in their schoolwork performance; had modest gains in their grade point average; felt more competent about doing their school work; were able to get along better with their families; were more trusting of their parents; were less likely to lie to their parents; and had better relationships with peers. These results pertain to Big Brothers Big Sisters mentoring programs which follow the BBBS National Standards. PR
- Rhodes, Grossman, & Resche (2000). This study was a secondary analysis of the BBBS CBM Impact Study (P/PV), examining the effect of mentoring on academic performance. They found mentoring had a direct effect on scholastic competence and attendance. Additionally, they found improved global self worth, school liking (positive attitude toward school) and grades, but these effects were mediated through improved parental relationships. In other words, the mentoring relationships positively impacted parental relationships, which in turn improved global self worth, school liking and grades. This suggests that some mentoring effects are due in part to the positive effect of mentoring in improving parental relationships. PR
- McKinney, Paten, and Smith (1999). This study examines the long-term effect of mentoring on youths' lives. Two hundred former Little Brothers between the ages of 24 and 57 that had a Big Brother/Sister for at least a year were interviewed. They found that the average number of years of formal education completed for these former Little Brothers/Sisters was 14 years, exceeding national average of formal education. Ninety-one percent of participants indicated that they were employed at the time of the interview and not receiving public assistance. This contrasts with their parents, of whom 57% were on public assistance during the Littles childhood. The median income was \$30,000 with a range of \$0- \$100,000. Additionally, 75% of the former Littles reported their Big was very helpful and 19% somewhat helpful. PE
- McLearn, Colasanto, Schoen and Shapiro (1998): McLearn and colleagues surveyed

over 1,500 adults who had mentored at least one youth between the ages of 10 to 18. They found that mentoring programs were reaching at-risk youth, with 80% of youth having one or more stressors in their lives and about 50% having poor relationships with their family members. Mentors reported that they felt they helped alleviate youth's negative feelings about themselves, helped youth avoid skipping school, helped them avoid getting in trouble in and out of school and helped them decrease their substance abuse. However, only a third of the mentors felt they helped the youth with poor relationships with their families. Additionally, the researchers found that mentors, who spent time with their mentees doing a variety of activities, were more effective than those who reported only limited types of activities. Furthermore, mentors in relationships lasting two or more years reported feeling they helped much more than mentors in relationships lasting less than two years. PR

- Turner and Scherman (1996). This study focused on the effect of mentoring on boys between the ages of 7 to 15. They found boys with Big Brothers had higher self-concepts, reported higher ratings of physical appearance and popularity and felt less anxious compared to a similar group of unmatched boys. PR
- BBBS of Canada (1994). BBBS of Canada conducted an evaluation of the long term effects of participation in mentoring on Little Brothers. Six-hundred-twenty-nine former Little Brothers were surveyed between the ages of 16 and 33. Of the total sample, about 32% percent had graduated high school, 14.2% completed some college, and 15.3% graduated from college. When looking only at Little Brothers between the ages of 20-24, 84% of former completed their high school education, compared to 61% of the general population in that same age range. Similarly, 80% of former Little Brothers between the ages of 25-34 graduated from high school compared to 59% of the general population in that same age range. PE

Academic Impacts from CBM. Specific academic benefits are shown in this small study.

- Thompson & Kelly-Vance (2001). This study was an evaluation of a BBBS community-based program and compared the academic performance of twelve boys who received mentoring to thirteen boys who did not. They found that the participating boys had significantly higher reading (6 point increase vs. 1.1 decrease) and math scores (4 point increase vs. .9 decrease) on a standardized academic achievement test, than the comparison group after nine months of program participation. PR

Behavioral Impacts from CBM. These two studies show that mentees avoid a variety of risk behaviors.

- Keating, Tomishima, Foster and Alessandri (2002). The focus of this article was on a mentoring program involving youth at-risk of juvenile delinquency or mental illness. They found that youth with mentors had improvements in their behavioral competencies and decreases in behavioral problems as reported by both teachers and parents on the Child Behavior Checklist, while a comparison group of youth on a waiting list showed no improvements. For example, mothers of mentored youth reported they were less likely to be demonstrating destructive behaviors toward

themselves and others and teachers reported less behavioral problems in school. PR

- Beier et al. (2000). Beier and colleagues examined the difference between adolescents who reported an adult mentor in their life, compared to those adolescents who didn't report a mentor. Adolescents with mentors were significantly less likely to ever carry a weapon, use illicit drugs in the past 30 days, have sex with more than one partner in the past 6 months, or smoke 5 or more cigarettes per day, compared to those adolescents that didn't report a mentor in their lives. PR

Social-Emotional Impacts from CBM. This article shows effects on the Big Brothers though not on the Little Brothers.

- Hines (1988). Hines examined the effect of a year of BBBS mentoring on the self esteem of Big Brothers and Little Brothers. Though they did not find any significant differences in the pre- and post- self esteem scores in the Little Brothers compared to a comparison group, they did find significant increases in self esteem scores for the Big Brothers. The researcher suggests that volunteering to be a Big Brother may provide psychological benefits. PR

Special Populations of Mentors and Mentees in CBM. Positive impacts from mentoring are shown for teen mothers, youth in the juvenile justice system, African Americans, and children in foster care.

- Osterling and Hines (2006). Osterling examined a program designed to help foster youth transition from foster care to adulthood through mentoring. Mentors and foster youth reported their relationship was most like that of a friend, was trusting and understanding and very important. Youth reported that their mentors helped them to be more open with their feelings, have a better understanding of their emotions and also be less angry. Furthermore, they felt their mentors helped them with independent living skills, such as finding a job, opening a bank account, saving money and finishing their education. However, the authors reported that foster youth should be matched with a mentor as early as possible, because after 18 the foster youth were often not interested in having a mentor. Also, mentors felt the need for more help with resources to assist the youth with independent living skills. For example, having access to a resource coordinator, a resource directory and information on how to fill out the common forms foster youth need complete. PR
- Rhodes, Haight, & Briggs (1999). This was a secondary analysis of the data collected in the BBSS CBM Impact Study (P/PV), focusing on youth in foster care. Rhodes and colleagues found that foster children who were mentored reported improvements in prosocial behavior (e.g. would your friends agree to do a favor for you if you asked?) along with self esteem, compared to control youth in foster care; these youth showed declines in these areas. Additionally, it was found that youth in relative foster care fared better than those youth in nonrelative foster care. PR
- Jones-Brown (1997). The authors examined mentoring as a possible juvenile delinquency prevention strategy. Though they felt that mentoring was not a magic bullet, current findings in mentoring research, such as decreases in alcohol and drug use and improvements in academic areas, indicates that mentoring programs can

make a positive impact on youth in the juvenile justice system. They also felt that the research literature indicated that hastily designed and implemented programs, however, run the risk of failure. PR

- Musgrave (1997). Musgrave examined the effectiveness of a community-based mentoring program that served youth aged 13 to 17 in a rural community. The author conducted 45 minute structured interviews with the youth, who had been in matches between 6 months to a year. The mentored youth reported improved attitudes toward school, increased school attendance, improved grades, improved relationships with family and friends and better control of their anger, sadness and disappointment. In addition, he found several traits of effective mentors. For example, it was important that mentors were good listeners, were trustworthy and honest and they helped solve problems and were there for their mentees, but only if asked. Also, a good sense of humor and positive attitude helped in the development of the relationship and making the youth feel comfortable. D
- Zippay (1995). A study of low income teen mothers showed that when paired with a professional female mentor, their social networks were broadened, which provided them with increased opportunities for employment, education, and training. PR
- Jones, Bibbins and Hendersen (1993). The authors examined the impact of African American male mentors (mostly alumni of African American fraternities) on predominantly middle school aged mentored boys. The mentors felt they had a positive impact on the youth, that they served as a deterrent to crime, and improved the mentees' quality of life. PR

II. School/site-based Mentoring (SBM) Impacts

Key Findings:

- Improvements/increases in:
 - Academic Performance
 - Positive attitude toward school
 - Relationships with Peers
 - Grade Promotion
 - High school graduation
- Decreases in:
 - Bullying/fighting in school
 - Unexcused absences
 - Tardiness
 - Substance Abuse

Article Summaries:

General SBM Impacts

- Herrera et al. (2007). The BBBS SBM Impact study, a randomized, nationwide study conducted by Public/Private Ventures, involving over 1,000 youth, will be issued in late spring/early summer of 2007.

- Karcher (2005b). Karcher examined the effect of an SBM program utilizing high school mentors on mentees after six months of program participation. The program was designed to promote children's development by facilitating connectedness. He found that mentees showed an increase in connectedness to school and parents compared to a similar group of nonmentored youth. In addition, he found that changes in mentees' self-esteem, social skills and behavioral competence were related to mentor attendance at mentor/mentee activities. Mentees with mentors who consistently met with them showed positive increases, whereas mentees with inconsistent mentors, showed declines in self-esteem and behavioral competence. PR
- Portwood, Ayers, Kinnison, Waris, and Wise (2005). The authors examined a YouthFriends SBM program. They found that mentored youth had an increase in their sense of school membership, compared to a comparison group. Additionally, students performing poorly at the beginning of the program had increased community connectedness, goal setting, and academic performance, compared to the comparison group. PR
- King, Vidourek, Davis and McClellan (2002). King and colleagues conducted an evaluation of the Healthy Kids Mentoring Programs, which was a 5 month SBM program for 4th grade students focused on relationship building, increasing self esteem, improving goal setting and helping with academics. They found increases for the mentored youth, based on pre and post test data, in self esteem and positive connections with peers, family and school. They also found significant decreases in depression symptoms and the youth's occurrences of bullying or fighting. PR
- Dennison (2000). Elementary school-aged youth were paired with upperclassmen in high school and were tutored in various subjects. Mentored youth had increases in self-esteem, were more likely to be "on-task" in the classroom, and had increases in positive attitudes toward school. In addition, for the subjects youth were tutored in, there was a significant increase in grades, for those tutored subjects. PR
- BBBS of SW Idaho (1999). In this study researchers examined Littles enrolled in a BBBS SBM program. They found that enrolled youth had improvements in self-esteem, academics, peer relations, and school attendance after a year of participation. Additionally, they showed these improvements regardless of volunteer type (i.e., high school student or adult). PE
- Curtis and Hansen (1999). This study was an evaluation of school-based mentoring programs at five BBBS agencies. After a year of program participation (8 months or longer), mentored youth had significant improvements in attitude toward school, significant decrease in unexcused absences, and significant increase in grades in language, science, social studies and overall GPA when comparing the first quarter of the school year to the end of the school year. Additionally, 60.5% of teachers reported that participating youth had increases in relationships with adults, 64.8% reported improvements in self-confidence and youth were less likely to be held back a grade. However, they didn't find significant increases in grades for youth matched less than 8 months. PE
- Matzenbacher (1999). Utilizing randomized treatment and control groups, Matzenbacher examined a mentoring program serving at-risk elementary school students with college students. After a semester of involvement in the study, mentored youth showed improvement in self-esteem and perceived self-confidence,

compared to the control group. Additionally, teachers reported a decrease in behavioral problems for the mentored youth. However, no effects on the mentored youth's empathy, perceived physical, cognitive competence or locus of control were found. D

- Terry (1999). In this study, youth ages 7-11 were mentored for a school year once a week for 45 minutes. The youth reported that they liked spending time with their mentor, they could count on their mentor and they learned new things. All the mentees wanted to continue in the program the next year. Mentors also reported that they enjoyed the program and that they had more respect for educators. All the mentors expressed a desire to continue in the program. PR
- Powers & McConnor (1997). Researchers examined Project SOAR, a mentoring program for at-risk middle school and high school students. Ninety-five matches participated in the study. Mentored youth reported increases in attendance and decreases in suspensions after a year of program participation. Additionally, mentored youth reported improved self confidence and self-esteem, and said they were more likely to consider going to college. PE
- Opinion Research Centre (1995): Comparing pre and post data, principals, social workers and teachers reported improvements for the mentored youth in the BBBS of Canada SBM programs. Teachers rated the youth high in personal improvement and general improvements. The youth reported increased self-esteem, happiness, and popularity. However, greater improvements were mostly found for youth in longer matches. PE
- Sidoruk (1995). Sidoruk conducted an evaluation of the Big Brothers of Canada school-based program in eight inner-city schools, involving 90 youth. When comparing performance before the start of the mentoring relationship and after at least of five months of mentoring, he found that youth had significant gains in overall self-esteem, happiness/satisfaction, self-reported popularity and a reduction in anxiety, compared to a group of similar nonmentored youth. PE
- Abcug (1991). This study evaluated the Teachers Achieving Success with Kids (TASK) mentorship program, which was designed to improve the attendance, discipline, academic achievement and attitudes of at-risk middle school students. Results indicated a significant improvement measuring pre and post data, in attendance, discipline and academic achievement among the targeted population, as well as a positive change in attitudes about school. UP
- Rowland (1991). This study was an evaluation of a SBM program serving youth at risk of not completing high school, as determined by the school district. The mentors were adults in the community and the youth were in grades 1st through 5th. The majority of teachers and parents reported the mentor was able to help the mentee in expressing themselves verbally and in writing, helping them to read, increasing their self-confidence, improving their ability to listen and sense of responsibility. In addition, over 70% of teachers and parents reported that in general the mentors were able to help a great deal. One teacher commented about a student that "Because of having a mentor, this was my most improved student." Furthermore, 100% of the mentors reported enjoying the mentoring program. However, they did not find any differences in grades, discipline referrals or attendance, when compared to a group of similar non mentored youth. D

- Seidl (1982). Seidl evaluated behavioral outcomes for youth with Big Sisters compared with those waiting for a Big Sister. Referrals for the program were made by the youth's teachers, and with the referrals teachers included a list of areas in which they thought the youth needed improvement. Seidl found that girls with Big Sisters were more likely to improve in the areas listed by the teachers than girls in the control group. PR

Academic Impacts in SBM. Impacts include academic performance and attitudes.

- Herrera (2005). Herrera examined SBM in three BBBS agencies. She found that the mentored youth had improvements in classroom behavior, social skills and peer relationships, fewer visits to the principal's office and less fighting. She also found improvements in school engagement and school liking (positive attitude toward school). However, the majority of findings were only for youth in matches lasting longer than 9 months. PR
- Nakkula (1999): This study was an evaluation of youth enrolled in a BBBS SBM program. Youth involved in the program showed increases in their GPA, compared to a comparison group of non-mentored youth. Additionally, they found that lower achieving students tended to have greater gains than higher achieving students, and in spelling and science, boys had larger grade improvements than girls. PE
- Starks (1999). This study assessed the effectiveness of a mentoring program on the academic achievement of at-risk youth in a California School District. Participants were 61 high school students matched with a mentor, and 61 high school students who did not have a mentor. Mentored students had significantly higher grade point average, reading test scores, language, and attendance compared to non-mentored students. D
- Slicker and Palmer (1993): In this study, eighty-six 10th grade students were divided into two groups, mentored and control. The mentored groups, because of ethical issues, were the ones most at-risk for dropping out. They found that 100% of effectively mentored youth (those who followed program guidelines on frequency of meetings) returned to school the following year, whereas only 74% of the ineffectively mentored youth (those who didn't follow guidelines on frequency of meetings) and 69% of non-mentored youth returned to school the following year. PR

Behavioral Impacts of SBM. These two studies show impacts on at-risk behaviors.

- Rollin, Kaiser-Ulrey, Potts, & Creason (2003): This study evaluated a program in which at-risk eighth graders were matched with community-based mentors in an employment setting. The mentored youth, compared to a control group of non-mentored youth, had a decreased number of days suspended, days of sanction, and infractions committed on school property. PR
- Cavell (2001): In this study the researchers examined a program where aggressive youth were enrolled in a mentoring program. After participation in the program parents reported decreases in the youth's aggression. Additionally, youth with positive beliefs about their mentor were less likely to endorse positive beliefs about aggression. PR

Social-Emotional Impacts in SBM. Impacts include new friends, sense of responsibility, self control, cooperation, appreciation of diversity, self-efficacy and aspirations.

- Muscott, O'Brien & College (1999): The authors examined an after-school mentoring program for children with behavioral or learning disabilities. The mentors were college and high school students whose goal in the program was to build friendships with the youth and introduce a character education curriculum. Mentees reported making new friends, were better able to understand the importance of responsibility, self control, cooperation, teaching, and appreciation of diversity. The youth enjoyed making new friends and learning about character. PR
- Lee and Cramond (1999): This study involved 130 youth participating in a mentoring program. They examined the effect of a school-based mentoring program for economically disadvantaged youth in three areas: self-efficacy, aspiration and possible selves. The program had a positive effect on youth's level of aspiration for those youth matched more than a year. PR
- Plucker (1998): Plucker examined whether school-based mentoring affected aspirations. He found that students developed higher aspirations when matched with adults who modeled good problem solving skills and high achievement. PR

Special Populations of Mentors or Mentees in SBM. Positive outcomes are demonstrated in these studies where mentors include older volunteers and the military, and where mentees include those with mental illness, are at-risk of dropping out of high school, are disabled, Latino, or are in the criminal justice system.

- Anderson, Lipman, and Mills (2006). This evaluation examined a program aimed at helping children with moderate emotional-behavioral difficulties through mentoring at a community recreation facility. They found the program was able to engage the youth, and participants reported high levels of satisfaction. Youth reported more engagement in recreational activities, such as swimming and gymnastics along with increases in art activities and hobbies. Additionally, parents reported increases in emotional-behavioral functioning. The author concluded that the program was a promising strategy to reach youth with mental health problems. However, additional evaluation studies need to be conducted, which include a comparison group. PR
- Diversi & Mecham (2005). Authors examined an after-school mentoring program matching Latino(a) youth who had problems in school performance with Caucasian mentors. The mentored youth had increases in GPA from the first to third trimester and the increase was maintained over the course of two school years. Mentors helped bridge the communication gap with the youth's teachers and assisted the youth in having a better understanding of homework assignments. Additionally, program coordinators reported that the mentored students were less likely to get in trouble in school. PR
- Aseltine (2000). This study examined the Across Ages program over three years where volunteers are over age 55. They found that mentoring was associated with lower levels of problem behavior and substance use and higher levels of self-

- confidence, self-control, cooperation, and attachment to both the school and the family. Students receiving mentoring reported lower levels of alcohol use. PR
- Taylor & Dryfoos (1999). This was an evaluation of the Across Ages mentoring program, where middle school youth are matched with older adults. They found that the mentored youth had increased attitudes toward school, the future, and elders. Also, they reported less substance abuse. PE
 - Holland (1996). Holland evaluated Project 2000, a school-based mentoring program for African American boys in inner city elementary schools. He found that youth in the mentoring program, compared to similar nonmentored youth, had significantly higher GPAs and test scores. Additionally 85% of the boys in Project 2000 were at or *above* grade level in most subjects. In contrast, 85% of the boys in the control group *below* grade level in most subjects. PR
 - Rogers and Taylor (1997). This study examined the effect of elder mentors on youth outcomes. They found youth with elder mentors had better attitudes toward school, the future and elders, increased feelings of well being, used drugs less frequently and had better reactions to stress and anxiety compared to controls. PR
 - O'Connor (1995): O'Connor examined a mentoring program focused on preventing high school juniors from dropping out of high school. After 20 months of participation, mentored youth were significantly less likely to drop out than a comparison group. Furthermore, the only mentored youth who did drop out, went on to get her GED with the support of her mentor. In addition, mentored youth had increased school attendance and self-esteem. D
 - Peterson (1994). Peterson conducted an evaluation of the Intergenerational Linkages Program, which provided mentors over the age of 55 to elementary aged youth in schools. Parents of the Littles reported significant improvements in the youth's academic capabilities, academic strengths, grades, self confidence and self motivation. PE
 - Blum and Jones (1993): This study evaluated the effects of a site-based mentoring program, called REACH, which targets teenagers at high risk of dropping out of high school. Teenagers in the program met in small single-sex groups with a Big for eight weeks. The group sessions lasted a class period and in each session each member of the group set a reasonable academic goal to meet for the following week. There was no improvement in school attendance, but there was a decrease in F's and D's and an increase in C's and B's for the group participants. PR
 - Haas & Haas (1993): Researchers evaluated a program designed to prevent juvenile delinquency by matching at-risk youth, who had been referred to the prosecutor's office after their first arrest, with adult mentors. After six months of program participation, they found mentored youth, compared to similar non-mentored youth, had a substantial drop in self-reported delinquency. Additionally, 79% of the mentored youth were not rearrested, as opposed to 67% of the comparison group who were not rearrested. PE
 - Ferrier (1991). This study evaluated a SBM program utilizing mentors from a military base, serving at-risk elementary youth. After a school year of mentoring, Ferrier found significant gains for mentored youth in reading, composition and mathematics compared to a similar group of non-mentored youth. Additionally, teachers and mentors reported increases in self concept for the mentored youth. Furthermore, teachers reported that though the program increased their workload; the

positive benefits experienced by the students, outweighed the increased workload. Teachers were also more positive about community involvement in the schools. Mentors felt the program had a positive effect on their personal life, they had a more positive view of their public school, and a better understanding of the obstacles schools need to overcome to serve their community's youth. D

- Moccia (1989): This study examined a program designed to assist disabled youth through mentoring with the goal of helping them through their second half of high school and promote goals after high school. Ninety-five percent of the mentored youth graduated from high school, compared to 78% of a similar group of nonmentored disabled youth. Also the mentored group was more likely to pursue a post secondary education, than the comparison group and was more satisfied with their high school education. Furthermore, after two years of high school they were less likely to be unemployed and more likely to have a driver's license and a car than the comparison group. PR

III. General Effective Program Practices

Key Findings:

Programs are found to create closer relationships and/or stronger impacts when the following practices are followed:

- Training for mentors:
 - Training mentors in relationship building and background on special populations of youth that they may work with, such as youth with incarcerated parents.
 - Expectations:
 - Specify expectations for frequency of contact between mentor and mentee
 - Successful mentors expect the beginning of a mentoring relationship will be one-directional, with the mentor needing to take the lead. Successful mentors are realistic about possible slow response from the mentee in the first year, about changes that will result from the match and consider even slow progress in the format of the relationship an accomplishment. On the other hand, mentors who begin their relationships expecting to transform their mentee are typically disappointed.
- Supports to mentors to get through the challenges.
- Monitoring of program effectiveness
- Careful recruitment, screening and matching
- Parental involvement
- Use of "relationship quality" as an interim outcome by which to measure which practices are most successful

Article Summaries:

- Cavell and Smith (2005). Based on their review of the literature, the authors recommend that programs should pay close attention to terminations and try to link program practices with results in reducing match terminations. The authors

recommend collecting data on the type of mentoring relationships, closeness of mentoring relationships, consistency of matches meeting, the type and amount of training received before the match, and training received during the match relationship and tracking this data in relationship to match termination rates. BC

- Dubois & Silverthorn (2005): The authors examine the role of natural mentors using data collected from the Add Health study. They found that mentoring relationships with non familial mentors were related to better outcomes in education/work, problem behavior, and physical health compared to youth with mentoring relationships within the family. Further, they found that greater reported closeness in relationships was predictive of positive outcomes. Additionally, they found that mentors in “helping” professions such as teachers or counselors had a more positive effect on the youths’ outcomes than those not in a helping profession. Furthermore, as found in other studies, the length of the relationship was also related to positive outcomes. BC
- Keller (2005a): Keller proposes a systematic model of mentoring as a representation of the interpersonal relationships that arise from the mentor-child relationship. He suggests that mentoring impacts will be enhanced when case workers, parents and mentors work together. From examination of the research, Keller concludes that this type of model suggests a broader view for researchers on examining mentoring programs. For example, exploring the relationships between all four of the mentoring participants; mentee, parent, mentor and case manager. PR
- Keller (2005b). Keller discussed important characteristic of successful mentors. Keller found that similarity of mentors and youth’s interest is important when making matches. Additionally mentors’ expectations are a key to successful and lasting mentoring relationships. Successful mentors expect the beginning of a mentoring relationship will be one-directional, knowing that they need to take the lead in the relationship by focusing on the youth. Additionally, successful mentors have realistic expectations about the type of changes they will see in the beginning of the relationship and they are happy with even small improvements. In contrast, mentors who expect significant changes in their mentees, in a short time period, are typically disappointed. Studies suggest that in the beginning of a mentoring relationship, mentees can be uncommunicative, distrustful and unreliable. Therefore, it is important for mentors to understand that this is common and for the program staff to be supportive and provide positive feedback and training. BC
- Nakkula and Harris (2005). The researchers discussed the importance of relationship quality and the measurement of relationship quality in mentoring programs. They recommend that all mentoring programs have a collection of relationship quality measures as standard practice in the program infrastructure. Additionally, programs should use the results found from the relationship quality measures to shape program practices. BC
- Barron-McKeagney, Woody, & D’Souza (2001): For Latino(a) children mentored with parental involvement from their mothers; there was a positive increase in self-reported social skills, a decrease in problem behaviors, and a positive change in the mothers’ perception of their children. Indicating the possible importance of working with parents in programs serving Latino(a) youth. PR
- Rhodes (2005). Rhodes reviewed the mentoring literature and found that program practices that brought about closer relationships between the mentor and mentee and

more impacts in the mentees include; training for mentors; offering structured activities; having high expectations for frequency of contact between mentor and mentee; and monitoring of overall program implementations. Additionally, careful recruitment, screening and matching are also important program practices to ensure quality mentoring programs. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that adolescents who are overwhelmed by social or behavioral problems may benefit less from mentoring, than those less at-risk. These youth appear to have more difficulty sustaining relationships and may have little experience with behaviors that establish and maintain closeness and support (Lynch and Cicchetti, 1997). Moreover, Rhodes reported that mentoring programs that seek out parents have greater success in shaping youth outcomes. BC

- Spencer & Rhodes, (2005). The authors examined different approaches to helping volunteers build stronger mentoring relationships. They recommend training volunteers in relationship building, as well as giving them a background on special populations of youth that they may work with. They noted that research indicates basic relationship skills can be taught and this should be incorporated into the program training. Additionally, they recommended that for programs working with special population youth, such as youth with incarcerated parents, should create special training to ensure the mentors receive information about the issues the youth are coping with and any types of particular stresses or relationship styles of the youth in these groups. BC
- Stukas and Tanti (2005). The authors discuss ways to help in recruiting and sustaining mentors. They recommend using existing members in the agency's social network to help with delivering recruitment messages—such as mentors, board members, and family members of mentees. Additionally, it may be helpful to use messaging that focuses on the benefits mentoring has for mentors. Though focusing on benefits is helpful, it is also important to discuss the possible difficulties that can happen in developing a mentoring relationship and the supports the program offers to help handle these difficulties. BC
- Weinberger (2005): Weinberger discussed the issues mentoring organizations need to consider when developing a mentoring program. Based on her experience and her review of the research, she found that parental involvement increases the likelihood of an impactful mentoring relationship. Also, it is important to recognize mentoring partners, honor funders and organizations that sponsor programs. BC
- Spencer (2004): Research has shown that using the common factors of empathetic understanding, warmth and positive regard, and congruence or authenticity as well as collaborative relationships will help mentors and mentees to connect, especially earlier in the relationship. These factors can be applied to mentor training practices, especially for mentors who will be mentoring youth who are distrustful of adults. PR
- Dubois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper (2002). This study was a meta-analysis of mentoring studies. The authors concluded that the findings provide support for the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs. However, program effects were enhanced when greater numbers of both theory-based and empirically based best practices were utilized (i.e., training, structured activities, expectations for frequency of contact, support of parents, monitoring of program implementation, professionally supported matches) and when strong relationships are formed between mentors and

youth. Also, youth from backgrounds of environmental risk and disadvantage are more likely to benefit from participation in mentoring programs than youth with serious personal problems. PR

- Parra, DuBois, Neville, Pugh-Lilly & Povinelli (2002). Parra and colleagues examined the relationship between training, self-efficacy of volunteers, closeness of mentoring relationships and youth outcomes. Level of training was found to affect the volunteer's self-efficacy, which in turn affected the closeness of the match. Closeness of matches affected how often they interacted, which in turn affected the outcomes for the youth, indicating that volunteer training may be important factor in garnering positive youth outcomes. PR
- Herrera and Sipe (2000). Over 1,000 mentors in CBM or SBM programs were interviewed about their mentoring relationships. The researchers also conducted interviews at eight sites and held focus groups with youth, school and agency staff. They found that in both community-based and school-based programs, 90% of the mentors reported feeling close to their mentees, indicating that in both programs, strong relationships are formed. Additionally, they found eight factors that were consistently related to relationships quality: mentor and youth engagement in social activities; mentor and youth engagement in academic activities; hours per month youth and mentor spent together; how decisions were made about how mentors and youth spent their time; mentor-youth similarity; pre-match orientation and training; post-match training and support from program staff; and age of mentee. PR
- Beltman and MacCallum (1999). This paper was commissioned by the DOE in Australia to investigate SBM programs for potential implementation in Australian schools. Through a literature review the authors found several key features of successful mentoring programs: 1. setting goals and purpose of program in collaboration of stakeholder; 2. appropriate screening and matching of volunteers, ensuring a good match between program goals and mentor expectations; 3. training in active listening skills and learning styles; 4. ongoing training and match support of mentors; 5. selecting mentees that match program goals and resources; 6. family support of the program; and 7. program evaluation, preferably by outside evaluator. PR

IV. CBM Effective Practices

Key Findings:

Programs are found to create closer relationships and/or stronger impacts when the following practices are followed:

- When the relationship between the mentor and mentee is marked by authenticity, empathy, collaboration, and companionship.
- When relationships are “moderate” (moderate levels of structured activity) and “active” (high levels of activity).
- Frequent contacts between mentors and mentees
- When mentors and mentees discuss personal relationships and social issues
- When mentors and mentees participate in sports and athletic activities.

Article Summaries:

- Spencer (2006). In this study twenty-four pairs of BBBS matches were interviewed regarding their mentoring relationship, with an average match length of a little less than four years. Spencer found that successful mentoring relationships displayed four types of relational processes: authenticity, empathy, collaboration, and companionship. When these processes were evident in the mentoring relationship, then the mentor was likely to make a positive impact on the mentee's life. PR
- Lanhout, Rhodes and Osbourne (2004). This was a secondary analysis of the BBBS CBM Impact Study (P/PV) and focused on examining different types of mentoring relationships and their effects on impacts. They found four different types of relationships; moderate, unconditionally supportive, active and low key. The moderate relationships were characterized by moderate levels of structured activities, but lower reported levels of support than other types of relationships. Unconditionally supportive relationships had high levels of support and moderate levels of structure and activity. Matches in active relationships reported the highest level of activity, but had low levels of structure. Low key relationships reported high levels of support, moderate levels of structure and the matches participated in few activities. Lanhout and colleagues found that youth in moderate relationships had better psychological, parent, peer and school outcomes, improved sense of self worth, school competence, decreased alienation from parents, and decreased conflict and inequality with friends. Youth in active relationships reported better school and peer relationship outcomes, improved peer emotional support and intimacy and increase school competence. Youth in low key relationships reported less peer conflict. However, they found no benefits for the unconditional support matches and youth in this group, reported increased parental alienation. Therefore, the two most successful types of relationships were moderate and active, whereas low key and unconditional support had little or no impacts. PR
- DuBois, Neville, Parra, and Pugh-Lilly (2002). This article discussed findings from a study of 67 youth in a BBBS CBM program. After a year of program involvement, they did not find a direct effect of the mentoring programs on the emotional or behavioral adjustment of the youth. However, they did find that youth were more likely to report their mentors as significant adults in their lives when the mentoring relationship consisted of frequent contacts, discussion of personal relationships and social issues, and participation in sports and athletic activities. BC
- Grossman and Rhodes (2002). This study was a secondary analysis of the BBBS CBM Impact Study (P/PV), examining the effect of match length on impacts. The results showed that youth who were in relationships that lasted a year or longer reported improvements in academic, psychosocial and behavioral outcomes. There were progressively fewer effects among youth who were in relationships that terminated between 6 months and 1 year or between 3 and 6 months. Also, youth who were in relationships that terminated within 3 months reported drops in self worth and perceived scholastic competence. PR

V. SBM Effective Practices

Key Findings:

Programs are found to create closer relationships and/or stronger impacts when the following practices are followed:

- Securing school support.
- Match activities that are socio-emotional or a mix of socio-emotional and academic.
- Meeting more than an hour or more per week
- Involvement of mentees in making decisions about how mentors and youth spend their time.
- Similarity between mentor-youth.
- Pre-match orientation and training
- Post-match training and support from program staff
- Broad, positive interactions among the mentor, mentee, parent(s) and agency staff.
- Staff training to ensure appropriate supervision of matches.
- Clear and fair rules for the program.
- Establishing methods of communication for all program participants.

Article Summaries:

- Hansen (2005). In an evaluation of effective practices in BBBS SBM programs, Hansen found that programs with a social/emotional focus had stronger impacts in academic performance, higher levels of relationship satisfaction, and lasted longer than matches in programs with a narrow academic focus. Additionally, programs with highly supportive schools had matches with higher quality and stronger impacts, compared to matches in low support schools. Furthermore, elementary school Littles reported closer relationships with Bigs than middle school Littles, but differences in impacts were not found. PE
- Hirsch and Wong (2005). This article examined mentoring in after-school programs, anchored in theory and research on mentoring and youth programs on general. Based on this examination, the authors suggest that special training for staff working in after school programs be implemented in agencies. The staff should also play a mentoring role in the relationship with the program youth. Also, programs should focus on developing the mentoring relationship and less on the specific program activities. BC
- Karcher, Nakkula, & Harris (2005): Karcher and colleagues examined factors related to high quality mentoring relationships. They found that mentors' self-efficacy and motivations for self-enhancement as well as the mentees' support-seeking behavior predicted the quality of the mentoring relationship. The authors recommended encouraging mentees to seek support from their mentors. Additionally, some focus should be on increasing mentors' self-efficacy and making sure they have realistic expectations. PR

- Larose & Tarabulsky (2005): This article addressed the issues involved in serving at-risk youth. They found that it is important to screen academically at-risk students to appropriately understand the kind and level of risk to which they are exposed, and to use this analysis to help target needed academic activities. They recommend providing staff training to ensure appropriate supervision of matches. They also recommend creating clear and fair rules for the program, and establishing methods of communication for all program participants in order for everyone to be able to express opinions and communicate ideas. BC
- Portwood & Ayers (2005): The authors addressed the importance of the mentoring program's relationship with the school. They found that ensuring school support was vital to SBM programs. They recommended securing the school's commitment in providing program resources—such as a place to meet, school liaison staff and access to evaluation data to measure program effectiveness. BC
- Herrera (1999). This was a Public/Private Ventures' evaluation of two BBBS school-based mentoring programs. The study found that program practices that lead to effective programming were similar for both school- and community-based mentoring. These included: engaging in social activities, engaging in academic activities, number of hours per month that youth and mentors meet, Littles sharing in decision-making, and pre-match training. Herrera also found that SBM volunteers were busier outside their match activities, younger, more likely to be male and minority than those in CBM programs. The youth in these SBM programs were found to be needier, had more minorities and were more frequently from two-parent homes compared to CBM program participants. The families of the youth were often found to be overwhelmed with personal issues or relatively uninvolved with their children, suggesting that they were unlikely to enroll their children in the CBM program. She also found that mentors were at times advocates for the youth in the school. Additionally, SBM youth stated that mentors helped their relationship with their teacher and peers. BC

VI. Effective Practices in Special Populations

Key Findings:

Programs are found to create closer relationships and/or stronger impacts with special populations when the following practices are followed:

- Having culturally and age sensitive recruitment, enrollment and support techniques and materials.
- Mentor training about youth development, including differences between boys and girls.
- Recognizing the needs of adolescent mentors.

Article Summaries:

- Darling (2005). Based on her analysis of the literature, Darling recommends that when working with adolescents, to include mentor training about adolescent

development and the social context in which they live. She recommends making sure the mentors have realistic expectations about their relationships with their adolescent mentees; this is particularly important in the early phases of the relationship. It is very important to encourage mentors to stick it out. During training mentors should understand that premature termination of the relationship could be harmful to youth. One approach to decreasing early terminations is to have time where matches engage in structured activities. This may help to provide a bridge during the formation of new relationships and make it easier for mentors to overcome relationship obstacles. Also, she suggests using some type of personality measure to assist in the matching process. BC

- Karcher (2005a): Karcher addressed issues in programs that utilize high school mentors. He recommends that activities should suit the needs of the mentee's age. For example, young children are often unaware of their own desires and wants until pressed to articulate them. They enjoy fun, physical, rule-based play. Adolescents are more likely to seek interaction with their peers, opportunities to explore and learn about what makes them unique and contexts in which they can receive attention and praise. With adolescents social skills should be emphasized, as well as how to positively connect to adults. Programs should make sure that mentors don't engage in authority-undermining statements, such as putting a teacher down. Programs should encourage behaviors such as development of crucial social skills (empathy, cooperation, self control) and positive connectedness to adults. BC
- Larkin, Sadler, & Mahler (2005): The authors explored the benefits of older mentors working with youth, finding older adults to be effective mentors. For example, they are well-suited to work with children who need steady, patient, nurturing adults in their lives. Also, they found that once the older adults had made the commitment they were able to stick with the relationship and provide the youth with a positive stable relationship. Furthermore, they found that the best method of recruiting older adult volunteers was to approach them personally. They found that although they will likely benefit from the mentoring relationships, using this benefit as a recruitment strategy will probably not convince them to volunteer. PR
- Sanchez & Colon (2005): The authors discuss the role of race and ethnicity in mentoring relationships. Based on their review of the literature, they recommend that volunteer training should be tailored to mentee gender, due to different ideas boys and girls have about relationship development and expectations. They found research indicates that girls thrive in relationship-based mentoring relationships whereas boys thrive in activity-based mentoring. Boys have more negative views about seeking help and mentors working with boys should understand this negative view. These mentors need to underemphasize the helper role and emphasize their other roles, such as being a friend and someone who enjoys engaging in shared activities. BC
- Taylor, LoSciuto, Porcellini (2005). In discussing intergenerational mentoring, Taylor and colleagues find that in order to attract older volunteers, programs needed to develop age-sensitive recruiting statements, such as avoiding any ageism and to include language that is culturally appropriate to the population a program is trying to attract. For recruitment materials aimed at African American church elders, the authors suggested recruitment may emphasize scripture or other issues culturally relevant to the elders' role in the community. When targeting elders in the Hispanic

community, a different message may be needed that appeals to their cultural experiences. Additionally, they reported that some studies have found programs especially structured to involved participants of color were more successful in keeping participants in programs longer and in having participants meet their original time commitment than participants of color in generalized programs. BC

References

- Abcug, L. (1991). A teacher-student mentorship program for at-risk students. Unpublished manuscript.
- Anderson, T., Lipman, E., Mills, B. and Metz, H. (2006). The Recreation Mentoring Program: A Community Engagement Initiative for Children. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 15(2), 59-63.
- Aseltine, R., Dupre, M., & Lamlein, P. (2000). Mentoring as a drug prevention strategy: An evaluation of Across Ages. *Adolescent and Family Health*, 1, 11-20.
- BBBS of Canada (1994). *Project Impact: Program evaluation of BB of Ontario*. BB of Ontario: Kingston, ON.
- BBBS of Southwest Idaho (1999). *School mentoring program impact study*. Boise, ID: BBBS of SW ID.
- Barron-McKeagney, T., Woody, J. D., D'Souza, H.J. (2001). Mentoring at-risk Latino children and their parents: Impact on social skills and problem behaviors. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 18(2), 119-136.
- Beier, S.R., Rosenfeld, W.D., Spitalny, K.C., Zansky, S.M. & Bontempo, A.N. (2000). The potential role of an adult mentor in influencing high-risk behaviors in adolescents. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 154, 327-331.
- Beltman, S. & MacCallum, J. (2006). Mentoring and the Development of Resilience: An Australian Perspective. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 8(1), 21-32.
- Blum and Jones (1993). Academic growth group and mentoring program for potential dropouts. *School Counselor*, 40(3), 207-217.
- Cavell, T.A. & Smith, A. (2005). Mentoring Children. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 160-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cavell, T.A. (2001). Implications of aggressive children's positively biased relatedness views for future relationships. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 31(3), 215-231.
- Curtis, T.C. & Hansen, K. (1999). *Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring: Evaluation summary of five pilot programs*. Philadelphia, PA: BBBSA.
- Darling, N. (2005). Mentoring adolescents. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 177-190). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dennison, S. (2000). A win-win peer mentoring and tutoring program: A collaborative model. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 20, 161-174.
- Diversi, M. & Mecham, C. (2005). Latino(a) Students and Caucasian Mentors in a Rural After-School Program: Towards Empowering Adult-Youth Relationships. *Journal of Community Psychology Special Issue: Youth-Adult Relationships in Community Programs: Diverse Perspectives on Good Practices*, 33(1), 31-40.
- DuBois, D.L., Neville, H.A., Parra, G.R. & Pugh-Lilly, A.O. (2002). Testing a new model of mentoring. In J.E. Rhodes, *A critical view of youth mentoring*, (pp. 21-57). San Francisco, CA.
- DuBois, D.L., Holloway, B.E., Valentine, J.C. & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: a meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 157-197.
- DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Research methodology. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 44-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ferrier, M.H. (1994). Mentoring: Its effects on at-risk elementary students, mentors and teachers of mentored students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54(8-A): 2818
- Grossman, J. B., & Rhodes, J. E. (2002). The test of time: Predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring programs. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30, 199-219.
- Haas, A. & Haas, L. (1993). *Evaluation of partners for youth program*. Big Sisters of Central Indiana: Indianapolis, IN.
- Hansen, K. (2003). *Big Brothers Big/Sisters High School Bigs evaluation for school year 2002-2003*. Philadelphia: Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America.
- Hansen, K. (2005). *School-based mentoring study Phase I report 2003-04 school year: Effective Practices*. Philadelphia: Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America.
- Herrera, C. (1999). *School-based mentoring: A first look into its potential*. Philadelphia: Private/Public Ventures.

- Herrera, C. L., Sipe, W. S., & McClanahan, W. S. (2000). Mentoring school-age children: Relationship development in community-based and school-based programs. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Hines, M.H. (1988). Effect of first year of matches on the self-esteem of Big and Little brothers. *Journal of humanistic education and development*, 27, 61-68.
- Hirsch, B.J. Wong, V. (2005). After-School Programs. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 364-375). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holland, S.H. (1996). PROJECT 2000: An educational mentoring and academic support model for inner-city African American boys. *Journal of Negro Education*, 65(3), 315-321.
- Jones, Bibbins, & Henderson (1993). Reaffirming youth African American males: Mentoring and community involvement by fraternities and other groups. *Urban League Review*, 16, 9-19.
- Jones-Brown, D. (1997). Promises and pitfalls of mentoring as a juvenile justice strategy. *Social Justice*, 24, 212-233.
- Karcher, M. J. (2005a). Cross-age peer mentoring. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 266-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Karcher, M. J. (2005b). The effects of school-based developmental mentoring and mentors' attendance on mentees' self-esteem, behavior, and connectedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 65-77.
- Karcher, M. J., Nakkula, M.J., Harris, J. (2005). Developmental Mentoring Match Characteristics: Correspondence between Mentors' and Mentees' Assessments of Relationship Quality. *Journal of Primary Prevention Special Issue: Mentoring with Children and Youth*, 26(2), 93-110.
- Karcher, M. J., Davis, C., & Powell, B. (2002). Developmental mentoring in the schools: Testing connectedness as a mediating variable in the promotion of academic achievement. *School Community Journal*, 12(2), 36-52.
- Keating, L.M., Tomishima, M.A., Foster, S. & Alessandri, M. (2002). The effects of a mentoring program on at-risk youth. *Adolescence*, (148), 717-734.
- Keller, T. E. (2005a). A systemic model of the youth mentoring intervention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2), 169-188.
- Keller, T. E. (2005b). The stages and development of mentoring relationships. In D.L. DuBois & M. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 82-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- King, K. A., Vidourek, R. A., Davis, B., & McClellan, W. (2002). Increasing self-esteem and school connectedness through a multidimensional mentoring program. *Journal of School Health*, 72, 294-299.
- Langhout, R.D., Rhodes, J.E. & Osbourne, L.E. (2004). An exploratory study of youth mentoring in an urban context: Adolescents' perceptions of relationship styles. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(4), 293-306.
- Larkin, E., Sadler, S.E. & Mahler, J. (2005). Benefits of Volunteering for Older Adults Mentoring At-Risk Youth. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 44(3-4), 23-37.
- Larose, S. & Tarabulsky, G.M. (2005). Academically at-Risk Students. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 440-453). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lee, J., & Cramond, B. (1999). The positive effects of mentoring economically disadvantaged students. *Professional School Counseling*, 2, 172-178.
- Matzenbacher, D. L.(1999). Evaluating the effects of college student mentors on children in an elementary school environment. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(5-B): 2387
- McKinney, R.E., Paten, A.S. and Smith, H.R. (1999). A outcome study of 200 former Little Brothers and Sisters served by Big Brothers. *Big Sisters of Saginaw Bay Area, MI. BBBS of Saginaw Bay. Saginaw, MI.*
- McLearn, K.T., Colasanto, D. Schoen, C. & Shapiro, M.Y. (1999). Mentoring matters: A national survey of adults mentoring young people. *Contemporary issues in mentoring*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Moccia, R. E., Schumaker, J. B., Hazel, J. S. & Vernon, D. S. (1989). A mentor program for facilitating the life transitions of individuals who have handicapping conditions. *Journal of Reading, Writing, & Learning Disabilities International*, 5(2), 177-195.
- Muscott, H. S. & O'Brien, S.T. (1999). Teaching character education to students with behavioral and learning disabilities through mentoring relationships. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 22(3), 373-390.

- Musgrave, J.B. (1998). Perceived experiences of youth participants in a rural, community-based adult-youth mentoring program. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(2-A): 0426
- Nakkula, M.J. & Harris, J. (1999). Project IF: Evaluation report on academic performance. Unpublished report. Harvard University.
- Nakkula, M. J. & Harris, J. T. (2005). Assessment of Mentoring Relationships. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 100-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Connor, S. M. (1995). Evaluation of a mentoring program for youth at risk. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(2-B): 1130.
- Opinion Research Centre (1995). Program evaluation of the mentoring program. Opinion Research Centre: Dundas, ON.
- Osterling, K. L. (2006). Mentoring adolescent foster youth: Promoting resilience during developmental transitions. *Child & Family Social Work*, 11(3), 242-253.
- Osterling, K.L. & Hines, A.M. (2006). Mentoring adolescent foster youth: Promoting resilience during developmental transitions. *Child & Family Social Work*, 11(3), 242-253.
- Parra, G. R., DuBois, D. L., Neville, H. A., Pugh-Lilly, A. O., & Povinelli, N. (2002). Mentoring relationships for youth: Investigation of a process-oriented model. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30, 367-388.
- Peterson, D. (1994). An evaluation of an elementary school based intergenerational linkages program: Mentoring for academic enrichment. Philadelphia: Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America.
- Plucker (1998). The relationship between school climate conditions and student aspirations. *Journal of educational research*, 58, 252-257.
- Portwood, S. G., Ayers, P. M., Kinnison, K. E., Waris, R.G. , Wise, D.L. (2005). YouthFriends: Outcomes from a School-Based Mentoring Program. *Journal of Primary Prevention Special Issue: Mentoring with Children and Youth*, 26(2), 129-145.
- Portwood, S.G. (2005). Schools. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 336-347). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Powers, S. & McConnor, S. (1997). Project SOAR evaluation report. Creative Research Associates: Tucson, AZ.
- Rhodes, J.E., Haight, W.L. & Briggs, E.C. (1999). The influence of mentoring on the peer relationships of foster youth in relative and nonrelative care. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 9(2), 185-201.
- Rhodes, J.E., Grossman, J.B. & Resche, N. L. (2000). Agents of change: Pathways through which mentoring relationships influence adolescents' academic adjustment. *Child Development*, 71(6), 1662-1671.
- Rhodes, J.E. (2005). A Model of Youth Mentoring. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 30-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rogers, A.M. & Taylor, A.S. (1997). Intergenerational mentoring: A viable strategy for meeting the needs of vulnerable youth. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 28(1-2), 125-140.
- Rollin, S. A., Kaiser-Ulrey, C., Potts, I., Creason, A.H. (2003). A school-based violence prevention model for at-risk eight grade youth. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(4), 403-416.
- Rowland, R.G. (1992). An evaluation of the effects of a mentoring program on at-risk students in selected elementary schools in the North East Independent School District (record of study). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53: 39.
- Sánchez, B. & Colón, Y. (2005). Race, Ethnicity, and Culture in Mentoring Relationships. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 191-204). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Seidl, F. W. (1982). Big Sisters: An experimental evaluation. *Adolescence*, 17(65), 117-128.
- Sidoruk, N. (1995). Project Impact: A program evaluation of Big Brothers of Ontario. Hamilton, Ontario: Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton-Wentworth.
- Slicker, E. K. & Palmer, D. J. (1993). Mentoring at-risk high school students: Evaluation of a school-based program. *School Counselor*, 40(5), 327-334.
- Spencer, R. (2004). Studying relationship in psychotherapy: An untapped resource for youth mentoring. *New Directions for youth development*, 103, 31-43.
- Spencer, R. & Rhodes, J.E. (2005). In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 118-132). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Spencer, R. (2006). Understanding the Mentoring Process between Adolescents and Adults. *Youth & Society*, 37(3), 287-315.
- Starks, F.I. (2002). Mentoring at-risk youth: An intervention for academic achievement. Dissertation Abstracts International, 63: 1714
- Stukas, A. A. & Tanti, C. (2005). Recruiting and Sustaining Volunteer Mentors. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 235-250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor & Dryfoos (1999). Creating a safe passage: Elder mentors and vulnerable youth. *Keeping the promise*, Winter 1998-1999, 43-48.
- Taylor, A., LoSciuto, L., Fox, M., & Hubert, S. (1999). The mentoring factor: An evaluation of Across Ages. In V. Keuhne (Ed.), *Intergenerational programs: Understanding what we have created*, (pp. 77-99). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Terry, J. (1999). A community/school mentoring program for elementary students. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(3), 237-240.
- Thompson, L. A. & Kelly-Vance, L. (2001). The impact of mentoring on academic achievement of at-risk youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 23(3), 227-242.
- Tierney, J.P., Grossman, J.B. & Resch, N.L. (1995). *Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures
- Turner, S. & Scherman, A. (1996). Big Brothers: Impact of Little Brothers' self-concepts and behaviors. *Adolescence*, 31, 875-882.
- Weinberger, S.G. (2005). Developing a Mentoring Program. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring*, (pp. 220-234). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zippay, A. (1995). Expanding employment skills and social networks among teen mothers: Case study of a mentor program. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 12(1), 51-69.