5-2004

Multiple Mentors and Family Involvement in Mentoring At-Risk Youth

Christine W. Woodbury
Utah State University

MULTIPLE MENTORS AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT IN MENTORING

AT-RISK YOUTH

by

Christine W. Woodbury

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family, Consumer, and Human Development

Multiple Mentors And Family Involvement In

Mentoring At-Risk Youth

by

Christine W. Woodbury, Master of Science

Utah State University, 2004

Major Professor: Dr. Thomas R. Lee
Department: Family, Consumer, and Human Development

This study examined whether higher family involvement plus additional

mentoring relationships had a greater positive effect than a one-on-one relationship with a

mentor and low family involvement. The study demonstrated, in this sample, that having

two mentors does not have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency,

family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having one mentor. It was also shown, in

this sample, that higher family involvement does not have a greater impact on academic

motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than lower family

involvement. Although additional studies are needed to fully understand the impacts of

mentoring and family involvement, this study suggests that the multiple components of

two mentors and increased family involvement do not have a greater impact on at-risk

youth than a traditional mentoring program utilizing only one-on-one mentoring. The

information from this study could prove useful in designing comprehensive support

programs for families of at-risk children.

(70 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Tom Lee for being my mentor not only as I worked on this project, but also on my path to becoming a professional in the field of Family and Human Development. Thank you for all the opportunities you have given me and for the lessons you have taught me both in and out of the classroom.

Thank you to Janet Cox and Roxane Pfister for all of your hours of statistical analysis help and for your suggestions and explanations.

I would also like to thank Marcelo Diversi for serving on my committee and for opening my eyes to new ways of thinking, researching, and teaching. Thank you as well to Randy Jones for serving on my committee and for your statistical expertise.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband for his patience, encouragement, and help in this project and in everything.

<div align="right">Christine W. Woodbury</div>

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Children need to have supportive, caring relationships with adults (Werner, 1990).
The ability to develop attachment with a primary caregiver is an important predictor of
success in the life of a child (Golombok, 2000). In addition to a caring relationship with
a parent, support from alternative family members, such as grandparents or older siblings,
is a protective factor against stressful life events (Werner, 1990). Further, Benson (1997)
found that youth who have positive relationships with three or more caring adults outside
the family are less likely to be involved in negative behaviors

The focus of many mentoring programs is to provide another supportive adult
relationship for children. "The very foundation of mentoring is the idea that if caring,
concerned adults are available to young people, youth will be more likely to become
successful adults themselves" (Jekielek, Moore, Hair, & Scarupa, 2002, p. 2). Many
mentoring programs have been established to pair at-risk youth with an adult in a one-on-
one relationship (Grossman, 1998; Grossman & Tierney, 1998; Herrera, Sipe, &
McClanahan, 2000). Mentoring programs have been shown to be effective in reducing
dropout rates and teen pregnancy, lowering delinquency, and increasing academic
achievement and social skills (Grossman, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

It is becoming harder and harder for children to have positive, supportive
relationships not only with their parents, but also with additional caring adults in their

lives (Brewster & Fager, 1998). As a result of a segregation of community members by age, which creates mistrust, an emphasis on privacy, and the isolation of families, communities often work against the healthy development of youth (Benson, 1997). Parents in today's economy and complex society find it difficult to spend the time to form meaningful relationships with children (Brewster & Fager).

Parents trying to raise children to become compassionate, capable, and industrious members of society are running into numerous obstacles. For example, parental effectiveness is limited by several factors such as: the youth's own genetic makeup, how they react to parental influence, outside influences on the youth, and lack of social support for parental authority and for parental responsibility (Ambert, 1997). Other obstacles, such as distance, contribute to lack of support for parents. Many families, moving to find employment, are likely to be geographically isolated from close relatives, friends, or other needed resources. There are also fewer adults within families today. More than one in four children are born into a single-parent home, and half of the current generation of children will live in a single-parent household during some part of their childhood. This lack of adult interaction is related to lower self-confidence, problem behaviors, increased delinquency, and lower academic performance (Bernard, 1992; Brewster & Fager, 1998).

The purpose of mentoring programs is to connect at-risk youth with an adult to build a relationship (Grossman, 1998; Grossman & Tierney, 1998; Herrera, et al., 2000). Although these programs are successful in helping the youth, they often do not involve or support the other family members. Further, they do not provide

additional supportive relationships with alternative caring adults. This individual perspective may not achieve results as positive as those of a systems perspective which utilizes multiple interventions to enhance the mentoring relationship.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of the Youth and Families with Promise mentoring program on the behavior and attitudes of the youth in the program. Previous evaluations of YFP have focused on the overall effects of the program without accounting for the effects of the separate components of the program. This study examined whether increased family involvement and additional mentoring relationships (a college-age mentor plus a grandparent-age mentor) had a greater positive effect than simply a one-on-one relationship with a mentor and low family involvement. For the youth behaviors, we examined whether or not the fully implemented Youth and Families with Promise program had a greater effect on academic achievement, social skills, family unity, self-esteem, and delinquency than the partial program of only one mentor and lower family involvement.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Role of Adults in Youth Development

"The measure of the health of a society is how well it takes care of its youngest

generation" (Benson, 1997, p. xiii). In addition to parents, other adults can also play

crucial roles in the positive development of youth (Werner, 1990). In a community that

is meeting the needs of its youngest generation, the youth will experience consistent

support, either by loving parents or caregiver(s), relationships with other nonparent

adults, intergenerational relationships, and a protective, caring, involved neighborhood

(Benson, 1997). In fact, the Search Institute has listed additional support from other non-

parent adults as one of the developmental assets youth need for healthy development

(Benson, Galbraith, & Espeland, 1998). While a community with little or no connections

between adults and children is a risk factor in the healthy development of youth, a strong

community with multiple sources of adult support is a protective factor for youth

(Bogenschneider, Small, & Riley, 1997).

In a study that followed 505 individuals in Kauai, Hawaii from before birth to

adulthood, Werner and Smith (1990) analyzed both risk factors and protective factors that

contributed to the development of the individuals in the study. The researchers looked at

the personal characteristics of the individuals, their home environment, economic status,

and external environmental factors. Many of the participants were born to immigrant

farm workers in low economic conditions. Of the individuals that experienced potential

risk factors, such as prenatal stress, poverty conditions, or family discord, those who also had protective factors grew up to be competent, content, and successful. Two of the protective factors were an attachment to parental substitutes, such as grandparents or older siblings, and outside support from adults in the community.

Interaction with adults can be a protective factor for the youth because of the skills and abilities the adults can teach the youth and the new opportunities and experiences that they can provide for the youth. In his social learning theory, Bandura (1986) describes how children learn from observing. He also explains that learning through example is longer lasting and more effective than lecturing. An adult can model prosocial behaviors for the youth during adult-youth interactions. This is important for at-risk youth who are often surrounded by antisocial examples. A concept within social learning theory is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's abilities. A youth will be much more likely to be motivated to succeed if they believe they have the capability. Self-efficacy can be increased by positive appraisals from someone the youth respects. As a positive role-model and advocate, an adult can greatly increase the chances a youth has for success.

Adults can also help the youth learn skills much more quickly than the youth would be able to on their own. The distance a more experienced individual can help someone problem-solve more effectively than they would alone is the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1935/1978). By being available to offer suggestions or to ask important questions that would help a youth think more effectively about a problem, an adult can help the youth progress more quickly than if they had to do it alone. For

example, an adult that helps an at-risk youth to think of positive solutions to an interpersonal conflict could deter a possibly violent situation that could severely limit the youth's future options.

Finally, an adult can be a protective factor by shaping the self-image of the youth. The idea that a person's self-view is shaped by the feedback they receive from others is called the looking glass self (Cooley, 1902). It means that if a person is continually told through words or actions that they are worthless, they will start to believe they are worthless. Conversely, if they receive feedback that they are worthwhile and loveable, they will see themselves as such. A respected adult that consistently gives the youth positive feedback could do a great deal to shape the youth's self-image in a positive way.

Most if not all intervention programs for at-risk youth recognize adult interaction as a critical factor and include it as a component of the program in some way, such as role model, educator, authority figure, or counselor. In fact, one of the five critical resources in America's Promise, founded by Secretary of State, Colin L. Powell, is for communities to "provide all young people with sustained adult relationships through which they experience support, care, guidance, and advocacy" (Alliance For Youth, 2000).

Mentoring

Traditionally, mentoring is viewed as a one-on-one relationship between a caring, more experienced, older adult mentor and a younger mentee (Flaxman, Ascher, & Harrington, 1988). The Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America program, which pairs adults

with youth from single parent households, is called the "prototype of one-to-one mentoring" (Grossman & Johnson, 1998; Jaffe, 1998). This type of mentoring has become a common intervention for disadvantaged youth (Freedman, 1993; Galbo, Demetruluis, & Crippen, 1990; Gambone, 1993; Hamilton & Darling, 1989). Mentors are considered to be mature and caring people who form a relationship in which they listen to, care for, interact with, give advice, and share experiences with another person (Dondero, 1997). Mentors help youth by creating learning opportunities and by applying learned skills to life situations over an extended period of time (Dondero; Grossman & Garry, 1997). Mentoring programs demonstrate success in helping youth increase their self-confidence and decrease their delinquent behaviors (McLearn, Colasanto, Schoen, & Shapiro, 1998).

Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, Sponsor a Scholar, and Across Ages are examples of successfully established mentoring programs (Grossman & Johnson, 1998; LoSciuto, Rajala, Townsend, & Taylor, 1996; McParland & Nettles, 1991; Tierney, Grossman, & Resch, 1995). These mentoring programs may have a specific focus such as academics or career, or they may have the general focus of youth development. The Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program of America is an example of a program with the general focus of youth development. Tierney and colleagues evaluated The Big Brothers/Big Sisters mentoring program in 1992 and 1993 using the traditional pretest-posttest design. This was the first time scientific research methods were used to evaluate the impact of a mentoring program. One thousand 10- to 16-year-old adolescents were evaluated to see if the program had impacts on antisocial activities, academic

performance, attitudes and behaviors, and family relationships. Half of the youth who applied to the program were matched with volunteer mentors from the community and the other half were placed on a waiting list, becoming the control group. Initial interviews were compared to follow-up interviews after 18 months of being in the program. The youth with mentors were 46% less likely to start using drugs and 27% less likely to start using alcohol than those in the control group. They were also 52% less likely to skip a day of school and almost one third less likely to hit someone. They also showed a small increase in grade point average compared to the youth in the control group. Finally, they were more trusting of parents/guardians and less likely to lie to them and they were more likely to feel supported by their peers and friends.

An example of a program with a specific academic focus is the Sponsor a Scholar program of Philadelphia. The program is designed to help youth reach college by providing long-term mentoring with an adult mentor, academic support, and help with college applications and financial assistance (Grossman & Johnson, 1998). Grossman and Johnson (1998) evaluated this program to find impacts on grade point average in high school and college, college attendance in the first two years after high school, and rate of persistence in college during the first two years after high school. A treatment group consisting of 180 high school students in the program was matched against a comparison group of 180 similar high school students who were not in the program. After three years, students in the program were more likely to enroll in a college, and remain enrolled in college than the comparison group. Although both groups had a decrease in grade point average from freshman to junior year, while the grade point average of youth

in the group without a mentor decreased 5.27 points, the grade point average of the youth with a mentor only decreased 2.77 points (on a scale of 1 to 100).

Whether the focus is general or specific, mentoring programs are helping youth succeed. A national study, called Mentoring Matters, surveyed 1,504 mentors from a number of different programs. To be considered in the sample, participants had to have mentored a 10- to 18-year-old in the last 5 years. Mentors reported spending an average of ten hours per month with the youth. Mentors were asked which selected problems their assigned youth was having and if they felt they had helped the youth with those problems (McLearn et al., 1998). Sixty two percent of the mentors felt they were effective in helping the youth overcome negative feelings about themselves, 52% felt they helped the youth decrease the amount they skipped school, 49% felt they helped decrease the amount the youth was in trouble at school, 47% felt they had decreased the amount of trouble the youth was in outside of school, 48% felt they had helped the youth deal with poor grades, and 45% felt they had helped decrease substance abuse (McLearn et al.). The mentors also indicated they had assisted the youth with other problems including family and friends, sexual activity, running away from home, abuse, or eating disorders. Data were only collected from mentors so no information was available from the actual youth or their parents in this study.

Additional support networks combined with one-on-one mentoring relationships are also beneficial. In a study on the effectiveness of mentoring programs, Jekielek et al. (2002) found that many programs included other strategies such as parenting skills classes and life skills classes for the youth. They concluded that these other strategies

may have contributed to the positive outcomes of the mentoring programs. A study on the effectiveness of the Across Ages mentoring program found that combining mentoring, curriculum, parental involvement, and community service helped youth to have more positive attitudes toward school, themselves, their community and older people (LoSciuto et al., 1996).

<center>Family Relations</center>

Although mentoring programs are successful in helping at-risk youth, most do not directly address family relationships or family support as they focus on the individual youth. If changes in the family relations are measured, they are usually combined with the overall relations with teachers, parents, and peers (Brewster & Fager, 1998). However, in a national survey of adult mentors, negative family relations were listed as being the second most prevalent problem for the youth (McLearn et al., 1998).

Ambert (1997) found that parents can have a large effect on the development of their children in many ways. They can either moderate or aggravate certain negative traits that are inherently genetic and they can also enhance and encourage the positive hereditary traits. Family involvement and support is an important advantage contributing to the success of adolescents. In fact, "effective parental nurturing may be the single best predictor of successful child outcomes" (Smith, Cudaback, Goddard, & Meyers-Walls, 1994, p. 35).

Children need to have closeness and intimacy with their parents (Golombok, 2000). Youth who are securely attached with their parents are more likely to have higher

self-esteem, be more popular, be more competent, and interact more positively than
children who are not securely attached (Ainsworth, 1985; Golombok, 2000).   The
Search Institute has listed family emotional support and positive family communication
as two of the developmental assets youth need for healthy development (Benson et al.,
1998). Involved parents have better communication with their youth and use more
effective disciplinary techniques (Benson et al.). They also maintain supportive home
environments, set realistic expectations, and encourage their youth (McNeal, 1999;
Teachman & Paasch, 1998). On the negative side, poor parental monitoring,
distant/uninvolved/inconsistent parents, and unclear expectations/rules were found to be
risk factors in the development of youth (Bogenschneider et al., 1997).

Adolescence is a unique time for most families. Developmental changes and
changes in peer influence and parental influence can be a source of stress for families as
they try to retain boundaries while redefining relationships and interactions (Murry &
Bell-Scott, 1994). How families react to conflict during this period of adjustment
determines whether this experience is a normal process, or whether it leads to serious
problems (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 2000). Parents of particularly difficult adolescents
may resort to using ineffective parenting styles with their youth, either by implementing
overly restrictive boundaries, or by a complete lack of structure or involvement (Murry &
Bell-Scott). Overly strict and limiting parenting, called authoritarian parenting, leads to
children that are usually more conforming, less socially competent, and have an external
locus of control (Baumrind, 1991). Further, children often respond to overly

restrictive parenting by engaging in other high-risk behaviors (Murry & Bell-Scott,

1994). Children from overly permissive homes typically have more problems with drug

and alcohol use, are less successful in school, have a lower self-image, and lower social

competency (Baumrind, 1991; Martin & Martin, 2000). Authoritative parents set clear

and fair limits, but also use compromise and good communication in their interactions

with their children. Children in authoritative homes are more successful cognitively and

socially, have a higher self-image, and score higher on moral reasoning (Baumrind, 1991;

Pratt, Arnold, Pratt, & Deisher, 1999).

Along with parenting style, parents that interact with their youth regularly will

build better relationships with the youth, which leads to better understanding during

stressful situations (Golombok, 2000). Social support networks give parents added

resources for coping during stressful events, which can lead to better outcomes (Demo &

Cox, 2000). It then becomes important to include the family in the mentoring

relationship instead of focusing on the individual youth. The mentoring will not only

provide an added support system for the family, but may also help as the mentored

individual then contributes more positively to the family.

The national survey of 1,504 mentors found that 35% of the mentors felt they

helped the youth with poor relationships with family members (McLearn et al., 1998).

However, this survey did not describe how the mentors felt they had helped in family

relationships or which specific improvements they had observed. Further, a program

called Career Beginnings reported that students felt their mentor had helped them

improve family relationships and one fourth of the students felt mentoring had

strengthened their family relationships (Bernard, 1992). One of the goals of the Big

Brothers/Big Sisters of America program is to help youth create better relationships with

family and friends. The "Relationship with Mother Scale of the Inventory of Parent and

Peer Attachment" (IPPA; Grossman & Tierney, 1998), a scale that measures trust,

communication, anger, and alienation was used to measure if they had met this goal. The

area in which the youth improved the most was an increase in trust of parents, which was

reported highest among caucasian boys at seven percent (Tierney et al., 1995). No

improvement was reported for communication, alienation or anger, except for caucasian

boys who reported they communicated better with their parents (Grossman & Tierney).

No data were collected from parents about family relationships.

Grandmentors

Using older mentors is a relatively new concept, but more and more programs are

utilizing this untapped resource. Older adults are experiencing "generativity" or the need

to pass on their knowledge to the next generation (Erikson, 1961). Older mentors have

lived and experienced more and therefore might be able to offer more than many young

mentors. For example, one study found that older mentors who had endured and

overcome challenges of their own were more effective mentors (Freedman, 1998). Older

mentors are also more stable and likely to stay in a mentoring relationship longer than a

college-age mentor who usually ends the relationship at graduation. This is important

because mentoring relationships that last longer are more beneficial to youth (Jekielek et

al., 2002). Senior mentors also have more time to devote to their youth which is more effective in creating stable and positive relationships (Taylor & Dryfoos, 1999).

Several intergenerational models have been created to meet the increasing needs of at-risk youth. Mentoring Matters, a program of the Intergenerational Urban Institute of Worcester, Massachusetts, pairs elder mentors with teenage mothers. Family Friends, established by the National Council on Aging, utilizes volunteers over 50 to help families with disabled or special needs children. Generations Together pairs older volunteers with families who have a child with a mental disorder. Home Friends utilizes the unique talents of seniors to help families in which abuse or neglect has occurred.

A recent and successful model of intergenerational mentoring is the Across Ages program developed by Temple University's Center for Intergenerational Learning in Philadelphia (LoSciuto et al., 1996; Taylor & Dryfoos, 1999). Youth in severely economically depressed neighborhoods are matched with mentors who range in age from 60 to 85 years. The mentors are primarily African American, reflecting the ethnicity of the population they are trying to help. The mentors are screened before being matched and are given training and support from the project staff. Mentoring is supplemented with community service activities, classroom-based life skills curriculum, and parent involvement. To evaluate the program, a randomized pretest-posttest control group design was used over the period of a school year. Approximately 180 youth received all components of the program, approximately 193 received all components except a mentor, and 189 youth received no components, serving as the control group. The program had a significant impact on the youth who received all the components except a mentor over the

control group, but an even greater impact was seen for the youth with all the components including a mentor (LoSciuto et al.; Taylor & Dryfoos). Youth reported improvement in attitudes toward school, themselves, their community, and older people and a decrease in substance abuse (LoSciuto et al.; Taylor & Dryfoos).

Summary

The literature shows that mentoring programs are effective in connecting youth with caring adults. These programs are also effective in helping youth reduce delinquency and increase academic and social skills. Older mentors are at a stage in life that is perfect for mentoring youth. They have experienced life and are in a more stable position than younger mentors. Involved parents have better relationships with their youth and better communication and disciplinary skills. Although programs with multiple interventions have had positive outcomes, many programs still focus only on a one-on-one relationship between a mentor and a youth. There is a need to connect youth with caring adults outside of their family as well as a need to increase positive family interactions and parental involvement in lives of their children.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions guided the data analysis:

1. Does having two mentors (a college-age mentor and a grandmentor) have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having just one mentor?

2. Does increased family involvement have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than lower family involvement?

3. Does the interaction between number of mentors and family involvement have an impact in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance?

To address these questions, the following hypotheses will be tested:

1. H_1: The youth with both a college-age mentor and a grandmentor will report a greater increase in academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance with a greater decrease in deviant behavior than the youth with just one mentor.

2. H_2: The youth with increased family involvement will report a greater increase in academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance with a greater decrease in deviant behavior than the youth with lower family involvement.

3. H_3: The youth with both a college-age mentor and a grandmentor, plus increased family involvement will report a greater impact in academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than the youth with just one mentor and lower family involvement.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study utilizes quantitative program evaluation data from the Youth and

Families with Promise mentoring program. After a description of the Youth and Families

with Promise program, this chapter presents the research design and data collection

procedures, followed by the analysis procedures and comparison groupings used for this

project.

Program Description

The Youth and Families with Promise (YFP) mentoring program was developed

as part of a multi-year study designed and implemented through Utah State University

Extension Services to address youth problems through early intervention with at-risk

youth, ages 10-14, and their families. Each YFP site is administered by the local Utah

State University Extension Agent and YFP Site Coordinator, in collaboration with an

advisory board of local community leaders and parents.

The YFP program has expanded from one county in 1994, to 22 counties in 2001-

2002. Funding for the program is provided through Utah State University Extension

Service with grants from the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

Prevention, Utah Board on Juvenile Justice, the Utah State Legislature, and the U.S.

Department of Agriculture.

The youth are matched with volunteer mentors recruited through universities,

colleges, the family's religious congregation, or from community volunteer

organizations. Whenever possible, the youth are matched with both college-age and grandparent-age mentors (grandmentors). In some counties, some youth were not matched with grandmentors, or were not matched the entire time they were in the program.

Mentors work directly with the youth, focusing on building academic and social skills while providing a positive role model for the youth to emulate. Young adult mentors participate in a 4-hour orientation and training that focuses on building a relationship with the youth, understanding the youth, the role of a mentor, and the goals and policies of the program. Monthly follow-up trainings are given along with a curriculum of activities focusing on eight of the 40 behavioral assets from the Search Institute's Developmental Asset model (Benson et al., 1998), which the mentor adapts to fit the needs of the assigned youth. These eight assets include: achievement motivation, school engagement, homework, reading for pleasure, planning and decision making, interpersonal competence, resistance skills, and peaceful conflict resolution. The eight assets were chosen because they directly relate to the three goals that drive the YFP program which are: improving academic performance, increasing social skills, and strengthening family bonds.

Program youth, their families, and mentors participate in monthly "Family Night Out" group activities, and periodic service projects. Through these activities and interaction with the youth, mentors support parent(s) and assist in the development of strong family bonds, better communication, and clear family rules. Family Night Out activities are based on experiential learning principles with activities focusing on the

eight behavioral assets as well as family communication, family unity, understanding feelings, and listening, with a debriefing period after the activity.

<div align="center">Participants</div>

The youth in YFP were referred to the program by school administrators, officers of the Juvenile Court, community social service agencies, or parents. Once a youth is referred to the program, the youth's parent(s) are interviewed and the program is explained to obtain informed consent for the youth to participate in the program and its evaluations (see Appendix A). Further, commitment to be involved as a family is enlisted.

Of the 550 participants in the program who were sent surveys, 342 returned completed or partially completed surveys, for a response rate of 59%. One hundred (34.8%) of the participants were male and 144 (50.2%) were female, while 43 (15%) did not respond to the question on gender. The youth ranged in age from 10 to 16 years old. One hundred and ninety-one youth (66.6%) were Caucasian, 20 (6.4%) were Native American, three (1%) were Asian, six (2.1%) were African American, 13 (4.5%) were Hispanic, and 10 (3.5%) responded "other." Forty-four (15.3%) did not respond to the question on race.

The youth were divided into two groups based on the following criteria: whether they had just a mentor (either a college age mentor or grandmentor), or both a mentor and a grandmentor. One hundred and sixty-six participants had one mentor and 82 participants had two mentors. One hundred and four participants did not fully answer the section regarding their mentor and were removed from the study, for a total of 238

participants. Participants were also divided into groups based on how often they participated in the Family Night Out activities. One hundred and eight belonged to the always/usually group, 50 participants comprised the sometimes group, and 80 participants were in the not often/never group.

<div align="center">Measures</div>

Response-Shift Bias

One of the most widely used methods of program evaluation is the traditional pretest/posttest design. However, this traditional method has an important weakness, especially when participant self-report measures are used. The problem with the pretest/posttest method is due to the knowledge level of the participants. In order for pretest scores to be compared to posttest scores, a comparable common metric unit must exist between the two scores (Chronbach & Furby, 1970). This means that on a scale of one to five, a score of five must mean the same thing on both the pretest and the posttest. In traditional pretest-posttest measures, it is assumed that the standard for measurement will not change from pretest to posttest (Rohs, Langone, & Coleman, 2001). The problem occurs if the participants do not clearly understand the concepts behind the skills or abilities that the program is trying to affect (Pratt, Mcguigan, & Katzev, 2000). The intervention is likely to alter the participants' understanding of the concepts being measured, which alters their perception of their skills or abilities, and therefore alters the standard of measurement between pretest and posttest (Goedhart & Hoogstraten, 1992; Hoogstraten, 1982; Howard et al., 1979). This change in the frame of reference of the

participants, and therefore in the standard of measurement, is called response-shift bias (Howard & Dailey, 1979).

For example, in a program designed to improve listening skills, the pretest might ask the respondent to assess whether or not he actively listens on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always). The youth, not fully understanding the concept of active listening, feels that he listens well and marks "4." He then learns active listening skills through the program and is given opportunities to practice this skill. In a later post-test, when asked again to assess his listening skills, he knows he is a good listener, but realizes due to his training that he is not perfect, so he responds "4." His pre-test and post-test scores of four indicate that he did not improve his listening skills by participating in the program. If he could go back and take the pretest, he might rate himself differently with this new knowledge. The retrospective post-then-pretest design allows the participants to evaluate their level of understanding or behavior prior to their participation in the program from their perspective after the intervention.

The type of question that is most likely to elicit response-shift bias is a question that is ambiguous and open to misinterpretation by the participant. Questions about attitudes are susceptible to response-shift bias. These questions are especially open to misinterpretation if the participant has not yet learned the skills involved in the concept being measured. For example, in this study, participants were asked questions based on the developmental assets needed for healthy development (Benson, Galbraith et al., 1998). The youth were asked if they finished their homework on time, if they planned ahead for things that needed to be done, if they were good at making and keeping friends, if they tried to solve problems without fighting, if they did things that are considered safe,

if they reached goals they had set for themselves, if the kept trying when things got difficult, and if they acted as a leader. These are all questions that could be interpreted differently depending on the respondents' understanding. While in the program, the youth were instructed in a curriculum that was based on the principles of the developmental assets that increased their understanding of these skills.

Participants were also asked questions about their family interactions. The youth were asked if they expressed love for each other, if they complimented each other, if they tried to understand each other's feelings, if they did nice things for each other, if they said what they really felt, if they really listened to each other, if they enjoyed talking about things together, and if they talked about things without arguing. As the youth participated in the program, they were involved in monthly "Family Night Out" activities. During these activities, the families took part in group activities that focused on family communication, building family unity, conflict resolution, understanding feelings, and listening. As they participated in the program, their understanding of the skills involved in these concepts was increased as was their level of understanding of the questions asked in the survey. As their awareness increased, their answers more accurately reflected their abilities before and after the program.

An example of how response-shift bias could occur in this survey would be when the youth were asked if they finished their homework on time. A youth might think that she finishes her homework more than half the time and is proud of the fact that it is usually done five minutes before class starts. The youth might also think that because she gets a D grade, which is passing, she is doing ok and would mark a "4" on the survey. She would then participate in the program in which the mentor would teach the

curriculum based on the Developmental Assets which includes a section on homework. The youth would learn specific homework skills such as setting up a time each evening to work on unfinished assignments, using a space with no distractions, and getting help when needed. In the posttest, she might realize that she sets up a time every night and removes distractions, but sometimes forgets to ask for help. Because she is getting a B grade she marks a "4" on the survey. These results would show that she had not improved in finishing her homework when in reality she had improved a great deal.

The purpose of prevention programs, especially mentoring for at-risk youth, is to teach new skills and educate participants about the benefits of more positive behaviors. As the youths' perception of the behaviors and attitudes change, response-shift bias is likely to occur. The retrospective post-then-pre test has been effective in eliminating the response-shift bias in educational and training programs (Robinson & Doueck, 1994; Sprangers & Hoogenstraten, 1989), and has effectively been used in these programs. A home-visitation child-abuse prevention program found that retrospective post-then-pre testing showed "a more legitimate assessment of program outcomes" than the pretest/posttest format would (Pratt et al., 2000, p. 347). This 2-year study used self-report data from 307 first-time mothers of infants. Comparing data taken from both pretest/posttest measures and post-then-pre measures, the study found that when response-shift bias was present, pretest/posttest methods underestimated the effects of the program.

Rhos et al. (2001) also found response-shift bias in a nutrition training program. The researchers divided 162 food service staff from eight rural schools into three groups. The first group received the treatment and was evaluated with the traditional

pretest/posttest method using a self-report questionnaire. The second group also received the treatment and was evaluated with the post-then-pre method also using the self-report questionnaire, but answering how they felt before they received the training and how they felt after participating in the training. The control group did not receive the treatment but was given the same self-report questionnaire using the pretest/posttest method. The pretest/posttest group only reported significant differences in 5 of the 12 food-handling behaviors. The post-then-pre group reported significant differences in 7 of the 12 food-handling behaviors. Although both treatment groups reported practicing more food-safety behaviors than the control group, the post-then-pre group reported significantly lower mean pretest scores on 5 of the 12 questions than did the pretest/posttest or control groups. Both participant groups received the same training from the same instructors yet reported significantly different levels of impact. These findings also provide evidence that response-shift bias effects only happen in treatment groups and not in control groups.

Even though it is effective in educational and prevention programs, there are possible limitations to the post-then-pre research design. For example, participants may incorrectly remember or reconstruct their abilities. Another possibility is that participants may remember their abilities correctly, but may inflate their responses to show a more positive result to achieve social desirability. Making sure the participants know the evaluations are anonymous should limit this second possibility. Although the participants' memories of their abilities before the treatment are subjective, this is true of any self-report measure that is subjective and open to misinterpretation by the

participants. The post-then-pre research method is designed to decrease this possibility of misinterpretation.

YFP Study Measures

In many programs, where funding is linked to program outcomes, an accurate assessment of outcomes is necessary. It is becoming increasingly important that the positive effects of the programs not be underestimated (Pratt et al., 2000). For this reason, YFP chose a post-then-pre format questionnaire to evaluate the youths' behaviors and attitudes in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance prior to their involvement in the program and after participating in the program for eight months. Frequency of behavior and strength of beliefs was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for always, to 5 for never. To find if the youth had improved in academic motivation, they were asked if they thought that doing well in school was important, if they liked to learn new things at school, if they thought their teacher cared about them, if they finished their schoolwork on time, and if they enjoyed school. These were questions one through four and question 17 on pages one and two of the youth survey (see Appendix B). Cronbach's alpha for academic motivation was .76 ($n = 238$). To measure social competency, the youth were asked if they thought they planned ahead for things that need to be done, if they were good at making and keeping friends, if they said no to their friends when asked to do something wrong, if they tried to solve problems without fighting, if they did things that were considered safe, if they reached goals they set for themselves, if they kept trying when things got difficult, if they acted as a leader in their school, community or church group,

if they felt confident about themselves, and if they got along well with their friends. These were questions six through 12, and 14-16 on pages one and two of the youth survey (see Appendix B). Cronbach's alpha for social competency was .82 ($n = 238$). To measure family interactions, the youth were asked if they felt close to their family, if they respected their parents, how often their family expressed love for each other, complimented each other, tried to understand each other's feelings, and did nice things for each other, were able to say what they really felt, if they really listened to each other, if they enjoyed talking about things together, and if they were able to talk without arguing. These were questions one through eight on page two of the youth survey plus questions 18 and 19 on page two of the youth survey (see Appendix B). Cronbach's alpha for family interactions was .88 ($n = 238$).

The Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, a 10-item scale with five reverse-scored items, was used to measure self-esteem (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965). Demo (1985) reported a test-retest reliability of $r = .85$. In a study of 120 middle school students, Hagborg (1996) investigated the construct validity of the RSES, and reported no statistically significant differences between gender or grade, and found that internal consistency was high. The RSES included questions one through 10 on page three of the youth survey (see Appendix B).

The next nine questions were designed to measure deviant behaviors. The youth were asked how often they had stolen, damaged property, smoked or chewed tobacco, consumed alcohol, had hit or beat someone, skipped school, been sent to the principal's office, cheated on a test, and received a D or F grades. These were questions one through nine on page five of the youth survey (see Appendix B). Again, they were asked to

answer these questions on the same five-point Likert scale for the time before and after

they had been involved with the mentoring program. Cronbach's alpha for deviant

behavior was .80 ($n = 238$).

Demographic questions were also asked. The youth were asked their age, grade

in school, and gender. The youth questionnaire contained a total of 82 questions. Parents

or guardians, mentors and grandmentors were also given surveys with questions that were

either identical or similar to the questions in the youth survey. However, these surveys

were not used in this study.

Procedures

This study compared participants within the same program. Participants were

divided into five categories based on whether they had one mentor or two, and high,

medium, or low family involvement. A post-then-pre testing design was used (Robinson

& Doueck, 1994; Sprangers & Hoogenstraten, 1989) to see if there were differences

between the categories of one mentor or two mentors and high, medium, or low family

involvement in the areas of academic motivation, social competencies, family unity, self

esteem, and deviance.

Survey data were collected in spring of 2002 for youth who were enrolled in the

Youth and Families with Promise program in the fall of 2001. To maintain

confidentiality, all youth were assigned a number by the site coordinator, which was

placed on the questionnaires before they were administered. Questionnaires were

distributed and collected by the site coordinator for each county. Respondents placed

their completed questionnaire in a sealed envelope that was sent off-site for analysis. The

questionnaires were then coded and analyzed using only the youth's assigned number to match the different questionnaires for each youth. No specific identifying information was collected. Respondents were offered $10.00 each for completing the questionnaires.

There was no random assignment of groups. All referred youth were placed in the program. Because of this, there could be confounding variables due to group selection. Participants were compared to other participants within the program.

History issues could also be a possible threat to this study. Individuals could be experiencing crises in their lives that could be resolved independently of the intervention. With the crisis resolved, they could show improvement that has nothing to do with the intervention. Maturation is definitely an issue in this age group. Adolescents mature rapidly and at different rates. Emotional and psychological maturation could be the actual cause of improvement, although maturation effects could also lead to increased deviant behavior. This should occur in both groups due to their similarity. Test-retest reactivity will not be a problem because we used the post-then-pre testing format.

There should be no issue of regression towards the mean as this is a one-time measurement instead of several measurements over time. Selection by time interactions should be controlled by the variation in risk level of the participants. Both groups had a range of adolescents from those who were only slightly at-risk to those who were extremely at-risk. These two types of participants should have averaged each other out, avoiding any front-loading issues.

Experimenter expectancy effects should not be an issue in this study due to the use of standardized assessments rather than questions created by those with a stake in the outcome. Assessments such as Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale and measures from

the Search Institute (Benson et al., 1998) were used. Demand characteristics, such as novelty effects shouldn't be an issue as this study took place over a nine-month period and the participants had time to become habituated to the program and the mentors.

Selection might be a problem as youth who returned surveys may be more involved and motivated in the program than those who did not return surveys. Many of those who did not respond could have had less significant results. However, as each county site was responsible for collecting the surveys, the response rate may have been due to the diligence of the site coordinator rather than self-selection. While some counties had an extremely high response rate, other counties had a low rate. The 59% response rate was therefore not an average rate for each county, but the average over the whole program.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

The following research questions guided the data analysis:

1. Does having two mentors (a college-age mentor and a grandmentor) have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having just one mentor?

2. Does increased family involvement has a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than lower family involvement?

3. Does the interaction between number of mentors and family involvement have an impact in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance?

To determine if having two mentors has a greater impact than having one mentor, a paired samples t test was used to compare the means of the retrospective pretest and the posttest for youth with only one mentor, either a college-age mentor or a grandmentor, and youth with two mentors in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance. Because of the number of t tests that were run, p was set at .001 of significance to reduce the chance of making a Type I error.

To determine if high family involvement had a greater impact than low family involvement, a paired samples t test was also used to compare outcomes for youth with high family involvement, youth with medium family involvement, and youth with low family involvement in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance. Family involvement was split into three levels using the answers from the 5-point Likert scale. The answers always and usually were combined to represent high family involvement, the answer sometimes represented medium family involvement, and the answers not often and never were combined to signify low family involvement. As with the first question, p was set at the .001 level of significance to reduce the chance of making a Type I error.

An analysis of covariance was run to further determine if the number of mentors and the level of family involvement plus the interaction between the number of mentors and the level of family involvement had an impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the data analysis. The first research question, does having two mentors (a college-age mentor and a grandmentor) have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having just one mentor, is answered by presenting the results of the paired samples t tests for youth having one mentor and youth with two mentors. The second research question, does increased family involvement have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than lower family involvement, is answered next with the results of a second set of paired samples t tests for high, medium, and low family involvement. Both the first and the second question will also be answered by the results of the analysis of covariance. Finally, the third research question which asks, does the interaction between number of mentors and family involvement have an impact in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance, is answered with the results of the analysis of covariance. A summary of the findings will conclude this section.

Number of Mentors

For the paired samples t tests for one mentor, the mean of the posttest scores was statistically significantly higher than the mean of the retrospective pretest scores at the p < .001 level for academic motivation, social competency, and family unity (see Table 1). It did not show a statistically significant difference for self-esteem or deviance (see Table

Table 1

Paired Samples t-Test Results for Academic Motivation, Social Competency, Family Unity, Self-Esteem, and Deviance for Number of Mentors

Factor	Retrospective pretest means	SD	Posttest means	SD	Paired t test value
Academic motivation					
One mentor	3.50	.93	4.06	.75	9.30*
Two mentors	3.32	.94	3.98	.68	6.72*
Social competency					
One mentor	3.51	.75	3.96	.59	9.01*
Two mentors	3.41	.76	3.94	.64	7.01*
Family unity					
One mentor	3.48	.89	3.86	.74	8.91*
Two mentors	3.45	.90	3.89	.76	5.54*
Self-esteem					
One mentor	2.74	.53	2.86	.43	3.28
Two mentors	2.59	.50	2.73	.41	2.64
Deviance					
One mentor	4.60	.51	4.70	.54	2.13
Two mentors	4.61	.41	4.67	.53	1.37

Note. n = 238

$* p < .001$

1). The paired samples *t* test for two mentors also showed the means of the posttest scores were statistically significantly higher than the means of the retrospective pretest scores at the $p < .001$ level for academic motivation, social competency, and family unity (see Table 1). Again, there was no statistically significant difference for self-esteem or deviance. In answer to research question

number one, having two mentors (a college-age mentor and a grandmentor) does not have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having just one mentor.

Family Involvement

The results for family involvement were very similar to the results for number of mentors. For the paired samples *t* tests for high, medium, and low family involvement, the mean of the posttest scores was statistically significantly higher than the mean of the retrospective pretest scores at the $p < .001$ level for all three levels of family involvement in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, and family unity (see Table 2). It did not show a statistically significant difference for high, medium, or low family involvement in the areas of self-esteem or deviance (see Table 2). To answer to research question number two, increased family involvement does not have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance.

Interaction Between Number of Mentors and Family Involvement

The analysis of covariance results reflected the results found in the *t* tests for the number of mentors and family involvement. The ANCOVA indicated a statistically significant difference between the means of the retrospective pretest scores and the means of the posttest scores for academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance. It did not indicate that the number of mentors, the level of family involvement, or the interaction between these two variables had a significant effect on the posttest means. Therefore, the interaction between the number of mentors and the level

Table 2

Paired Samples t-Test Results for Academic Motivation, Social Competency, Family Unity, Self-Esteem, and Deviance for Family Involvement

Factor	Retrospective pretest means	SD	Posttest means	SD	Paired t test value
Academic motivation					
High involvement	3.50	.93	4.10	.74	7.15*
Medium involvement	3.62	.82	4.20	.62	5.63*
Low involvement	3.25	.99	3.86	.79	6.66*
Social competency					
High involvement	3.59	.73	4.02	.63	6.63*
Medium involvement	3.47	.77	3.95	.54	6.43*
Low involvement	3.37	.79	3.85	.62	6.81*
Family unity					
High involvement	3.59	.92	3.93	.83	6.48*
Medium involvement	3.32	.94	3.85	.76	6.30*
Low involvement	3.41	.83	3.78	.68	4.91*
Self-esteem					
High involvement	2.71	.53	2.80	.46	2.04
Medium involvement	2.64	.56	2.81	.39	2.40
Low involvement	2.68	.52	2.83	.42	2.71
Deviance					
High involvement	4.68	.46	4.74	.50	1.28
Medium involvement	4.54	.42	4.66	.59	1.83
Low involvement	4.49	.58	4.63	.54	1.90

Note. n = 238

* $p < .001$

of family involvement did not have an impact in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance. It did show, however, that overall the YFP program was effective in improving academic motivation, social competency, and family unity which are the three main goals of the program.

Summary of Findings

The differences between the means for the retrospective pretest and the posttest were statistically significant for both those with one mentor and two mentors and for all three levels of family involvement in the areas of academic motivation, social competency and family unity. Having two mentors does not have a greater impact than having one mentor, and increased family involvement does not have a greater impact than lower family involvement for those three categories. Further, in the categories of self-esteem and deviance, the difference between the means of the scores for the retrospective pretest and the posttest were not significant for those with either one mentor or two mentors or for any of the three levels of family involvement. Having two mentors does not have a greater impact than having one mentor, and increased family involvement does not have a greater impact for those two categories. Finally, the interaction between the number of mentors and the level of family involvement did not impact any areas.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of the Youth and Families with Promise mentoring program on the behavior and attitudes of the youth in the program. Previous evaluations of YFP had focused on the overall effects of the program without accounting for the effects of the separate components of the program. This study examined whether higher family involvement and additional mentoring relationships (a college-age mentor plus a grandparent-age mentor) had a greater positive effect than simply a one-on-one relationship with a mentor and lower family involvement.

The following research questions guided the data analysis:

1. Does having two mentors (a college-age mentor and a grandmentor) have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having just one mentor?

2. Does increased family involvement has a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than lower family involvement?

3. Does the interaction between number of mentors and family involvement have an impact in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance?

Summary

The differences between the posttests and the retrospective pretests were significant for both youth with one mentor and for youth with two mentors. This

supports previous research that has shown mentors to be helpful for youth (McLearn et al., 1998). It is of interest to note that the results showed a significant difference for the areas of academic motivation, social competency, and family unity. These three areas tie directly to the three main goals of the YFP program. These results show that although mentoring has a positive effect on youth, having two mentors does not have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having just one mentor for the youth in this sample. Although additional support from other non-parent adults is one of the developmental assets youth need for healthy development (Benson et al., 1998), it may be that one consistent, caring relationship is enough to make a difference. Also, though multiple sources of adult support are protective factors for youth (Bogenschneider et al., 1997), multiple sources may only be necessary to ensure the youth has one quality relationship with a loving adult. In addition, although intergenerational relationships are important for youth (Benson, 1997), having a grandmentor along with a young adult mentor may have not shown as great an impact for the reason that the grandmentors may have been more of a help and example to the parents. This would be a help to the youth because the parents' skills would be increased, but the benefits might not have show up in our study.

Further, the differences between the posttests and the retrospective pretests were also significant for both youth with higher family involvement and for youth with lower family involvement. Consequently, increased family involvement does not have a greater impact for the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance. These results were surprising, because of the findings of Benson et al. (1998) that more involved parents have better communication with their youth and use more

effective disciplinary techniques. It would seem that the more involved the parents were, the better the family interactions would be (Golombok, 2000; Smith et al., 1994). Group selection may have been a problem for this section of the study. Youth were not assigned to a group that only focused on family involvement. Rather, the youth that were studied had experienced multiple components of the program, which might have had an effect on the results for family involvement. Data collection methods may have also had an effect on the results (a detailed explanation follows in the limitations section).

Finally, the interaction between the number of mentors and family involvement does not have an impact on youth in the areas of academic motivation, social competency, family unity, self-esteem, and deviance. This is consistent with the findings in the individual areas of number of mentors and level of family involvement. The same possible explanations for the results in the individual areas apply to the interaction between them. There may be a ceiling effect in which the youth will not show additional improvement after a certain level of intervention, no matter how many components are included. Group selection and data collection may have also limited the results for the interaction.

Limitations

Higher family involvement may not have shown a greater impact because of the method of data collection. Both the youth and the parents were asked how often they attended the Family Night Out activities using a Likert type scale of 1 to 5. This method did not clarify the amount of attendance that each value from one to five should represent. This left the question open to individual interpretation. In future evaluations of the program, each

value on the scale should be clearly identified as a specific amount of attendance. Another possible way to collect more reliable results for this category would be to take roll at the Family Night Out activities.

The biggest limitation of this study was the absence of a control group and no random assignment to groups. The results of this study could have been confounded due to group selection. Future studies should use a control group and random assignment of participants to groups. A possible method to create a control group would be to establish a waiting list for a certain amount of youth. They would be in the program but would receive no treatment or only certain components of the program. Youth would be divided into groups so that each group only received one component so that each individual component could be studied for effectiveness.

Another problem with the design of the study had to do with data collection. All the youth in the program were sent a survey, and those who returned the survey were included in the study. This might have led to self-selection, which could have influenced the results. It could be that those youth who returned the surveys were pleased with the program, while those that did not return the survey were not as pleased with the program. If this was the case, the results may have shown a greater impact than was actually achieved.

The post-then-pre retrospective survey design, which was selected to overcome the effects of a response-shift bias, might have introduced other limitations. When respondents are asked to evaluate their pre- and posttest behaviors at the same time, they might have the desire to show an improvement simply because the participant enjoyed the program or feels that improvement is expected.

Implications

As many mentoring programs rely on outside funding which is dependent upon program outcomes, programs are increasingly looking to get 'more bang for their buck'. The program that was evaluated in this study is a multiple component model but the evaluation did not show that the additional components of a grandmentor or family involvement resulted in increased benefits, at least as reported by the youth. If simply a relationship with a caring adult is enough to make a significant difference, then funding that is currently going to these additional components could be used more efficiently. Perhaps more money could be spent on the training and support of the single mentor to further improve the mentor-youth relationship, which might enhance program outcomes. Studies focusing on the effect that the quality of the mentoring relationship has on program outcomes might be more useful than studying the number of mentors or how often they met with the youth. Further, the qualities of successful mentors and the types of relationships they have with the youth would be helpful to study as the results could be used to train mentors to be more effective.

Because the results for family involvement may have been due to faulty data collection, further studies should be done on this component with explicitly detailed questions or the actual taking of roll at the activities. A different approach to capturing family involvement might also be used instead of the number of times the family attends the activities. More useful information might be: how useful does the family find the information taught at family night out, or does change occur in the interaction of the family at home? Previous evaluations of the YFP program showed significant impacts on

family interactions (Cox, 2001). Also, previous studies showed that the parents found the grandmentors to be helpful because of support and parenting advice. This suggests the need for additional examination in this area.

The YFP program also engages the youth in service projects and community participation. Future studies should be conducted on the effects these components. Because a community with little or no connections between adults and children is a risk factor in the healthy development of youth, and a strong community is an asset (Benson, 1997; Bogenschneider et al., 1997), this is an important area to consider in youth development programs.

Conclusion

This study examined whether higher family involvement and additional mentoring relationships (a college-age mentor plus a grandparent-age mentor) had a greater positive effect than simply a one-on-one relationship with a mentor and low family involvement. The study demonstrated that mentoring has a positive effect on youth. It was not found that having two mentors has a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, and family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than having one mentor. It was also shown in this sample, that higher family involvement does not have a greater impact on academic motivation, social competency, and family unity, self-esteem, and deviance than lower family involvement. Although additional studies are needed to fully understand the impacts of mentoring and family involvement, this study suggests that the multiple components of two mentors and increased family involvement do not have a greater impact on at-risk youth than a traditional mentoring program

family functioning, but that was not addressed in this study. The information from this study could prove useful in designing comprehensive support programs for families of at-risk children in that a greater emphasis on the recruitment and training of mentors, and the support of a single one-on-one mentoring relationship may be more cost effective and may have as great an impact on program outcomes as would multiple components.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. (1985). Patterns of infant-mother attachments: Antecedents and effects on development. *Bulletin of New York Academy of Medicine, 66* (9), 771- 790.

Alliance For Youth. *America's promise: The five promises.* Retrieved January 10, 2003, from http://www.americaspromise.org/

Ambert, A.M. (1997). *Parents, children, and adolescents: Interactive relationships and development in context.* New York: Haworth Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*, 56-95.

Benson, P.L. (1997). *All kids are our kids.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benson, P.L., Galbraith, J., & Espeland, P. (1998). *What kids need to succeed.* Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.

Bernard, B. (1992). *Mentoring programs for urban youth: Handle with care.* Portland, OR: Western Regional Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.

Bogenschneider, K., Small, S., & Riley, D. (1997). *An ecological, risk-focused approach for addressing youth-at-risk issues.* Chevy Chase, MD: National 4-H Center.

Brewster, C., & Fager, J.J. (1998). Student mentoring. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory's Informational Services.

Chronbach, L.J., & Furby, L. (1970). How we should measure "change" - Or should we? *Psychological Bulletin, 74*, 68-80.

Cooley, C.H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Scribner's.

Cox, J.H. (2001). *An impact study of the youth and families with promise mentoring program on parents and family outcomes*. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Demo, D.H. (1985). The measurement of self-esteem: Refining our methods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 1490-1502.

Demo, D.H., & Cox, M.J. (2000). Families with young children: A review of research in the 1990's. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 876-895.

Dondero, G.M. (1997). Mentors: Beacons of hope. *Adolescence, 32,* 881-886.

Erikson, E.H. (1961). *The life cycle completed*. New York: Norton.

Flaxman, E., Ascher, C., & Harrington, C. (1988). *Youth mentoring: Programs and practices*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Freedman, M. (1993). *The kindness of strangers: Adult mentor, urban youth and the new voluntarism*. New York: Jossey Bass.

Freedman, M. (1998). *Partners in growth. Elder mentors and at-risk youth*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Galbo, J.J., Demetruluis, D.M., & Crippen, C.M. (1990). Recollections of significant adults by pre-service teachers and non-teaching students. *Teacher Education Quarterly, Spring*, 17-37.

Gambone, M.A. (1993). *Strengthening programs for youth-promoting adolescent development in the JPTA system*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Goedhardt, H., & Hoogstraten, J. (1992). The retrospective pretest and the role of pretest information in evaluation studies. *Psychological Reports, 70*, 699-704.

Goldenberg, I., & Goldenberg, H. (2000). *Family therapy: An overview* (5th ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Golombok, S. (2000). *Parenting. What really counts?* London: Routledge.

Grossman, J.B. (1998). The practice, quality and cost of mentoring. In J.B. Grossman (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in mentoring* (pp. 5-9). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Grossman, J.B., & Garry, E.M. (1997). *Mentoring: A proven delinquency prevention strategy.* Washington, DC: US Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Grossman, J.B., & Johnson, A. (1998). Assessing the effectiveness of mentoring programs. In J.B. Grossman (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in mentoring* (pp. 24-47). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Grossman, J.B., & Tierney, J.P. (1998). Does mentoring work? *Evaluation Review, 22*, 403-426.

Hagborg, J.W. (1996). Scores of middle school age students on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 1071-1074.

Hamilton, S.F., & Darling, N. (1989). Mentors in adolescent lives. In K. Hurrelmann, & U. Engel, (Eds.), *The social world of adolescents* (pp. 154-175). New York: De Gruyter.

Herrera, C., Sipe, C.L., & McClanahan, W.S. (2000). *Mentoring school-age children: Relationship development in community-based and school-based programs.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Hoogstraten, J. (1982). The retrospective pre-test in an educational training context. *Journal of Experimental Education, 50,* 200-204.

Howard, G.S., & Dailey, P.R. (1979). Response-shift bias: A source of contamination of self-report measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64,* 144-150.

Howard, G.S., Ralph, K. M., Gulanick, N.A., Maxwell, S.E., Nance, D., & Gerber, S.L. (1979). Internal invalidity in pretest-posttest self report evaluations and the re-evaluation of retrospective pretests. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 3,* 1-23.

Jaffe, N. (1998). Mentoring in 1998: Four models for the 21st century. In J.B. Grossman (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in mentoring* (pp. 84-100). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Jekielek, S.M., Moore, K.A., Hair, E.C., & Scarupa, H.J. (2002). Mentoring: A promising strategy for youth development. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

LoSciuto, L., Rajala, A.K., Townsend, T.N., & Taylor, A.S. (1996). An outcome evaluation of across ages: An intergenerational mentoring approach to drug prevention. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11,* 1116-1129.

Martin, D., & Martin, M. (2000). Understanding functional and dysfunctional family behaviors for the at-risk adolescent. *Adolescence, 35*(140), 785-793

McLearn, K.T., Colasanto, D., Schoen, C., & Shapiro, M.Y. (1998). Mentoring matters: A national study of adults mentoring young people. In J.B. Grossman (Ed.),

Contemporary issues in mentoring (pp. 66-83). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

McNeal, R.B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social Forces, 78*, 117-145.

McPartland, J.M, & Nettles, S.M. (1991). *Using community adults as advocates or mentors for at-risk middle school students: A two-year evaluation of project RAISE.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Murry, V.M., & Bell-Scott, P. (1994). Dealing with adolescent children. In P.C. McKenry & S.J. Price (Eds.), *Family and change* (pp. 88-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pratt, C.C., Mcguigan, W.M., & Katzev, A.R. (2000). Measuring outcomes: Using retrospective pretest methodology. *American Journal of Evaluation, 21*(3), 341-350.

Pratt, M.W., Arnold, M.L., Pratt, A.T., & Diesher, R. (1999). Predicting adolescent moral reasoning from family climate: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*(2), 148-175.

Robinson, E.A.R., & Doueck, H.J. (1994). Implications of the pre/post/then design for evaluating social group work. *Research on Social Work Practice, 4*, 224-240.

Rohs, F.R., Langone, C.A., & Coleman, R.K. (2001). Response shift bias: A problem in evaluating nutrition training using self-report measures. *Journal of Nutrition Education* 33(3), 165-170.

Rosenberg, M., (1965). *Society and the adolescent self image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Smith, C.A., Cudaback, D., Goddard, H.W., & Meyers-Walls, J. (1994). Part two: The model in depth (pp. 19-44). *National Extension parent education model*. Manhattan: Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

Sprangers, M., & Hoogenstraten, J. (1989). Pretesting effects in retrospective pretest-posttest designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 265-272.

Taylor, A.S., & Dryfoos, J.G. (1999). Creating a safe passage: Elder mentors and vulnerable youth. *Generations 22*(4), 43-49.

Teachman, J.D., & Paasch, K. (1998). The family and educational aspirations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 704-715.

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.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1935/1978). Mental development of children and the process of learning. (M. Lopez Morillas, trans.). In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *L.S. Vygotsky: Mind in society* (pp. 342-387). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Werner, E.E. (1990). Protective factors and individual resilience. In S.J. Meisels & S.J. Shonkoff (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 97-116). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Werner, E.E., & Smith, R.S. (1990). *Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Informed Consent Form

UtahState
UNIVERSITY
EXTENSION

Family & Human Development
2705 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-2705

Phone: (435) 797-1543
FAX: (435) 797-7220

INFORMED CONSENT
YOUTH AND FAMILIES WITH PROMISE

Introduction/Purpose:
Dr. Thomas R. Lee in the Department of Family and Human Development is conducting a research study to find out more about the impact of the Youth and Families with Promise mentoring program. You have been asked to take part in this research study because of your involvement in the mentoring program. There will be approximately 15-60 participants in each county site.

Procedures:
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be expected to participate in the Youth and Families with Promise mentoring program (YFP). YFP is a two-level mentoring program (young-adult individual mentors and grandparent-age mentor couples) designed to assist youth, ages 10-14, and their families. The program has three goals: 1) improve academic performance; 2) increase interpersonal competence; and 3) strengthen family bonds.

The well-screened, background-checked mentors establish caring relationships with the identified youth and his or her family through providing motivation and tutoring in reading and academic skills and by participating with them in structured recreation, community service, and community youth groups, such as 4-H. The young-adult age mentors are often recruited from students attending one of Utah's university, colleges, or technical schools. In areas where there is no college or technical school, the mentors are recruited from places of employment, religious organizations, and other volunteer organizations. The grand-mentors are recruited from the family's religious congregation or from volunteer organizations. Youth, parents, and mentors participate in monthly group activities designed to strengthen family bonds through experiential learning ("Family Night Out"). Youth will, on occasion, be transported by program volunteers or staff to and from program activities.

The effectiveness of the program is evaluated in several ways. All participating youth, parents, and mentors will be asked to complete voluntary surveys and some individuals will be selected to participate in focus group interviews. Surveys will be delivered to your home and filled out after your child has participated in the program for 4-8 months, and on an annual basis thereafter. You and your youth will be asked to complete the surveys, then seal them in a postage-paid envelope which will be sent to the state office for analysis. The surveys will be used to evaluate how effective the program has been. The answers are confidential and will only be used in a combined report with youth from throughout the county or state and the answers will not be identified with you personally. Additional information will be collected through progress reports by teachers and school data on attendance, discipline referrals, and grades.

New Findings:
During the course of this study, you will be informed about any changes in the risks or benefits of participating in this study. You may also request information about new findings or outcomes.

UtahState
UNIVERSITY
EXTENSION

Family & Human Development
2705 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-2705

Phone: (435) 797-1543
FAX: (435) 797-7220

INFORMED CONSENT
YOUTH AND FAMILIES WITH PROMISE

Risks and Unforeseeable Risks:
There are minimal risks involved in participating in this study. Participation in this study involves spending time with and building a relationship/friendship with a mentor. While every effort will be made to recruit dedicated and committed mentors, it is possible that both a young adult and grandparent mentor may not be found for every youth or that a volunteer mentor will not follow through in building the relationship and spending time with the youth as expected. If this occurs, every effort will be made to recruit additional mentors and reassign the youth to another mentor.

Benefits:
The benefits of participating in the YFP program and this study may include improved academic performance, increased interpersonal competence, increased self-confidence, and stronger family relationships. Benefits may also include reductions in problem or delinquent behaviors.

Explanation and Offer to Answer Questions:
Your local YFP Site Coordinator has explained this study to you and answered your questions. If you have other questions or research-related problems, you may contact the local County Extension office or Dr. Thomas Lee (435) 797-1543 at the Utah State University Extension YFP Office.

Cost:
The program is coordinated through the local schools, churches, and other community agencies. It is a voluntary program and will not cost your family anything.

Voluntary Nature and Right to Withdraw Without Consequence:
Participation in research is entirely voluntary. You can refuse to complete the survey and still participate in the program. You may refuse to participate or voluntarily withdraw from the program at any time without consequence, simply by notifying the local YFP Site Coordinator in writing via the following address: *Youth and Families with Promise, Utah State University, 2705 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-2705.*

Confidentiality:
Research records will be kept confidential consistent with federal and state regulations. Only the investigator and program evaluation staff will have access to the data, and it will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked room when not in use. The data will be kept for the duration of the mentoring program and then destroyed.

Care if Harmed:
In the event that you sustain injury resulting from your participation in this research project, Utah State University can reimburse you for emergency and temporary medical treatment not otherwise covered by your own insurance. If you believe that you have sustained an injury as a result of your participation in this research program, please contact the Vice President for Research Office at (435) 797-1180.

UtahState
UNIVERSITY
EXTENSION

Family & Human Development
2705 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-2705

Phone: (435) 797-1543
FAX: (435) 797-7220

INFORMED CONSENT
YOUTH AND FAMILIES WITH PROMISE

IRB Approval Statement:
The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects at Utah State University has reviewed and approved this research project.

Copy of Consent:
You have been given two copies of this Informed Consent. Please sign both copies and retain one copy for your files.

Investigator Statement:
"I certify that the research study has been explained to the individual, by me or my research staff, and that the individual understands the nature and purpose and the possible risks and benefits associated with taking part in this research study. Any questions that have been raised, have been answered."

--   -----------------------
YFP Site Coordinator   Date

--   -----------------------
County Extension Agent   County   Date

--   -----------------------
Principal Investigator   Date
Dr. Thomas R. Lee
(435) 797-1543

Parent/Guardian Consent
By signing below, I agree to participate in the program and evaluations.

--   --
Parent/Guardian signature   Date   Parent/Guardian signature   Date

We (I) further authorize the release of student records for our son/daughter, including transcripts of courses and grades, cumulative records, attendance records, records of school disciplinary actions, or other school records of performance, to authorized representatives of **Youth and Families with Promise** for program evaluation purposes until my youth is no longer involved in YFP.
☐ Yes ☐ No

I hereby give my permission for my youth, as well as myself, to be photographed, recorded, videotaped and/or interviewed for purposes of program presentations, brochures, and other educational and promotional literature until my youth is no longer involved with the Youth and Families with Promise program.
☐ Yes ☐ No

UtahState
UNIVERSITY
EXTENSION

Family & Human Development
2705 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-2705

Phone: (435) 797-1543
FAX: (435) 797-7220

INFORMED CONSENT
YOUTH AND FAMILIES WITH PROMISE

Youth Assent

I understand that my parent(s)/guardian is/are aware of this research study and that permission has been given for me to participate. I understand that it is up to me to participate even if my parents say, "yes". If I do not want to be in this study, I do not have to and no one will be upset if I don't participate or if I change my mind later and want to stop. I can ask any questions that I have about this study now or later.

I hereby give my permission to be photographed, recorded, videotaped and/or interviewed for purposes of program presentations, brochures, and other educational and literature until I am no longer with the Youth and Families with Promise program.
□ Yes   □ No

By signing below I agree to participate in the program.

_____   _____
Youth signature   Date

Please sign two copies; one for yourself and one for YFP Site.

Appendix B. Youth Survey

Youth Survey

Dear Youth:

We're glad you have participated in the Youth and Families with Promise mentoring program. We would like to understand if the program has been beneficial for you and your family, and, if so, what changes you have seen as a result of your involvement. Your answers will be confidential. They will not be identified with you personally.

(1) Read the directions for each section carefully.
(2) Answer each one to the best of your knowledge.
(3) Place your completed survey in the business reply envelope provided.
(4) Seal and mail the envelope with the completed survey.

Following this procedure will allow your answers to remain private and confidential. Your perceptions are very important to help us understand how we can make the mentoring program more effective.

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions.

Sincerely,

Dr. Thomas R. Lee
Program Administrator

Post-Then-Pre Test 2002

Directions: Read each statement and rate yourself at the present time. Then, rate how you were before you had a mentor. Circle the numbers using the following key:

1=Always 2=Usually/Frequently 3=Sometimes 4= Not Often/Rarely 5= Never

	Now that you've had a mentor, do you...					Before you had a mentor, did you...				
	Always	Usually	Some times	Not often	Never	Always	Usually	Some times	Not often	Never
1. think that doing well in school is important.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. like to learn new things at school.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. think your teachers care about you.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. finish your school homework on time.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. read when you have free time.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. plan ahead for things that need to be done.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. think you are good at making and keeping friends.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. say, "No" to your friends if they want you to do something that is wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. try to solve problems without fighting.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. do things that are considered safe.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. reach goals you have set for yourself.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. keep trying when things become difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. get along with your parents.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14. act as a leader in a school, community, or church group.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
15. feel confident about yourself.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	New that you've had a mentor, do you.					Before you had mentor, did you...				
	Always	Usually	Some times	Not often	Never	Always	Usually	Some times	Not often	Never
16. get along with your friends.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. enjoy school.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18. feel close to your family.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19. respect your parents.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer some questions about your family. Read each statement and rate your family at the present time. Then, rate how your family was before you had a mentor.

	After having a mentor, how frequently does your family...					Before having a mentor, how frequently did your family...				
	Almost Always	Frequently	Some times	Once in a While	Almost Never	Almost Always	Frequently	Some times	Once in a While	Almost Never
1. express love for each other.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. compliment each other	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. try to understand each other's feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. do nice things for each other.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. say what you really feel.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. really listen to each other.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. enjoy talking about things together.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. talk about things without arguing.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

YOU'RE DOING GREAT!!!!

KEEP GOING!!!!

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you STRONGLY AGREE with the statement, circle SA. If you AGREE, circle A. If you DISAGREE, circle D. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE, circle SD. Rate yourself at the present time, then rate how you felt before you had a mentor.

	Now that you've had a mentor...				Before you had a mentor...			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. on the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
2. at times, I think I am no good at all.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
5. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
9. all in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD

Please answer some questions about the program in general. If you STRONGLY AGREE with the statement, circle SA. If you AGREE, circle A. If you DISAGREE, circle D. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE, circle SD.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When I first started the program, I felt that I'd be comfortable here.	SA	A	D	SD
2. There were staff or mentors in the program like me.	SA	A	D	SD
3. There were other youth in the program like me.	SA	A	D	SD
4. When we talked about what was happening in my life, I felt like my mentor understood what I was saying, or was trying to understand.	SA	A	D	SD
5. The program helped me understand my own culture better.	SA	A	D	SD
6. The program helped me feel good about who I am.	SA	A	D	SD
7. The program helped me understand other people better.	SA	A	D	SD

Please answer some questions about your mentor(s).

Do you have a young adult mentor? Yes No

Do you have a grandparent mentor? Yes No

If you have a young adult mentor, please answer the first column of questions. If you have a grandparent mentor, please answer the second column. If you have both types of mentors, please fill out both columns.

If you STRONGLY AGREE with the statement, circle SA. If you AGREE, circle A. If you DISAGREE, circle D. If you STRONGLY DISAGREE, circle SD.

	YOUNG ADULT MENTOR				GRANDPARENT MENTOR			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. My mentor really cared about me.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
2. I liked doing things with my mentor.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
3. I felt comfortable with my mentor.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
4. I felt like my mentor really wanted to spend time with me.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
5. My mentor asks me what I want to do.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
6. My mentor makes me feel special.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
7. My mentor and I like to do the same things.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
8. I trust my mentor.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
9. My mentor followed through with our plans.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
10. My mentor taught me new things.	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD

Good job!!!!

Keep smiling!!!!

-4-

Please answer some more questions about yourself. Read each statement and rate yourself at the present time. Then, rate how you were before you had a mentor.

	Now that you've had a mentor, how often do you...					Before you had a mentor, how often did you...				
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	A few times a year	Never	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	A few times a year	Never
1. steal something.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. try to damage or destroy property.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. smoke cigarettes or use tobacco.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. drink alcohol.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. hit or beat up someone outside your family.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. skip school without permission.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. get sent to the Principal's office for being in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. cheat on a test.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. receive D or F grades in school.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

A few more questions.

Are you: _____ Male _____ Female

Age: _____

Grade in school: _____

Ethnic/ Racial Background:
.... American Indian   .... Hispanic
.... Asian   .... White
.... Black   .... Other

What type of grades have you earned in school THIS SEMESTER? (please circle the one that BEST describes you)

All A's   A's and B's   B's and C's   C's and D's   D's and F's   All F's

-5-

What type of grades did you earn in school BEFORE HAVING A MENTOR? (please circle the one that BEST describes you)

    All A's   A's and B's   B's and C's   C's and D's   D's and F's   All F's

How often did you participate in program activities?   (Family Night Out, Service Projects, 4-H activities)

    1- Always 2- Usually 3- Sometimes   4- Not Often 5- Never

How often did your FAMILY participate in program activities? (Family Night Out, Service Projects)

    1- Always 2- Usually 3- Sometimes   4- Not Often 5- Never

Overall, how would you rate the Family Night Out activities?

    1- Poor 2- Fair 3- Okay   4- Good 5- Excellent

Did you complete a 4-H project?	Yes	No
Do you plan to submit a 4-H project to the fair?	Yes	No
Would you recommend having a mentor to others?	Yes	No
Would you participate in this program again?	Yes	No

What were your favorite things to do with your mentor?

_____

_____

_____

Please describe the group activity you enjoyed most.

_____

_____

_____

What are the two best things about having a mentor?

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for answering these questions. Please put your survey in the provided envelope and seal it so your answers remain private. Your envelope will be mailed to Utah State University and your answers will not be identified with you personally.

Utah State UNIVERSITY EXTENSION Utah State University Extension does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status in employment or program delivery.

The Youth and Families with Promise program is coordinated through the 4-H program in connection with Utah State University Extension.

YFP Utah's Youth and Families with Promise Program (YFP) is designed to strengthen youth, ages 10-14, and their families. YFP is a two level mentoring program, which uses young-adult individual mentors and grandparent-age mentor couples.