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ABSTRACT

An Evaluation of Group Differences in Mentoring Programs’ Perceived Outcomes

by

Jennifer Sue Anderson

Dr. Richard McCorkle, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Mentoring programs, like Big Brothers/Big Sisters (BBBS), focus on targeting at-risk youth in a preventative effort to increase pro-social behaviors as well as improving one’s confidence, competence, and caring. These factors are important as they are indicative of the types of attachment bonds that insulate juveniles from delinquent behavior. Using data from a BBBS located in the Southeast part of the United States, the current study examined whether different groups of juveniles in mentoring programs are considered to be equally successful in promoting feelings of confidence, competence, and caring. Employing a series of one-way ANOVAs, no significant relationships were found between age, sex, race, match length and evaluator’s perceptions of successful mentoring outcomes. When examining the composite group of non-White males and confidence, a relationship was found suggesting that mentoring may not have the ability to decrease risk of delinquency among all groups. Limitations and future research suggestions are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Positive role models, specifically the parental bond, have been recognized to reduce juvenile delinquency (Demuth & Brown, 2004; OJJDP, 1998). When there is an absence of parental support, a mentor can fill this void; thus acting as the positive role model a child needs to develop into a responsible individual. Mentoring programs focus on targeting youth who are considered at-risk of delinquency and other anti-social behaviors in a preventative effort to increase positive influences and improve academic performance.

Mentoring programs provide youth with positive relationships that allow for growing bonds to conventional ideas and increased abilities in overcoming obstacles (Matthews, 2004). These supportive relationships help prevent negative influences in three ways: altering youth’s self perception (Werner, 1993); altering youths perceptions of other relationships within their lives (Olds, Kitzman, Cole, & Robinson, 1997); and identifying the most important protective factor as a relationship with a caring adult (Anderson, 1994). Most importantly, mentoring programs are aimed at increasing socially acceptable behavior and improved academic success by providing at-risk youth the opportunity to create a social bond with a positive adult.
Research in the area of youth delinquency has identified several risk factors— the most significant including parental involvement in crime (Rowe & Farrington, 1997), being raised in a broken home (Audit Commission, 1996; Beam, Gil-Rivas, Greenberger, Chen, 2002; Beiswinger, 1985; Farrington, 1996b; Tierney, Grossman & Resch, 1995), and academic failure (Blackburn, 1993; Farrington, 1996b). These aforementioned risk factors leave many children disconnected from positive, influential adults. As parents spend less time bonding with their children, opportunities increase for other, less pro-social behaviors such as delinquency. For instance, Steinberg (1991) found relationships with non-familial adults to be uncommon for most at-risk youth. Continual research shows exposure to multiple risk factors causes strain for youth to succeed in school and other forms of conventional activities (Matthews, 2004).

Despite exposure to multiple risk factors, many youth have the ability to rise above pressures of delinquency. Matthews (2004) suggests that protective factors may provide juveniles with positive ways of dealing with negative situations. These factors are present in the social bond between a youth and a caring adult (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). Prevention programs aimed at reducing juvenile delinquency seek to strengthen social bonds in favor of youths’ development into productive members of society.

Speculation arises within research as to whether a mentoring relationship can compensate for the strong social bonds that are required to prevent youth delinquency. While this body of literature is continuously growing, it is still fairly new. Of the empirical research conducted, results have been favorable toward the effects of mentoring programs on micro-level delinquency issues. Accomplished research has found that
mentoring programs provide youth with positive relationships that allows for growing bonds to conventional ideas and increased abilities in overcoming obstacles (Matthews, 2004).

Past research on mentoring has yet to compare relationships between group differences and perceptions of successful mentoring outcomes. The purpose of this study is to evaluate group differences in sex, age, race, length of match and the program outcome indicators Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) uses nationally to measure gains in confidence, competence, and caring as reported by BBBS mentors, parents, and teachers of the participants.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Mentoring Programs

History and Prevalence

The concept of mentoring has roots as far back as Greek mythology. In Homer’s *The Odyssey*, Mentor was entrusted by Odysseus to teach and advise his son, Telemachus, in his absence. Through the advising of Mentor, Telemachus grew into a resilient individual who later played an important role in saving his family and society. When Odysseus returned from the Trojan War he found his son to be of good moral character and high esteem, no doubt due to the guidance and counsel of Mentor (Homer, 2006).

Many people find strength and guidance through a mentoring relationship, albeit formal or informal. Most conventional families pass down information and support from one generation to the next, allowing for growth and prosperity within an individual.

The first documented formal mentoring program dates back to 1902 when the Ladies of Charity visited the New York’s Children Court (Beiswinger, 1985). Female volunteers befriended girls who came through the juvenile justice system in an effort to help build confidence and positive relationships in the lives of young girls. This group later became the Catholic Big Sisters of New York (Beiswinger, 1985).
The next documented mentoring program began in 1904 and grew into an organization we know today as Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) (Beiswinger, 1985). Although it began as the Big Brother Movement, guided by the founder, Ernest Coulter, a Clerk of Courts in the New York Children’s Court, Big Sisters were added through a charter from the New York Supreme Court. In 1977 these two organizations merged to create the national federation of BBBS (Matthews, 2004). BBBS, which is largely funded by non-profit organizations such as the United Way and individual donations, is considered to be the most prominent mentoring program and services relationships among at risk youth and positive role models from over 500 agencies nationwide (Matthews, 2004; Tierney et al., 1995).

According to the National Mentoring Partnership (1998), mentoring organizations can be found in many varieties including churches, local community organizations (such as YMCA, Boys and Girls Scouts, and Boys and Girls Club of America), and schools. Many municipal courts have court-appointed mentoring programs that provide guidance to youth in hopes of changing the trajectory of their future. Advocacy programs that aim to intercept delinquency are becoming more prominent in recent years. One such advocacy program called the Youth Advocacy Program (YAP) employs volunteers to mentor youth already in contact with the juvenile justice systems and provides after care and school based programming.

Although slightly different in the types of youths’ serviced, the overall purpose and goals of the abovementioned mentoring programs render them similar in nature. The earliest forms of mentoring programs focused on reforming youth already involved in the juvenile court system while current mentoring programs aim to prevent delinquency
altogether (Beiswinger, 1985; Matthews, 2004). The national website of BBBS states their mission clearly, “to help children reach their potential through professionally supported, one-to-one relationships with mentors that have a measureable impact on youth”. It is such statements as these that reflect the overall premise of BBBS. Through design and structure, mentoring is implemented as a general cure-all, or panacea, to foster pro-social bonds that are not always available, regardless of age, sex, and race.

According to Tierney et al., (1995), BBBS has matched approximately 75,000 at risk youth with a caring adult in order to foster pro-social bonds and behaviors.

**Screening and Match Procedures**

The mentee and mentor screening process can be time consuming, though relevant in establishing proper populations of both groups. According to Beiswinger (1985), a child’s parent is the first contact into the program. As a child is referred to the program, the parent must begin the process with an application. Within this application, the parent must furnish information pertaining to the child’s background, school grades, and the parent’s reason for match request (Beiswinger, 1985; Rhodes, 2002). The next step includes an interview process conducted by a match specialist, employed by BBBS, with the parent and the child together and then separate interviews after. If the child is accepted, he or she is placed on a waiting list for an eligible volunteer (Beiswinger, 1985). Most mentors who volunteer their time are female, and as a result, female mentees are matched more quickly than males (Rhodes, 2002).

The screening process for mentors is much more rigorous than for mentees, as it should be since the idea is to place a child with a non-familial adult. The first step is to contact the local BBBS agency to express interest in the program (Beiswinger, 1985;
Post interest is an application process to determine eligibility with questions gathering data on demographics, employment, vehicle information, criminal history and personal references (Roaf et al., 1994). BBBS then takes several steps internally to complete background checks, criminal history checks, verification of employment, and conducts personal reference checks all in an effort to confirm a good fit among the standards of the organization (Rhodes, 2002; Roaf et al., 1994).

After all references and background checks are approved, the next step is a personal interview. In the interview process, a match specialist meets face to face with a prospective volunteer and asks questions about his or her interest in the program, expectations, what they feel he or she can bring to a relationship. At this point, the prospective mentor is asked what type of match he or she is looking for, such as race, sex, or age (Roaf et al., 1994). Through these interview questions, a match specialist can determine any issues of child safety and/or if they feel the applicant will honor their commitments. By the interview process the volunteer understands the program requirements: a one-year commitment (Beiswinger, 1985; Rhodes, Grossman, & Roffman, 2002) and interaction with the mentee, three to five hours per week (Roaf et al., 1994). By the end of the interview process, the match specialist will inquire if the volunteer is still willing to become a mentor. If the volunteer agrees to the challenge, the agency will contact with further details of acceptance.

If the volunteer is accepted as a “big brother” or “big sister” the match specialist begins the process of matching a mentor with a mentee. This process is where the match

---

1 BBBS National Guidelines require three to six hours of interaction per week.
specialist uses their experience and expertise to create a suitable match for both parties involved. Using information obtained in the interview process from both the mentee and mentor, the match specialist chooses a child from the waitlist and a new mentor typically based on geographic location, sex, race, and common interests and hobbies (Rhodes, 2002). After the two are introduced and the match is made, the successfulness of the relationship depends on those people involved. BBBS offers support and guidance for both sides of the relationship, requiring a monthly check-in to ensure the bond remains a success.

Most mentors find mentoring programs appealing in that they are a positive way to make a difference in a youth’s life. There is a common philosophy that is shared by those who mentor, stated best by Beiswinger (1985), “every child has an inherent capacity for goodness just waiting to be tapped by human concern”. Mentoring programs are supported by many initiatives and policymakers that show concern for prevention strategies and programs for our at risk youth. The George H. W. Bush Administration’s Points of Light Foundation is a favored initiative that encourages volunteers from all walks of life to get involved in their communities and change the future (Freedman, 1988). In 1992, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act included an amendment calling for the establishment of the Juvenile Mentoring Program known as JUMP (OJJDP, 1998). According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, this program provides one-to-one mentoring pairing youth at-risk of becoming delinquent by dropping out of school, joining a gang, or academic failure with a positive pro-social individual that can offer support and guidance. In 2003, George H. W. Bush referenced in his State of the Union Address the need of a mentoring program for youth whose
parents are incarcerated (Matthews, 2004). Many mentoring programs are born from important initiatives brought to light by concerned citizens and researchers alike. Initiatives such as these remind the general public that policymakers have a vested interest in funding prevention programs benefiting the youth and thus the entire nation.

**Effectiveness**

Mentoring effectiveness is a growing research field with several studies reporting mixed findings. The largest study thus far on mentoring is an impact study conducted by Tierney et al. (1995) for Public/Private Ventures (PPV) in which the researchers conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of BBBS. Using classical experimental methodology, new enrolling mentees were assigned to either a control group or treatment group over an eighteen month period in eight participating locations. The control group was assigned to a wait-list, which is customary for newly enrolled mentees and the treatment group was partnered with a mentor immediately. Baseline surveys were given at the beginning of the match and were compared to follow up surveys using the same instrument administered eighteen months later (N=959).

The results of the study yielded several supportive findings. First, “little brothers” and “little sisters” were less likely than the control group to initiate drug use, alcohol use, commit assault, and skip school. Second, race comparisons showed a positive increase in relationships between both parents and peers for minority males than the control group.

---

2 Locations included: Columbus, Ohio; Houston, Texas; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Phoenix, Arizona; Rochester, New York; San Antonio, Texas; and Wichita, Kansas (Grossman & Garry, 1997).

3 Youth in the study ranged from ages 10 to 16 years old. Males made up the slight majority of sex and of the more than 50% of minority youth, 70% were black (Grossman & Garry, 1997).

4 Researchers considered six areas that mentoring might effect: antisocial activities, academic performance, attitudes and behaviors, relationships with family, relationships with friends, self concept, and social and cultural enrichment (Grossman & Garry, 1997).

5 These findings were equivalent across sex and race.
Third, minority girls reported higher academic improvement over their comparison counterparts. Lastly, the researchers found that the partnerships displaying the most success were those in which the relationship was focused on the needs of the child (Tierney et al., 1995). These results indicate that mentoring relationships can have a sizable impact on improved self-esteem and academic competence, attachment to others, and reducing delinquency. The results of this study have been used by several advocacy groups and organizations to support mentoring initiatives and funding requests (Baker & Maguire, 2005).

In an additional analysis of the PPV data, Rhodes (2002) found that both the control and the comparison groups showed increases in problems over the 18 month period. Subsequently, the author also mentions that the PPV study did not measure their final survey against the original baseline survey but both surveys against that of the comparison group (Rhodes, 2002). DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, and Cooper (2002) studied the magnitude of the effect size on groups in their meta-analysis. Effect size is commonly tested to measure the relationship between variables. Their own analysis estimated the effect size at .02 and .05. These effect sizes are considered weak in statistical terms. When this group was added to the other evaluations, 55 in all, the researchers found the magnitude of these effects to be modest.\(^6\) Though the overall effect size was considered to be small, variations existed in effectiveness among the different types of programs compared (DuBois et al., 2002). Effect sizes proved larger for those mentees who entered the program with more psychological function and who were less at-risk. Also, effects were larger for programs that offered more structure, provided

\(^6\) Total effect size was (.13).
training for the mentors, and encouraged longevity between mentors and mentees (DuBois et al., 2002; Rhodes, 2002).

The findings of both these studies left researchers to examine why mentoring works in some situations and how can it be more effective overall. Grossman and Rhodes (2002) studied the effects of match length on mentoring relationships⁷. Using the same PPV data, the authors found the greatest effects for the group that had been matched for one year or more. This group demonstrated the most increases in self-worth, perceived social acceptance, perceived scholastic competence, parental relationship quality, school value, and decreases in drug and alcohol use (Grossman & Rhodes, 2002). In addition to these findings, the authors also observed that those relationships that ended in less than three months were associated with a decrease in self-worth and perceived scholastic competence (Grossman & Rhodes, 2002). These findings are consistent with the requirements of BBBS. Upon entry into the program volunteers are asked to make a one year commitment, knowing that a relationship that fosters their goals takes sufficient time to develop.

In addition to match length, research on resilience has recently become prevalent within the field of mentoring. Resiliency to delinquency is possible through a child’s set of protective factors such as the characteristics of the individual, the characteristics of the family, and the characteristics of the community. It is the community factor that ties in with the foundation of mentoring programs. Community organizations provide opportunities to at risk children and help strengthen a youth’s bond to the community itself (Rhodes, 2002). The strengthening of the social bond to the community empowers

---

⁷ The authors categorically coded their variables as less than 3 months, 3 months to just under 6 months, 6 months to just under 12 months, and 12 months and over (Grossman & Rhodes, 2002).
youth with increased self esteem and conventional means to deal with difficult situations (Matthews, 2004). Findings from a study conducted by Werner & Smith (1992) suggested that the most successful mentoring programs are those that focus on the reduction of risk factors in favor of characteristics that provided increased protective factors.

Theory

Juvenile Delinquency Theories

Several criminological theories attempt to reveal correlates of delinquency among juveniles. Classical criminologists study deterrence theory among juveniles in relation to such programs as “Scared Straight” and boot camps (Akers & Sellers, 2004). The “scared straight” program was developed to provide at-risk youth with the harsh reality of prison life. Boot camps are military-style camps designed to develop discipline and self-control through strict regimen. Both programs attempt to scare juveniles as a deterrence mechanism in an effort to keep youth from continuing criminal activity into his or her adult years (Akers & Sellers, 2004). Social learning theorists, such as Sutherland (1947) and Akers (1973), posit that deviance is a learned process. Interactions with deviant peers sway decision making processes among at-risk youth allowing for “excessive definitions favorable to law violation” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 82).

Another theory focused on determinants of crime and juvenile delinquency is labeling theory. This theory focuses on “labels” constructed in society that affect delinquency when youth adopt said “labels” as a characteristic of self-concept (Akers & Sellers, 2004). If he or she is told they are bad and he or she internalizes that belief, the actual act
of delinquency is secondary to the “stigmatization and criminalization” (p. 135) of the individual (Akers & Sellers, 2004). It is the labeling experience itself that is the correlate of crime (Akers & Sellers, 2004). While these aforementioned theories and others aim to explain crime, the following theory was developed to explain why people conform to pro-social behaviors, it is also the theory most commonly referred to by researchers studying mentoring programs.

*Social Bond Theory*

Social bond theory, developed by Travis Hirschi (1969) is derived from control theory. Control theories have an underlying assumption about the motivation of crime; it is universal across persons (Williams & McShane, 1998). Since the concern of control theories is not to explain crime but to explain conformity, it assumes that everyone is born with the same delinquent tendencies regardless of group differences (Akers & Sellers, 2004). All humans, much like our animal counterparts, are “naturally self-interested and hedonistic” (Vito, Maahs, & Holmes, 2006, p. 186) and it is our bonds to society that keep us from satisfying these hedonistic urges (Hirschi, 1969).

Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory states that the stronger the ties to the social order, the more constrained people will be from acting in ways that jeopardize their position in that social order. Furthermore, weak or absent social bonds would lead to increased risk factors and thus lead to increased juvenile delinquency (Hirschi, 1969). Hirschi (1969) discussed four important elements that necessitate social bonding theory including involvement, belief, commitment, and attachment. “The stronger these elements of social bonding with parents, adults, schoolteachers, and peers, the more the individual’s behavior will be controlled in the direction of conformity. The weaker they are the more
likely it is the individual will violate the law” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 117). Hirschi (1969) believed that these four elements were highly correlated with one another and each element contributed to delinquency directly (Matsueda & Heimer, 1987). If one was lacking, the likelihood that another element could make up for the neglect of the other is slim. The four elements will be discussed; however, for the purpose of this paper, only the element of attachment will be covered fully as it is known to be the most influential of all elements (Akers & Sellers, 2004).

Involvement is defined as the involvement in conventional activities such as community activities, school activities and studying, church-related activities, and spending time with family. Involvement in these conventional activities would provide less opportunity for youth to pursue behaviors favorable to delinquency (Curran & Renzetti, 2001). Belief is referred to as the person’s belief in societies’ norms and values (Matthews, 2004). Without the belief in right and wrong, or belief in the laws, this element will likely not occur. Commitment is the process of committing oneself to the ideas and activities that have been sanctioned by society as conventional. According to Akers and Sellers (2004) “the greater the commitment, the more one risks losing by non-conformity” (p. 118).

*Attachment.* Attachment is the final component of Hirschi’s social bond theory. It is conceptualized by Akers and Sellers (2004) as “the extent to which we have close affectional ties to others, admire them, and identify with them so that we care about their expectations” (p. 117). “Others” can mean parents, family members, teachers, and peers. It is the importance of having strong social bonds to someone who is conventional in nature that helps deter thoughts and acts of delinquency. Hirschi (1969) emphasizes that
the use of “others” indicates no familial importance but maintains that the attachment itself is what endorses the participation in conventional activities. “Attachment to others facilitates the internalization of society’s norms and the development of a conscious” (Curran & Renzetti, 2001, p. 147). Without these strong social bonds to society, the prevalence for delinquency is high. In a revision model of the theory, Waitrowski, Griswold, & Roberts (1981) found that the element of attachment was the “causal prior” to the other three elements (p. 534). A similar study conducted in 1975 by Bachman found that significant direct effects of delinquency were highly correlated with parental involvement and attachment. While mentoring programs aim to better educational commitments and focus on building a “stake in conformity” (Jackson, 1957) the element of attachment is arguably the most important (Curran & Renzetti, 2001). Without attachment, all other elements may not develop.

Attachment is commonly defined by researchers as “close parental supervision and discipline, good communication and relationships of the adolescent with parents, and his or her affectional identification with parents” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 119). Mentoring relationships aim to strengthen the bond felt by the mentee to a strong, reliable, and positive mentor. Lasting relationships are those found to encompass sufficient dual participation among the mentor and mentee (Sipe, 1996; Rhodes, 2002; Garmezy, 1985). Building a trusting relationship takes time, consistency, and consideration. This bond created between mentee and mentor is also beneficial to the parent. As a mentee develops a connection to the mentor, familial relations improve as the youth’s trust increases with the parent and other family members (Tierney et al., 1995).
Attachment to others through the bond process can facilitate increases in self-confidence, competence, and caring. Increases in self-confidence are possible through relationships that can be found in families, friends, and mentors. Through these supportive relationships, mentors have the ability to enhance the self-concept and self-worth of the youth (Felson, 1993; Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994). This can be done merely by spending one-on-one time talking about various topics, issues, or concerns. Competence can be influenced by the social bond relationship through increased encouragement and supportive guidance. Through increased resiliency, mentoring relationships have the ability to enhance a child’s competence in relation to academics (Herrera, Grossman, Kauh, Feldman, McMaken, & Jucovy, 2007) and pro-social behavior (Catalino & Hawkins, 1996) which may be able to lower levels of delinquency (Lau & Leung, 1992).

Also, the underlying concept of the social bond process is caring. Increased caring to create a bond that is withstanding is two-fold in a mentoring relationship. Caring should therefore increase for both the mentee and the mentor in a successful mentoring relationship. The attachment bond that is created has the ability to improve the concept of caring in a child. Past research is reflective of improved peer and family relationships due to mentoring (Tierney et al., 1995).

In a study conducted by Ryan, Stiller, and Lynch (1994), the researchers found supportive connections among adolescents and teachers and adolescents and parents facilitated increases in self-confidence and academic competence. In a mentoring evaluation study conducted by de Anda (2001), participants who developed a strong bond to his or her mentor experienced positive changes in emotional and social development.
Mentees were encouraged by their mentors to pursue educational and occupational goals (de Anda, 2001) lending to increases in self-confidence and competence.

**Group Differences and Social Bond**

**Age.** Recent research has shown that although the social bond model assumes no group differences in delinquent behavior among sex, race, or age (Hirschi, 1969; Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983), these demographics may nonetheless be important to the social bond theory and the element of attachment. Not only is age a strong predictor of delinquency (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985) but also, rates of delinquency vary across age (Greenberg, 1977). LaGrange and White (1985) found that adolescence is the most vulnerable stage in a youth’s life. To investigate their analysis, their stratified sample was coded into three separate groups, the beginning, middle, and end of adolescence. The most influential age group was found to be the middle of adolescence. Most importantly, their findings suggest that parental and school attachments diminished after mid-adolescence (La Grange & White, 1985).

Agnew (1985) had similar finding that stated at some point attachments to bonds are no longer effective. These findings are perhaps due to changes brought about by the onset of adolescence such as less supervision, the possibility of engaging with more delinquent peers, and growing independence (Darling, 2005). With these changes come decisions in which a mentor can play a critical role in the path chosen by the youth. That path is one that can lead to delinquency or socially acceptable behavior (Warr, 1993; Williams & Kornblum, 1985). This suggests the importance of the social bond and

---

8 Ages were stratified as follows: beginning of adolescents - 12 years (n=122), mid-adolescents - 15 years (n=138) and late adolescents - 18 years (n=81) (LaGrange & White, 1985).
attachments with parents and other non-familial members (LaGrange & White, 1985), especially at a crucial, opportune time where mentoring can still have an effective impact.

Studies of age and delinquency pose limitations that must be addressed. Maturation is a common validity problem when studying age variables. This validity concern assumes that other rival causal factors, such as maturity or growing out of delinquency can affect age outcome (Hagen, 2006). Studies of youth delinquency show that criminal behaviors tend to reduce as age increases (Rowe & Tittle, 1977). In a study conducted by Elliott (1994), findings indicated the male age of onset for a serious violent offense ranges between 12 and 20 years with the peak offending at 17 years old. Serious offending then begins its descent due to maturation effect and becomes less prevalent after age 24 (Elliott, 1994). These findings illuminate the importance of mentors to fill voids in the lives of youth, at an age where they can still be effective in improving relationships, whether it is supplemental or in conjunction with parental attachments or impactful by improving protective factors to reduce delinquency.

**Sex.** Another attribute researchers believe should be incorporated in social bond theory is sex. If, in fact, sex was not a factor and was indeed universal across persons then differences in gender would not exist in juvenile arrest rates (Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988). Self report data and official arrest statistics confirm that females engage in less delinquent acts than males (Dodge, Coie, & Lynam, 2006). According to the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) for 2003, females accounted for only 29% of juvenile arrest rates. The peak offending age also differs from the male counterpart. According to Elliott (1994), the female peak of serious offending is between ages 15 and 16 years. Duration of offending is considerably less for females than males, as well (Cauffman,
Gender gaps in crime and delinquency have been studied in detail. Role expectations and socialization processes (such as acceptable aggression among males) are innately different from birth through adulthood (Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988).

Differences in attachment bonds and sex have become more prominent within delinquency literature. These research studies focus on differences among delinquency and sex, suggesting that attachment bonds differ between male and females. The strongest predictor for females is attachment to peers and school (Anderson, Holmes, & Ostresh, 1999; Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988; Johnson, 1979) while parental attachment bonds are the strongest predictor of delinquency among males (Canter, 1982; Hindelang, 1973). Also, when parental attachment bonds are strong, the severity of juvenile male offending is greatly reduced (Anderson et al., 1999).

Additionally, Huebner and Betts (2002) explored the relationship between social control theory and delinquency, examining involvement and attachment bonds among gender. They found that although the involvement bond did not differ between sexes, the attachment bond “provided more protection for females than for males” (p. 140) and that females view the idea of relationships and friendships (eg., attachment bonds) more prominently than males (Huebner & Betts, 2002).

Race. According to Matsueda and Heimer (1987), race is an important variable that should also be included within the social bond theory. Though, like the two aforementioned variables, Hirschi believed there to be no differences in the motivation for delinquency across race (1969). Matsueda and Heimer (1987) argue that if Hirschi’s statement was in fact true, there would be no racial differences in arrest or incarceration rates. Yet, clearly, these rates are not universal across persons. In 2003, UCR data
revealed a disproportionate percent of arrests for black males in serious offenses such as robbery, murder, and motor vehicle theft (Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006). Other research has shown that black males are sentenced more severely and the effects of race and sentencing are more widespread among juveniles than adults (Steffensmeier, Ulmer, & Kramer, 1998).

In studies where self-report data is examined, the rate of offending between Black and White juveniles reveals less marginal discrepancies than official arrest records (Hirschi, 1969) and both groups are equally likely to engage in delinquency (Elliott & Ageton, 1980; Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1981; Huizinga & Elliott, 1987). Additionally, Elliott and Ageton (1980) found that Black youth reported having committed more offenses than White youth.

Matsueda and Heimer's (1987) study of black versus non-black’s delinquency rates in correlation to social control and differential association theory yielded important findings in relation to race and social bond theory. Most importantly and consistent with previous research findings (Moynihan, 1965), they found that broken homes was far more directly related with higher levels of delinquency for blacks than non-blacks (Matsueda & Heimer, 1987). Furthermore, if race is correlated with broken homes (Moynihan, 1965), a known risk factor, then said issues, in accordance with social bond theory “will produce more delinquency among blacks by inhibiting the formation of strong attachments and beliefs” (Matsueda & Heimer, 1987, p. 828). Sampson and Wilson (1991) suggest that racial discrepancies may exist in delinquency literature because Blacks are more likely to live in neighborhoods experiencing poverty, and instability.

According to UCR data, in 2003, the white population of figures includes those of Hispanic descent as ethnicity was not an option.
Current Study

Based on previous research and theory, the current study examines two specific research questions: (1) Do evaluators perceive group differences among juveniles on mentoring dimensions of competence, confidence, and caring, (2) What group, if any, are perceived by evaluators to be less likely to have positive changes from mentoring? The hypotheses discussed below focuses on groups who, according to previous delinquency research, should be most affected by the attachment bonds created by a positive role model. This study hypothesizes the following:

H\textsuperscript{1}: Evaluators will perceive more positive mentoring outcomes for juveniles in the over 10 year old age category compared to mentees in the 10 year old category.

H\textsuperscript{2}: Evaluators will perceive more positive mentoring outcomes for females compared to males.

H\textsuperscript{3}: Evaluators will perceive more positive mentoring outcomes for non-White mentees over White mentees.

H\textsuperscript{4}: Evaluators will perceive more positive mentoring outcomes for mentees matched one year or longer compared to those matched less than one year.

Given that previous research on juvenile delinquency has identified minority males as a group of individuals who have been less attached through family and community organizations, this study explores whether evaluators judged these particular group of children to be more, less, or equally likely to have improved in the areas of competence, confidence, and caring when compared to other groups. The following is the hypothesis for this composite group:
$H^3$: Evaluators will perceive less positive mentoring outcomes for non-White males versus other groups.

The following chapter discusses the data and methods used in this study, including the conceptualization and operationalization of each variable.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The current study examines whether different groups of juveniles in mentoring programs are considered to be equally successful in promoting feelings of confidence, competence, and caring. The ability of mentoring programs like BBBS to increase levels of confidence, competence, and caring is important because these factors are indicative of the types of attachment bonds that have been shown to insulate juveniles from delinquent behavior. If there are generally high positive evaluations of mentees or no group differences in evaluator’s response on these measures, it suggests that mentoring may decrease the risk of juvenile delinquency among kids within these programs. If, however, particular groups of kids (males vs. females, non-Whites vs. Whites) are judged as having achieved less success, then mentoring may not be a panacea for risk reduction for all kids. By exploring the nature of group differences and the responses of confidence, competence, and caring over the study period, this study will provide a preliminary investigation of the potential benefits of mentoring programs.

Data and Sample

The data for this study comes from one BBBS location that services several counties in the Southeastern region of the United States. Data was provided for three counties of
this location. Anonymity of the juveniles has been assured by assigning a unique numeric match identification number known only to the BBBS location that recorded the data. The sample for this study was drawn from the population of school-based mentoring (SBM) program relationships within the time frame selected by BBBS. The existing data set was forwarded from this location for analyses. The total sample involves the ratings given by the mentees teacher, parent, or mentor of 59 children.

The instrument for this study consists of a questionnaire on perceptions of mentees performance in which responses from the three abovementioned sources are completed at the end of each school semester. Program Outcome Evaluation (POE) data is used nationally by BBBS to measure increases in program outcome in SBM programs. It is designed to measure gains in confidence, competence, and caring of the mentee, all indicators BBBS uses to measure developmental assets.

**Measures**

**Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable in this study is perceptions of the mentee’s performance on various dimensions of program outcome. The mentee’s performance was established by combining specific measurings of the following concepts: confidence, competence, and caring. Specific measures of these concepts were chosen by BBBS to measure developmental assets that are important for a positive evaluation outcome and positive enrichment for the mentee. In the original coding of these variables respondents were

---

10 SBM programs differ slightly from community based mentoring (CBM) in that the mentoring often takes place within the school environment, albeit during school or directly after. It is still one-on-one attention with a goal of providing companionship, support, and scholastic assistance (Herrera et al., 2007).

11 These indicators are based on the Search Institute’s 40 Developmental Assets.
given a 7-point Likert-type scale and were asked to select the answer that best represented their perceptions. Scale values ranged from 1 (much worse), 2 (little worse), 3 (no change), 4 (little better), 5 (much better), 6 (don’t know), and 7 (not a problem). For the purpose of this paper, these categories were dichotomized to represent whether the mentee was perceived as better (1) or not (0). Under this coding system, higher scores on each variable represent a more positive evaluation.

As described below, composite measures of each of these dimensions of the mentees performance (i.e., confidence, competence, and caring) were developed by adding together the assessment for several variables within each of the dimensions. Cronbach’s alpha was used to evaluate the internal consistency of each of the composite scales of confidence, competence, and caring.

**Confidence.** Within the BBBS evaluation instrument, there are 6 possible indicators of evaluator’s assessments of the juvenile’s “confidence.” These measures include (1) child’s self confidence; (2) ability to express feelings; (3) can make decisions; (4) interests or hobbies; (5) personal hygiene/appearance; and (6) sense of future. The Cronbach’s alpha for these 6 items was .74, suggesting that these items are measuring the same dimension and may therefore be combined to form a composite index of “confidence.” This composite scale was developed by summing the six items and possible scale values range from 0 to 6.

**Competence.** The following 10 items were used on the POE to measure the evaluator’s assessments of the mentee’s “competence.” These indicators include (1) uses community resources; (2) uses school resources; (3) academic performance; (4) attitude

---

12 A sample of the POE questionnaire is available in the appendix.
toward school; (5) school preparedness; (6) class participation; (7) classroom behavior; (8) ability to avoid delinquency; (9) ability to avoid substance abuse; and (10) ability to avoid early parenting. Cronbach’s alpha was .83, suggesting that these ten items are measuring the same dimension. These ten items were combined to form a composite index of “competence” by the creation of an additive scale with scale values ranging from 0 to 10.

Caring. According to the POE developed by BBBS there are 5 possible indicators of evaluator’s assessments of the youth’s “caring.” These measures include (1) shows trust toward you; (2) respects other cultures; (3) relationship with family; (4) relationship with peers; and (5) relationship with other adults. Cronbach’s alpha for these 5 items was .74, suggesting that these items are measuring the same dimension and may be combined to create a composite index of “caring.” This composite scale was developed by summing these five items and possible scale values ranged from 0 to 5.

Independent Variables

The independent variables for this study are age, sex, race, and length of match time between the mentor and mentee. All variables were re-coded into dichotomous variables. Age is classified as the numeric age of the child at the time the POE was administered. Age, in its original form, was highly skewed and therefore, split at the median, coded as 10 years (0) or over ten years (1). Sex is conceptualized as either male (0) or female (1). Race is defined as either White (0) or non-White (1). Match length was defined as the duration of the mentoring relationship re-coded from months into years. Those under one year are coded (0) and relationships one year and over are coded (1).
Analyses

Several analyses were conducted to test for group differences in evaluator's perceptions of mentee's confidence, competence, and caring. First, basic univariate statistics were computed to assess the nature of the distribution of scores for the independent variables and dependent variables. Second, because the dependent variable was continuous, a series of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were performed to assess whether between or within group differences in ratings were found on each of the dependent variables (confidence, competence, and caring). ANOVA was also conducted to evaluate whether specific composite groups (e.g., non-White males versus other mentees) were perceived as being equally likely to have positive experiences for each of these measures of attachments. The results of these analyses are summarized in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Descriptive Characteristics

The sample size for this study consisted of 59 respondents. Of those survey participants about 30% of respondents were teachers (n=18), 34% was the mentor (n=20), and the remaining 36% were parents (n=21). Most of the mentees in this study were age 10 (59%), female (59%), non-White (53%), and had been matched with a mentor for one year or longer (54%). The survey participants evaluated these 59 mentees on several measures of program outcomes and attachments. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics and coding of the variables used in this study.

Among the indicators of “confidence,” evaluators considered mentees to be most successful in bettering their “self confidence” (61%), “ability to express feelings” (61%), and “decision-making” (59%). Mentees were perceived as less successful in improving their “sense of the future” (41%), “interests/hobbies” (36%), and especially their “personal hygiene/appearance” (24%). For the entire scale of “confidence,” the average rating was $\bar{x} = 2.81$, suggesting that most mentees were perceived to not have improved on their confidence over their BBBS experience on the majority of the items in the scale.

Among the indicators of “competence,” evaluators considered mentees to be most successful in bettering their “attitude toward school” (58%) and “academic/school
Mentees were perceived as slightly less successful in improving their “school preparedness/homework” (41%), “class participation” (41%), and “classroom behavior” (41%). Evaluators perceived mentees as considerably less successful in improving their “use of school resources” (30%), “use of community resources” (20%), “ability to avoid delinquency” (17%), “ability to avoid early parenting” (10%), and “ability to avoid substance abuse” (7%). For the entire scale of “competence,” the mean rating was $\bar{x} = 3.17$, suggesting that evaluators perceived that most mentees have not improved on their competence over their BBBS experience on the vast majority of items in this scale.

Among the indicators of “caring,” evaluators considered mentees to be successful in bettering their ability to “show trust” (51%). Mentees were perceived as less successful in improving their “relationship with peers” (47%), “relationship with family” (39%), “relationship with other adults” (39%), and “respect for other cultures” (27%). For the entire scale of “caring,” the mean rating was $\bar{x} = 2.03$, suggesting that most mentees, on average, were perceived to not have improved on their caring over their BBBS experience on the majority of items on this scale.

In sum, according to the descriptive statistics of the three major dimensions of attachments examined in this study, evaluators, on average, perceived no substantial improvement on the majority of items that are included as indicators of the mentee’s competence, confidence, and caring. For some items, evaluators considered the mentees to have improved, but this was not true for the majority of items within each scale. To explore more in-depth group differences, an ANOVA was conducted and is discussed next.
Table 1

*Descriptive Characteristics (N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childs self confidence</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to express feelings</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can make decisions</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has interests/hobbies</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene/appearance</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Future</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses community resources</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses school resources</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/school performance</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward school</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School preparedness/HMWK</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class participation</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom behavior</td>
<td>0 = Did not get better 1 = Better</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = Did not get better</td>
<td>1 = Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to avoid delinquency</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to avoid substance abuse</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to avoid early parenting</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows trust toward you</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects other cultures</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with family</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with peers</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with other adults</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Length</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was the statistical technique used in this study to explore the nature and magnitude of group differences in evaluator's perceptions of mentee's confidence, competence, and caring. The result of these analyses of the similarity and differences in perceived attachments on the basis of the mentee's age, race, sex, match length, and for particular composite groups are summarized below.

Age

The result of the ANOVA for age differences in perceptions of confidence, competence, and caring are shown in Table 2. These results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in rater's assessments of confidence, competence or caring on the basis of the mentee's age. While juveniles aged 10 were judged as slightly more confident ($\bar{x}_{10y} = 2.89$ vs. $\bar{x}_{10y} = 2.71$) and competent ($\bar{x}_{10y} = 3.20$ vs. $\bar{x}_{10y} = 3.13$) than mentees in the older age category, these differences were not statistically significant. Mentees in the over 10 years old age category were perceived as slightly more caring ($\bar{x}_{10y} = 1.89$ vs. $\bar{x}_{10y} = 2.25$) than the younger age category, but these differences were also not statistically significant.

Sex

The result of the ANOVA for differences of sex in perceptions of confidence, competence, and caring are shown in Table 3. These results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in survey participant's perceptions of confidence, competence or caring on the basis of the mentee's sex. Although male mentees were judged slightly more competent ($\bar{x}_m = 3.42$ vs. $\bar{x}_f = 3.00$) and caring ($\bar{x}_m = 2.17$ vs. $\bar{x}_f = 1.94$) by evaluators, these differences were not statistically significant. On the scale of
Table 2

*One-Way ANOVA: Age and Evaluator's Perceptions of Mentoring Dimensions (N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>210.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>210.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>423.23</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>432.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>168.04</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>169.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical F value = 4.01 (p<.05)

Table 3

*One-Way ANOVA: Sex and Evaluator's Perceptions of Mentoring Dimensions (N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>210.07</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>210.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>429.83</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>432.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>169.22</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>169.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical F value = 4.01 (p<.05)
confidence, female mentees were perceived as slightly more confident ($\bar{x}_f = 2.91$ vs. $\bar{x}_m = 2.67$) than male mentees, but these differences were also not statistically significant.

**Race**

Table 4 reveals the ANOVA for race differences and evaluator’s perceptions of mentoring dimensions of competence, confidence, and caring. These results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference on the basis of the youth’s race. While White mentees were perceived as slightly more confident ($\bar{x}_w = 3.18$ vs. $\bar{x}_{nw} = 2.48$), competent ($\bar{x}_w = 3.39$ vs. $\bar{x}_{nw} = 2.97$), and caring ($\bar{x}_w = 2.36$ vs. $\bar{x}_{nw} = 1.74$) than non-White mentees, these differences were not statistically significant.

**Table 4**

*One-Way ANOVA: Race and Evaluator’s Perceptions of Mentoring Dimensions ($N = 59$)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>203.85</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>210.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>429.65</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>432.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caring Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>164.36</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>169.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical F value= 4.01 ($p<.05$)
Match Length

The results of the ANOVA for differences in match length and perceptions of confidence, competence, and caring are shown in Table 5. These results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in rater’s assessments of confidence, competence, and caring on the basis of length of match time. Competence and match length were found to be marginally significant \((p = 0.06)\). While mentees in the one year and over category were perceived more confident \((\bar{x}_{ <1yr} = 2.56 \text{ vs. } \bar{x}_{ >1yr} = 3.03)\), competent \((\bar{x}_{ <1yr} = 2.44 \text{ vs. } \bar{x}_{ >1yr} = 3.78)\), and caring \((\bar{x}_{ <1yr} = 1.78 \text{ vs. } \bar{x}_{ >1yr} = 2.25)\) than mentees matched for under one year, these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 5

One-Way ANOVA: Match Length and Evaluator’s Perceptions of Mentoring Dimensions
\((N = 59)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>207.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>210.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>406.14</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>432.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>166.67</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>169.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical \(F\) value = 4.01 \((p<.05)\)
Non-White Males versus Other Groups

The result of the ANOVA test of these group differences is summarized in Table 6. As shown by the significant F-ratio $F(1,57) = 4.93$, $p = .03$, there are significant differences in evaluator's ratings of confidence. In particular, non-White males were considered to be far less likely to have improved in confidence than other juveniles ($\bar{x}_{\text{nwm}} = 1.86$ vs. $\bar{x}_{\text{o}} = 3.11$). However, there were no significant differences between groups on measures of competence and caring. For these measures of program outcome and attachments, non-White males were only slightly less likely to be viewed as improving than other juveniles ($\bar{x}_{\text{nwm}} = 2.71$ vs. $\bar{x}_{\text{o}} = 3.31$ for competence and $\bar{x}_{\text{nwm}} = 2.00$ vs. $\bar{x}_{\text{o}} = 2.04$ for caring).

Table 6

One-Way ANOVA: Non-White Males and Evaluator's Perceptions of Mentoring Dimensions ($N = 59$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>194.16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>210.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>428.50</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>432.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caring Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>169.91</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>169.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical $F$ value = 4.01 (*$p<.05$)
Overall, the analysis of group differences perceived by evaluators within a mentoring program has not resulted in any significant findings, with the one exception being when non-White males are compared to other groups. This suggests that evaluators generally perceive mentees to be equally successful in promoting feelings of confidence, competence, and caring regardless of age, sex, race, or match length. The following chapter discusses the findings of the current study as well as its limitations, conclusions, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Mentoring programs like BBBS are panacean in design, non-specific to group differences; however, findings from this study suggest that non-White males are not perceived as equally successful in measures of confidence as other groups for this study period. The non-significant findings from ANOVA demonstrate no group differences among perceived measures of confidence, competence, and caring, suggesting that mentoring may protect some youth from delinquent behavior. The significant finding of non-White males suggests that mentoring programs have yet to design a universal program able to protect all groups.

The first research question in this study related directly to findings from the first four analyses of variance. In accordance with hypotheses 1 through 4, this study fails to reject the claim that differences do exist. These findings support Hirshi’s (1969) social bond theory that posits group differences do not affect the bonding process and therefore have no effect on delinquency.

Hypothesis 1 posited a positive association in perceived mentoring outcome and the age category of over 10 years old. Results of the ANOVA found no statistical significance in support of this hypothesis. When comparing means both age groups were fairly evenly comparable in evaluator’s scores across mentoring dimensions of
confidence, competence, and caring. Non-significant findings may be due to the inability of the data to target the age of onset of delinquency, which according to Elliott (1994) is 12 years old. Additionally, the data was limited in targeting mid-adolescence which has been found to be the most crucial period for attachment to begin its descent of effectiveness.

The second hypothesis posited a positive association between female mentees and perceptions of mentoring outcomes. Findings from ANOVA suggest that rater’s evaluated mentoring dimensions equally for males and females, thus the claim of gendered differences was not supported. Definitive findings pointing to female favorability in perceived mentoring increases of competence, confidence, and caring over males could not be found. These findings are surprising since socialization among sex is vastly different (Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988). One would expect to find females to be more caring and males to be more aggressive (Huebner & Betts, 2002).

The third hypothesis postulated that non-White mentees would be associated with a positive perceived mentoring outcome according to the rater’s assessment. Results of the ANOVA suggest no statistical differences in race among the perceived mentoring dimensions of confidence, competence, and caring. When comparing mean scores, White mentees were perceived as slightly more confident, competent, and caring than non-White mentees, but these findings were also not statistically significant. Because of the lack of racial differences these finding may suggest that mentoring decreases the risk of delinquency equally across race categories.

The fourth hypothesis postulated a positive association with mentees in the one year and over match length category and positive perceptions of increases in confidence,
Results of the ANOVA suggest that rater's perceived mentoring dimensions equally across length of match, thus producing non-significant results. While the comparison of means scores showed slight increases in the confidence, competence, and caring for mentees matched one year or more, these findings were also not statistically significant. Match length and perceptions of increased competence were marginally significant \((p=.06)\). These findings are also surprising since past research points specifically to the importance of matches enduring one year. BBBS requires mentees and mentors to make a one year commitment in order to establish a well-rooted relationship. However, at least in terms of its effect on improving attachment, these findings suggest that the length of mentoring does not appear to influence these ratings of mentees.

The second research question asked what group, if any, are perceived by evaluators to be less likely to have positive changes from mentoring. While hypotheses 1 through 4 found no statistical significance to support such a statement, the specific group of non-White males was found to have some differences when compared to other groups. In particular, non-White males were judged to be less confident by evaluators than other groups, but there were no differences in their ratings on competence and caring. These findings suggest that mentoring may not have the ability to totally decrease the risk of juvenile delinquency among non-White male mentees. Without this ability, mentoring may not be viewed as a panacea since there is a distinct group of mentees that may not be benefiting from an increased social bond.

The difference in ratings of confidence of non-White males compared to other groups suggests that their structural differences are not easily eliminated by mentoring programs.
For this particular group, a more calculated effort may be required to enhance their confidence from mentoring activities. There is a phenomenon that exists within this specific group that makes it more difficult or impossible for mentoring to have a positive outcome. This may be due to exposure to growing up in neighborhoods that have increased poverty, inadequate schooling, and less community cohesion. These pressures may cause more autonomy among non-White males where social bonds are not effective in the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Although this study found perceived mentoring outcome to be equally ineffective across group differences, it does not imply that mentoring itself is ineffective. This study did not evaluate the overall effectiveness of mentoring; its purpose was to investigate the nature of group differences and the perceived responses by the evaluators. Findings indicated that mentees were rated as improving on less than half of the items on each scale: overall indicating that effectiveness of mentoring may not be a panacea to all structural problems in society. Ineffectiveness would have to be based on what one would consider ineffective or successful. By establishing an overall effectiveness benchmark, along with the use of a cost-benefit analysis, one would be able to ascertain effectiveness.

These results basically state that mentoring may not be a cure-all solution to the problems of juvenile delinquency. The findings of non-White males suggest that there are differences between perceived mentoring outcomes in relation to the instrument used. A cure-all solution is, thus, unrealistic. The strengthening of protective factors among particular groups may be through a combination of other outreach programs such as education, vocational training, and other community resources.
Research Limitations

No study is without its limitations and this study is no exception. The data provided posed specific issues with generalizability across mentoring programs populations. First, the sample of respondents was limited to 59 mentees. Second, the data was limited to one location in a southeastern region of the United States. Third, the data lacked a comparison group, which offers the ability to differentiate causal order of the treatment, in this case, mentoring.

An additional limitation of this study is its inability to ascertain direct outcomes of mentoring and behaviors from the mentees themselves. The POE is designed to measure perceptual increases or decreases in mentees behavior on mentoring dimensions of confidence, competence, and caring from the perspective of the child’s parent, teacher, or mentor. Evaluator’s perceptions may be prejudiced or tolerant of a particular mentee if a bias exists.

Lastly, the analysis of this data included the evaluator’s option of “don’t know” and “not a problem” within the “not better” category of each scale measuring confidence, competence, and caring. Including these response options may have subsequently weakened the findings. However, removing this response option significantly reduced the sample size of the data, inhibiting substantive analysis; therefore, these response options were included and re-coded as “not better”.

Future Research

Future research should seek to examine POE data on a greater level, encompassing a larger region and sample size. Multiple locations should be tested using a longitudinal
design to further enhance the findings of perceived mentoring effectiveness over time and across different populations. Also, future research should employ a classic experimental design to offer equivalence in researching POE data. Using this type of research method will allow for greater inference and accuracy of the overall mentoring intervention offered by BBBS. Attention to these matters will increase generalizability to not only the larger BBBS population but mentoring programs as a whole.

Future research should include measures of mentoring effectiveness from the mentees perspectives by employing direct questionnaires or face to face interviews. This may enhance the ability of the program to provide specific services to not only insulate youth from delinquency, but to better academic achievement. Also, it may boost self-confidence to the specific group not reporting increases in mentoring outcome. As a result, mentoring would be tailored to be beneficial to each child.

Lastly, this study did not assess the differences between the evaluator’s ratings based on the survey participant to find if certain evaluators were more likely to perceive improvements when compared to other evaluators. Future research should examine these differences to see if different types of evaluators matter in perceived outcome measures of mentoring.

Policy Implication

Significant findings from this study resulted in identifying non-White males as a group of concern in that they were viewed as less likely to improve in their confidence from mentoring. This finding has significant policy implications within mentoring programs. Identifying this group is important in order to assess the ability of mentoring
programs like BBBS to be a preventative program for all at-risk youth. BBBS should put forth a policy recognizing the possibility of group differences to provide services that may be directly beneficial to this group of juveniles.

Results of this study uncovered potential benefits of mentoring programs by exploring the nature of group differences and evaluators responses of mentoring dimensions of confidence, competence, and caring. By identifying non-White males as a group of interest among mentees, mentoring programs will be able to focus future efforts to the success and achievement of this group. Overall, findings from previous research on mentoring are in support of mentoring efforts as a means of increasing pro-social behaviors. By encompassing the specific needs for all kids, mentoring has the ability to make a difference in improving the lives and life experiences of different groups of children.
APPENDIX

Program Outcome Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>A Little Better</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>A Little Worse</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not A Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self Confidence</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Able to express feelings</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can make a decision</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has interests or hobbies</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal hygiene, appearance</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sense of the future</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>A Little Better</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>A Little Worse</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not A Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Uses community resources</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses school resources</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic performance</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitude toward school</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School preparedness (homework)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Class participation</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Classroom behavior</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Able to avoid delinquency</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Able to avoid substance abuse</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Able to avoid early parenting</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caring</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>A Little Better</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>A Little Worse</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not A Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows trust toward you</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respects other cultures</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship with family</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship with peers</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relationship with other adults</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCES


VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jennifer Sue Anderson

Home Address:
10961 Newcastle Hills Street
Las Vegas, NV 89141

Degrees:
Associate in Science, Criminal Justice, 2002
Ventura Community College

Bachelor of Arts, Criminal Justice, 2006
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Thesis Title: An Evaluation of Group Differences in Mentoring Programs' Perceived Outcomes

Thesis Examination Committee:
Chairperson, Dr. Richard McCorkle, Ph. D.
Committee Member, Dr. Terry Miethe, Ph. D.
Committee Member, Dr. Jane Gauthier, Ph. D.
Graduate Faculty Representative, Dr. Kenneth Fernandez, Ph. D.