



Mentoring

Toolkit technical report

Hannah Gaffney, Darrick Jolliffe and Howard White

October 2022

This report is produced in collaboration with staff from the Campbell Collaboration Secretariat. It is a derivative product, which summarises information from Campbell systematic reviews, and other reviews, to support evidence-informed decision making’.

The Campbell Collaboration thank Suchi Malhotra for the AMSTAR coding of included reviews (second coder).

Mentoring Programmes: YEF Technical Report

Hannah Gaffney, Darrick Jolliffe, and Howard White

Summary

The objective of this technical report is to review the evidence on the effectiveness of mentoring programmes as a strategy for preventing children and young people becoming involved in crime and violence. This technical report is mainly based on three systematic reviews: Burton (2020); Raposa et al. (2019); and Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022).

The central component of mentoring programmes is the act of creating mentor-mentee pairs or matches, though mentoring may be embedded in a programme with other activities (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2022). This can involve assigning a peer, an older youth, or a non-parental adult as a mentor for a suitable mentee. Activities in mentoring programmes focus on issues such as prosocial relationships, life skills/management, employability, self-esteem, problem-solving, communication skills, and tutoring or academic support (Raposa et al., 2019).

Adult-youth mentoring programmes are most common and involve a young person under the age of 18 being matched with an appropriate adult mentor (Raposa et al., 2019). However, mentoring programmes can involve participants of similar ages, and these are called cross-age mentoring or peer mentoring (Burton, 2020).

Mentoring programmes are implemented as prevention approaches and focus on supporting positive youth development and so prevent involvement in crime and violence through a developmental framework (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2022). Therefore, mentoring programmes are described as ‘targeted’ interventions (Raposa et al., 2019). The theory of change is that mentees can develop social-emotional and cognitive skills through their relationships with mentors. Good mentor-mentee relationships can help youth develop other prosocial relationships and help them to improve self-regulation and information processing.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) report a 14.2% reduction in youth offending based on 37 evaluations of mentoring programmes, and a 21.1% reduction in violent behaviour based on eight evaluations, with evidence ratings of 4 and 3 respectively (on a scale of 1 – 5). There is also a large effect on reoffending – a 20% decrease, based on findings from 23 studies, with an evidence rating of 4. These are our preferred estimates to inform the headline metric in the Toolkit. Raposa et al. (2019) report a

19% reduction in externalising behaviours based on 38 evaluations of mentoring programmes, with an evidence rating of 2.

Both reviews reported mean effect sizes for additional outcomes and the results suggest that mentoring programmes have the potential to impact a wide range of risk and protective factors for youth offending and violence. For example, Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) found that mentoring programmes had a desirable effect on academic achievement, drug use, and family relationships and physical health; but not on some other outcomes such as social and emotional outcomes and school behaviour. Raposa et al. (2019) found that mentoring programmes have desirable effects on outcomes across several domains, including school, psychological, social, cognitive and health outcomes.

Moderator analyses suggest that, based on current evidence, mentoring programmes are more effective with male mentees and when mentors are male. Shorter meetings between mentors and mentees are also associated with greater effectiveness. The effects of mentoring appear to be sustained. There are some contrary findings regarding untrained supervisors and unstructured programmes being more effective for some outcomes.

Qualitative data support positive views of mentoring but also identify possible issues such as inappropriate matching, the failure to match many potential mentors which results in cost inefficiencies, premature ending of mentoring relationships which are not going well, and poor handling of termination negating the positive impact of the programme.

Cost-effectiveness analyses suggests that mentoring programmes may not be as low cost as was thought when they were first implemented in England and Wales. Higher costs are in part related to high attrition rates. However, global evidence generally suggests that mentoring is cost effective when assessed against the costs of offending.

Overall mentoring appears to be moderately effective. However, despite a relatively large number of studies, there remain many design issues for which more research is needed. Principle amongst these are: (i) effective recruitment strategies to recruit mentees of the right demographic background; (ii) the relative merits of structured versus unstructured approaches, which activities to include in mentoring, and which complementary components are most effective; and (iii) effective management of termination of the mentoring relationship including follow up support.

Objective and approach of this technical report

The objective of this technical report is to review the evidence on the effectiveness of mentoring programmes as a strategy for protecting children and young people against involvement in crime and violence.

Mentoring programmes aim to improve youth outcomes for ‘at-risk’ populations through modelling and support from appropriate mentors. This report evaluates the behavioural impact of mentoring programmes on outcomes such as antisocial behaviour, aggression, violence, and youth offending.

This technical report is mainly based on three systematic reviews: Burton (2020); Raposa et al. (2019); and Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022). A follow-up meta-analysis that compared specific approaches in adult-youth mentoring programmes also informs the current report (i.e., Christensen et al., 2020). Burton (2020) reviewed cross-age peer mentoring programmes, of which there is limited evaluation research. Only six studies are included in that review and only two of those evaluated effectiveness on relevant outcomes. Therefore, it is not taken into account in our analyses of effectiveness, but the study is used to inform the descriptive overview of mentoring programmes.

The following inclusion and exclusion criteria were used to inform the selection of systematic reviews.

Inclusion criteria

To be included in this report a systematic review must:

- Review the impact of mentoring programmes on crime, antisocial behaviour, aggression, violence or related outcomes.
- Review evaluations of programmes using experimental or quasi-experimental methods with before and after outcome measures. Both randomised and non-randomised designs can be eligible for inclusion.
- Review either adult-youth mentoring programmes or peer-mentoring programmes.
- Report findings in the English language and published in peer-reviewed journals or by other reputable sources (e.g., Campbell systematic reviews, Cochrane systematic reviews) within the past 10 years (i.e., since 2010). Reviews that were not published in peer-reviewed journals, such as doctoral dissertations on ProQuest dissertation publishing or reviews in progress, were also considered for inclusion if they met other criteria satisfactorily.

Exclusion criteria

Reviews were excluded for the following reasons:

- The review was outdated or has been updated recently (e.g., Tolan et al., 2008 and 2013).
- The review did not include outcomes related to antisocial behaviour, crime, aggression, offending or violence (e.g., Wheeler et al., 2010).

Outcomes

The impact of mentoring programmes can be assessed on a variety of outcomes, for example substance abuse or internalising problems such as depression. The current technical report is concerned with outcomes of antisocial behaviour, aggression, crime, and/or violence.

Raposa et al. (2019) reported the effectiveness of mentoring programmes on five outcome domains: school, psychological, health, cognitive, and social. These domains included several factors known to be associated with our outcomes of interest, such as externalising behaviours, substance use, social skills, social support, and self-regulation. The impact of mentoring programmes is reported separately for these outcomes.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) included evaluations of mentoring programmes that reported the following outcomes: violent offending, overall offending and reoffending, antisocial and other externalizing behaviour, internalizing behaviour and mental health, education outcomes, and substance use. The effectiveness of mentoring programmes is reported separately for these specific outcomes.

Description of interventions

The main component of mentoring programmes is the act of creating mentor-mentee pairs or matches (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2022), though mentoring may be part of a programme with other components. This can involve assigning a peer, an older youth, or a non-parental adult as a mentor for a suitable mentee. Mentoring programmes tend to specialise in the intergenerational dynamic of the intervention, i.e., the programme involves adult-youth mentoring or cross-age peer mentoring. In relation to adult-youth mentoring, the mentee is typically under the age of 18 and the mentor is an appropriate adult or an older youth. Tolan et al. (2013) specify that the four fundamental components of mentoring programmes are: modelling/identification formation, emotional support, teaching and advocacy.

The small effect sizes which have been found in many evaluations of mentoring programmes has resulted in calls for them to be a vehicle for targeted skills development not just mentoring alone, which may be either life skills or academic training (Christensen et al., 2019).

An example of adult-youth mentoring programmes is the Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America initiative. Examples of cross-age peer mentoring include 'Cross-Age Mentoring Program (CAMP) Cross-Campus Model' or 'Children Teaching Children'.

Burton (2020) describes 'cross-age' peer mentoring as a "form of formal peer mentoring that matches an older youth mentor with a younger youth mentee to promote positive youth outcomes". This type of peer mentoring recognises that, beyond siblings and extracurricular activities (e.g., sports teams, youth clubs), there is little opportunity for natural relationships to form between young people of different ages, primarily as a result of grade-systems in education. Similar to adult-youth mentoring, pairing a younger youth mentee with an older youth mentor is said to provide support, guidance and an appropriate role model. In this way, the term 'peer' is used to indicate that both mentor and mentee are "of the same generation" (Burton, 2020, p. 5).

Lakshinarayan et al. (2022) evaluate the effects of formal mentoring in which a mentor is recruited, trained and matched with a mentee to engage in various activities such as goal-setting, address risk behaviours and build on the young person's strengths and abilities. Mentoring programmes are delivered as either prevention or treatment approaches in relation to involvement in crime and violence. They state that the focus has shifted from a preventive perspective to positive youth development which builds on a young person's strengths.

Raposa et al. (2019) report that the majority of adult-youth mentoring programmes were school-based (63%) and did not include a specific curriculum (82%). Moreover, most programmes were labelled 'unstructured' (62%) or 'semi-structured' (21%). Components of mentoring programmes focus on topics such as: prosocial relationships, life skills, employability, self-esteem, problem-solving, communication skills, and tutoring or academic support.

Mentoring may also be incorporated as a major, or minor, component of existing multicomponent intervention programmes (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2022). For example, mentees may also be engaged in family, individual or group counselling, community service, educational activities, or social and emotional skills training.

Targeted or Universal

Adult-youth mentoring programmes are typically ‘targeted’ interventions (Raposa et al., 2019). Generally, young people who need additional support are enrolled in a mentoring programme and matched with a suitable mentor. Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) report that programmes may identify eligible young people by (i) screening using an assessment tool either for the study or as part of an existing assessment system, (ii) referral from social workers, teachers or others, (iii) directly recruited through programme outreach, or (iv) geographical or proxy targeting.

Implementing personnel

Mentors are often, but not always, trained by organisations (e.g., Big Brothers Big Sisters of America) but reviews did not provide information on the implementing personnel for these training sessions (Raposa et al., 2019). Lakshinarayan et al. (2022) report that in the majority of cases mentors were volunteers, with paid workers being far less frequent. Mentors were also teachers, social workers and police or probation officers.

The most important implementing personnel are the mentors enrolled in the programme. Raposa et al. (2019) reviewed evaluations of ‘intergenerational’ mentoring programmes where mentors were non-parental adults or older young people who were providing mentoring in a non-professional capacity. Across 70 evaluations, mentors were on average more likely to be female (58%) and identify as White (62%). The mean percentage of Black mentors in studies was 31%, and the mean percentages of Hispanic (9%), Asian (6%), Other (11%) and Multi-ethnicity (1%) were relatively lower. Raposa et al. (2019) reported that, on average, 79% of mentors were helping professionals, for example counsellors or social workers. Across studies, the mean percentage of student mentors was 48%.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) reported in the included studies the most common age group for mentees was 10-14 (46% of studies) followed by 15-17 (35% of studies). Most programmes (86 studies, 77%) were for both boys and girls, with just nine studies of programmes for boys only and one for girls only. Twenty studies were for programmes which had a majority ethnic minority population, with most studies having partial ethnic minority participation.

In cross-age peer mentoring programmes, the intervention typically involves a combination of one-to-one and group mentoring (67%, Burton, 2020). These programmes are also mostly implemented in schools (67%) and are not curriculum-based (83%). Cross-age peer mentoring does also involve adults, primarily in a supervisory context, and most programmes include a high level of adult

supervision/oversight (60%; Burton, 2020). The focus of cross-age peer mentoring programmes can be described as academic, health, 'general' or concerned with problem behaviours.

Duration

Lakshminarayan et al. (2013) report that the majority of the studies (thirty-one) analyzed mentoring relationships lasting for 12-24 months, though 25 studies considered programmes with a shorter planned duration of six-twelve months, and 16 in which it was less than six months. There were 10 studies of longer programmes of between 2-3 years duration, and eight studies in which the mentoring relationship was longer than 3 years. In most cases mentees meet once a week.

Raposa et al. (2019) reported on several elements of the duration and scale of mentoring programmes across 70 evaluation studies. On average, mentoring programmes lasted 11 months but ranged from 2 months to 5 years in length. The average length of meetings between mentors and mentees across all studies was 1 hour 42 minutes, but these meetings ranged from a minimum of 30 minutes to a maximum of 4 hours. The mean number of training hours that mentors received prior to participation was 4 hours (range = 1 to 16 hours).

Burton (2020) included evaluations of cross-age peer mentoring programmes and found that the interventions were between 2 and 18 months long. The mean length was 8 months. The pre-training for mentors ranged from 2 to 8 hours, with a mean duration of 5 hours.

Theory of change/presumed causal mechanisms

The presumed causal mechanism in mentoring programmes can be explained through a developmental framework. Raposa et al. (2019) adopts the framework proposed by Dubois et al. (2011) that adult-youth mentoring programmes encompass three important and related processes that enable behavioural change.

First, the social-emotional process aspect of development refers mostly to relationships with others. Rooted in attachment theory, social-emotional development highlights how positive mentoring relationships between adults and youth can change the youths' perceptions of other relationships, thereby encouraging the development of prosocial bonds and behaviours.

Second, the cognitive aspect of adult-youth mentoring suggests that, by engaging in discussion with adults, young peoples' cognitive skills such as information processing and self-regulation may be

enhanced. Finally, Raposa et al. (2019) describe the process of identity formation, whereby adult mentors act as role models who can provide young people with aspirational qualities and goals.

Cross-age peer mentoring is similarly rooted in a developmental framework (Burton, 2020). The presumed causal mechanism is that “youth can reach a higher level of skills development and perform more complex cognitive, behavioural, and emotional tasks when working with or under guidance from those older than themselves”. Cross-age peer mentoring also involves elements of group socialisation, specifically that young people will adapt or modify behaviours to be cohesive with the norms established by their peer group.

Lakshminayanan et al. (2013) identify additional possible causal pathways which are skills building through complementary components, mentors being advocates for young people and connecting them to jobs or services, supporting job search through help preparing CVs and so on, and a ‘time use effect’ from the time spent with the mentor and new interests they may develop out of activities with the mentor.

Evidence base

Descriptive overview

Evaluations of mentoring programmes are primarily conducted in the USA. However, the reviews do not specify the location of evaluations, so this statement is not necessarily completely accurate, but it is a fair assumption based on the language and terminology used (Burton, 2020; and Raposa et al., 2019). However, Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) state that 87% of the studies are from North America, mainly the United States, with 11 studies being of programmes in the United Kingdom.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) included evaluations of mentoring programmes published between 1972 and 2020, and the majority employed experimental designs ($n = 64$). Burton (2020) included evaluations of cross-age peer mentoring programmes published between 1994 and 2011 and the majority were evaluated using an RCT design (67%).

Raposa et al. (2019) reviewed 70 evaluations of mentoring programmes, including data from 25,286 mentees. The majority of participants across all evaluations of mentoring programmes lived in a single parent household (63%) and were eligible for free school meals (72%). Raposa et al. (2019) note that 82% of mentees were ‘below grade academic functioning’ and 83% reported problem behaviours.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2013) report results from 109 studies of which 87 are effectiveness studies and 32 qualitative studies or process evaluations.

Burton (2020) also included information about the demographics of mentees and mentors. The mean percentage for male mentees was 55% and the mean percentage for male mentors was 61%. Mentees were predominantly Black (50%), followed by White (35%) and Hispanic (15%). Comparatively, similar percentages of Black (43%) and White (48%) mentors were observed across evaluation studies. The mean age of mentees was 11 years old.

Assessment of the strength of evidence

A modified version of the AMSTAR critical appraisal tool was used to evaluate the quality of the reviews used to inform the current report. The reviews by Burton (2020) and Raposa et al. (2019) were deemed to be of low confidence in study findings, and Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) were deemed to be of medium confidence.

Raposa et al. (2019) published their report in a peer-reviewed journal and Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) conducted a Campbell systematic review, with very high methodological standards (currently under review). Burton (2020) is a doctoral dissertation.

All three of the reviews adequately specified the research questions and the inclusion/exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria included components relating to the population, intervention, comparison group and outcome of interest. Specifically, inclusion criteria referred to evaluations of mentoring programmes for children and young people at-risk of offending. Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) specify that evaluations must be of mentoring programmes for young people who have offended or are at risk of doing so. Raposa et al. (2019) specify that evaluations had to be of adult-youth mentoring programmes that reported effectiveness on at least one psychological, social, school, health or cognitive outcome. Burton (2020) included only evaluations of cross-age peer mentoring that reported on outcomes similar to Raposa et al. (2019).

Neither Raposa et al. (2019) nor Burton (2020) registered a protocol prior to publication of the findings. Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) registered their protocol with the Campbell Collaboration.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) included both experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations of mentoring programmes with or without random allocation to an intervention or a control condition.

Evaluations must have met at least one of the following methodological criteria: (1) random assignment; (2) participants were matched on relevant variables at baseline; or (3) a comparison group was used and there was 'retrospective equivalence' on outcome variables and demographic variables at baseline. Burton (2020) and Raposa et al. (2019) also included randomised controlled trials and quasi-experimental evaluations.

Each review reported a comprehensive literature search strategy including a number of different databases, designated keywords and search strategies. None of the reviews restricted inclusion criteria to only peer-reviewed publications. All three reviews only included evaluations published in English.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) reported that studies were double-screened and coded; however, extraction of effect sizes was partly done by one person. Burton (2020) stated that all studies ($n = 6$) were double-coded according to a pre-determined coding manual. Similarly, Raposa et al. (2019) reported that five raters coded eligible evaluations and followed a coding manual.

Raposa et al. (2019) and Burton (2020) did not include a measure of risk of bias, beyond conducting some analyses for publication bias. Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) assess confidence in study findings against a range of criteria such as attrition and sample size.

Both Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) and Raposa et al. (2019) provided information about funding received for their respective projects and declared no known conflict of interest.

Each of the reviews conducted a meta-analysis and reported detailed information on the synthesis and estimation of weighted effect sizes and adequately reported the heterogeneity between primary effects. Each of the meta-analyses reported separate weighted effect sizes for independent outcomes and assessed multiple moderators as possible explanations for heterogeneity between primary effect sizes.

Raposa et al., (2019) report a direct estimate of the effect of mentoring programmes on externalising behaviour based on 38 studies. The review does report an estimate of heterogeneity between-study effect sizes in their three-level meta-analysis ($s^2_{\text{level } 3} = .07, p < .001$), suggesting high heterogeneity. This review provides only an indirect estimate for crime and violence outcomes and so the evidence rating for these outcomes is 2.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) report a direct estimate of the effectiveness of mentoring programmes on youth violence based on eight studies. There was high heterogeneity between evaluations ($I^2 = 99.3\%$) and so the evidence rating is 3. This is our preferred estimate to inform the headline metric.

Impact

Summary impact measure

Overall, mentoring programmes were effective in reducing violence, offending and externalising behaviour. The weighted mean effect sizes for reviews of adult-youth mentoring are reported in Table 1. As mentioned, Burton (2020) is not considered here because that report included only two relevant evaluations.

Table 1

Mean effect sizes for externalising behaviours and delinquency

Review	ES (<i>d</i> and OR)	CI (ES)	<i>p</i>	% reduction	Evidence rating
Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022); Violence** n=8	OR = 1.32 <i>d</i> = 0.153	1.073-1.543	<i>p</i> <0.01	21%	3
Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022); All offending n=37	OR = 1.22 <i>d</i> = 0.110	1.129-1.289	<i>p</i> <0.001	14%	4
Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022); reoffending n=23	OR= 1.47 <i>d</i> = 0.212	1.279-1.686	<i>p</i> <0.001	19%	4
Raposa et al. (2019); externalising behaviours	<i>g</i> = 0.15 OR = 1.31	<i>t</i> = 3.72	<i>p</i> < .001	19%	2

Note: ES = the weighted mean effect size; CI = 95% confidence intervals for the mean ES; *p* = the statistical significance of the mean ES; OR = odds ratio; *g* = Hedges' *g* reported under the random effects model of meta-analysis; *d* = Cohen's *d* reported under the random effects model of meta-

analysis; SMD = standardised mean difference; t = t-test comparing g value with zero, ** = headline impact estimate.

We transformed the g to the OR using the equation $\text{Ln}(\text{OR}) = \text{SMD}/.5513$ (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001, p. 202). If we assume equal numbers in the experimental and control conditions (e.g., $N = 100$ in each condition) and that the prevalence of offending in the control condition is 25% (i.e., 25 delinquents out of 100), the odds ratio for Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) of 1.21 corresponds to 21.6% delinquents in the experimental condition, a relative decrease of approximately 14%.

For violence we assume the baseline value is two-thirds of that for all offending, that is 17%. The same calculation for violence, gives a reduction of 21.0%. For reoffending, we assume a control reoffending rate of 50%. The OR of 1.47 gives 40.5% reoffending in the treatment group, equivalent to a 19% reduction in reoffending.

These estimates are not greatly affected by different assumptions. Further explanation of this transformation and how the relative reduction changes depending on the assumed prevalence is provided in Annex 1.

Our assumptions about the prevalence of offending are not unreasonable in light of UK criminological research. For example, in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, which is a prospective longitudinal study of London males, 34% were convicted of criminal offences up to age 21, as were 20% of their sons (Farrington et al., 2015).

Raposa et al. (2019) reported that the weighted mean effect size for 70 evaluations of adult-youth mentoring programmes across all outcome domains was $g = 0.21$, $p < .001$. When the mean effect sizes were classified into broad outcome domains, Raposa et al. (2019) found that adult-youth mentoring similarly significantly improved:

- (1) school outcomes ($g = 0.20$, $p < .001$);
- (2) psychological outcomes ($g = 0.17$, $p < .001$);
- (3) health outcomes ($g = 0.23$, $p < .001$);
- (4) cognitive functioning ($g = 0.19$, $p < .001$); and
- (5) social outcomes ($g = 0.19$, $p < .001$).

Of most relevance to this report, Raposa et al. (2019) found that adult-youth mentoring programmes significantly improved mentees' self-regulation ($g = 0.22$, $p < .01$), self-cognition ($g = 0.14$, $p < .001$)

and social support ($g = 0.20, p < .001$). This means that mentoring programmes are effective in not only reducing externalising behaviours but also supporting the development of positive, protective attributes.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) also reported weighted mean effects for different outcomes. These are shown in Table 2. There are positive effects on most outcomes, notably substance use and educational outcomes. There are exceptions such as service use and social and emotional outcomes where there is an adverse effect.

Table 2 Intermediate outcomes from Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022)

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Effect Size OR (CI)</i>	<i>Critical Appraisal</i>
Gang Involvement	0.885 (0.441-1.773) N=1, k= 2	One study, low confidence
Externalizing	1.13** (1.043-1.225) N=23, k=58	3 high confidence, 2 medium confidence, 16 low confidence
Internalizing	1.142 (0.981-1.328) N= 26, k=64	31 high confidence, 2 medium confidence, 29 low confidence
Attitudes and Beliefs	0.929 (0.785-1.098) N=18, k=50	83 high confidence, 41 medium, 7 low confidence, 17 low
Social and Emotional Outcomes	0.808*** (0.763-0.856) N=5, k=8	5 low confidence
Behavioural Outcomes	0.996 (0.902-1.110) N=14, k=22	1 medium confidence, 13 low confidence
Substance Misuse	1.343** (1.099-1.640) N=17, k=39	2 high confidence, 15 low confidence
Education - Attendance	1.212*** (1.118-1.314) N=18, k=34	18 low confidence
Education - Attainment	1.221*** (1.133-1.315) N=34, k=80	34 low confidence
Education – Aspirations and Attitudes	1.160** (1.025-1.313) N=16, k=33	16 low confidence

Education - Behaviour	0.997 (0.970-1.025) N=14, k=35	14 low confidence
Familial Outcomes	1.100** (1.023-1.184) N=11, k=33	1 medium confidence, 10 low confidence
Peer Outcomes	1.691*** (1.289-2.217) N=12, k= 14	12 low confidence
Physical Health Outcomes	1.152** (1.031-1.287) N=3, k=3	3 low confidence
Mental Health Outcomes	1.059 (0.894-1.254) N=11, k=16	11 low confidence
Service use, Attendance, and Engagement	0.740 (0.422-1.297) N=2, k=13	2 low confidence

Moderators

Raposa et al. (2019) conducted an extensive three-level meta-analysis and reported the relationship between a number of different moderators and the effectiveness of adult-youth mentoring programmes. However, these moderator-outcome relationships are not reported separately for externalising behaviour outcomes and instead are reported for an amalgamated outcome measure. In summary, the authors report the following significant between-study differences:

- Mentoring programmes with a greater proportion of male *mentee* participants were more effective ($t = 2.19, p < .05$).
- Mentoring programmes with a greater proportion of male *mentor* participants were more effective ($t = 2.14, p < .05$).
- Shorter meetings between mentees and mentors were associated with greater effectiveness ($t = -1.98, p < .05$).
- Programmes where mentors were described as ‘helping professionals’ were associated with greater effectiveness ($t = 2.34, p < .05$).

The gender of the mentee appears to be an important factor in mentoring programmes, as does the gender of mentors. It is particularly interesting that programmes with higher proportions of male mentors were more effective, since Raposa et al. (2019) report that, on average, programmes had higher proportions of female mentors. Whether or not mentees and mentors were matched based on

their gender was not coded as a moderator. This has important implications for future programmes and recruitment strategies, and future reviews should code more information about gender and matching based on gender. These analyses should be conducted for externalising behaviours, or preferably crime and violence outcomes separately. It is possible, based on the current evidence, that mentoring programmes that match male mentees with male mentors are more effective.

There were no significant differences in the effectiveness of programmes in relation to mentee age, ethnicity, or risk at baseline as indicated by single parent households, eligibility for free school meals, poor academic achievement and reports of problem behaviours (Raposa et al., 2019). Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences in the effectiveness of unstructured, semi-structured, or structured mentoring programmes, and no significant difference between mentoring programmes that were described as having a general, academic, behavioural, or psychosocial focus. Also, there was no significant effect of any methodological moderators on programme effectiveness.

In a follow-up meta-analysis to the review published by Raposa et al. (2019), Christensen et al. (2020) found that targeted/problem-specific approaches ($g = 0.25, p < .001$) in mentoring programmes were more effective than non-specific approaches ($g = 0.11, p < .05$). They concluded that adult-youth mentoring programmes can be effective in improving youth academic, psychological, and social outcomes, especially when employing targeted approaches that are suitable for the needs of mentees.

Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) also conducted a number of moderator analyses. The main findings were as follows:

- Structured approaches had larger effects for a number of outcomes (internalizing behaviour and other behavioural outcomes, and peer outcomes). But unstructured approaches had a larger effect on reoffending and mental health, and moderately structured had the largest effect on educational attainment.
- There were no differences according to which country the programme was in.
- Mentoring interventions alone provided larger impacts on violence, attitudes and beliefs and behavioural outcomes than mentoring combined with other interventions. Programmes with additional components had a larger effect on peer outcomes. Otherwise, there were no significant differences, including on offending.
- Generally, programmes with no training for mentors had larger effects than those with training; however, this may reflect lack of reporting of training in the primary studies.

- There were generally larger effects on high-risk youth, except attitudes and beliefs which had lower effect for this group.
- Boys showed larger effect for behaviour at school, but no gender differences were found for any other variable.
- Longer duration interventions had larger effects on educational aspirations and attitudes and educational attainment, but a smaller effect on attitudes and behaviour.

Burton (2020) found no differences in programme effectiveness based on mentee or mentor demographics, such as age, sex, or race. Evaluations of cross-age peer mentoring programmes that were implemented in a school setting and in urban locations were associated with greater effectiveness. Programmes with higher levels of adult supervision were also significantly associated with greater effectiveness, as were targeted interventions.

Implementation

This report draws on the qualitative synthesis of Lakshminayaran et al. (2022), which summarizes the findings from 33 process evaluations, and a separate analysis of seven process evaluations of UK mentoring programmes used to inform the first edition of this report: Blazek et al. (2011), O’Dwyer (2019), James-Roberts et al. (2005), McMellon et al. (2016), and Philip et al., (2004), Shiner (2004) and Wadia (2015). Annex 3 gives more details of these seven studies.

The findings from Lakshminayaran et al. (2022) are shown in Table 3. Some of these themes are elaborated below.

Table 3. Qualitative analysis summary from Lakshminayaran et al. (2022)

Domain	Major themes identified
Barriers to participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentor and mentee hesitancies • Limited mentor availability • Recruitment processes of mentors and mentees: rigid prerequisites, non-awareness of service referrals & challenges relating to mentor induction. • Matching of mentors of mentees: issues of compatibility • Failed expectations • Volunteer drop out • Proselytising or judgemental approach

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear of law enforcement authorities • ‘Additional’ after school mentoring • Harassment and disrespectful behaviours towards student mentors. • Issues of trust and confidentiality
Facilitators to participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentor characteristics/qualities • Targeted recruitment • Training of mentors • Mentoring relationship: phases, unconditional bond, trust, reciprocity, relationship based on respect rather than authority Blending mentoring with other interventions • Mentors donning various hats: mentors as role models, mentors as guides, mentors as confidence builders • Well-matched mentor and mentee.
Barriers to outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentee activity attenuation • Grappling with mentoring complexities • Communication and coordination of services • Leadership and senior management • Location • Funding issues • Transportation • Short term mentoring programmes • Poor management of termination
Facilitators to outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buy-In from teachers and other members in after school mentoring interventions • Long term mentoring • Supervision of mentors • Financial Incentives • Leaders going an extra mile • Multi-faceted nature of mentoring • Parent /care giver engagement & involvement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful mentoring relationship • Formal termination of mentoring
Study design issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of information on content of intervention • Lack of clarity on mentoring specific components • Mentee self-report was a common method of assessment • Weak explanation on the termination process • Heterogeneity between studies

Source: Lakshminayaran et al. (2022).

James-Roberts et al. (2005), who report on an evaluation of 80 community mentoring programmes across England and Wales, is the most comprehensive of the seven UK studies. That report is the main basis for the summary, noting also evidence from other evaluations which confirms or contradicts the report's findings.

James-Roberts et al. (2005) report that mentees entered programmes with positive expectations: at baseline, 81% of mentees hoped that mentoring could help stop them from getting into trouble, 76% to help them find new activities, 68% to help them through tough times, and 54% with maths or reading.

The report found that mentoring programmes were successful in meeting these expectations in varying degrees. This finding is consistent with the quantitative evidence reported above and was confirmed by qualitative reports that many young people agree that mentoring has helped them to address socioemotional and academic difficulties (e.g. Blazek et al., 2011). McMellon et al. (2016) note that for some mentees the programme helped in handling troublesome behaviours, and also helped them in building their confidence and developing their skills.

But there were several important implementation issues to take into consideration. James-Roberts et al. (2005) divide mentoring into the following stages: (1) recruitment of mentors and mentees; (2) screening of applicants for suitability; (3) training of mentors; (4) matching of mentors and mentees and initiation of the mentoring process; (5) mentoring with monitoring and support; and (6) closure. The following implementation issues arose at the different stages.

Recruitment of mentors and mentees and screening of applicants for suitability

Process evaluations show that substantial numbers of children who are referred to the mentoring service do not take up the offer or fail to engage (see Box 1). This is one reason why many potential mentors, who may get trained, end up not acting as a mentor. Attrition of mentors may be reduced by (1) a more accurate assessment of the need for mentees, not just in terms of numbers but also taking into account other factors such as geographical location (lack of transport, especially from rural areas, is mentioned as a constraint on participation in other studies; e.g. O'Dwyer, 2019), (2) more rigorous assessment of the suitability and commitment of mentors upfront, and (3) being sure mentors are aware of the work required to be a mentor. Mentees appreciate additional activities, in which the project is like a youth club, as something to do and a way to keep out of trouble.

Box 1: National Evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes 2001 to 2004: an overview

The evaluation covers 84 projects with over 3,000 volunteer mentors. The projects are targeted programmes, with a majority intended for black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) participants, and others for children with literacy and numeracy needs. The majority of mentees (79%) were male, with an average age of 14 years, and 69% had a history of offending.

Many projects had the conventional mentoring model of a weekly one-on-one meeting in the community. Others met daily, sometimes in project premises, and the mentor delivered basic literacy and numeracy skills. The programme duration varied from three months to a year.

The study observed improvements for mentees in attendance and behaviour at school, increases in literacy and numeracy, better accommodation and family relationships, and more involvement in community activities such as sports. However, these results are based on before versus after comparisons, with no comparison group, and so cannot be taken as credible evidence of causal effects. Analysis of data from a smaller sample of mentees, compared to a comparison group, found no significant differences in outcomes.

Significant problems in implementation are reported. Half of programmes finished earlier than planned, with many volunteers failing to become mentors. Many young people who were referred to the projects declined to participate or did not to engage with their mentors: just 2,045 of 4,828 young people who were referred to the projects received mentoring. A more detailed study of 11 programmes found that over half the youth who started the programme failed to finish.

Of the 3,400 volunteers, 584 were rejected as unsuitable. Of the remaining 2,820 suitable volunteers, only two-thirds (62%) were matched with mentees. The other third either dropped out during training or could not be matched to a suitable mentee. Also, in some cases the programme recruited far more volunteers than needed, which was a problem that was exacerbated by low take-up by mentees.

Despite being volunteer-based, mentoring programmes were more expensive per young person than the YJB education training and employment (ETE) schemes which had been found to produce similar levels of benefits.

Source: James-Roberts et al. (2005) National Evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes 2001 to 2004: an overview. London: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.

Training of mentors

Training comprises (1) information about the project, the mentees and local services for children, (2) skills development, especially listening and non-judgemental counselling skills, (3) discussion and role play dealing with various issues, and (4) do's and don'ts of being a mentor. Training for mentors placed importance on seeing the perspective of the mentee and treating him or her with respect.

Since mentors are volunteers, who possibly do not have prior relevant experience, then training, as well as providing considerable support once they assume their role, is reported to have enabled mentors to feel safe and well equipped to fulfil their roles (Wadia, 2015). Another evaluation also mentioned that all mentors found the training to be both enjoyable and extremely valuable (McMellon et al., 2016).

Matching of mentors and mentees and initiation of the mentoring process

In some programmes, the matching of mentors and mentees takes place through a residential activity weekend. An evaluation of 10 Mentoring Plus projects in the UK described these weekends as somewhat chaotic, including dangerous and violent incidents, and so a thorough risk assessment (at least) is needed prior to the event.

A shared background may be important in the matching. Female mentors who were matched with female mentees reported more successful outcomes. Mentors with black or minority ethnic backgrounds were found to be more successful than those with white mentors in improving the family relationships of mentees with black or minority ethnic backgrounds.

Mentoring with monitoring and support

The mentoring process itself depends on the dynamic between mentor and mentee. Several regular meetings will usually be required for the relationship to move beyond meeting for a chat, and many may not go beyond that. The cue for a deeper relationship is often the opportunity to deal with a particular issue faced by the mentee such as a problem at home. Ideally, a relationship will become more action-oriented in assisting the mentee in school, work and social life, although that appears to happen in only a minority of cases. In the words of one mentee: "She helped me develop social skills which is a major part of it because I used to really struggle like speaking to new people, like even

buying new things and stuff like that. I think she helped me a lot with that. I'm mostly ok now with communicating" (quoted in McMellon et al., 2016).

Successful relationships depend upon being able to talk, reciprocity, mutual respect and interest, and having fun (including 'having a laugh' in regular mentoring sessions). A respondent in McMellon et al, (2016), captures the last of these: "If I go and meet him when I'm down I always come out with a smile." And a mentee quoted in O'Dwyer (2019): "I just liked the way she was, like. She talked and had a good personality. She was a nice person. I got on with her from the start."

When mentoring is successful then mentees see the mentor as a trusted friend they can turn to for advice, which is different to the relationship they have with other adults (Blazek et al., 2011). In the words of a mentee quoted in O'Dwyer (2019), "I liked a lot about him. He would listen, was always there, reliable, a good friend and good support, a good help. He was just a great person to be honest."

Where the mentoring takes place can be an issue. Some projects chose unsuitable locations which were either far from the mentee, or where the mentee felt unsafe, possibly because it was on another gang's 'turf'.

It seems that there is often little or no supervision of mentors. Lack of adequate supervision of mentors is highlighted as an issue in the evaluation of the Move on Peer Mentoring Programme (McMellon et al., 2016). Effective supervision of mentors, and other aspects of the programme, may be hampered by high staff turnover and inadequate resources. These problems may also affect delivery of additional services. In the evaluation of ten Mentoring Plus projects, four had closed down before the end of the evaluation.

Termination

Project closure can bring an abrupt end to mentoring relationships. However, even if the project continues, the ending (termination) of mentoring relationships needs to be well managed. If the mentee feels abandoned that may reverse any gains that the intervention has made: "They were just people that I have lost, Susan, I wrote to her, but then she just disappeared. I hate people who just disappear, it is like anything in life, you put so much effort in to it, and it is like why the fuck do you put so much effort in to it and like they disappear" (mentee quoted in Philip et al., 2004).

James-Roberts et al. (2005) make the following recommendations for future mentoring programmes in England and Wales:

- Mentoring programmes should respond to assessments of youths' strengths and needs.
- Programmes should take account of youths' views of their needs, since the largest barrier to access is youth unwillingness to participate.
- Mentoring programmes are more effective when implemented as prevention strategies for at-risk youth, rather than for older youth already engaged in offending behaviours.
- Short and 'one-off' programmes are not likely to make a significant impact, because needs develop as young people age.
- Trust and competency building skills for mentors are a vital component that could be integrated into other professional capacities.

Cost analysis

James-Roberts et al. (2005) found that mentoring programmes in England and Wales were not low-cost, as originally anticipated. Two types of programmes were included in their evaluation, 'BME projects', where Black and minority ethnic young people were specifically targeted for recruitment, and 'LN projects', where young people with literacy and numeracy needs were specifically targeted. Projects that targeted Black minority ethnic young people and young people with literacy and numeracy needs were labelled 'DB projects'.

When cost data was evaluated in 2004, programmes had not yet been implemented fully. Overall, mentoring programmes cost on average £11,903 (standard deviation = £26,919). BME/DB projects (combining BME and LN) cost on average £20,480 with a standard deviation of £39,176. In comparison, LN projects cost on average £6,364 with a standard deviation of £11,961. James-Roberts et al. (2005) suggested that the main explanation for the differences in cost between BME and LN projects was that LN projects were more likely to be implemented on 'Youth Offending Team' premises and this was associated with reduced cost.

Table 4 reproduces the costs analysis from Lakshminarayan et al. (2013). The majority of the cost effectiveness studies find mentoring to be cost effective.

Table 4 Cost analysis from Lakshminarayan et al. (2013)

<i>Cost Analysis</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Cost Effectiveness	13 studies provided cost-effectiveness information for their mentoring intervention, with all but one indicating cost-effectiveness of their interventions.
Cost Per Participant	8 studies provided information relating to the cost per participant to partake in their mentoring interventions compared with standard service or no intervention. Costs per participant ranged from £845 to £3,500.
Total Cost	10 studies provided information relating to the total costs of their interventions. Costs ranged from £11,903 to £845,000 per mentoring program.
Cost Involved	24 studies reported information on the costs involved. These studies referred to salary costs, costs to offer services, stipends, and incentives to complete interventions.

Findings from UK/Ireland

Two examples of evaluations on the effectiveness of mentoring in the UK and Ireland are Dolan et al., (2011) and Shiner et al., (2004).

1. Big Brothers Big Sisters

Dolan et al. (2011) evaluated the effectiveness of the Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) programme in a randomised controlled trial with 164 children and young people aged 10 – 14 years old in Ireland. Participants were recruited in 2007 and randomly assigned either to the intervention plus youth activities condition or to the control group who participated in youth activities alone (i.e., an alternative treatment control group). There were 84 young people allocated to the intervention condition and of those, 72 were matched with a mentor during the evaluation.

The majority of mentees were Irish-born and had a mean age of 12 years old. Children and young people were most commonly referred to the BBBS programme because they were identified as being affected by economic disadvantage, had poor social skills or were considered “shy and withdrawn”.

51% of the mentees were female and 49% were male. 73 mentors took part, and these were mostly women (55%) and on average 31 years old.

Analysis of implementation data suggests that the supervision of mentors enhanced the implementation of meetings between mentors and mentees (Dolan et al., 2011). Overall, programme staff were seen to be accessible and helpful, but there were possible issues where programme staff also acted as mentors and it was observed that this dual role may enhance implementation fidelity. Staff were also very experienced, which may mean that there was improved efficacy.

Overall, 57% of the mentor-mentee matches were matched for 12 months or more as required, and 57% of matches met for the minimum 4 hours/month or longer. 85% of participants took part in the additional 'youth activities'.

Self-report measures were used to assess the effect of the BBBS programme on several youth outcomes, including, "risk behaviours". In this domain, mentees were asked about their misconduct (e.g., skipping school, hitting others, stealing) and their alcohol and cannabis use. After 24 months, the intervention group scored higher on the misconduct scale ($d = -0.05$) in comparison to the control group (Dolan et al., 2011). Overall, multiple regression analyses suggested that the best predictor for misconduct was the level of misconduct at time (i.e., at the start of the intervention; $B = 0.479$, $SE = .07$) and there was no significant interaction effect for groups and time ($B = .006$; $SE = .006$).

2. *Mentoring Plus*

Shiner et al. (2004) published findings of an evaluation study of the British programme: 'Mentoring Plus'. The programme targeted 'disaffected youth' and aimed to enhance education, employment skills and confidence through an adult-youth mentoring programme. The Mentoring Plus programme was implemented across England, in eight London boroughs, Manchester, Bath and Northeast Somerset. Ten projects were evaluated between July 2000 and September 2003 with 550 at-risk young people, 378 of whom participated in the mentoring programme and 172 acted as a comparison group. The control group was composed of young people who expressed an interest in participating but ultimately did not take part. A large proportion of participants identified as 'Black African/Caribbean'¹.

¹ Information based on abstract, as full text was unavailable.

Desirable effects of the programme were seen in relation to educational attainment and employability skills, but these did not translate into reductions in offending within the timeframe of the evaluation study. The long-term impact of the mentoring programme on youth violence or offending is not known. Shiner et al. (2004) commented that, while decreases in offending were observed among young people in the mentoring programme, there were also reductions in offending among young people in the comparison group. Since the comparison group were young people who had expressed an interest in participating in a mentoring programme, it is possible that these young people had already begun the process of desistance. They concluded that a mentoring programme may be a viable strategy to provide support and guidance during the process of desisting from offending.

What do we need to know? What don't we know?

Overall mentoring appears to be moderately effective. However, despite a relatively large number of studies, there remain many design issues for which more research is needed. Principle amongst these are: (i) effective recruitment strategies to recruit mentees of the right demographic background; (ii) the relative merits of structured versus unstructured approaches, which activities to include in mentoring, and which complementary components are most effective; and (iii) effective management of termination of the mentoring relationship including follow up support.

References

- Blazek, M., Brown, D.M., Smith, F.M. & van Blerk, L. (2011) *An external evaluation of the plusone mentoring early intervention programme*. Scottish Institute of Policing Research (SIPR).
- Burton, S. (2020). *Cross-age peer mentoring: A meta-analysis*. (Publication no. 28026051). [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Christensen, K. M., Hagler, M. A., Stams, G-J., Raposa, E. B., Burton, S., & Rhodes, J. E. (2020). Non-specific versus targeted approaches to youth mentoring: A follow-up meta-analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01233-x>
- Dolan, P., Brady, B., O'Regan, C., Russell, D., Canava, J., & Forkan, C. (2011). *Big Brothers Big Sisters of Ireland: Evaluation Study. Report One: Randomised Control Trial and Implementation Report*. Foróige.
- DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2), 57 – 91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611414806>
- Farrington, D. P., Ttofi, M. M., Crago, R. V. & Coid, J. W. (2015) Intergenerational similarities in risk factors for offending. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 1, 48-62.
- James-Roberts, I., Greenlaw, G., Simon, A., & Hurry, J. (2005). *National evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring schemes 2001 to 2004*. London: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.
- Lipsey, M.W. & Wilson, D.B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McMellon, C., Davidson, E., Morton, S., Berry, H. & Morrison, F. (2016) *Move on Peer Mentoring Programme: Evaluation Report*. Edinburgh: Centre for Research on Families and Relationships (CRFR)
- O'Dwyer, K. (2019) Reducing Youth Crime: The Role of Mentoring. *Irish Probation Journal*, 16, 153-167.
- Philip, K., Shucksmith, J. & King, C. (2004). *Sharing a laugh? A qualitative study of mentoring interventions with young people*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Raposa, E. B., Rhodes, J., Stams, G. J. J. M., Card, N., Burton, S., Schwartz, S., Skyes, L. A. Y., Kanchewa, S., Kupersmidt, J., & Hussain, S. (2019). The effects of youth mentoring programs: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48, 423 – 443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-00982-8>
- Shiner, M., Young, T., Newburn, T., & Groben, S. (2004). *Mentoring disaffected young people: An evaluation of Mentoring Plus*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

- Lakshminarayanan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., & Bass, A. (2008). *Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems*. University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Lakshminarayanan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., Bass, A., Lovegrove, P., & Nichols, E. (2013). Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 10*. <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.10>
- Wadia, A., & Parkinson, D. (2015) *The Informal Mentoring Project: A Process Evaluation*. London: National Offender Management Service.
- Wheeler, M. E., Keller, T. E., & DuBois, D. L. (2010). Review of three recent randomized trials of school-based mentoring: Making sense of mixed findings. *Social Policy Report, 24*(3), 3 – 21.

Annex 1: Effect size calculation

This annex shows the calculation based on the results and assumptions given in the text. We assume 200 youth, evenly divided between treatment and comparison groups. That means there are 100 youth in the control group and 100 youth in the treatment group. Assuming that 25% of youth in the control group were delinquent or reported externalising behaviours, the mean effect sizes from both reviews can be easily transformed to a percentage reduction in the outcome.

If the odds ratio for the effect on juvenile delinquency is 1.46 (i.e., Lakshminarayanan et al., 2022), then using the table below and the formula for an OR, we can estimate the value of X. The odds ratio is estimated as: $A*D/B*C$, where A is the number of non-delinquents in the treatment group, B is the number of delinquents in the treatment group, C is the number of non-delinquents in the control group, and D is the number of delinquents in the control group. Therefore, the value of X is 18.59 in the case of Lakshminarayanan et al. (2013).

	Non-delinquents	Delinquents	Total
Treatment	100-x	x	100
Control	75	25	100

Therefore, the relative reduction in delinquency is $(25 - 18.59)/25 = 25.64\%$. In relation to the review by Raposa et al. (2019) the value of X is 20.28 and the relative reduction in externalising behaviours is 19%.

The prevalences of juvenile delinquency and externalising behaviours are likely to vary considerably between studies and can be influenced greatly by the type of report (e.g., self-report or peer-report), the behaviours included, or the questions asked (e.g., frequency of externalising behaviours in the past couple of months versus the frequency of externalising behaviours in the past year, or ever). If we were to adjust our assumption that 25% of the control group are delinquent and/or report externalising behaviours, the overall relative reduction in the intervention group is not greatly affected. For example, if we assume that 10% of the control group are delinquent, the 2x2 table would be as follows and the value of X is 7.07 (for the Lakshminarayanan et al., 2022 review). Therefore, the relative reduction is 29.3% (i.e., $(10 - 7.07)/10 * 100$).

	Non- delinquents	Delinquents	Total
Treatment	100-x	x	100
Control	90	10	100

Similarly, if we assume that 40% of the control group are delinquent, the value of X would be 31.35 (for the Lakshminarayanan et al. 2013 review) and the relative reduction in delinquency is 21.63%. Given the dramatic difference in the assumed prevalence of juvenile delinquency, the percentage relative reduction does not vary in a similar fashion. Table 2 shows this further.

Table 2

Variation of the relative reduction in juvenile delinquency and externalising behaviours depending on various estimates.

	Lakshminarayanan et al. (2022) <i>Juvenile delinquency</i> OR = 1.46	Raposa et al. (2019) <i>Externalising behaviours</i> OR = 1.31
Assumed prevalence	Relative reduction	
10%	29.3%	21.8%
25%	25.6%	19%
40%	21.6%	15.7%

Annex 2. Evidence rating

Table A.2.1. Assessment of review against AMSTAR criteria

Modified AMSTAR item	Scoring guide	Burton 2020	Lakshminarayan 2022	Raposa 2019
Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of the PICOS?	To score 'Yes' appraisers should be confident that the 5 elements of PICO are described somewhere in the report	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	At least two bibliographic databases should be searched (partial yes) plus at least one of website searches or snowballing (yes).	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?	Score yes if double screening or single screening with independent check on at least 5-10%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?	Score yes if double coding	Yes	Partial yes	Yes
Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?	Score yes if a tabular or narrative summary of included studies is provided.	Yes	Yes	No
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Score yes if there is any discussion of any source of bias such as attrition, and including publication bias.	Partial Yes	Yes	Partial Yes

Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	Yes if the authors report heterogeneity statistic. Partial yes if there is some discussion of heterogeneity.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	Yes if authors report funding and mention any conflict of interest	No	Yes	Yes
Overall rating		Low	Medium	Low

Table A.2. Evidence rating

	No. of included studies			
	1-4	5-7	8-11	12 or more
No review or empty review *				
Low confidence in review				** Raposa externalizing behaviour.
At least moderate confidence in review			*** Lakshminarayan, Violence	**** Lakshminarayan All



Notes: (1) For indirect effect estimates the evidence rating is dropped 1-2 levels with a floor of **. (2) If Q is reported we calculate I squared ($I^2 = (Q-df)/Q$ where df is no. of effect size estimates -1); (3) if tau squared is reported we use 'high heterogeneity' as reported by authors (4) if heterogeneity is unclear drop a * (we may make an exception if the eyeball test shows clearly low-moderate).

Annex 3: Summary of issues from process evaluations

Overview of process evaluations				
	Intervention	Success factors	Challenges	Young people's views
Blazek et al. 2011	YMCA <i>Plus one</i> - early mentoring intervention for young people at risk for crime.	1. Work along with other supportive processes that take place within families and communities, or are pursued by other institutional agencies. (Holistic approach) 2. Careful attention to how mentors & mentees are matched.	1. Lack of resources (time) 2. Issues in multi-agency partnership 3. Social & environment circumstances which mentoring cannot affect directly 4. Voluntary role of mentors:	Many young people reported that mentoring was helping them address socioemotional and academic difficulties. Young people expressed their view of mentors as different from how they

		<p>3. Long term engagement: Mentoring is understood as a process and not an event or set of activities.</p> <p>4. Detailed monitoring and supervision of mentors by programme managers.</p> <p>5. Staff quality (professionalism, commitment & theoretical & practical integrity).</p> <p>6. Successful targeting of young people fitting the scope of the programme.</p> <p>7. Multi agency partnership (child protection, health, criminal justice & education)</p>	<p>Programme managers reported that they could not be strict with the volunteer mentors as they were unpaid.</p>	<p>viewed their parents or other adult family members. Mentors were seen rather as <i>'friends'</i>.</p> <p>In terms of what motivated them to join the plus one mentoring project, the majority of young people interviewed stated that they had not been motivated to join in order to make a specific change in their behaviour or situation (such as offending behaviour).</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>8. Young people’s voluntary involvement- no pressure to join.</p> <p>10.Non-judgemental attitude & unconditional support of mentors.</p>		
Roberts et al. 2005	<p>Community mentoring projects of Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (YJB).</p> <p>The mentor projects were competency focussed and targeted groups of young people who</p>	<p>1.Mentor-mentee matching process: Female mentors matched with female mentees had more successful outcomes.</p> <p>Mentors with Black or minority ethnic backgrounds were more successful than White mentors in improving the family relationships of mentees with Black or minority ethnic backgrounds.</p>	<p>1.Unwillingness/reluctance from mentees to participate in the programme: 11 % of mentees felt that it had not really been their choice.</p> <p>2.Drug /alcohol use among mentees.</p> <p>3.Drop out in volunteers (potential mentors) after recruitment.</p> <p>4.Drop out among mentees.</p>	<p>Young people said they were on the project due to offending, problem behaviour and educational issues. A small number reported other reasons, including problems at home and the need for someone to talk to and to trust.</p> <p>Of the young people, 89% said that it was their choice to embark on the mentoring scheme and 11% felt that it had not really been their choice.</p>

	<p>had offended, or were at risk of offending.</p>	<p>2. Other gains from mentoring such as improvements in the young people’s attendance and behaviour at school, increases in literacy and numeracy, improvements in accommodation and family relationships, increased involvement in community activities such as sports, clubs, social groups and voluntary organisations at school or in the community.</p>	<p>5. Not cost effective: Resource intensive.</p> <p>6. Administrative issues: (communication barriers found between community projects and statutory Organisations)</p> <p>7. Language barriers: Where English is not the mentor’s first language it has proved a challenge to engage the individuals.</p> <p>8. Accessibility: One of the difficulties has been the mobility of mentors due to the geographical size of the county and lack of frequent public transport in the more rural locations.</p>	<p>At baseline, 81% of mentees hoped that mentoring could help stop them from getting into trouble, 76% to help them find new activities, 68% to help them through a tough time, and 54% with maths or reading.</p> <p>Other common reasons were improving relationships and making improvements in education or training. Of mentees, 33% hoped that mentoring would help them to get into some sort of training.</p> <p>At the follow-up, most (73%) thought mentoring had been ‘very useful’, 18% ‘a little useful’, 7% ‘not sure/don’t know’, and 3% (two mentees) ‘not useful’. Most (80%)</p>
--	--	---	---	---

				<p>would have liked mentoring to continue for longer because they were enjoying it or it was helping them in some way.</p> <p><i>"I loved going out with her and stuff. I wish I could keep doing it. He spoke to me, how he wanted to be talked back to. We get on really well, and I can talk to her about anything."</i></p>
Mc Mellon et al. 2016	Move on: Peer Mentoring Programme	<p>1. Mentor training: All mentors and all staff spoke very positively about the mentor training and found it to be extremely valuable and, overall, enjoyable.</p> <p>2. Mentor-mentee matching process: The mentoring service</p>	<p>1. Supervision & support from implementing agency (lacked consistency).</p> <p>2. Balancing the need to provide a consistent service and responding flexibly to the needs of different individuals and matched pairs.</p>	<p>Young participants reported meeting with mentors helped them feel heard & happy. For some, it helped in handling troublesome behaviours. It also helped them in building their confidence & developing their skills.</p> <p><i>"If I go & meet him when I'm down I always come out with a smile."</i></p>

		<p>matches vulnerable young people (including those who are care-experienced) with a volunteer mentor. Some mentors, known as ‘peer mentors’, have experienced the care system or other forms of disadvantage themselves and bring this life experience to matches with care-experienced young people.</p> <p>3.Flexibility of the programme: Move On’s mentoring service is flexible to the individual needs of the mentee.</p> <p>4.Mentor-mentee relationship: All mentees and mentors were able to identify positive outcomes that they attributed</p>		<p><i>“She helped me develop social skills which is a major part of it because I used to really struggle like speaking to new people, like even buying new things & stuff like that. I think she helped me a lot with that. I’m mostly ok now with communicating”</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

		to their mentoring relationship. Central to Move On's mentoring model is the "triangle of support", a triangular relationship between the individual mentee, individual mentor and Move On.		
O'Dwyer 2019	La Cheile mentoring services	<p>1. Building a trusting relationship based on mentoring values (providing a listening ear, being non-judgemental, supportive & empathetic)</p> <p>2. Activities such that focussed on healthy coping, self-confidence enhancement.</p> <p>3. Space and time for the mentee & exclusive focus on them.</p>	<p>1. Issues relating to accessibility: Practical challenges arose in respect of travel and access, suitability of facilities and inability to participate in activities together. Travel to Oberstown, from rural areas in particular, raised issues of time and cost.</p>	<p>Young person mentees who were interviewed were universally positive about their mentors and consistently spoke very highly about them.</p> <p><i>"I just liked the way she was, like. She talked and had a good personality. She was a nice person. I got on with her from the start."</i></p> <p><i>"I liked a lot about him. He would listen, was always there, reliable, a good friend and good support, a</i></p>

		<p>4. Voluntary nature of the program-helped mentors in building strong bonds with mentees.</p> <p>5. Mentor qualities-persistence, patience, and attentive.</p>		<p><i>good help. He was just a great person to be honest."</i></p>
<p>Phlip; Shucksmith and King 2004</p>	<p>Covesea Intensive Housing Project, Pinefield Education Project & Dundee Youth-Link Befriending Project</p>	<p>1. Mentor-mentee relationship: Young people described how some relationships progressed through stages to become a mutually supportive one. For others, the discovery that they could confide in an adult made the relationship meaningful.</p> <p>2. Qualities of mentors:</p>	<p>1. Structural constraints: (such as poverty, early & childhood difficulties inequalities in health).</p> <p>2. Interpersonal issues between key workers.</p> <p>3. Termination process: Some participants felt that badly managed endings undermined the benefits of mentoring. Some young people expressed a view that they had been abandoned by the project. Some</p>	<p>A number of young people expressed the intention to use their experiences of mentoring in future employment, in bringing up their own children and in developing their own careers.</p> <p><i>"It wasn't confidence that made me want a befriender, it was because I needed somebody active and Susan was active. Like we went canoeing,</i></p>

		<p>A sense of humour in mentors was deeply appreciated by the mentees.</p> <p>It covered a wide spectrum from sharing a joke, to recognition of a shared sense of humour and a shared capacity to laugh at their own actions. Participants often drew on examples of having a laugh to highlight differences between relationships with their mentors and other professionals. Having a laugh was therefore an important component of a trusting relationship and symbolised the reciprocity that many participants prized.</p> <p>Other qualities such as being non-judgemental & friendly.</p>	<p>young people expressed anger and disappointment when their befriender moved on.</p> <p>4. Moving out of the projects or changing living arrangements often brought issues about the nature of mentoring relationships to light.</p>	<p><i>we went to karate and stuff like that, we went to the cinema.”</i></p> <p><i>“It was great, yeah, it was really good to see him, so. Yeah, that was fantastic yeah, you know, he was one of the best befrienders that I have ever had basically, he was really funny, and somebody’s personality makes a big difference, and his personality was just so good, mm, he was funny he was, mm, he was a laugh, he saw a good side of everything, he saw a funny side of everything basically, he was always optimistic, you know, he was never moody or pessimistic or anything like that, he was always, he was just always great fun to be with.”</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>3. Formal closure of the mentoring relationship: Many young people noted a lasting effect and a continuing affection for their mentor, even were the relationship had formally ended.</p> <p>4. Helping mentees to deal with family issues: Family relationships, particularly relationships with mothers, were highly valued by mentees.</p>		
Shiner et al. 2004	Mentoring Plus Mentoring disaffected young people	<p>1. Mentoring relationship: Qualities of a successful relationship-reciprocity, being able to talk, <i>A relationship based on respect rather than authority & being able to have fun.</i></p>	<p>1. Staff feeling overloaded: Staff reported to having to work unreasonably long hours and having to <i>"cram stuff in to each day"</i>.</p> <p>2. Funding: Financial difficulties were identified as an important threat to programme</p>	<p>A substantial proportion of the young people recruited to Mentoring Plus felt that the programme had helped them in some way.</p> <p><i>"If you come here, they can put you on little courses and stuff, things to do"</i></p>

		<p>2.Educational support:</p> <p>In the words of one of the mentors,</p> <p><i>“My young mentee, it’s helped her a lot and I think it’s the education programme that’s made her realise that ‘yeah I can do things’, you know it’s got her confidence as well.”</i></p>	<p>integrity. Some of the project workers felt the programme would have been better implemented and would have a greater impact if funds had been available to provide additional specialist services.</p> <p>3.Location:</p> <p>The location of the projects formed a recurring theme in interviews with project workers. Only one of the projects occupied premises on its own and this was considered important by the workers: ‘the young people are free to roam about here and that’s been fundamental to the success of the project’. The remaining projects shared premises with other community groups and workers voiced concerns that the projects were inaccessible and/or unappealing because</p>	<p><i>instead of getting into trouble. So, I started coming ... Because I thought like going on the way that I’m going on I’m going to go in prison soon, so I thought I don’t want to go down that route, I’ve got to sort myself out ... I just thought that [Mentoring Plus] was going to be about like, a place to chill out and people to talk to, people to help out with problems and keep you off the streets.”</i></p>
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>they were located a long way from where the young people lived and/or because they were based in unsafe and inappropriate locations.</p> <p>One of the projects ceased to operate temporarily as it relocated from premises in an area which the workers considered to be unsafe. Another project had to postpone elements of the programme, as its premises were flooded and another project had to vacate its premises when they were declared unsafe by health and safety inspectors.</p> <p>4. Attitude & Behaviour of mentees: The workers expressed serious misgivings about the 'violent', 'intolerant', 'misogynistic' and 'disrespectful' nature of some of the young people's attitudes and behaviour. Residential were</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>characterised by an underlying sense of chaos and tension between the young people and adults (both as project workers and mentors).</p> <p>5. Use of drugs & harmful substances by the mentees.</p>	
Wadia., Parkinson 2015	The informal mentoring project (for offenders leaving prison)	<p>1. Inter-agency partnership: Securing the support of local agencies, including Prison Governors.</p> <p>2. Training and supporting volunteer mentors: Providing relevant training and considerable support enabled mentors to feel safe and well equipped to fulfil their roles.</p> <p>3. Management:</p>	<p>1. Transfer of offenders to other prisons.</p> <p>2. High dropout rate of mentors</p> <p>3. Delay: There were some security issues involved in enabling mentors' access to offenders in prison, which impacted on the time taken to establish the service.</p>	<p>Many of the offenders interviewed valued the emotional support they had received from their mentor and some reported that this had helped them feel better about their future and less isolated.</p> <p><i>"Just knowing that someone's there whereas before I didn't really feel as if I had anyone to turn to."</i></p> <p>For some offenders, having a mentor had helped them to feel more in control of their lives.</p>

		<p>The programme benefited from clear leadership and robust management.</p>	<p>4.The process of providing mentoring for offenders was complex, lengthy and resource-intensive because:</p> <p>Offenders presented with multiple needs.</p> <p>There was a lack of co-ordinated resettlement support for offenders.</p> <p>Mentoring relationships took time to set up and required considerable input from project staff in order to sustain offenders’ engagement.</p>	<p><i>“My life was spiralling out of control and this makes sure I do what I’ve got to do and don’t slip back to the old ways.”</i></p> <p>Some offenders described how their mentor had helped them to become more involved in their local community. In addition, some of the offenders talked about re-establishing contact with their family whilst others talked about getting volunteer work.</p> <p><i>“They sat me down and told me what I needed to do to get help...getting a solicitor and all that. Now I am getting to see my kids.”</i></p> <p>The majority of the offenders interviewed felt that having a</p>
--	--	---	---	---

				<p>mentor had helped them to change their offending behaviour. They described how their mentor had shown them a different path to take and had helped them to avoid the triggers that led to reoffending.</p> <p><i>“I would be back in prison without them – guaranteed. My way of coping is to reoffend. The minute something goes wrong, I reoffend, I revert to type... But now I know I’ve got a choice.”</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--



www.youthendowmentfund.org.uk

The Youth Endowment Fund Charitable Trust

Registered Charity Number: 1185413