Facilitator Characteristics and Competencies that Promote Prosocial Development Among Adolescent Girls in Mentoring Groups

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Curry School of Education

University of Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Amanda Sovik-Johnston

August, 2011

Abstract

Edith C. Lawrence

Group mentoring may be an especially beneficial intervention for adolescent girls at-risk. Literature suggests that, while some group interventions promote positive change, some may lead to iatrogenic effects. To understand factors that are related to positive outcomes, this study utilized hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) and qualitative methods to investigate the group facilitator characteristics, experiences, demographic variables, and behaviors that promote prosocial development among adolescent girls in mentoring groups. Eighteen groups were studied, including 141 adolescent girl mentees and twenty group facilitators. Among mentees, 60% qualified for subsidized school lunch, 55% were of color and 29% were Caucasian. Among facilitators, 75% were undergraduate students and the rest graduate students, 45% were of color, and 50% were Caucasian.

Three domains of social behavior were determined through factor analysis: Social Adjustment, Externalizing Behaviors, and Victimization. Change scores were created for each domain and served as the dependent variables of the HLM analyses. Level-1 predictors included age, identifying as African-American, identifying as Caucasian, being of low SES, being from a single-adult home, and attending school in the urban district. Three sets of analyses were conducted for each domain to investigate variation based on: 1) facilitator characteristics, 2) facilitator experience, and 3) facilitators demographics. There was significant variation between and within groups for changes in Social Adjustment and Externalizing Behaviors. Among level-1 predictors, identifying as African-American and being from a single-adult home predicted increased positive

changes in Externalizing Behaviors. Among Level-2 predictors, adults with experience with youth at-risk and having two facilitators lead the group predicted increased changes in Social Adjustment in the positive direction.

Based on quantitative results, three groups were chosen for qualitative analysis: one with an experienced facilitator, one with two facilitators, and one with a quiet facilitator with limited prior experience. Field notes were coded and analyzed for facilitator behaviors theorized to promote prosocial development. Findings indicate that the facilitators of the groups that made prosocial gains spoke frequently, utilized a consistent set of tools, and appeared authentic in their interactions. Additionally, the facilitators of both groups were natural in sharing their adult-world ideas in the context of their relationships with mentees.

Results indicate that group mentoring outcomes can be variable based partially on adult factors. Knowledge of and attention to these factors is imperative for responsibly implementing group mentoring programs. Recommendations for facilitator hiring and training are offered.

Department of Human Resources
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

APPROVAL OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation, "Facilitator Characteristics and Competencies that Promote Prosocial Development among Adolescent Girls in Mentoring Groups," has been approved by the Graduate Faculty of the Curry School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Edith C. Lawrence, Advisor

Dr. Nancy L. Deutsch

Dr. Peter L. Sheras

Dr. Joanna Lee Williams

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS IV

TABLE OF CONTENTS V

LIST OF TABLES IX

CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE 5

Adolescent Girls and Risk 5

Prosocial Development 6

Mentoring Theory and Outcomes 8

Mentoring Females 9

Mentoring Adolescents 12

Effective Mentors 13

Group Mentoring 15

Peer Influences, Group Intervention, and Gender 18

Adult Competencies 24

The Current Study 28

Objective 1 28

Objective 2 29

Objective 3 29

Objective 4 29

Objective 5 30

CHAPTER III: METHODS 31

Site 31

Participants 32

Procedure 33

Measures 34

Adolescent Girls 34

Facilitators 37

Qualitative Results 39

Researcher Role 45

Trustworthiness 46

CHAPTER IV: ANALYSES AND RESULTS 48

Question One 48

Question Two 52

Question Three 53

Question Four 55

Summary of Quantitative Results 55

Question Five 59

CHAPTER V: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS BY GROUP 60

Facilitator with Experience with Youth At-Risk 60

Overall Verbalizations 60

Structure 60

Intervening 64

Sharing Adult-World Ideas 65

Summary of Experienced Facilitator Findings 69

Facilitator Pair 69

Overall Verbalizations 69

Relationship Building 70

Adult-World Ideas 72

Adult Relationships 76

Responsiveness to Mentee Needs 76

Promoting Prosocial Group Culture Through Positive Expressions 78

Facilitator Pair Summary 83

Quiet Facilitator 83

Overall Verbalizations 83

Limited Structure 84

Limited intervention and Increased Negative Behavior 86

Reinforcing Negative Behavior 88

Discomfort 90

Quiet Facilitator Summary 94

CHAPTER VI: ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE FINDINGS 95

Tools that Promote Prosocial Behavior 97

Reciprocal Prosocial Interactions 101

Authenticity and Confidence 103

Sharing Adult-World Ideas Through Relationships 106

Conclusions 109

CHAPTER VII: DISCUSSION 111

Individual Factors 111

Group Factors 114

Adult Factors 116

Adult Competencies 116

Social Adjustment for Adolescent Girls 118

CHAPTER VIII: IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS 120

Limitations 120

Implications *121*

Hiring *121*

Training *122*

Evaluation *123*

APPENDIX 124

REFERENCES 127

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Changes in Social Adjustment Scores by Group *41*

2. Attendance Data *42*

3. Factor Loadings from Principal Axis Factoring Analysis *50*

4. Descriptives of Facilitator Experience Variables *54*

5. Measures of Dependent and Predictor Variables *57*

6. Significant Predictors *58*

Chapter I: Statement of the Problem

Due to a unique intersection of age and gender, relationships are considered to be critically important to adolescent female development. Psychological theorists and researchers alike have begun to highlight gender differences in human development, which they suggest become increasingly salient in adolescence. While early theorists primarily emphasized individuation and separation as the critical processes of adolescent identity formation (Erikson, 1963), Gilligan (1982), members of the Stone Center (Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991, Introduction) posit that, for females, connection to others is an integral component of their sense of self. Thus, females begin not only to focus more on their relationships during this period, but also to gain a sense of who they are in reference to their relationships. In addition, Jean Baker Miller theorizes that as adolescents explore their identities, they strive to use all of their skills and capabilities (1991). As a part of this exploration, females work to fulfill their desire to be in relationships with others, termed a "being-in-relationship" need, whereas males are socialized to suppress this need when they are young (Miller). Taken together, these theories suggest that relationships are critical to female identity development during adolescence, and that they remain so throughout women's lives (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990).

Given the importance of connection for females, adolescent girls marked by poor relationships and inadequate social skills are at-risk for negative outcomes over the trajectory of their lives. Of most concern, research consistently finds that weak interpersonal relationships and relational life stressors have a large effect on adolescent

female suicidality (Ang, Chia & Fung, 2006; Bettridge & Favreau, 1995; Center for Disease Control [CDC], 2007). Unfortunately, recent studies show that the risk for adolescent girls to attempt suicide is increasing. The CDC reported in 2002 that adolescent females are almost twice as likely as their male counterparts to attempt suicide (12.3 % vs. 6.7%). Furthermore, in 2007, the CDC reported that between the years of 2003 and 2004 the suicide rate for 10 to 19 year-old-girls increased by 76%. Also of concern, weak peer relations have been linked to physical aggression and violent offending among adolescent females. Specifically, Moretti, Holland, and McKay found that assaultive behavior among this population is predicted by, among other factors, a belief that peers hold a derogatory view of them. Furthermore, similar to the increase in adolescent female suicidality, studies indicate that there has been an increase of violent offending and physical aggression among female youth over the past two decades (Odgers & Moretti, 2002; Savioe, 2000; Snyder & Sickmunc, 1999; Statistics Canada, 2001).

One way to understand strained peer relationships for adolescent girls is by looking for the presence of relational aggression, defined as behaviors that harm others through damage, or the threat of damage, to relationships or feeling of acceptance, friendship, or group inclusion (Crick, 1996). This type of aggression peaks during adolescence, especially among females, and can be detrimental to both the victim and the aggressor (Underwood, 2003). Specifically, studies show that relational victimization can inflict serious psychological harm and is linked to the increase in female suicidality. In addition, inflicting high levels of relational aggression is often a precursor to physical aggression among adolescent girls (Underwood). Despite its associations with negative

outcomes, relational aggression is normative among adolescent girls and can also serve some healthy functions, such as establishing norms for behavior and defining the in/out groups (Gottman &Mettetal, 1983). Thus, even girls with relatively healthy peer relationships increase their levels of relational aggression during adolescence, suggesting that most adolescent females may be struggling with aspects of social connection or are at some level of relational risk.

Given the importance of healthy relationships to female development, it is critical that girls who have limited relational skills or display antisocial behaviors learn new, prosocial ways of interacting. Fortunately, research shows that a relationship with a caring adult is a protective factor for adolescents and, as a result, there has been an increase in formalizing these relationships through one-on-one and group mentoring programs (MENTOR, 2006). Girls in particular are referred to mentoring programs for difficulties with trust, communication, and intimacy in their relationships (Rhodes, 2002) and, as a result, there is an especially high level of relational risk in group mentoring programs for girls. While the group mentoring setting seems conceptually appropriate for girls struggling in relationships given the opportunities for social learning and connection, feedback, and support from peers (Bogat & Liang, 2005; Deutsch, 2008; Ladd & Mize, 1983), considerable controversy has emerged regarding the effects of aggregating youth at-risk together for the purpose of intervention.

Broadly, there is a body of research that indicates iatrogenic effects when aggressive or delinquent children and adolescents are grouped (Dishion & Dodge, 2005; Dishion, McCourd, & Poulin, 1999), even in the presence of prosocial peers (Mager, Milich, Harris, and Howard, 2005). There is also a smaller, but growing, body of

evidence suggesting that group interventions are in fact beneficial and can lead to positive outcomes under the right circumstances (Dishion & Dodge, 2005; Lochman, et al., 2008). Initial studies on group mentoring, in particular, have indicated benefits at the conclusion of the program, particularly in the areas of social skill development. However, the research in group mentoring is in its preliminary stages and, in light of the mixed findings on group interventions, the National Research Agenda for Youth Mentoring highlights the need for more studies on group mentoring in particular. In parallel, group intervention researchers are eagerly investigating the group-level factors that predict positive outcomes among aggregated youth with similar risk profiles (Prinstein & Dodge, 2008).

Over the past few years, researchers have begun to look to the competency of the adults as a potential moderating factor for group outcomes in both group interventions and group mentoring programs. It is theorized that their character, education, and skills may play an important role in the adverse or positive effects of youth in group interventions (Dishion, Dodge, & Lansford, 2006; Feldman et al., 1983; Larson & Lochman, 2002; Lochman et al, 2008; Rhodes, 2002). Despite recognition that adult competencies likely play a role, there has been little empirical study of adult factors up to this point, and intervention and mentoring scientists are calling for investigations of adult impacts on group outcomes (Prinstein & Dodge, 2008; Rhodes, 2002). This study attempts to address this need by identifying the characteristics and competencies of adults that promote prosocial behaviors and attitudes among groups of at-risk adolescent girls after a year of participation in a group mentoring program.

Chapter II: Review of the Relevant Literature

Adolescent Girls and Risk

Adolescence is a period of adjustment as well as risk, especially for adolescent girls. While both genders feel distress as their body develops, sexual development in females, unlike males, can lead to negative social outcomes. Adolescent females are at increased risk for sexual victimization (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001), depression (Culbertson, 1997), body dissatisfaction and disordered eating (Littleton & Ollendick, 2003), as well as increased levels of physical aggression (Odgers & Moretti, 2002). Of special concern, adolescent females are also almost twice as likely as males to attempt suicide as their male counterparts (12.3% vs. 6.7%) (CDC, 2002). The Girl Scout Research Institute (GSRI)'s recently published study of girls' health, body image, diet, weight, and exercise, *The New Normal? What Girls Say About Healthy Living,* indicates that girls are more concerned with appearance and acceptance than nutrition, eating habits, or exercise. Emotional health, self-esteem and body image play a critical role in girls' attitudes about diet and exercise but there is a disconnect between knowledge and practice relating to healthy behaviors. Girls report that their mothers are the major source of their knowledge on about healthy living (Girl Scout Research Institute, 2006).

Compounding these changes, adolescent females must take increased responsibility for making academic, social, and emotional decisions that can significantly affect the trajectory of their lives. During this period, adult support decreases, as both parents and teachers reduce their supervision of adolescents, which likely contributes to adolescents' increased engagement in cigarettes and marijuana use (i.e., 23% and 15% reporting use in the last year; CDC, 2002). Regarding sexual activity, 24.5% of sexually

active ninth-grade girls in 2001 had used alcohol or drugs during their last sexual intercourse. This may contribute to the 1 million teens that become pregnant each year, of which 80% are unplanned pregnancies and to unmarried teens (Ventura, Abma, Mosher, & Henshaw, 2003).

Furthermore, research suggests that girls may face more emotional challenges than boys do during adolescence. Gilligan, Brown, and Rogers theorize that girls learn to silence their own thoughts and feelings in order to preserve their relationships during this stage, a phenomenon they term "loss of voice" (1990). Research by Harter, Waters, and Whitesell (1997) disputes this, however, as they found no significant gender differences in the developmental trajectory of adolescence. The vulnerability of females' self-concept is evident, though, as girls' self-regard begins to drop as early as age eleven, decreases farther than boys', and never catches up (Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990). Thus, they leave this stage with decreased expectations, less self-confidence, and less self-esteem than in pre-adolescence (AAUW, 1992; Eccles, Barber, Josefowicz, Malenchuk, & Vida, 1999). A study by Girls Incorporated (2000) found that adolescent girls are also frustrated by the gender stereotypes that they find create barriers to achieving their goals, and that they do not always get optimal support from others in helping them confront those barriers. Results indicated that 28% of girls in grades 7-12 think people often make decisions about what girls can and cannot do based on their gender rather than their individual abilities (Girls Inc, 2001).

Prosocial Development

Interacting with others in a prosocial way may be a protective factor for adolescent girls. Prosocial behavior is defined as any purposive action on behalf of

someone else that involves a net cost to the helper (Hoffman, 1994). Evidence indicates that feeling empathy for a person in need is an important motivator in helping (Batson, Duncan, Ackerman, Buckley, & Birch, 1981) and that individual differences in empathy are related to individual differences in prosocial and altruistic behavior during adolescence (Bierhoff & Rohmann, 2004; Eisenberg, Carlo, Murphy, & Van Court, 1995) and into early adulthood (Eisenberg et al., 2002).

Recent research has shown that prosocial behavior is a broad and multidimensional construct. Carlo and Randall (2002) divided prosocial behaviors into *altruistic* (voluntary helping motivated primarily by the concern for the needs and welfare of another), *public* (in front of others and self-interested), *anonymous* (actor remains unknown), *dire* (in a crisis), *emotional* (in response to another person's emotions), and *compliant* (when requested) behaviors. Prosocial behavior has been linked theoretically and empirically to various forms of social competencies and familial connectedness. Specifically, demonstrating prosocial behaviors is associated with social acceptance and approval (Bukowski & Sippola, 1996; Newcomb, Bukowski, & Pattee, 1993) and, accordingly, self-esteem regarding friendship and peer relations. Researchers have hypothesized that the relationship between prosocial behavior and self-esteem is likely bi-directional, as adolescents with high levels of self-esteem feel more competent to assist others and are also more able to do so than adolescents with low self-esteem, because their own needs are not being met (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). However, it is also suggested that an adolescent's engagement in prosocial and positive social activities increases their self-esteem (Yates & Youniss, 1996).

In addition, prosocial behavior has been linked to adolescent self-esteem and connectedness within their family system. Researchers have found empirical support for the idea that warm, nurturing relationships with parents in adolescence promotes prosocial behavior and decreases aggressive behavior (Coie & Dodge, 1997, Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998), likely mediated by the development of empathy (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg & McNally, 1993; Hawkins & Lishner, 1987). Researchers have argued that warm, supportive parenting inherent in secure parent–adolescent relationships creates an affective climate in the home that fosters the development of empathy and reciprocity (Garber, Robinson, & Valentiner, 1997; Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1990). Similarly, when adolescents increase their social problem-solving skills, their family relationships also improve (Dishion & Andrews, 1995).

Prosocial behaviors have also been linked to academic competencies among students. In a study designed to understand how social and academic behaviors are linked, Wentzel (1993) found that significant correlations between social behavior and academic outcomes can be explained, in part, by significant associations between social and academic behavior, even when controlling for intelligence and other demographic variables. Similarly, researchers have demonstrated that academic achievement has been related to the following social behaviors: displays of prosocial and empathic behavior (Feshbach & Feshbach, 1987), prosocial interactions with peers (Green, Forehand, Beck, & Vosk, 1980), appropriate classroom conduct (Lambert & Nicoll, 1977; Wentzel, Weinberger, Ford, & Feldman, 1990), and compliance (Cobb, 1972; Kohn & Rosman, 1973).

Mentoring Theory and Outcomes

Research suggests that a positive relationship with an extra-familial adult may prove to be a protective factor for youth (Bower & Chapman, 1996; Scales & Gibbons, 1996; Werner, 1995). While some youth naturally form relationships with caring adults, there has also been an increase in promoting this relationship through formal mentoring programs. The definition of a *mentor*, as derived from Vygotskian's socio-cultural theory and supported by Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, is "an older, more experienced person who seeks to further the development of character and competence in a younger person" (Darling, 2005). More specifically, youth mentoring refers to a relationship between a caring, supportive adult and a child or adolescent (Rhodes, 2002). Mentors play a unique role in the lives of their mentees, as they serve multiple social functions and may transcend specified categories of functioning in a way a parent, adult guardian, teacher, or peer may not.

Over the past few years, studies have found an association between formal mentoring relationships and positive outcomes for youth (DuBois & Karcher, 2005; DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; Grossman & Tierney, 1998; Jackson, 2002; Jent & Niec, 2006; Rhodes, 2002; Rhodes & DuBois, 2006; Rhodes, Reddy, & Grossman, 2005; Zimmerman, Bingenheimer & Behrendt, 2005), many of which counteract the specific problems of adolescent girls. Research indicates that participation in mentoring programs is associated with reductions in engaging in risky behaviors, such as drug and alcohol use, as well as improving the relationship quality between mentees' and their peers as well as their families (Deutsch, Lawrence, & DeBlank, 2007; Jekielek, Moore, & Hair, 2002). Academically, one-on-one mentored youth make measurable

gains in school achievement, attendance, school attitudes and behaviors, and also increases the likelihood of youth attending college (Cragar, 1994; Grossman & Tierney, 1998). In general, one-on-one mentoring is considered to be a valuable and effective intervention and prevention for youth who are at-risk in a variety of domains (Herrera, Vang, & Gale, 2002).

Jean Rhodes (2005) has developed a model of effective youth mentoring which largely guides the field of youth mentoring research and practice. She proposes that at the heart of effective mentoring is the development of feelings of mutuality, trust, and empathy within the relationship (Rhodes, Grossman, & Resch, 2000). Additionally, she posits that this type of mentoring relationship enables the following proposed pathways towards positive youth development: 1) enhancing youth's social skills which influence their positive social-emotional development; 2) dialogue and listening which influences youth's cognitive development; and 3) role modeling which influences youth's positive identification and behavior. Moderators of the extent to which a given mentoring relationship will lead to positive youth development include levels of demographic factors, relationship duration, interpersonal histories, and social competencies (Rhodes, 2002). Additionally, mediators such as improved parent and peer relationships have been found to explain positive outcomes for adolescents (Rhodes, 2002).

Mentoring Females

Given the importance of relational competence among adolescent girls, the youth development literature suggests that mentoring may be an especially effective intervention for this population (DuBois & Karcher, 2005). In fact, Grossman and Tierney (1998) found that girls may benefit more than boys from mentors, especially in

academic improvement. In addition, Deutsch, Lawrence, and DeBlank (2007) found that girls at high relational risk made more changes in social domains than those at low relational risk. MENTOR, however highlights that the potential for effective mentoring for females is still unrealized (2006b). The majority of youth programming for girls and boys is provided by agencies that formerly served males only, so program were initially designed with males in mind. In fact, in a study of 25 youth programs, Mead (2001) found that many youth programs did not serve girls as effectively as boys because of a mismatch between program design and girls' interests. She concluded that girls were marginalized and their needs unmet.

More recently, it has been suggested that when there is more programming for females, the effects of mentoring this population will be better understood (MENTOR, 2006b). For example, psychosocial mentoring, a process-oriented approach which focuses on interpersonal relationships, may be especially effective for girls (Bogat & Liang, 2005). Mentoring programs may be especially relevant for adolescent girls as 12% of younger girls and one in five high school girls (20%) say they do not know three adults to whom to turn if they have a problem (Girls, Inc., 2006).

While mentoring may be a beneficial intervention for females, developing an empathic and trusting relationship with female mentees may pose unique challenges. Girls are usually referred to mentoring programs because of problems in their relationships, including issues with trust, communication, and intimacy with their mothers, whereas boys are usually referred because of behavioral problems (Rhodes, 2002). Because attachment theory suggests that adolescents who have troubled relationships with their parents are more likely to have problems in future relationships

(Bowlby, 1988; Collins & Read, 1994), it may be especially difficult to build an empathic and trusting relationship with female mentees. This may help explain the fact that female mentoring relationships are more likely to terminate than those of males (Darling, Bogat, Cavell, Murphy, & Sanchez, 2006; Grossman & Rhodes, 2002) and that girls are significantly less likely than boys to identify their mentors as significant adults in their lives (27% vs. 73%) (Dubois, Neville, Parra, & Pugh-Lilly, 2002).

Mentoring Adolescents

Research and theory emphasize the importance of relationships with non-parental adults in the lives of all adolescents. These adults provide emotional support, offer skills and knowledge, motivate youth, and serve as role models and advocates (Sanchez, Reyes, & Singh, 2006). Several studies have found that adolescents who have relationships with caring and concerned adults are more likely to become healthy and successful adults themselves (Furstenberg, 1993; Werner & Smith, 1992). The support and guidance of nonparental adults can help adolescents become more prepared for adult life, which in turn eases their transition to adulthood (Deutsch & Hirsch, 2001; Hirsch, Mickus & Boerger, 2002).

Unfortunately, there are many barriers to adolescents and adults forming caring and consistent relationships with one another. Adolescents tend to be segregated from other age groups, often by their own choice. The larger class sizes and increased number of teachers they have in middle school mean they are less likely to form close bonds with their teachers that they did in elementary school (Eccles et al., 1999). Societal changes have also affected their connection with adults. Today's youth are less likely to be from two-parent households or live in close proximity to family relatives (Darling, 2005).

Furthermore, as adolescents transition from elementary to middle school and explore their own interests, especially with peers, they have less time for the adults who are in their lives (Darling; Larson, 1997). The developmental tasks of adolescence also inhibit relationship building between adults and youth. Adolescents tend to be concerned with individuating from their parents and expanding their social networks. They disclose less information to adults, especially parents, and more information to peers during this developmental stage (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1984; Darling).

The challenge of adults and youth forming a meaningful relationship during adolescence is especially evident in mentoring. Research indicates that mentoring relationships with adolescents are the least likely to last for a full year (Grossman & Rhodes, 2002). Unfortunately, the research also indicates that when mentoring relationships last less than 12 months, they are less likely to be positive and can, in fact, be damaging to the youth (Grossman & Rhodes; Rhodes, 2002). Also of note, both the adolescents and their mentors tend to be less satisfied with their relationship than younger children and their mentors (Grossman & Rhodes).

Effective Mentors

Since the mentoring research indicates that the key ingredient of mentoring is the relationship between the mentor and mentee, it is important to understand the psychosocial characteristics of mentors that promote a close and connected relationship. Research indicates that self-efficacy, for instance, or the level of confidence with respect to establishing a positive relationship with a youth, is related to mentees' benefits (Parra, Dubois, Neville, Pugh-Lilly, 2002). Within a sample of 50 Big Brother/Big Sister dyads, mentor self-efficacy assessed at the outset of the relationship was positively related to

mentee's perceived benefit, monthly contact with youth, fewer relationship obstacles, and involvement in program-relevant activities. Pre-existing self-efficacy is also linked to mentee psychosocial outcomes, as Leyton, Lawrence, & Deutsch (2009) found that, in a sample of college women mentors, mentors' academic and general college self-worth at the outset of the relationship was positively related to mentee relationship satisfaction at termination. Karcher, Nakkula, & Harris (2005) found that mentor self-efficacy may also be related to mentor outcomes and, specifically, that, in combination with motivation, self-efficacy may help explain mentors' perception of relationship quality, regardless of the child's risk-status.

Research also indicates that mentors' ethnocultural empathy is related to mentee outcomes. This construct, taken from the field of counseling psychology, refers to empathy directed toward people from racial and ethnic cultural groups who are different from one's own ethno-cultural group (Wang et al., 2003). The concept coalesces general empathy, "the feeling in oneself the feelings of others" (Strayer & Eisenberg, 1987, p. 391), and culturally specific empathy, a modified psychological construct that describes empathy in cross-cultural contexts (Wang et al., 2003). It is hypothesized that ethnocultural empathy is particularly relevant for mentoring because, for many dyads, racial and ethnic minority mentees are matched with white mentors.

Studies of cross-race versus same race matches have indicated varying results. While a large meta-analysis of 1,138 youth found that cross-race matches (White mentor and racial minority mentee) terminated more often than same-race matches (Grossman & Rhodes, 2002), several other studies cite no differences between cross-race and same-race matches (DuBois, Hollaway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; Herrera et al., 2000;

Sanchez & Colon, 2005). Additionally, although race may be an important consideration, there is further speculation that socioeconomic status may be more of a barrier than issues of race or ethnicity (Flaxman et al., 1998).

There is also preliminary evidence that mentors' mental health and psychosocial functioning are related to mentee outcomes. Although there is little research on this topic, Leyton et al. found that mentor's initial depression was negatively related to mentee satisfaction post mentoring. These finding make clinical sense, as the primary symptoms of depression are social withdrawal or avoidance, low energy, lack of interest in activities and relationships, and inconsistent moods. Research has found that inconsistent mentors lead to mentee dissatisfaction (Johnson, 1998; Styles & Morrow, 1992; Mecartney, Styles & Morrow, 1995), and it follows that depression poses significant challenges for individuals serving as mentors, and may indirectly pose risk to their mentees. On the other hand, from Leyton and colleagues found that mentor's initial anxiety was positively related to mentee satisfaction post mentoring. From their review of the anxiety scale at the item level, they hypothesize that mentors who worried and were considering asking for help might work harder to engage and stay engaged with their mentee.

Group Mentoring

As mentoring programs are generally considered effective interventions for youth at-risk and have garnered extensive public attention over the past few years, there has been a push to provide mentoring relationships for more youth. Although there has been an increase in formal relationships, there are still not enough adult volunteers to provide one-on-one mentors for many young people (Herrera, et al., 2002), In response to this shortage, programs have taken innovative approaches to providing more mentoring

opportunities, and have increased the settings and formats in which children can form caring relationships with adults. Group mentoring, specifically, has gained popularity over the last several years, although there is still very little empirical research available on this modality (Herrera et al.). In 1999, about 20% of mentoring programs served at least some youth in a group format (Sipe & Roder), and it is hypothesized that this number has increased over the past few years. As such, there is a significant gap between the practice of group mentoring and the evidence-base for its use. To address this gap, the National Research Agenda for Youth Mentoring described the need for empirical research on the new and innovative formats that are serving many of our youth today (Rhodes & Dubois, 2004). More research on group mentoring is needed.

Traditionally, group mentoring was intended to provide the opportunity for one adult to form several relationships with multiple youth at a time. It was hypothesized that this may be more cost and time effective and allow more youth opportunities to develop these important, protective relationships (Herrera et al., 2002). This adult can serve as a counselor or guide to mentees much in the same way that one-on-one mentors do, although the intensity of the relationships is reduced (Herrera et al.). In one of the first studies of group mentoring, however, Herrera and colleagues argued that group mentoring does not consist of several adult-youth relationships occurring in the larger context of a group, as originally thought. They describe group mentoring as, more specifically, a context in which youth are mentored by a group that consists of at least one adult and one or more peers (Herrera et al., 2002). Thus, peers are important players in understanding and utilizing group mentoring programs.

Given the opportunities for peer socialization, it is hypothesized that the group format may be especially beneficial for adolescent girls, who are most frequently referred to mentoring because of difficulties developing healthy relationships (Rhodes, 2002). The group setting allows mentees opportunities to interact with peers in the context of a caring adult relationship and can promote social risk-taking, problem solving, and peer feedback in a generally safe environment. In fact, research indicates that after participation in group mentoring programs, mentees' social and relational development is one of the most frequently noted outcomes by both mentors and mentees. For instance, a study of three group mentoring programs conducted by Public/Private Ventures found that mentors and mentees most consistently cited that youth improved in social skills at the conclusion of the program (Herrera et al., 2002). Additionally, in a study of a cognitive-behavioral approach to structured group mentoring, Jent and Niec found that children reported significantly more gains in social problem-solving skills than their wait-listed, control group peers (2009). Furthermore, a study by Deutsch, Lawrence, and DeBlank (2006) found that, at the conclusion of a combined group and one-on-one mentoring program, girls at high relational risk reported more gains than their control group peers in relational domains, such as sticking up for friends or dealing with difficult social problems. Given the relational benefits of group mentoring, this format may be particularly appropriate for adolescent girls who are referred for problems in the social domain. On the other hand, an initial study by Bracy (2008) found no changes at the conclusion of a group mentoring program for older adolescent girls.

In addition to the positive social outcomes cited at the conclusion of group mentoring programs, it is theorized that the peer component of these interventions may,

in fact, promote a caring relationship between mentee and adult mentor. Again, this benefit may be especially relevant for adolescent girls, whose mentors more frequently terminate their relationships early, possibly because girls have a harder time developing caring relationships given their reason for referral (DuBois, Neville, Parra, & Pugh Lilly, 2002; Grossman & Rhodes, 2002). Herrera et al. (2002) indicate that the presence of peers can initially serve as buffers, allowing youth who are initially uncomfortable in one-on-one relationships to begin interacting with their mentor in a more familiar, group setting. Furthermore, the same study notes that mentors can actually learn a great deal about their mentees through the group interactions. First, peers can help spark conversations about important topics. Second, observing mentees with other youth informs the mentor about specific social deficits and areas of strength. Finally, in the group setting, mentors are able to support their mentees as they practice interpersonal skills and then help shape improvements in these behaviors (Herrera et al). It is also probable that these processes help promote the mutuality, trust, and empathy that Rhodes indicates are the key ingredients to successful mentoring. Furthermore, peer support may also help reduce attrition rates, as a study by Jent and Niec (2009) found that only 7% of their mentees dropped out of the group format over a 3-month period and no mentors terminated early.

Peer Influence, Group Interventions, and Gender

Despite the promise of group mentoring, Herrera and colleagues (2002) pose that there are some risks associated with aggregating youth that may negate the positive outcomes of mentoring. Specifically, taken from the group intervention literature, there is evidence that grouping individuals with similar risk profiles may lead to iatrogenic

effects at the conclusion of the intervention (Dishion, McCourd, & Poulin, 1999). In contrast, other researchers found that positive outcomes increased when at-risk youth were grouped together (Allen & Philiber, 2001). This line of research is especially relevant to group mentoring for adolescent girls, as these groups will have an especially high density of youth with relational problems.

Group outcomes, in which individuals have similar outcomes as their group mates, have been theorized to be due to the powerful process of peer influence, in which members adopt group behaviors as it socializes individuals around group rules or norms (Moreland & Levine, 1992). Allen and Antonishak (2009) suggest that peer influences are an essential aspect of adolescents and that these processes are continuously reinforced via normal and healthy adolescent social interactions. Cohen (1983) hypothesizes that peers influence each other towards homogeneity because homophilic relationships are self-validating and that they anchor similar belief, attitudes, and behavioral patterns. Moreland and Levine (2002) further suggest that the influence of group and individual is reciprocal: groups attempt to change individuals in ways that improve his/her value, whereas individuals attempt to change peer groups in ways that makes it more rewarding (Moreland & Levine, 2002). Other theorists posit that peer groups work to improve individuals' value for reasons of safety and legitimizing intergroup inequality (Bobo, 1988; Guimond, 2000).

Research validating the influence of social groups is well established and is demonstrated over a variety of dimensions, including the perception of the nature of physical stimuli, engaging in risky behavior, and more complex attitudes and beliefs like stereotypes, political beliefs, and prejudices (Asch, 1951; Maxwell, 2001; Sherif, 1936).

Among adolescents, peer influence has been found to explain orientation towards school, bullying behavior, and popular teen culture (Davies & Kandal, 1981; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). In addition, both the media and the field of psychology have recently turned their attention towards peer groups and perceived group norms as influencing adolescent's engagement in risky behaviors (Maxwell, 2001). Studies also demonstrate that peer behaviors are associated with adolescent cigarette smoking (Ennett & Bauman, 1994), marijuana smoking (Maxwell, 2001), sexual activity (Billy & Udrey, 1985), and condom use (Henry et al., 2007).

Some theorists suggest that female adolescents may be especially susceptible to peer group influences. Gilligan, Brown, and Rogers theorize that girls learn to silence their own thoughts and feelings in order to preserve their relationships during this stage, a phenomenon they term "loss of voice" (1990). By silencing their voice, girls resign their ability to withstand peer influence and, thus, may increase the effect that peer groups have on their behaviors. Studies on bullying behavior confirm that girls' may be more influenced by peers than boys, at least in some social behaviors. Salmivalli et al. (1998) found that while eighth grade girls were more likely to engage in bullying behavior similar to that of their female classmates than their own behavior two years earlier, boys' bullying was better predicted by their previous bullying behavior. Furthermore, a study by Salmivalli and Voeten (2004) demonstrated that the class context had more of an effect on the bullying behavior of girls than boys. In addition, adolescents in general are theorized to be especially at-risk for peer influence because this is when their reference group changes from the family to their peers.

In intervention groups designed for similarly at-risk peers, iatrogenic effects can occur when there are unintended, negative consequences for aggregating youth together, hypothetically due to various types of influence (Dishion, 2000). For instance, an intervention designed to promote problem-solving and prosocial development among high risk young adolescents resulted in increases in self-reported smoking as well as teacher-reported delinquent behaviors, even though there were improvements in the youth's parent-adolescent relationship (Dishion, McCourd, & Poulin, 1999). Similar iatrogenic effects of interventions have been found across a variety of interventions and behaviors, including increases in drug abuse (Dishion, Capaldi, Spracklen, & Li, 1991), antisocial problem behaviors (Capaldi, Dishion, & Stoolmiller, 2001; Capaldi, Dishion, Stoolmiller, & Yoerger, 1997), and the escalation of aggression. Among females in particular, negative peer influence effects have been found in intervention groups for self-mutilating behavior, anorexic behavior, as well as bingeing and purging behaviors (Beaumont, Russell, & Tuoyz, 1993; Walsh & Rosen, 1988). In fact, in 1992, Lipsey found that 29% of published articles on interventions for adolescents at-risk resulted in negative effects, a probable underrepresentation as many interventions with null or negative effects were not even submitted for publication.

Given the occurrence of iatrogenic outcomes, researchers have turned their attention to the mechanisms underlying this influence, which has several labels including contagion, peer pressure, and peer deviancy training. Lochman, Wells, and Lenhart (2008), authors of the Coping Power Program for aggressive children, theorize that aggregating youth at-risk can lead to negative peer influences via two pathways: 1) group norms shifting upward due to the high density of aggressive youth, or 2) peer deviancy

training. In 1986, Wright et al. used the person-group similarity model and found that grouping children with a high level of aggression may cause the social norms for that behavior to shift to a higher level, making aggressive and antisocial behavior appear to be more socially acceptable. Peer deviancy training occurs when members of a deviant peer group directly reinforce each other for their antisocial attitudes and behaviors (Dishion, 2000). This can happen via subtle social support, such as laughing or smiling, or the amount of deviant talk that youth engage in. In support, Patterson et al. (2000) found that adolescent dyads with deviant attitudes reinforce deviant and/or aggressive talk, while non-deviant dyads reinforce normative discussions. Stated differently, the negative peer influence occurs as a result of the deviant messages that are transmitted among the youth, even in the presence of adults (Gifford-Smith et al.).

Currently, there is only preliminary research on gender differences and negative peer influence in intervention groups. While most studies that have included samples of both boys and girls have pointed to similar peer contagion effects (Cardoos, 2006), there is initial evidence suggesting that females may be more susceptible to negative influence than their male counterparts when aggregated. For instance, Hanish, Matrin, Fabes, Leonard, and Herzon (2005) found that, among 137 low-risk preschool and kindergarten students, exposure to externalizing peers predicted the development of short-term problem behaviors (aggression, hyperactivity, and anxiety) for girls, but not for boys. Similarly, there is evidence that girls may reinforce negative behaviors more than boys do, especially relational aggression (Cardoos, 2006; DeBoer, Zakriski, Wright, & Cardoos, 2009). In Cardoos's 2006 study, the self-indicated first study on gender differences and peer deviancy training, delinquent girls in intervention groups received

high levels of peer support, whereas as highly delinquent males were rejected by their peers and low delinquent males received high levels of peer support. These same highly delinquent girls changed less over the six-week intervention than boys did in problem behaviors, including externalizing behaviors, internalizing behaviors, anxiety/depression, social problems, attention problems, as well as aggression, hypothetically because their peers reinforced their behaviors. In contrast, however, Dishion (2000) found some evidence of higher levels of observed deviancy training in boys as compared to girls. Underwood (2003) indicates that research on the grouping effects of adolescent girls is needed.

Despite the negative peer influence that can lead to iatrogenic effects for group interventions, there is a line of research that indicates that group interventions can, in fact, also be beneficial (Dishion, 2000; Prinstein & Dodge, 2009). Allen and Antonishak (2008) posit that, in order for aggregates of at-risk youth to make positive changes, they must not only resist the pull towards negative peer influence, but also transmit prosocial ideas to promote influence in the positive direction. These same researchers further suggest that group practitioners are the key to this process, as they have the ability to actively change the content of the transmitted messages among the group and, accordingly, direct the influence. Moreover, their research suggests that, in order for groups of at-risk youth to make positive changes, group leaders must actively teach and enable youth to transmit ideas that promote success in the adult world, and not the sometimes deviant adolescent world (Allen et al., 1994; Allen & Philliber, 2001). Thus, it is hypothesized that it is the competency of the adults themselves that influences the positive or negative effects of a group intervention. Leading researchers in the field of

group interventions and group mentoring are indicating that research on the specific competencies of adults is needed (Dishion, McCourd, & Poulin, 1999; Herrera et al, 2002; Prinstein & Dodge, 2009; Rhodes, 2002).

Adult Competencies

Managing a group of youth at-risk, especially with social deficits, is a challenging endeavor (Lochman et al, 2008; Larson & Lochman, 2002). Not only are successful group practitioners charged with addressing referral concerns and managing group behaviors, but they must also change adolescent messages, promote positive peer influence, and combat deviancy training to avoid iatrogenic effects. Accordingly, there is a push in the literature to better understand the personal characteristics, competencies, and experience of the adults that work with groups of youth at-risk that promote positive and prosocial development.

There is virtually no group mentoring literature on the adult factors that promote positive outcomes among groups of at-risk youth. Similarly, there is little information on effective adult behaviors in groups with an equal number of adults and youth, such as group mentoring. In the only study looking at mentor behavior in group mentoring, Herrera et al. (2002) found that group mentors who had a strong relationship with youth attended group regularly, were sensitive to youth's activity preferences, had fun with youth and got to know them personally, and were open to one-on-one conversations. The group activities that mentees seemed to enjoy were focused on relationship building and discussion versus academic competence. These insights are gathered from interview data and are considered by Herrera to be only preliminary.

While the group counseling literature indicates that leader effects are rarely studied in relation to group member outcomes (Riva & Smith, 1997), there is preliminary research on this topic that may guide group mentoring practices. Some literature suggests that the personal characteristics of group leaders may be the most important predictor of positive outcomes. As such, Corey and Corey (2006) found that the leader's personality had the strongest impact on group members, and refer to personal presence, power, courage, self-awareness, authenticity, creativity, and belief in the group process as important characteristics for group leaders. In an earlier study, Dies (1994) had also found that leaders who are warm, supportive, and genuinely interested in individual members have a positive impact on the gains of group members. In contrast, considerable literature has espoused that leaders who are unfriendly and distant have a destructive impact on group members (McCallum, Piper, Ogrodniczuk, & Joyce, 2002; Smokowki, Rose, & Bacallo, 2001).

There is also literature suggesting that the competencies of the group leaders may have an important impact on youth outcomes. Specifically, verbal skills such as active listening, restating, clarifying, summarizing, questioning, interpreting, confronting, reflecting, supporting, self-disclosure, and guidance (Corey & Corey, 2006; Hill & O'brien, 1999; Ivey & Ivey, 1999) are all hypothesized to play a role, however, research has not yet demonstrated a direct connection between verbalizations and outcomes (Shechtman, 2004). Similarly, the Group Leader Intervention System (GLIS) identifies six types of global verbalizations which are theorized to be important to group process, including structure, group cohesion, modeling, information, exploration, and feedback (Nuijens, Teglasi, Simcox, Kivlighan, & Rothman, 2006). This instrument has recently

been validated and researchers cite developing this with the intention of examining group outcomes. Although understanding the competencies of group counselors is helpful, it is important to note that these group skills are similar to those used by individual therapists (Nuijens et al., 2006; Schechtman, 2004). Thus, they may require more specialized training than most mentoring programs offer and may be too sophisticated for the average mentor.

The Coping Power Program (CPP), a group intervention for youth struggling with aggression and peer rejection, indicates that skills directly intended to combat deviancy training may be associated with positive youth outcomes. CPP is an empirically-supported treatment for this population (Breston & Eyberg, 1998; Smith, Larson, Debaryshe, and Salzman, 2000), and trains their facilitators in the following skills:

1) Limiting opportunities for negative messaging, such as smooth transitions and using body language and eye contact to supervise students,

2) Recognizing the signs of peer deviancy training and intervene, such as splitting the group into two more manageable groups or suspending a child until the group sets more positive norms,

3) Refraining from power struggles, especially with powerful members of the group, to warn against an oppositional group norm, and

4) Intervening with youth sending negative messages, such as having a one-on-one meeting, building rapport, or pairing them with a highly engaged student in hopes of positively influencing their attitudes (Lochman et al., 2008).

Literature also suggests that the adults' previous experiences working specifically with groups may have an impact on outcomes (Dishion, 2000; Prinstein & Dodge, 2009, Larson & Lchman, 2002). Larson and Lochman note that prior experience offers confident and flexible leadership that promotes collaboration with youth. Through this collaborative versus a top-down leadership students develop a therapeutic alliance with their leader (Lochman et al., 2008), which eases the process of transmitting adult-world messages. Experience also enables practitioners to balance this alliance with the necessity of setting firm expectations, monitoring children's behavior, and providing consequences (Lochman et al., 2008). When implemented consistently, these skills send clear messages about the acceptable and normative behavior necessary to be a part of the group. In addition, experience offers comfort with the management structures of the program, which allows more time and attention to be devoted to monitoring the development of group norms. Thus, experience with the specific programmatic curriculum may be especially relevant.

The Young Women Leaders Program (YWLP) is an established mentoring program designed to build the competencies of middle school girls. YWLP is unique in that it combines one-on-one and group mentoring for the duration of a 9-month academic year. Each trained college woman mentor is paired with a 7^{th} grader identified by her school as being at-risk for poor academic, social, and/or emotional outcomes. Each pair is a part of a larger group that meets for two hours weekly and consists of up to ten mentees, their individual mentors, and the group facilitator(s). Pairs also meet for at least four hours a month one-to-one doing mutually agreed upon activities (e.g., studying together, going to a cultural event). Group facilitators are trained undergraduate and

graduate students with a variety of previous experiences. Weekly group mentoring sessions follow a curriculum that addresses critical aspects of girls' scholastic achievement, social aggression, and healthy decision-making (Lawrence, Roberts, Thorndike, 2006). In addition, YWLP also implements many of the programmatic "best-practices" for mentoring youth at-risk (Dubois et al., 2002). Given its structured group component, YWLP lends itself to empirical investigation of the adult factors that promote positive development in group mentoring program.

The Current Study

The goal of the current study was to understand what adult characteristics, experiences, demographics, and competencies promote prosocial growth among groups of adolescent girls in a group mentoring program. YWLP offers a platform for exploration as a structured, research-based group mentoring program that implements many youth mentoring "best-practices." This study contributes to the gap in the knowledge base, as identified by both mentoring and group intervention literature, regarding the impact of adults on group outcomes for youth considered at-risk.

The current study meets the following objectives:

Objective 1: To determine if there are significant differences in social behaviors and attitudes between groups of at-risk adolescent girls at the conclusion of a mentoring program. This study investigated the prosocial behaviors and attitudes of adolescent girls across 12 subscales in four domains: self-esteem (global, peer, academic, and family), peer relationship skills (bullying, victim of bullying, and interceding in bullying), attachment (to school and to mother), and other problematic behaviors (depression, and risky behavior, and behavioral referrals at school).

Objective 2: To determine what facilitator characteristics account for between-group differences. This study investigates what facilitator characteristics are related to group outcomes. A study on individual mentoring found that mentor's academic self-worth (a combination of scholastic and global self-worth items), general college self-worth (a combination of items assessing global self-worth and connection to family), and ethnocultural empathy were all related to mentee relationship satisfaction (Leyton et al., 2009). These same characteristics may be important for facilitators, as well, as mentors and fs for YWLP are generally drawn from the same population of students.

Objective 3: To determine what facilitator experiences account for between group differences. This study investigates the facilitators' pre-existing group and youth experiences that account for between group differences. Three facilitator experiences were examined, including their experiences with group leadership, youth at-risk, and the program itself. Understanding the specific type of experience that is related to positive outcomes can help inform mentoring practice.

Objective 4: To determine what facilitator demographic characteristics account for between group differences. This study investigated the facilitator's demographic characteristics that account for between group differences. The facilitators in this study were either undergraduate or graduate students, and the youth served were often of different race and/or socioeconomic status. Thus, the three demographics that were examined include the race, status as a graduate or undergraduate student, and the number of facilitators in the group (one vs. two). Demographic information related to positive outcomes can contribute to the knowledge base on mentoring practice.

Objective 5: To determine qualitatively what behaviors, if any, differentiate adults in groups that promote prosocial behaviors and attitudes versus those that do not. This study qualitatively compared the behaviors among the facilitators in groups of adolescent girls that made prosocial gains versus the adults in those groups that did not make prosocial gains. Using qualitative data, specific facilitator behaviors thought to be related to the development of prosocial behaviors and attitudes of mentees were coded and analyzed. Start codes for behaviors were taken from behaviors identified in both the group mentoring and group intervention literature. Codes were adjusted as informed by the qualitative data.

Chapter III: Methods

Site

The Young Women Leaders Program (YWLP) is an established mentoring program designed to build the competencies of middle school girls. YWLP is unique in that it combines one-on-one (or rarely two mentees to one mentor) mentoring with structured group experiences. Each trained college woman is paired with a 7th grader identified by her school as being at-risk for poor academic, social, and/or emotional outcomes. Mentors and mentees make contact at least weekly for the duration of at least one year. Since research suggests that individual mentoring may be optimal for developing a one-to-one relationship between the mentoring pair while a group format may be better for promoting positive peer interactions (Herrera, Vang, & Gale, 2002), YWLP incorporates both. Each mentoring pair meets: 1) for at least four hours a month one-to-one doing mutually agreed upon activities (e.g., studying together, going to a cultural event) and 2) for two hours a week in a group of up to ten mentees, their mentors (either one Big Sister: one Little Sister or one Big Sister: two Little Sisters), and one or two facilitators. Group sessions, led by facilitators, follow a curriculum that addresses critical aspects of girls' scholastic achievement, social aggression, and healthy decision-making (Lawrence, Roberts, Thorndike, 2006). All groups attend YWLP structured activities twice a semester on the college campus and most groups have sleepovers and take outings to university activities each semester. Each semester there are also one or two YWLP events which all the facilitators, girls, and, mentors attend with the girls'

parents. Facilitators also enroll in a two-semester service-learning course aimed at fostering leadership in girls and women.

Each year YWLP offers groups at four to five schools; one school serves urban youth, one serves rural youth, and three serve a mixture of urban and suburban youth. Currently, one school offers one group, two offer two groups, and the urban school offers three groups. To prevent conveying a negative message to the girls about their risks, participating schools recruit them "honorifically." They tell the girls that a teacher or staff member has identified them as an "emerging leader" and offer them membership in YWLP, a mentoring program that will support their emerging leadership skills.

Participants

Eighteen mentoring groups were studied in affiliation with a larger ongoing evaluation of YWLP. Groups from three academic year-long cohorts from 2006 to 2009 were examined, with each group consisting of 7 to 11 mentoring pairs, and 1 or 2 facilitators. Individual participants in these groups who were part of this study were 141 early adolescent girls and 20 facilitators ages 19 to 29. Among adolescent girls, 83% were 12 years old at time 1. The sample included 53 (37.6 %) mentees that self-identified as African American, 41 (29.1%) as Caucasian, 4 (2.8%) as Asian-American, 13 (9.2%) as Hispanic or Latina, and 8 (5.7%) that identified as being of mixed race. Seventy-eight mentees (60.5%) qualified for free or reduced-price lunch and 48 (34%) lived in single-parent households. Among the facilitators, 10 (50%) identified as Caucasian, 6 (30%) as African-American, 1 (5%) as Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2 (10%) as Multi-racial or other, The majority were undergraduate students in college with various majors (n =-15) and five were graduate students in Clinical and School Psychology.

Procedure

Facilitators, middle school girls and their parents provided informed consent prior to participation in the study. School personnel nominated female students to participate in the YWLP based on being identified as at-risk socially, emotionally, and/or academically, and not already receiving special services. After obtaining parental and individual permission, the girls were invited to participate in the mentoring program. YWLP facilitators were recruited from the University of Virginia to volunteer for one year of facilitating and on-going training. As part of the application process, prospective facilitators completed an interview with staff and a government background check. After screening, facilitators were assigned to YWLP groups based on scheduling availability, experience with various populations (urban or rural youth), strength in facilitation skills as evidenced in the interview and recommendations, and facilitator preference. Two groups were assigned two co-facilitators, who were placed in pairs based on being younger and having less experience working with groups. As such, it was thought they would have a stronger support system and less responsibility as a co-facilitator.

The quantitative portion of this study used data from a larger evaluation of the Young Women Leaders Program, funded in part by a grant from the Department of Education. Both mentees and facilitators completed self-report questionnaires at the outset of the program and then again at the conclusion. These surveys measure participants' social, emotional, and academic adjustment and, at the end of the program, mentee's assess their satisfaction with the group and with their mentor. Facilitators were also interviewed over the phone to assess their pre-existing experiences working with groups, youth considered at-risk, as well as experience specific to YWLP.

The qualitative portion of this study is part of a larger study on mentoring groups as developmental settings for adolescent girls, funded by the WT Grant Foundation. Cohorts during academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 were observed either weekly or bi-weekly and observations were documented in field notes. In general, researchers acted as participant observers in their groups, writing a "thick description" of what they observed in the mentoring groups, which anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) explains is helpful for uncovering webs of meaning. Thus, they were recording the behaviors, interactions, and discourse of group members with a focus on how the mentoring group functions as a setting for girls to develop their identity, connection with others, and psychosocial competencies. Similarly, observers were also attending to group characteristics/resources (composition, facilitator skills) and social processes (types/qualities of interactions) that may be associated with positive academic, social, and mental health outcomes for girls. My access to these field notes is facilitated by my role in YWLP as a Research Assistant as well as a Facilitator Coordinator and Facilitator. As it would constitute a conflict, I did not consider the group I facilitated for the qualitative portion of the study.

Measures

Adolescent Girls. At the beginning of the mentoring program and again at the conclusion, adolescent girl participants were measured across multiple domains of psychosocial functioning. The following self-esteem related social attitudes were assessed:

Self-esteem. The Self-Esteem Questionnaire (SEQ) was developed for use with early adolescents (middle and junior high school aged youth) (SEQ; DuBois, et al,

1996). Participants respond to items like "I am as good as I want to be at making new friends" on 4-point scales ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Four subscales were used for esteem-related social attitudes. *Peer self-esteem* (8 items, □ = .85-.86) measures happiness with peer relations, *Global self-esteem* (8 items, □ = .86) measures overall self-esteem (DuBois et al., 1996), *Family self-esteem* (8 items, α = .90-.91) measures satisfaction with family relationships, and *Academic self-esteem* measures esteem related to academic competency and school behavior (8 items, □ = .87-.88).

The following social behaviors and attitudes related to peer relationships were assessed.

Engagement in bullying. Victim of and bullying behavior were measured by a 4-point Likert scale adapted from Mynard & Joseph (2000). The original scale is comprised of four dimensions (physical victimization, verbal victimization, social manipulation and attacks on property) with satisfactory internal reliabilities (α's ranging from .73-.85). The instrument was modified to examine bullying behavior as well as being a victim of bullying. Reliability of the adapted scales were tested on data from girls 2003-2006 (n=168) and was satisfactory (being bullied α = .75; bullying α = .67). Bullying questions included items such as "During the past month, I have made fun of someone for some reason" and victim questions include "During the past month, someone has gossiped about me."

Interceding in bullying. This measure was devised by Lawrence (2000) and consists of three items which ask about how frequently girls' intervened in situations in which peers were being bullied by other people, such as "During the past 30 days I stood

up to bullying without being mean myself." Internal consistency of the scale was tested on data from girls 2003-2006 (n=168) and was satisfactory *reliability* ($\alpha = .69$).

Rhodes theory of mentoring posits that effective mentors help improve relationships between mentee and their parent (2002) and, by proxy, could also promote attachment to school. The following measures of attachment were used:

Attachment to mother. This instrument was designed to measure an individual's attachment to her mother or mother figure (Armsden & Greenburg, 1989). The instrument is comprised of 25 items total measuring relational attachment between girls and their parents, including items such as "She can tell how I feel about something." The instrument has been previously used by researchers to examine how mentoring affects mentees' relationships with their parents (Rhodes, 2002, 2005). The instrument consists of three sub-scales measuring trust, communication, and alienation. The trust scale is comprised of 10 items ($\alpha = .91$), communication 10 items ($\alpha = .91$), and alienation 8 items ($\alpha = .86$; Armsden & Greenburg, 1989).

Attachment to school. This measure was originally developed for a large longitudinal study on the effects of several interventions (Hawkins, Catalano, Kosterman, Abbott & Hill, 1999). It consists of four items ($\square = 0.64$; Hawkins et al., 1999) such as "I like my class this year."

We also assessed behaviors and attitudes that are related to social risk. The following risk factors were assessed:

Depression. This was measured with a scale taken from Eccles's (Eccles, Barber, Jozefowicz, Malenchuk, & Vida, 1999) questionnaire (6 items, $\alpha = .82$). It asks for the

frequency of depressive symptoms, such as "During the past month, how often have you felt lonely?"

Behavioral referrals. Girls were asked the number of behavioral referrals, fights, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspension they earned over the year, as well as the number of times they skipped class.

Risky behavior. This is taken from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (CDC, 2007). This is an instrument developed and administered by the CDC to adolescents nationwide in order to assess current levels of emotional health and risk behavior amongst American youth, including drinking behavior, marijuana use, sexual activity, and cigarette smoking.

Facilitators. Prior to initiating the YWLP group and after an academic year, participants were measured across many demographics and domains of psychosocial functioning. The following social domains were assessed:

Self-efficacy. This was measured using subscales of the Self-Perception Profile for College Students (SPPCS) (Harter, 1986) an instrument that has been widely used to study college students' sense of self-worth and competency and demonstrates strong reliability in the literature. Three subscales were taken from this measure, *Scholastic Competence* (4 items, alpha = .84), *Parent Relationship Importance* (4 items, alpha = .88) and *Global Self-Worth* (6 items, alpha = .82) (Neemann & Harter, 1986). Items on this measure include two dichotomous statements. For example, "Some students are often disappointed with themselves. Other students are usually quite pleased with themselves". Reponses involve selection of one or the other, and indication of the whether the statement is "sort of true for me" or "really true for me". Using the same sample of

college women mentors as is being used in the proposed sample, Leyton et al. (2009) conducted confirmatory factor analysis at the item level to verify that data from the present sample mapped onto the intended subscale structure. While there was some overlap with the original structure proposed by Harter there were also important differences resulting in a slight re-conceptualization of the measured constructs for this sample. As such, six items formed one factor: the four *Scholastic Competence* items ("confident in mastering coursework," "do very well at studies," "have trouble figuring out homework assignments" and "do not feel intellectually competent at my studies") and two of the *Global Self Worth* items ("disappointed with self" and "dissatisfied with myself"). This factor appears to be assessing a sense of self-worth for college women that is focused primarily on academics. The six other items formed the second factor: four items from the *Global Self Worth* subscale ("like the kind of person I am," "like the way I am leading my life," "would really rather be different" and "usually like myself as a person") and two items from the *Parent Relationship Importance* subscale ("do not think getting along with parents is important," "think it is important to maintain a good relationship with parents"). This factor appears to be assessing their general sense of worth at college (GCSW), one that includes a connection to parents. Since both factors were interpretable and appeared to better capture the data, they will be used in this study as well. To distinguish the factors used in this study from Harter's original subscales, the first factor will be identified as Academic Self-Worth and the second as General Self-Worth.

Ethnocultural Empathy. This was measured with the 15-item *Empathic Feeling and Expression* subscales of the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (alpha = .89) (Wang, et

al., 2003). Items include questions like "I seek opportunities to speak with individuals of other racial or ethnic backgrounds about their experiences" and "When I know my friends are treated unfairly because of their racial or ethnic backgrounds, I speak up for them."

In addition, facilitators' preparation for and experience working with groups of youth at the outset of the program was assessed via phone interview that addressed the following domains:

Group leadership experience. This consisted of facilitators' experiences leading groups, including teaching, facilitating with YWLP, head camp counselors, or other volunteer activities. Again, each experience will be assessed for length in hours, professional vs. volunteer, type of supervision/training, and population served.

Experiences with youth at-risk. This was comprised of information on the facilitator's previous experiences with youth at-risk on a one-on-one or group basis, including tutoring, mentoring, running camps, or baby-sitting youth with special needs. Information regarding individual experiences with typically developing youth was not gathered. Amount of time, in hours, was assessed.

Program specific experience. This represents the facilitator's previous experience with YWLP, including as a Big Sister, Facilitator, or Administrative position. Number of hours of contact with the program, including any training, class course, or time with Little Sister, was assessed in hours.

Qualitative Analysis

To answer the 5th question, I analyzed qualitative data from three mentoring groups. Sixteen groups had observation data (cohorts 2007-2008 and 2008-2009) and, as

I facilitated one of these groups and could not reliably analyze it, the remaining fifteen groups were considered. Because the quantitative data revealed that facilitators with experience with youth at-risk as well as having two facilitators predicted positive change in mentee adjustment, I chose a group with a facilitator with experience with youth at-risk as well as a group with two facilitators for analysis. Additionally, for comparison to these groups, I also chose to analyze a group with a single facilitator with limited experience.

Among the total sample of girls in YWLP for 2007-2009, there was little difference between the pre and post-test score in adjustment, as evidenced by a mean *Changes in Social Adjustment* score of M = -.02 (SD =1.02, N = 104). There were two facilitators who were categorized as having significant experience with youth at-risk. One of these facilitators was me so the other facilitator was chosen to be analyzed. This group had higher scores at the end of the mentoring program, as evidenced by a mean *Changes in Social Adjustment* score of M = .46 (SD = 1.36, n = 6). There were two groups with two facilitators and since the goal of this analysis is to determine what facilitator characteristics relate to positive group outcomes, the group with the higher score in *Changes in Social Adjustment*, also positive (M = .53, SD = .53, n = 10), was chosen for analysis. Finally, among the three single facilitators categorized as having no experience with youth at-risk, the facilitator with the lowest score in *Changes in Social Adjustment* was chosen for analysis, as it offered the greatest contrast to the groups with the positive changes (M = -.78, SD = .94, n = 8). Notably, the group's change score was negative, which could potentially suggest an iatrogenic effect of the group intervention.

Overall, the groups chosen will allow me to analyze two groups with positive change and a group with negative change. These results are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 *Changes in Social Adjustment Scores by Group*			
Group	*M*	SD	*n*
YWLP (2007-2009)	-.02	1.02	104
Facilitator with Experience with Youth At-Risk	.46	1.36	6
Two Facilitators	.53	.53	10
Single Facilitator with No Experience with Youth At-Risk	-.78	.94	8

Attendance data were collected and analyzed for YWLP mentees. Both attendance at group meetings as well as the number of hours mentees spent with their Big Sisters outside the group were collected. Of the reported data, girls in YWLP (N = 141) attended a mean of 83 percent (SD = .14) of the mentoring groups and spent a mean of 20.3 (SD = 16.26) hours with their big sister outside of the group. The three groups chosen for analysis had similar attendance to the larger YWLP sample as well as to each other. Mentees in the experienced facilitator's group (n = 10) attended a mean of 89% (SD = .14) of mentoring meetings and spent a mean of 22.24 hours (SD = 20.08) hours in outside time. Mentees in the group with two facilitators (n = 8) attended 80 percent (SD = .15) of mentoring meetings and spent 19.97 hours (SD = 10.47) in outside time. Mentees in the group with the quiet facilitator (n = 8) attended 84% (SD = .10) of reported meetings and spent a mean of 19.38 (SD = 7.25) hours in outside time. These results are listed in table 2.

Table 2 *Attendance Data*			
Group	*N*	Mean mentoring groups (SD)	Mean Outside Hours (SD)
YWLP Mentees	141	83 % (0.14)	20.3 (16.26)
Fac. with Experience	10	89% (0.14)	22.24 (20.08)
Two Facilitators	8	80% (0.15)	19.97 (10.47)
Quiet Facilitator	8	84% (0.10)	19.38 (7.25)

As Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest, I began analyzing the field notes of the three groups with an initial list of codes. I analyzed eight sessions for each group, choosing the sessions that had the most group interaction based on the mentoring curriculum. For example, one session involves the mentees hosting a dinner for parents and teachers, which allowed for minimal group interaction. As such, I did not choose to include this session among the eight that I analyzed. I extracted the dialogue from the field notes to focus on verbalizations rather than using the full notes. I then coded the verbalizations of the facilitators only and did not include those of the Big Sisters. These start codes were based on my training and experience working with groups of youth at-risk, as well as reviewing research and training literature for working with groups (Allen & Antonishak, 2009; Lochman, et al., 2008). The original start codes are included in the appendix.

Due to the emergent nature of qualitative research, I expected that these codes might change as the data were analyzed. As such, while reading through and coding my

colleagues' field notes, emergent themes and codes became apparent while some original codes became less relevant. For instance, the code for getting into power struggles was dropped as it rarely occurred, whereas asking scaffolding questions was added as it was a heavily utilized tool for some facilitators. Furthermore, I collapsed and expanded codes as necessary in order to reach the following, final code list for data analysis:

Modeling and Sharing Adult World Ideas

- Sharing adult-world ideas (i.e., sharing personal opinions, sharing ideas typically held among adults)
- Talking about personal problems (i.e., problems that are typical of adults)
- Modeling prosocial behavior (i.e., speaking kindly to others, asking prosocial questions, demonstrating interest in others)
- Setting prosocial expectations for behavior (i.e., reviewing and reminding participants of

  prosocial expectations for behavior, including YWLP behavioral expectations and leadership guidelines, Introducing YWLP Curriculum)

Promoting Prosocial Group Culture

- Acknowledging prosocial behaviors (i.e., labeling mentees' helpful behavior, noticing and acknowledging mentees' demonstrations of empathy)
- Providing opportunities for mentees to demonstrate prosocial behaviors and attitudes (i.e., encouraging community service, asking mentees for help solving problems, calling directly on mentees)
- Scaffolding questions (questions that prompt mentees to think only slightly beyond their current thought, clear and specific)

- Expressions of positive feeling (i.e., saying something positive about group experience, thanking mentee, expressing joy)
- Laughter

Preventing Peer Deviancy Training

- Structuring transitions and tasks (i.e., giving warnings, engaging with mentees throughout the transition from one activity to another, single-step directions)
- Intervening when mentees are engaging in social risk behaviors (i.e., commenting when girl engages in socially risky behavior, encouraging mentees to re-engage with group)
- Changing course when negative messages are being sent (i.e., changing content of group discussion when mentees are being reinforced for socially risky behaviors, starting a new activity when intervening with negative messaging is ineffective)

Relationship Building

- Implying intimate knowledge of mentees (i.e., asking a question based on previous knowledge, sharing something with the group about a mentee)
- Asking personal questions of the mentee
- Reflective statements (clarifying and restating what other person is saying)
- Responsiveness to mentees' emotional needs (i.e., talking to girls who may be left out, calling on girls who don't generally share, providing encouragement when observing a mentee is nervous)

Through the course of analysis, two codes emerged due to their prevalence in the group that did not make positive gains. They were developed to better understand the

differences between the verbalizations of the facilitators in the groups that made positive gains and the one that did not.

- Unrelated statements (statements that do not reflect or relate to the immediately preceding comment, although they may relate to the facilitator's discussion)
- Broad questions (in contrast to scaffolding questions, these questions invite a range of possible answers and can lead to off-topic conversations)

I coded a total of eight mentoring meetings for each of the three groups. A member of the YWLP research team also coded excerpts of the field notes for two mentoring meetings to check for inter-coder agreement, which was calculated using the formula suggested by Miles and Huberma (1994) (the number of agreements between the raters divided by the sum of the total number of agreements and disagreements). Miles and Humberman suggest that an inter-coder agreement of 80-90% is acceptable. An inter-coder agreement of 83% was achieved in this study.

Then, I looked for patterns within individual facilitators and, at times, how the group responded to the facilitator. I also looked for patterns and differences across groups. In addition, I looked at how codes interacted and worked to collapse and expand codes in accordance with findings (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). As I began to write about emergent themes, I looked to the data for detail, clarification, and confirmation and turned to the literature when needed. The facilitator behaviors that were more prevalent in the groups that made prosocial change are described in the following chapter.

Researcher Role

I first came to YWLP in 2006 as a graduate research assistant and advisee of the program's founder and director, Edith Lawrence as a part of UVA's doctoral program for

Clinical and School Psychology. Prior to graduate school, I had worked for six summers at a group-based residential treatment center for youth with emotional and behavioral disorders as well as taught Special Education for four years. I spent four of the summers leading and supervising groups of pre-adolescent and adolescent girls. In both settings, group dynamics and culture were highly supervised, and many interventions were group based, even when they targeted an individual. For example, individuals in groups frequently gave structured feedback to each other so that the individuals could learn how their behavior was affecting others.

Because of my programmatic experience with groups and with adolescent girls, from 2007-2008, I piloted a group facilitation course with the aim of helping YWLP facilitators become more effective in their role. I also continued to work on the YWLP research team and served as a Teaching Assistant for the YWLP Service-Learning course that all mentors are required to take. From 2008-2009, I continued in my roles as Teaching and Research Assistant and also took the role of Facilitator Coordinator, a new role based on YWLP's expansion and need to continue training and supporting the facilitators. In the summer of 2010, I revised the course curriculum for training future YWLP facilitators based on group therapy research and my experience. The literature and research I used for this curriculum informed my understanding of facilitator behaviors and was helpful in interpreting the findings for this research project.

Trustworthiness. In the year 2008-2009, I served as an YWLP Facilitator and Big Sister. As a participant in this study, I was not able to reliably code or analyze the observations of my group and, thus, did not consider my group for qualitative analysis. In addition, as I had supervisory relationships with the facilitator participants in years 2007-

2008 and 2008-2009, it was important that my personal feelings towards these facilitators not influence my analysis. As such, the facilitators' names and groups were de-identified in order to guard against bias; however, I was able to determine the groups based on my knowledge as a supervisor. I also had a peer code excerpts to look for inter-coder agreement and provide a check on my potential biases. Given that the field notes were taken by an observer, and not by me, opportunity for bias was further reduced. Moreover, since the quantitative data drove the groups that I chose for analysis, my potential bias was not a factor in group selection.

Before conducting this research project, I anticipated feeling both proud and frustrated when reading the field notes, as I have a personal investment in the facilitators and YWLP. However, even when the facilitators were intervening in ways contrary to their training, I found myself excited to learn about their mistakes and ways YWLP could improve facilitator education. The interplay between my work as a Facilitator Coordinator and this research project consistently motivated me to read and understand more about facilitator competencies that promote prosocial development.

Chapter IV: Analyses and Results

Data analyses for the quantitative study were conducted using SPSS version 16.0 for Windows and addressed the following research questions:

Question 1: Are there differences in the social behaviors and attitudes between groups of at-risk adolescent girls at the conclusion of a mentoring program?

First, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to investigate the underlying factors of social behaviors for adolescent girls at-risk. The pre-existing scores of 141 mentees of the following measures were used: *Peer Self-Esteem, Global Self-Esteem, Interceding in Bullying, Family Self-Esteem, Academic Self-Esteem, Depression, Bullying, Victim of Bullying, Behavioral Referrals, Risky Behavior, Attachment to School, and Attachment to Mother.* The assumption of linearity between variables was met. 11 of the 12 items correlated at least .3 with at least one other item, suggesting reasonable factorability. In addition, the examined data were factorable based on sampling adequacy (Kaiser-Myer-Olkin (KMO) >.5) and Bartlett's test of sphericity $p < .05$). Principal axis factoring was used to analyze shared variance in the items with the intention of reducing subscale scores into composite scores for subsequent analyses. During several steps, the measures *Attachment to Mother* and *Attachment to School* were eliminated because they did not contribute to a simple factor structure and failed to meet a minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of .4 or above and no cross-loading of .35 or above.

Results of the principal axis factor analysis of the 10 remaining social behaviors indicated three primary latent variables. Factors were rotated using promax rotation and

Kaiser Normalization as theory and data suggest that the factors were correlated. The rotated pattern matrix provided the best defined factor structure. All items but *Depression* had primary loadings over .5 and none but *Depression* had a cross-loading above .3. *Depression* was within .02 of both of these criteria with a primary loading of .481 and a cross-loading of .311. The pattern loading matrix for this final solution is presented in Table 3.

The first factor to emerge accounted for 31% of the sample variance (eigenvalue = 3.5), and included mentees' reported *Peer Self-Esteem* (factor loading = .942), *Global Self-Esteem* (factor loading =.895), *Family Self-Esteem* (factor loading =.691), *Academic Self-Esteem* (factor loading =.546), and *Depression (*factor loading =.481*)*. As such, this factor represents the mentees' *Social Adjustment.*

The second factor accounted for 15.37% of sample variance (eigenvalue = 1.99) and included mentees' reported *Risky Behaviors* (factor loading =.738), *Bullying* (factor loading = .568), and *Behavioral Referrals* (-.557). *Behavioral Referrals* is negative because it is a composite of the total number of behavioral referrals and higher numbers indicate more referrals. Higher numbers on the other two measures represent fewer problems in this area (ie, high numbers on the bullying scale represent lower levels of bullying). This factor represents mentees' *Externalizing Behaviors.*

The third factor to emerge accounted for 5.55 % of sample variance (eigenvalue = 1.14) and included measures of *Victim of Bullying* (factor loading = .663) and *Intervening in Bullying* (factor loading = -.609). This factor demonstrates that high victimization is related to low intervening, and vice versa. As such, this factor represents mentee *Victimization.*

Table 3

Factor Loadings from Principal Axis Factoring Analysis

	Factor Loading		
Item	1	2	3
Social Adjustment			
Peer self-esteem	.942	-.240	-.094
Global self-esteem	.895	.064	-.165
Family self-esteem	.691	-.017	.092
Academic self-esteem	.546	.278	-.200
Depression	.481	-.024	.311
Externalizing Behaviors			
Risky Behaviors	-.071	.738	-.163
Bullying	.057	.568	.264
Behavioral Referrals	.000	-.557	-.029
Victimization			
Victim of Bullying	.244	.094	.663
Intervening in Bullying	.265	.089	-.609
Eigenvalues	3.5	1.99	1.14
% of variance	31	15.37	5.55

To assess if there were differences between groups on the three Social Factors (SFs), unconditional one-way Analysis of Variance with Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) were utilized. HLM has two major advantages over ordinary least-squares regression analysis (Bryk and Raudenbush 1992; Kreft and de Leeuw, 1998). First, it lets researchers investigate, within a single analytic framework, hypotheses about the effects of both individual- (adolescent girl) and institution- (group) level predictors on the outcomes of interest. Second, in working with nested data (i.e., girls nested within groups), HLM takes into account dependencies among observations within clusters (groups) when estimating parameters of interest such as a particular grouping effect. Ignoring these dependencies runs the risk of underestimating standard errors (Burstein 1980; Bryk and Raudenbush 1992).

The dependent variables of the unconditional ANOVA were the change score (from before the intervention to the conclusion of the intervention) for each of the three Social Factors and the independent variable was groups. Results are as follows:

Changes in social adjustment. The ANOVA revealed significant variation in *Changes in Social Adjustment* both within and between groups. Differences between mentees accounted for 89% of the variance, whereas differences between groups accounted for 11% of the variance.

Changes in externalizing behaviors. The ANOVA revealed significant variation in *Changes in Externalizing Behaviors* both within and between groups. Differences between mentees accounted for 89% of the variance, while differences between groups accounted for 11% of the variance.

Changes in victimization. The ANOVA revealed no significant variation in *Changes in Victimization* between groups.

Question 2: What facilitator characteristics at the group level account for between-group differences in SFs?

To answer this question, as well as questions 3 and 4, Level-1 predictors, or those that are specific to the adolescent girl, were entered into the model first in order to investigate variation at the individual level. The Level-1 predictors were self- reported demographic characteristics including age, if the youth identified African-American, if the youth identified as Caucasian, were of low SES (determined by receiving free or reduced lunch), from a single-adult home, or from the urban school district. These predictors were chosen because theory suggests that they may play a role in mentoring outcomes (Dubois et. al., 2002). To determine the facilitator characteristics at the group level that account for Social Factor differences, Level-2 (group) predictors were entered into the model, including pre-existing levels of Ethnocultural Empathy, Academic Self-Worth, and General Self-Worth. Results for each of the three Social Factors are as follows:

Changes in social adjustment. No Level-1 or Level-2 variables predicted differences in *Changes in Social Adjustment.*

Changes in externalizing behaviors. Level-1 predictors being from a single-adult home ($b = .66$, $p = .02$) and African-American Youth ($b = .94$, $p < .01$) were significant and explained 26% of the variance in *Changes in Externalizing Behaviors* between mentees. Thus, coming from a single-adult home and being an African-

American youth predicted more positive change in externalizing behaviors at the conclusion of a mentoring program. No level-2 predictors were significant.

Question 3: What pre-existing facilitator experiences at the group level account for between-group differences in SFs?

Facilitator Experience variables, including Group Leadership, with Youth At-Risk, and Program Specific, were classified as no experience, some experience, or significant experience based on reported hours with each. Zero hours was classified as no experience and some experience and significant experience were classified by conducting a K-Cluster analysis specified for two clusters for each variable. Facilitators were deemed as having some or significant experience based on the cluster with in which their hours fell. Table 4 shows the hours for each cluster and the distribution of facilitators within the variable.

Table 4 *Descriptives of Facilitator Experience Variables*		
Variable	Hours	No. of Facs
Group Leadership Experience		
No Experience	0	2
Some Experience	48 - 892	8
Significant Experience	4047 - 9500	4
Experience with Youth at Risk		
No Experience	0	1
Some Experience	96 - 532	8
Significant Experience	1392 - 9600	5
Program Specific Experience		
No Experience	0	2
Some Experience	49 - 230	8
Significant Experience	928 - 2150	4

Then, Level-1 predictors and Level-2 predictors of Facilitator Experience were entered into the model for each of the three Social Factors. Results specific to each Social Factor are as follows:

Changes in social adjustment. No Level-1 variables predicted *Changes in Social Adjustment* but the Level-2 variable of Experience with Youth At-Risk was significant ($b = .19$, $p = .043$).

Changes in externalizing behaviors. Being from a Single-Adult Home ($b = .60$, $p = .01$) and being an African-American youth ($b = 1.00$, $p < .01$) were both significant

level-1 predictors. No Level-2 predictors were significant in the overall model or predicted the variance for mentees from single-adult homes or who are African-American.

Question 4: What facilitator demographic characteristics at the group level account for between-group differences in social factors?

Level-1 predictors and Level-2 predictors of Facilitator Demographic characteristics, including if the facilitator identified as African-American, a Graduate Student, and if there were Two Facilitators for the group, were entered into the model for each social factors. Results specific to each Social Factor are as follows:

Changes in social adjustment. No level-1 predictors were significant. At Level-2, having Two Facilitators ($b = .501$, $p = .022$) was revealed to significantly predict *Changes in Social Adjustment.*

Changes in externalizing behaviors. Being from a single-adult home ($b = .55$, $p = .01$) and African-American ($b = .89$, $p < .01$) were significant Level-1 predictors of *Changes in Externalizing Behaviors.* No Level-2 predictors were significant in the overall model or predicted the slopes of either being from a single-adult home or African-American.

Summary of Quantitative Results

In summary, factor analysis identified three Social Factors: 1) Social Adjustment, which consists of measures of Peer Self-Esteem, Global Self-Esteem, Academic Self-Esteem, Family Self-Esteem, and Depression, 2) Externalizing Behaviors, which consists of measures of Risky Behaviors, Behavioral Referrals, and Bullying, and 3)

Victimization, which consists of measures of Victim of Bullying (positive) and Interceding in Bullying (negative).

Change scores were created for each Social Factor and served as the dependent variables of the HLM analyses (*Changes in Social Adjustment, Changes in Externalizing Behaviors, and Changes in Victimization*). Level-1 predictors were entered into each analysis, including age, identifying as African-American, identifying as Caucasian, being of low SES, being from a single-adult home, and attending school in the urban district. Three sets of analyses were conducted for each Social Factor to investigate variation based on: 1) Facilitator Characteristics, 2) Facilitator Experience, and 3) Facilitators Demographics. Level-2 predictors for the analyses on Facilitator Characteristics included measures of Ethnocultural Empathy, Academic Self-Worth, and General Self-Worth. Level-2 predictors for the analyses on Facilitator Experience included measures of prior Group Leadership Experience, prior Experience with Youth At-Risk, and prior Program Specific Experience. Level-2 predictors for analyses on facilitator Demographics included if the facilitator identified as African-American, as a graduate student, or if there were two facilitators that lead the group. Table 5 indicates measures included for each type of variable.

Table 5

Measures of Dependent and Predictor Variables

Dependent Variables	Level-1 predictors	Level-2 predictors
Changes in Social Adjustment	Age	Facilitator Characteristics
Peer Self-Esteem	African-American	Ethnocultural Empathy
Global Self-Esteem	Caucasian	Academic Self-Worth
Family Self-Esteem	Low SES	General Self-Worth
Academic Self-Esteem	Single-Adult Home	
Depression	Urban School	Facilitator Experience
	District	Group Leadership
Changes in Externalizing		with Youth At-Risk
Behaviors		Program Specific
Risky Behaviors		
Bullying		Facilitator Demographics
Behavioral Referrals		African-American
		Graduate Student
Changes in Victimization		Two Facilitators
Victim of Bullying		
(positive)		
Interceding in Bullying		
(negative)		

Overall, there was significant variation between and within groups for *Changes in Social Adjustment* and *Changes in Externalizing Behaviors*. Among Level-1 predictors (those specific to the individual), none were significant for *Changes in Social Adjustment*. Identifying as African-American and being from a single-adult home predicted increased positive *Changes in Externalizing Behaviors*. Among Level-2 predictors (those specific to the group), adults with experience with youth at-risk and having two facilitators lead the group predicted increased *Changes in Social Adjustment* in the positive direction. No Level-2 predictors were significant for *Changes in Externalizing Behaviors*. Significant predictors are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Significant Predictors

Social Factor	Significant ANOVA	Level-1 Predictors	Level-2 Predictors
Changes in Social Adjustment	Yes	None	Experience with Youth At-Risk (+) Two Facilitators (+)
Changes in Externalizing Behaviors	Yes	Single-Adult Home (+) African-American (+)	None
Changes in Victimization	No	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Question 5: What behaviors, if any, differentiate adults in groups that promote prosocial behaviors and attitudes versus those that do not?

Results are discussed in Chapter V.

Chapter V: Qualitative Findings by Group

The qualitative portion of this study yielded important findings on the adult behaviors that promote prosocial development among groups of adolescent girls at-risk. The findings are primarily reported and explained by group, in order of Facilitator with Experience with Youth At-Risk (Rosie), Two Facilitators (Sara and Dara), and Single Facilitator (Angela). The final section provides a comparison of the facilitator behaviors across the three groups.

Facilitator with Experience with Youth At-Risk

In the interest of confidentiality, no identifying information for the facilitators will be provided unless particularly relevant. As such, the experienced facilitator, Rosie, had significant prior experience working with youth at-risk in the juvenile justice system.

Overall verbalizations. Rosie made a great deal of verbalizations overall, defined as any instance of spoken word or string of spoken words (i.e., "Sit" and "Please sit down right here" are both counted as one), throughout the mentoring sessions. She made multiple verbalizations in each larger category of behavior investigated, including *Modeling and Sharing Adult World Ideas, Promoting Prosocial Group Culture, Preventing Peer Deviancy Training*, as well as *Relationship Building*. Thus, she demonstrated the ability to utilize a range of strategies theorized to promote prosocial development.

Structure. The majority of Rosie's verbalizations provided structure for the mentees when interacting in a group, specifically for discussions, tasks, and transitions.

She used short, direct statements as a means to quickly and effectively inform the mentees of their expectations throughout each session. There were a number of specific, verbal techniques that she used in helping structure discussions and provide expectations for tasks and transitions to the group members.

Structuring discussions. In leading group discussions, Rosie typically utilized a range of *scaffolding questions* and brief *reflective statements*, allowing her to maintain group focus and communicate that she was listening. These verbalizations were originally coded as *Active-Listening*, however, upon microanalysis, the specificity of her verbalizations became more evident. Her *scaffolding questions* (those that facilitate learning and allow youth to come to their own conclusions) (Deutsch, 2010) were clear and asked them to extend only slightly beyond their current thoughts. As such, she incrementally led them to larger, more conceptual ideas. For example, she frequently asked mentees "What happens next?" after they made a decision about how to solve a problem. By extending their thinking, she enabled them to learn the process of connecting actions with the appropriate consequences (examples will be presented below in conjunction with examples of *reflective statements*).

Rosie's *reflective statements* (clarifying and restating what the other person is saying) (Rogers, 1951) were typically brief repetitions of what the mentee had just shared. For example, a mentee saying, "I don't think that is a good idea," followed by a facilitator response "Leah doesn't think that's a good idea" is a reflective statement. Rosie's use of *reflective statements* informed the mentees what to think about and respond to, effectively directing the conversation towards prosocial topics or opportunities to learn. The following excerpt exemplifies Rosie's direct style of

structuring discussions, in which she uses *scaffolding questions* and uses *reflective statements*, in an activity around responding to rumors[1]:

Rosie (Fac): (Pretends to tell Leah a rumor about a girl peeing on herself) How might Leah respond? *(scaffolding question)*

Leah (LS): Mmhm, that was disgusting.

(There was some laughter)

Rosie (Fac): What happens? *(scaffolding question)*

Alice (LS): The rumor keeps spreading.

Rosie (Fac): So tell me what you could do instead of saying, 'Ooh, that's nasty." *(scaffolding question and reflective statement)*

Leah (LS): You could tell someone you trust and tell them to be quiet about it.

Ana (LS): (Volunteered an answer but observer could not hear it)

Rosie (Fac): (Repeating Ana's answer) Tell the person who's telling the rumor to just stop. What would you say in that instant? *(reflective statement and scaffolding question)*

Ana (LS): Don't say that about her

Rosie (Fac): I would hope someone would say 'don't say that about her.' What if you find out it's not true? *(reflective statement and scaffolding question)*

Someone: You made the problem worse.

---

[1] In this example, and all following, names are changed for confidentiality. Roles are noted in parentheses following the individual's name. Mentors, or Big Sisters in this program, are noted as BS, and mentees, or Little Sisters, are noted as LS. Additionally, to ease reading, observer notes are rewritten as dialogue (e.g., the observer note, "Rosie asks how Leah might respond" becomes "Rosie: How might Leah respond?"). Following pertinent facilitator verbalizations are this writer's analyses in italicized parentheses.

By structuring discussions with *scaffolding questions* and *reflective statements*, Rosie was able to effectively lead the group to a prosocial conclusion, that spreading rumors can be harmful. In this instance, and many others throughout the program, the prosocial attitude was generated by the mentees themselves, not through top-down teaching or lecturing from Rosie. Thus, the mentees' were likely more able to remember and implement the prosocial behaviors (Vygotsky, 1978) while also maintaining a sense of respect from Rosie (Larson & Lochman, 2002).

Giving directions to structure tasks and transitions. Rosie also structured group tasks and transitions by giving clear directions to the group about tasks and transitions (coded as *Structuring Tasks and Transitions).* Her instructions were *single-step*, or requiring one action, for even the most menial tasks and transitions. Examples include "You sit here," and "Talk amongst yourselves." Additionally, she gave specific *warnings* about time before transitions were to occur, such as "I need one more answer," (before transitioning to the next task) and yelling "Five more minutes" before one activity was to end. The following excerpt gives a good example of Rosie structuring the group task of taste-testing Luna bars and providing feedback:

Rosie (Fac): Everybody, unwrap your bars. *(single-step direction)*

Harriet (BS): The one I had was nasty. You liked it? (to a mentee)

Rosie (Fac): Let's go around. *(single-step direction)*

Bri (LS): You got chips in it?

Rosie (Fac): It's the aftertaste that gets me.

Alice (LS): I need stuff with sugar.

Rosie (Fac): Harriet says yes. Alice says no. *(reflective statement)* What didn't you like? (to Alice) *(scaffolding question)*

Alice (LS): It needs more flavor.

Rosie (Fac): What were you expecting it to taste like? *(scaffolding question)*

Harriet (BS): Chocolate Brownie like it said. (She said this in a tone of voice that made her sound like she felt wronged. They all laughed.)

The conversation continues about the Luna Bar until all mentees and mentors had offered their opinions. Throughout the conversation, the group laughed and engaged in comfortable, social talk (i.e., Rosie asking another mentor about being a vegetarian), ending with:

Rosie (Fac): This is sister time, too if you want to migrate... 20 minutes! *(single-step and warning)*

By giving *single-step directions* and *warning* for transitions, Rosie provided clear expectations for mentee behavior and, therefore, improved the mentees' ability to comply (Larson & Lochman, 2002). Additionally, the clear expectations allowed for few instances of unstructured time, when peer deviancy training typically occurs (Dishion, Dodge, & Lansfored, 2006).

Intervening. Rosie intervened in socially risky behaviors that could be considered fairly low-level, using a range of strategies that seemed natural to her style of leadership. The following examples highlight the mentees' mildly inappropriate or disrespectful behavior with which Rosie intervened, as well as her typical tools for redirection. One strategy Rosie used was to joke with girls. For instance, when a mentee arrived wearing a low-cut shirt, Rosie said "...your bosom is coming out to talk to me."

The mentee tugged her shirt up higher. Another time a mentee came into the room announcing that someone had made the girls' bathroom smell "fresh," and Rosie replied "You know you have bodily functions, too."

Rosie also relied on her own feelings when interacting with the mentees to intervene with them. For instance, when mentees skipped the facilitator's turn to share the highs and lows of her week, Rosie declared (somewhat reproachfully), "You all just skipped over me!" Another time, Rosie told a mentee that by being "greedy" about taking snacks she (Rosie) would not get one.

Another intervention strategy Rosie utilized was a brief statement and a serious tone to redirect a negative behavior towards a more prosocial interaction. For instance, when mentees were talking out of turn, she said "Girls" in a reproachful tone. Similarly, when a girl answered a question with a sarcastic tone, she responded with "Be serious, please." At times, Rosie also utilized positive feedback to reinforce prosocial behaviors, such as responding "Good" or "Nice" to a particularly appropriate interaction. Overall, however, Rosie provided more redirection and intervention to negative behaviors than she did reinforcement for positive ones.

By intervening in low-level behaviors, Rosie communicated to the group that risky behaviors were not acceptable and therefore needed to be modified to maintain membership in the group (Larson & Lochman, 2002). Thus, mentees were required to acquire new, prosocial behaviors as a means of meeting the group norm.

Sharing adult-world ideas. Rosie made many verbalizations aimed at *sharing adult-world ideas*. Allen and Antonishak (2006) posit that adult-world ideas are those that provide opportunities for youth to be socialized to adult norms (versus adolescent

norms). Examples include appropriately sharing personal problems, which socialize youth to the challenges and problem-solving techniques of adults, or personal opinions and reflections, which socialize youth to adult perspectives. These types of verbalizations typically occurred during the more relaxed conversations and flowed naturally from Rosie. Notably, they also flowed naturally from Rosie's fellow mentors. The next excerpt demonstrates the *sharing of adult-world ideas* in the context of the alleged abuse of pop star Rihanna by her boyfriend, pop star Chris Brown. This highly publicized event brought domestic violence to the attention of popular culture and the group.

Someone (BS): Are there examples of relationships gone bad?

Bri (LS): Chris Brown and Rihanna. There was unsufficient evidence.

Rosie (Fac): Insufficient. But the fact that she had a bruised face and bite marks on her body… *(adult-world idea)* Please say something, Dierra. *(intervening)*

Harriet (BS): Somebody put up false pictures.

Rosie (Fac): Let's assume that…

Bri (LS): I heard that he got…

Harriet (BS): You know what happened, though, right?

Rosie (Fac): Does it justify what he did? *(scaffolding question)*

(There is a lot of talking)

Someone: She gave him an STD.

Rosie (Fac): But hold on, girls. *(intervening)*

Nadasia (LS): This is why we use condoms. Well, not we… Y'all.

Harriet (BS): This is a scientific fact just for the future, are you all listening? You can still catch herpes with a condom because it's transmitted through contact, not bodily fluids.

Nadasia (LS): Can you just tell us what happened?

Harriet (BS) and Rosie (Fac) explained the story of Chris Brown and Rihanna again.

Harriet (BS): Let's say a woman gives herpes to a man, does that justify him beating her up?

Bri (LS): No

Ellen (LS): It gives him a reason to…

Bri (LS): It could be handled differently.

Bri (LS): (Something about going to the doctor to get rid of the herpes.) He can't beat away the herpes. It's not going to do anything.

(Dara (BS) and Harriet (BS) laughed hard)

Nadasia (LS): Can you just tell us what happened?

Harriet (BS): We just told you! All you know is what the media says. She has herpes, he found out and beat her up.

Dierra (LS): He bit her!

Ellen (LS): She bit herself. She ran herself over with the car.

Bri (LS): But they were talking about her contusions. She could get a knot from running into something. (Observer note: She seems set on Chris Brown being innocent.)

Rosie (Fac): Chris Brown said he witnessed domestic violence and did hit Rihanna. *(adult-world idea)*

Bri (LS): You're going to be like that if you see it.

Rosie (Fac): Are you going to be like that or is it a choice? *(scaffolding question and adult-world idea)*

Bri (LS): A very high chance.

Ellen (LS): My uncle had said something that if a child lives in something, that this is the outcome of something.

Bri (LS): Chris Brown just made a mistake and there are plenty of people like that but he was just put on display.

Harriet (BS): So how would you respond to that?

Nadasia (LS): What's the difference from the woman hitting the man?

Harriet (BS): It could go both ways, but the most reported incidents were of men hitting women.

(Some people had to leave because it was 4:30)

Rosie (Fac): Is domestic violence ever right? *(scaffolding question and adult-world idea)*

Dierra (LS): No.

(The conversation continues about Chris Brown and domestic violence, continuing on to what the girls want in their own relationships.)

Notice the ease in which Rosie and mentors share *adult-world ideas.* They communicate their ideas in the natural flow of their relationships, interspersing jokes, laughter, and connection. Likely as a result, the mentees maintain their interest, as evidenced by

responding and asking questions throughout the discussion. Thus, Rosie was able to communicate these ideas while also maintaining her relationship with the mentees and increasing the likelihood they will remember and implement these ideas in the future (Larson & Lochman, 2002).

Summary of the experienced facilitator findings. Rosie made a considerable number of *verbalizations* throughout the observed mentoring sessions. Her behaviors were primarily used to *structure discussions, transitions, and tasks*. She structured discussions by asking brief, *scaffolding questions*, and giving brief *reflective statements*. She structured tasks and transitions by giving *single-step directions* and *warnings*. She also *intervened* using a range of strategies, often redirecting low-level socially risky behavior. Additionally, Rosie and fellow mentors *shared adult-world ideas* with ease and as a natural part of their relationships with the mentees.

Facilitator Pair

Two groups were assigned two facilitators to co-lead the group. These women were specifically chosen by YWLP staff to co-facilitate because they were younger than other applicants and demonstrated less maturity in the YWLP facilitator interview. Despite their age, they had a program-specific experience and indicated desire to devote a significant amount of energy to YWLP. Thus, YWLP staff felt the four women would not be qualified to facilitate alone, but could be successful with the support of a co-facilitator relationship. The group analyzed was led by Sara and Dara.

Overall verbalizations. The facilitator pair, Sara and Dara, made a great deal of verbalizations throughout the mentoring sessions, much like Rosie. Their verbalizations were coded as if they were one person, not two separate individuals. Thus, their

verbalizations are the total for two people, versus one person for Rosie or the quiet facilitator, Angela. Of the four categories of behaviors investigated in this study, primarily demonstrated verbalizations coded as *Modeling and Sharing Adult World Ideas, Promoting Prosocial Group Culture,* and *Relationship Building*. They rarely made a comment coded as *Preventing Peer Deviancy Training.*

Relationship building. Sara and Dara demonstrated many behaviors that were coded aimed at building their relationships with the mentee. One method they used to develop their connection was to *imply personal knowledge* of a mentee by making simple statements about what they already know about her. These statements were made throughout sessions in both large and small group discussions, denoting a sense of history and intimacy in the relationships. Examples include, "I know you like Chinese food because I saw you eating it last week," "How were your grades on your report card?" (implying that she knew grades were coming out soon), or "You would be really good at music." In another instance, when talking about snack, Sara (Fac1) implies personal knowledge by saying, "I'm going to bring a whole box of cereal for Alisha," (apparently it is her favorite), followed by, "Amia gave me the best idea to bring chocolate, marshmallows, and graham crackers!"

Sara and Dara also asked *personal questions* of the mentees in their group. Their questions were typically non-obtrusive and surface level, seeming to stem from genuine curiosity and desire to build a relationship. The questions frequently followed a statement the mentee had made about her life, and prompted them to provide more information. Notably, the questions were similar to the type of questions that Sara and Dara asked the other Big Sisters when in conversation or discussion. Examples include:

Deborah (LS): I need to be home by 5:30.

Sara (Fac1): Okay. Thanks for telling me. Do you have to be home for something at your sister's school? *(personal question)*

Darlene (LS): I guess that it was Rachel who is from another country.

Rachel (LS): Yeah.

Sara (Fac1): That's awesome. Did you live in any of those places? *(personal question)*

Rachel (LS): No

Sara (Fac1): Let's all go around and say the color of our rooms! *(personal question)*

Sara (Fac1): (Shows Lynn the sticker choices) What is your first favorite color on here? What's you second? *(personal question)*

The observer for this group notes their genuine curiosity, as evidenced by her description, as somewhat unique in the observer's experience with these groups: "This surprises me and is in contrast to the other group I observed (the quiet facilitator's group). It seems like the BS [Big Sisters and Facilitators] are genuinely trying to make conversations about the LS [Little Sisters] lives. They are asking questions that directly relate to them, and they seem to actually genuinely care about the answer."

As the facilitator pairs' use of *asking personal questions* communicated genuine care to the observer, it is likely that the mentees also experienced the facilitators'

questions as stemming from genuine care. Similarly, the *implications of personal knowledge* likely expressed interest and thought to the mentees. Thus, these behaviors were used as tools to build an authentic relationship between Sara, Dara, and the mentees, a necessary ingredient in effective group work (Larson & Lochman, 2002) and mentoring (Rhodes, 2002).

Adult-world ideas. Although this group had similar attendance data to the other two groups as well as to YWLP overall, there were several observed sessions with only three or four mentees. Some mentee absences were related to conflicting basketball practice and disinterest in the program, however most were unaccounted for. Fewer youth created more opportunities for conversations between mentors, Sara, and Dara, as well as more opportunities for the facilitators and mentors to participate in group discussions. Likely as a result of their increased participation, there were many instances of Sara and Dara *modeling prosocial behaviors* and *talking about personal problems*.

Sara and Dara modeled prosocial behaviors by developing healthy relationships with each other and other mentors in group sessions. Thus, the mentees had the opportunity to watch and learn how successful adults interact with each other in a kind and friendly way. As previously mentioned, Sara and Dara frequently asked *personal questions* to build the relationships and implied intimate knowledge of the other adults in the group. They modeled the give-and-take of adult conversation, both listening respectfully and sharing personal information appropriately. The following interaction took place in the large group setting and demonstrates the prosocial behaviors that were typical of those modeled by Sara and Dara:

Christine (BS): I went to Jamaica and I won a dance competition.

Dara (Fac2): What was your signature move? *(personal question and models prosocial behavior)*

Laura (BS): Demonstrate! *(personal question and models prosocial behavior)*

Christine (BS): (Demonstrates dance move)

Dara (Fac2): Do you know a dance move called the pancake flip?

(Big Sisters mention other dance moves like the sprinkler and the lawn mower.)

Dara (Fac2): Are you feeling under the weather? *(personal question and models prosocial behavior)*

Christine (BS): No, just tired. We sang and danced a lot.

There were also frequent mentions in the observer's field notes of Sara, Dara, and mentors talking in small groups about various *adult-world ideas* (such as housing, intramural clubs, school work), although the specifics of these conversations were not always included because mentees were not involved. These conversations were typically described in general terms, such as "Dara (Fac2) and Rhonda are talking about classes. Dara (Fac2) says she's a government major. Maria talks about a professor." At times, these exclusive conversations may have been at the expense of the mentor/mentee relationship, which will be discussed in the following section.

In addition to *modeling prosocial behavior* through the give-and-take of conversation, they also modeled asking for, offering, and accepting help, such as in the following exchange:

Deborah (LS): What is a conundrum?

Sara (Fac1): (Looks at Dara [Fac2].) What is a conundrum?

Dara (Fac2): A problem, like a Hot Topic.

(Observer Note: I think Sara (Fac1) used the word originally. She obviously knew the definition, but did not know how to explain it to Deborah, so turned to Dara [Fac2] for help).

Additionally, Sara and Dara *talk about personal problems* frequently throughout the sessions by responding to questions in the large group discussions. They typically respond in an honest and self-reflective way, conveying a sense of collaboration with the mentees as they think through these questions. The following two excerpts highlight their sincerity when responding to group questions:

Peyton (BS): Do boys bully differently than girls?

Dara (Fac2): (Shakes her head.) When boys bully they do the shove-you-in-a-locker and beat-up thing, but girls do it in a way that makes you not look so mean. In middle school—this story makes me look like a bully—but I didn't like a girl in my lunch room and we all decided we would vote her off our lunch table like Survivor. Looking back, that was probably more mean than to physically bully her.

(More conversation and questions about how you deal with bullying)

Dara (Fac2): Even from my story in 7th grade, so when I was your guys' age, four or five years later I was friends with this girl and she brought it up one time. It had hurt her feelings a lot more than I had ever even thought it would and I think that's why I remembered it and so I apologized. It was good to apologize even though it was four years later.

Peyton (BS): Is there anything you can do to stop bullying?

Qualisha (LS): It's difficult sometimes.

Paris (BS): What can you do? There's gotta be something.

(Silence)

Maria (BS): If you can, I would say stand up for yourself because going to a teacher or principal might make it worse, but if you handle it first is shows you… (observer missed the rest).

Sara (Fac1): It's easier to do that when you practice what to say. I write down what I want to say first so I know what to say to someone who was mean to me. Then I might be more prepared.

Additionally, there are instances in which Sara and Dara *modeled prosocial behavior* in the give-and-take of adult discussions while also *sharing personal problems*. Thus, the mentees were able to see how adults work together and support each other in times of stress.

Rhonda (BS): My low of the week is that I think I have a sleep disorder because I'm a light sleeper and it's hard to get back to sleep. I went to bed at midnight and by 3 AM I still couldn't fall asleep.

Sara (Fac1): I would love to talk to you about that later. Because my low is that I have a sleep disorder.

Catherine (BS): Is it related to coffee?

Sara (Fac1): No, it's a three year thing. I have to go get a sleep study… (and explains what it is). I have to do it for the next day and night and nap. I sleep a lot and I am always tired. Hopefully they will help me figure something out but it stresses me out that I have to take up all that time (sleeping).

By modeling *prosocial behaviors* and *talking about personal problems*, Sara and Dara naturally incorporated *adult-world ideas* into the mentoring sessions. It is possible that their honesty and sincerity conveyed these messages in the context of a mutual relationship, a key ingredient to effective group work (Larson & Lochman, 2002). Moreover, their perceived genuine affect may have allowed the mentees access to a better understanding of how adults interact in the world, begetting prosocial behavior (Allen & Antonishak, 2006).

Adult relationships. At times, the conversations among Sara and Dara and mentors were at the expense of building relationships with the mentees. This typically occurred when the mentors dominated the discussions, either leaving the mentees out or not allowing them to contribute. For example, the Big Sisters in this group had a long conversation about a "secret society" that a mentor had been chosen for. The observer noted, "At this point the Big Sisters are really dominating the conversations and the Little Sisters really aren't talking." However, this conversation was also coded for *modeling prosocial behavior*. In another instance, during an activity on bullying that required teams to race to tape cards on the black board, the observer writes: "The mentors are laughing throughout the exercise. The littles aren't smiling as much. When Jessica(LS) goes over, Dara (Fac2) says 'Come on!'[Jessica is walking slowly, but Dara (Fac2) is really excited to win the game]." It is possible that the domination of the mentors is related to the high rate of mentee absence on some days, as there were more opportunities to participate.

Responsiveness to mentee needs. Fortunately, when the Big Sisters were noted for over-participating, Sara or Dara typically responded by actively trying to include the

girls. This was coded as *responsiveness to mentee needs*. Sara and Dara tried to redirect the conversation back to the mentees through asking *personal questions*. For instance, immediately following the conversation about "secret societies" that was occurring while the group was decorating shoe boxes, Sara (Fac1) singled out a particularly quiet Little Sister, Deborah. The interaction is as follows:

Sara (Fac1): What does your box say? *(personal question)*

Deborah (LS): (She holds it up; it says "Little Sister".)

Sara (Fac1): (Holds up her box and shows Deborah.)

Observer Note: It seems like Sara (Fac1) is trying to make Deborah feel included.

Peyton (BS): (Continues talking about secret societies.)

(The Big Sisters move to talking about their housing for next year.)

Sara (Fac1): Deborah, so which one of your parents is from Guatemala? *(personal question)*

Deborah (LS): My mom.

Then, later in the same session, the following interactions occur while the Big Sisters are discussing classes:

Sara (Fac1): Jessica, what was the coolest thing you did over break? *(personal question)*

(Response not recorded)

Dara (Fac2): Did you get those earrings for Christmas? *(personal question)*

Jessica (LS): (Shakes her head no).

Thus, Sara and Dara consistently demonstrated awareness of the mentees needs, allowing them to maintain connection and build their relationship. Additionally, by re-engaging the mentees, Sara and Dara attempted to ensure that each mentee would benefit from the prosocial ideas offered in the mentoring curriculum.

Promoting prosocial group culture through positive expressions. Throughout the recorded mentoring sessions, Sara and Dara promoted a prosocial group culture through their *laughter* and *expressions of positive feelings*. Studies demonstrate that laughter increases prosocial behavior and group identity (Van Vugt, Hardy, Stow, & Dunbar, 2007) and that positive feelings in a group improve cooperative support among all members (Bierhoff & Muller, 1999) . Thus, although these are not measures of mentee laughter or positive feelings, the literature suggests that the presence of these behaviors influence the prosocial behavior of the whole group (Bierhoff & Muller, 1999; Van Vugt, Hardy, Stow, & Dunbar, 2007). As such, the facilitators' utilization of *laughter* and *expressions of positive feelings* may have contributed to the increases in social adjustment.

In the facilitator pair's group, there were multiple times each session that the observer noted *laughter* on the part of mentees and mentors (including Sara and Dara) together. *Laughter* occurred in various situations, including informal discussions such as the one described below, in which the girls are decorating shoe boxes:

Lauren (BS): What is going on at your school?

Sara (Fac1): It is almost report card time.

(Scissors, stickers, and tissue paper are in the middle of the room and the mentors and mentees have to ask for supplies and hand over supplies and there are many "thank you's" and laughs.)

Sara (Fac1): This is such good sharing and caring!

(Big Sisters laugh)

Sara and Dara also lead multiple games that generate a great deal of laughter among the mentors and mentees, such as in musical chairs, described below:

Dara (Fac2): Alright, we should play musical chairs.

(The group arranges the chairs and gets the music ready.)

(Dara (Fac2) plays Lady Gaga's "Just Dance." Lauren (BS) doesn't get a seat.)

Erin (BS): (Laughs) You didn't even fight me for it!

(Next song. Sara (Fac1), Petra (BS), and Amanda (BS) dance around the circle)

(Maria gets a chair.)

Erin (BS): Good job, Maria! That's impressive.

The game continues for several rounds, with the observer noting behavior such as "dancing and laughing," "everyone hollers laughter," "everyone screams laughs," and "it seems like everyone is having a lot of fun." Notably, the group's laughter is different from the laughter which will be described in the quiet facilitator's group, which is mostly the mentees laughing without the mentors.

In addition to the frequent *laughter* throughout the facilitator pair's mentoring sessions, Sara, Dara, and the mentors in their group frequently *expressed positive feelings* in a genuine and sincere way. They did this through complimenting the mentees, thanking them, and making observations of their own feelings when with the mentees.

Frequently, the behaviors coded as *expressing positive feelings* were also coded as *acknowledging prosocial behaviors*. Given the emotional content of their acknowledgments, reporting these behaviors as *expressing positive feelings* may be more accurate. These behaviors are seen in the following interactions:

(First group after the winter vacation. Sandra (LS) walks in the room and goes over to hug Sara (Fac1).)

Sara (Fac1): I missed you so much!

(Observer note: As I'm packing up, I hear Dara (Fac2) tell Maria(LS) that the Valentine that Maria(LS) gave her is on her mirror and she gets happy when she looks at it).

(The group is conversing while making friendship bracelets. Jennifer gives Petra (BS) a completed bracelet)

Petra (BS): Thank you. That is really cute! Yay! It matches my scarf.

Dontasia (BS): I would give mine to Dara (LS) right now, but it would only be a ring. Do you like blue, Serena(LS)?

Sara (Fac1): It's so cool that you picked my name, Sandra(LS).

Petra (BS): Thank you for my bracelet, Jessica(LS).

The *laughter* and *expressions of positive feelings* are highlighted in one of the final exercises in the group. Note the prosocial behaviors of the mentees, the joy of the mentors, and the ease with which they interact with each other.

(Everyone hangs the paper plate over their neck so that it is on their back.)

Sara (Fac1): Everyone will walk around and write on each person's plate something nice!

(Jessica immediately writes on Patrice's plate. Patrice immediately writes on Maria's).

Sara (Fac1): This is so fun… We are all in a circle! *(expression of positive feeling)*

Your plate is really nice, Lauren (BS). *(modeling prosocial behavior)*

Erin (BS): This is so funny.

Lauren (BS): Can I eat off this plate?

Sara (Fac1): (Joking) I don't know if it is dishwasher safe.

(Observer note: Things I see on plates are: brings a lot of energy, caring, nice, respectful, you make me laugh, fun to talk to in the car, gives honest compliments.)

Dara (Fac2): Does anyone have a cheer for us to do?

Sara (Fac1): Something that sums up the whole year. Gather around!

(Everyone is reading the plates. Most people are smiling.)

Katie (BS): We can do YWLP in the YMCA song voice.

Sara (Fac1): Okay, everyone stand up and come in the circle. Dara (Fac2) and I loved having you in group and we hope you do summer club and 8th grade club because you are awesome Young Women Leaders. *(expression of positive feeling)*

(Katie (BS) leads a YWLP cheer, ending with the group screaming "YWLP." Everyone claps.)

(The group scatters and Dara (Fac2) begins cleaning up.)

Sara (Fac1): Okay, let's put the room back together.

Lauren (BS): Thanks Sara (Fac1) and Dara (Fac2) for being such great leaders.

(Lauren (BS) and Sara (Fac1) hug.) *(modeling prosocial behavior)*

Sara (Fac1): The theme for today is warm and fuzzy. *(expression of positive feeling)*

Sandra: [To Sara (Fac1)] Do you want to read what people said about me?

Sara (Fac1): I do!

(They trade plates and read each others.)

(The group scatters putting the desks back together. Mentors and mentees are both helping.)

As research suggests, the Sara and Dara's *laughter* and *expressions of positive feelings* likely increased the prosocial behavior, cooperative support, and sense of group identity (Bierhoff & Muller, 1999; van Vugt, Hardy, Stow, & Dunbar, 2007). Additionally, they likely also served as reinforcers for the girls' positive behavior, increasing the chance the mentees will demonstrate them again (Skinner, 1966).

Facilitator Pair Summary. Sara and Dara's verbalizations were primarily aimed at *building relationships* with mentees (through *personal questions* and *implying personal knowledge*) and mentors (thus *modeling prosocial behaviors*). At times, Sara and Dara's relationships with fellow mentors came at the expense of including mentees. Fortunately, Sara and Dara recognized these situations, and were *responsive to the mentees* needs by trying to engage them in the conversation. Additionally, Sara and Dara made many verbalizations that *promoted a prosocial group culture* by exhibiting frequent *laughter*

and *expressions of positive feelings*. These behaviors also served as *acknowledgements of prosocial behavior* on the part of the mentees.

The Quiet Facilitator

The quiet facilitator, Angela, was chosen to facilitate primarily due to her Masters level education in the social sciences and enrollment in a doctoral program in the social services field. After the initial coding, subsequent coding for Angela was primarily conducted in contrast to Rosie and the facilitator pair. This allowed the researcher to not only account for the absence of certain behaviors, but also specify the types of behavior the Angela was using.

Overall verbalizations. Angela verbalized less frequently than either Rosie or the facilitator pair. This contributed to fewer behaviors than Rosie in all four categories, including *Modeling and Sharing Adult-World Ideas, Promoting Prosocial Group Culture, Preventing Peer Deviancy Training,* and *Relationship Building*. She verbalized less than the two faciliatators in all categories but *Preventing Peer Deviancy Training.* Throughout the examples, note the infrequency of her verbalizations.

Limited structure. Angela provided limited structure when leading group activities. This is in contrast to Rosie, who actively structured group discussions, transitions, and tasks. Whereas Rosie utilized *scaffolding questions* as well as *reflective statements* when leading group discussions, Angela utilized *broad questions* and *unrelated statements.* Statements that were coded as *unrelated* may have been related to the content which Angela was hoping to discuss; however, they were unrelated to the content of the mentees' most recent statement. These behaviors, in combination with her infrequent verbalizations, resulted in missed opportunities to reinforce prosocial ideas

and direct the group to adult-world themes. Likely as a result, the group frequently had difficulty engaging in conversations, leading to off-task behavior, as evidenced in the following group discussion about walking away when angry:

Tyler (LS): ...having people talk about you.

Angela (Fac): How does it make you feel? *(broad question)*

Elizabeth (LS): It makes me feel bad.

Tyler (LS): (Cutting Elizabeth off) No, don't make yourself feel bad.

Elizabeth (LS): No, if you witness them (finishing her previous thought). If you witness them saying something bad it's not really right. You know you should stop it but you don't want to. *(Elizabeth's empathy is important for bullying prevention and a prosocial behavior that could be reinforced or reflected.)*

Angela (Fac): Anyone else, any other feelings? (Silence) *(unrelated and broad question)*

Angela (Fac): What about if it is not quite yet a fire, but you know it's going to be a fire. I'm about to get really fired up. What happens in your body? *(unrelated [to the most recent statement made by mentee Elizabeth])*

Elizabeth (LS): I feel like squeezing something.

Tyler (LS): I don't squeeze anything.

Tyler (LS), Anne (LS), and Elizabeth (LS) laugh. Anne (LS) continues laughing.

Angela (Fac): I will give you an example, sometimes people's hearts start racing. *(unrelated)*

Tyler (LS): I just look mad but don't say anything.

Angela (Fac): Bad feelings lead to bad thoughts, and bad thoughts lead to bad actions.

Elizabeth(LS) is laughing hard. Anne(LS) begins laughing.

Kara(LS) (to girls): Do you need to pee?

Elizabeth (LS): No

Kara(LS) starts laughing again.

Furthermore, Angela provided limited structure to group tasks and transitions. Again, this is in contrast to Rosie who utilized *single-step directions* and *warnings* to structure these activities. Angela gave very few directions and typically did not provide the youth with warnings of upcoming changes. The following excerpt is taken from the same task as described in Rosie group, as the mentees are asked to eat Luna bars and provide feedback. In Rosie group, there were multiple instances of Rosie structuring the conversation, leading to relationship building behaviors. In Angela group, there was limited warning to the upcoming transition, likely related to their difficulty focusing on the new task.

Angela (Fac): We got a donation from Luna bars and they want feedback on them.

Tyler (LS): It has a bad after-taste.

Elizabeth (LS): It has a bad taste. It tastes like protein and protein does not taste good.

Anne (LS): (talks to Elizabeth(LS) about how it tastes like fish).

Tyler(LS): Doesn't fish have protein?

Angela (Fac): Yeah, fish is protein.

(More comments from kids about protein.)

Molly (BS): I will start with high-lows.

(There are multiple side conversations.)

Molly (BS): (paraphrased) High is the election, low is a lot of work.

(High-lows continue with some side conversations.)

Thus, in this example, the group began the activity of saying their highs and lows for the week without any warning of the transition. This may have contributed to the side conversation that the observer noted during the activity.

Limited intervention and increased negative behavior. Angela rarely intervened when mentees were engaging in off task or distracting behaviors, as illustrated in the previous two excerpts. This is in contrast to Rosie, who utilized multiple strategies to redirect mentees for mild infractions. In Angela's group, there were frequent instances of girls laughing or having side conversations while either an adult or another mentee was talking. This is also evidenced throughout the field notes, usually multiple times a session, by the observer indicating that she could not tell if the mentees were laughing at the comment aimed at the group or their personal conversations. While Angela rarely intervened herself, Big Sisters typically attempted to manage the group when the laughing or side conversations became increasingly obvious and/or distracting. Their redirections typically took a pleading tone, such as "C'mon guys" or "Only fifteen more minutes, guys." In general, the brief requests reduced the side chatter for a few minutes.

Additionally, there were several interactions in Angela's group that demonstrated more extreme relational aggression than those found in Rosie or the facilitator pair's groups. At times, girls were verbally aggressive towards each other and frequently had

side-conversations while other mentees were talking, a form of disrespect and exclusion. Furthermore, the observer sometimes questioned if mentee laughter was aimed directly at the mentee who was sharing with the group. The following excerpts demonstrate bullying in the middle of an exercise about choosing a teacher who supports them. In this brief interaction, Elizabeth is bullied twice with no intervention from an adult.

Angela (Fac): You should keep in mind that your teachers can support you. Your teachers can help you, so you can ask them and take a risk. You should identify a teacher who can help them with your goals.

Elizabeth (LS): (To Tatiana(LS)) I don't know.

Darlene(LS): If you read it, you aren't supposed to write it, Elizabeth(LS) (in a mean tone). *(bullying behavior)*

(no intervention)

(Elizabeth(LS) looks down)

(A few more comments about who to choose)

(Tisha (BS) is explaining to Angelica(LS) that your last name changes when you get married)

Darlene(LS): What is the difference between Mrs. and Ms?

Elizabeth(LS): Mrs. means that you are a married woman.

Darlene(LS): (To Elizabeth(LS)) Shut up. *(bullying behavior)*

(no intervention)

Elizabeth(LS): I'm just teaching you.

(During this exchange, Angela [Fac] is writing on Tatiana's[LS] paper, suggesting that she is close enough to Elizabeth[LS] to hear this exchange but doesn't intercede.)

As there is limited intervention after bullying behaviors, Angela implicitly communicates that bullying is an acceptable means of interacting in this group (Lochman et al., 2008). Thus, the bully learns she can continue to bully and the victims learn to expect this negative behavior from her.

Reinforcing negative behavior. In addition to limited intervention when mentees exhibited bullying behavior, there were instances in which the mentee who was bullying was reinforced for her behavior. The reinforcement is subtle on the part of Angela as well as the mentors, and takes the form of giving her attention for mildly aggressive behavior. In the excerpt below, the only mentee who is verbally praised in this interaction is the girl who is bullying, suggesting that the adults may unintentionally model acquiescing to her demands and/or promote her bullying behavior as a group norm.

Jackie (BS): So what happens when you lose your cool?

Elizabeth(LS): If your friends are putting you down maybe you shouldn't have those friends.

Darlene(LS): Well what if it wasn't your friend? (mean tone) *(bullying behavior)* *(no intervention)*

Elizabeth(LS): Well, maybe try your hardest to ignore them.

Darlene(LS): (Makes a fist gesture towards Elizabeth(LS)) *(bullying behavior)* *(no intervention)*

Jackie (BS): Maybe you can step back.

Kerrie (BS): We all know when we grow up we are going to have negative things happen.

Jackie (BS): These are all difficult situations but just remember not to let your anger get the best of your judgment.

Mary (BS): You can always control your own behavior, but not what other people do.

Darlene(LS): If you get in trouble with school…

Elizabeth(LS): (Interrupts her) But what if…

Darlene(LS): (frowns)

Kerry (BS): It's okay, go ahead Darlene. *(this first attempt to encourage Darlene move past the interruption is appropriate)*

Angela (Fac): We want to know. *(attention)*

Tory (BS): (Also prods Darlene) *(attention)*

Darlene: Elizabeth can tell you. *(bullying behavior)*

Elizabeth: I don't know what you were going to say.

Kristine: Well, I think…

Darlene: Be quiet. *(bullying behavior and no intervention)* I got sent to ISS (in school suspension). My teacher said I could count to 10 when I get upset.

Angela (Fac): That is a really good strategy to deal with your anger. Sometimes we don't have enough of those skills. *(reinforcing the mentee who was bullying)*

Notably, when Darlene was interrupted, she became mildly aggressive and was reinforced by the Big Sisters' attention. A prosocial response to being interrupted would be to move past it fairly quickly, possibly with a brief intervention on the part of the

adults in the group. Darlene, however, refuses to continue with her story as a means of being relationally aggressive towards Elizabeth. A few seconds later, when Darlene became the person interrupting, she was again reinforced, this time by verbal praise from Angela.

Discomfort. In one instance, Angela demonstrated visible discomfort when interacting with mentees. This is in contrast to both the two facilitator and Rosie's groups who were observed to appear quite natural in their interactions (Rosie for *intervening* and Sara and Dara for *sharing adult-world ideas* and *relationship building*). In this instance, in which Angela was trying to implement a "no cell phone" policy, Angela allowed long silences and did not complete her sentences. As such, she was met with resistance by one mentee and bullying by another. The bullying was unaddressed by Angela or another mentor.

Angela (Fac): The next thing is cell phones. Does anyone realize why this is an important issue?

Elizabeth(LS): Yes.

Angela (Fac): Why?

Elizabeth(LS): Because you can get distracted.

Angela(Fac): Do you remember the 3 R's? Respect the group. This is one way we are going to try to respect each other.

(Most mentees and Big Sisters hand over their phone)

(Kristine(LS) has not handed over her phone.)

Darlene(LS): Tatiana's phone is dead.

Angela (Fac): (To Tatiana) Regardless of whether it is dead...

Kristine(LS): Mine is in my locker.

Darlene(LS): (to Kristine) You are a liar. *(bullying behavior)*

(no intervention)

Kristine(LS): I don't like giving it to other people.

Angela (Fac): (to Kristine[LS]) So you don't wanna…

Darlene(LS): (to Kristine[LS]) So put it in there! *(bullying behavior)*

(no intervention)

Elizabeth(LS): (to Kristine[LS]) No one's gonna take it.

(Observer note: First this seems more of a security thing than that Kristine[LS] is worried that someone is going to take it. This whole exchange is really awkward. It seems like the girls think that they are getting in trouble and they also think it is a stupid rule. Kristine[LS] is directly challenging Angela [Fac], and it seems as though Angela [Fac] is unwilling to stand up to her. The other Big Sisters kind of look around like they do not know what to do. The whole exchange takes about one minute. There is a lot of awkward silence in between talking, and Angela [Fac] seems like she does not really know what do or how to handle this situation. She seems relieved when Kristine[LS] finally turns in her phone).

Darlene(LS): Everyone said that phone was ugly (about Kristine's[LS] phone).

(bullying behavior)

(no intervention)

Elizabeth(LS): Kristine, don't listen to everybody.

Tisha (BS)): Thank you, Kristine.

As Angela communicated discomfort to the observer, it is likely that she communicated the same message to the mentees. Unfortunately, mentees in this situation may have interpreted Angela's discomfort as lack of authority or a breach of the relationship, both related to reduced positive outcomes (Lochman et al., 2008).

A more comfortable facilitator may have been better able to navigate Kristine's resistance using the tools utilized by Rosie and the facilitator pair, such as *scaffolding questions*, *acknowledgment of prosocial behaviors*, *expression of positive feelings,* or *intervention*. The following is a hypothetical example, created by this researcher, to illustrate the use of these tools in a similar situation:

Facilitator: The next thing is cell phones. Does anyone realize why this is an important issue?

Elizabeth(LS): Yes.

Facilitator: Why?

Elizabeth(LS): Because you can get distracted.

Facilitator: Right, because you can get distracted. And why would that be an issue? *(reflective statement and scaffolding question)*

Darlene (LS): Because we might talk on them and not listen to each other.

Facilitator: Exactly. And do you remember what the 3 R's are? *(scaffolding question)*

Elizabeth (LS): Respect yourself, each other, and the group.

Facilitator: Yes. So we're going to respect the group by putting our phones away.

(Most mentees and Big Sisters hand over their phone)

(Facilitator thanks each person when they turn the phone in) *(acknowledging prosocial behavior)*

Facilitator: We are really respecting the group! I like it! *(expressing positive feeling)*

It is possible that, at this time, peer influence and the Facilitator's reinforcement may have encouraged Kristin(LS) to hand over her phone. If not, the following demonstrates additional steps the Facilitator could take:

(Kristine[LS] has not handed over her phone.)

Darlene(LS): Tatiana's phone is dead.

Facilitator: (To Tatiana[LS]) Okay, well let's still put it in the bag anyway *(single-step direction)* Thanks, Tatiana. *(acknowledging prosocial behavior)*

Kristine(LS): Mine is in my locker.

Darlene(LS): (to Kristine) You are a liar. *(bullying behavior)*

Facilitator: Darlene (in reproachful tone) *(intervening)*

Kristine(LS): I don't like giving it to other people.

Facilitator: Okay. How come? *(personal question)*

Kristine(LS): Because my mom would kill me if I lose it.

Facilitator: Okay, what can we do to make sure we don't lose it? *(scaffolding question)*

Kristine (LS): Can I just keep it?

Facilitator: Actually we can't do that because the whole group is giving their phone in. What if I hold it in my back pocket?

Kristine (LS): I guess that works.

Facilitator: Awesome, thank you. *(acknowledging prosocial behavior)*

Although a hypothetical, this example highlights the use of multiple tools in order to encourage a prosocial behavior from Kristine(LS). Furthermore, by not showing discomfort, the facilitator in this example demonstrates authority while maintaining the relationships, even helping Kristine(LS) improve her communication skills by explaining her reason for not wanting to turn in her phone. Thus, the facilitator encouraged both Kristine and the group to demonstrate prosocial behaviors in this interaction.

Quiet Facilitator Summary

Angela made limited verbalizations throughout the mentoring sessions. As such, there were limited behaviors in the categories of *Modeling and Sharing Adult World Ideas, Promoting Prosocial Group Culture, Preventing Peer Deviancy Training,* as well as *Relationship Building.* Angela provided *little structure* for her group, asking *broad questions* and making *unrelated statements* when leading discussions. For transitions and tasks, she gave few single-step directions and little warning when moving to a new activity. Additionally, Angela provided *limited intervention* and, at times, may have inadvertently *reinforced negative behaviors,* likely related to the *increased negative behavior* of the mentees. Finally, in at least one instance, Angela displayed visible *discomfort* when interacting with the mentors.

Chapter VI: Analysis of Qualitative Findings

Analyzing across cases illustrated important themes in understanding the adult behaviors that promote prosocial development among groups of adolescent girls. First, both the experienced facilitator, Rosie and the facilitator pair, Sara and Dara, made frequent verbalizations throughout the mentoring sessions, in contrast to the quiet facilitator, Angela, who made infrequent verbalizations. The frequent verbalizations of Rosie and the facilitator pair resulted in ongoing communication with their mentees, possibly demonstrating a sense of presence in the group that was different from that of Angela. Presence, as defined by Corey and Corey (2007), is seen in leaders who are not "fragmented when they come to a group session, that they are not preoccupied with other matters, and that they are open to their reactions in their group" (pp.16). Thus, the facilitator pair and Rosie demonstrated their focus on the mentees and work by verbalizing frequently throughout the sessions. In fact, Corey and Corey deem presence as one of the most important characteristics of group counseling leaders, as it promotes compassion and empathy with group members. Additionally, presence allows the facilitator to "be there" for group members, communicating a sense of caring and willingness to understand their world. Thus, in many ways, presence enhances the relationships between the group leader and the members of the group. It is this relationship that is considered to be essential to enhancing social outcomes (Lochman et al., 2008; Yalom & Lesczc, 2005).

In addition to frequent verbalizations, both the facilitator pair and Rosie demonstrated a range of communication strategies, as evidenced by behaviors that fell into each domain theorized to promote prosocial development. For the purpose of this study, these domains were modeling and sharing adult world ideas, promoting prosocial behavior, preventing peer deviancy training (Rosie only), as well as relationship building. This suggests that, while each of these behaviors may be important on their own, it is also possible that they only promote prosocial development when used together. For instance, it may be that leaders who make frequent verbalizations aimed at preventing peer deviancy training must also make frequent relationship-building comments. Corey and Corey (2007) also emphasize the importance of group leaders' ability to utilize a range of verbal strategies in order to promote change in groups.

In contrast to both Rosie and the facilitator pair, Angela made relatively few verbalizations throughout the mentoring sessions. Yalom and Lesczc (2005) note that silent group leaders foster anxiety and regression among members, especially during the initial stages of group development. They posit that this is true even in groups made of socially savvy individuals, suggesting that underlying worry and insecurity may be more amplified in groups made of youth at-risk. Although we cannot attribute feelings to the behavior of the mentees in Angela's group, it is possible that their frequent side conversations and difficulty staying on task were related to increased anxiety. Additionally, as relational aggression is utilized when an individual is feeling uncertain in her position (Alder & Alder, 1995; Eder, 1991), the individual who engaged in bullying behaviors may also have been doing so in relation to her anxiety. Thus, it is possible that

Angela's quiet nature was related to increases in socially risky behavior among mentees as well as the iatrogenic outcomes for this group.

Tools that Promote Prosocial Behavior

Both Rosie and the facilitator pair utilized a consistent set of behaviors, or tools, that research and theory suggest promote prosocial development. Rosie used the tools of structure and intervention, whereas the facilitator pair utilized tools that built relationships. Although their tools were quite different, both have a substantial research base supporting their strategies as effective means of promoting prosocial development. Angela, in contrast, struggled to employ the structuring, intervening, or relationship-building behaviors effectively.

Rosie primarily used tools of structure and intervention to promote prosocial behaviors among her group members. Research and theory suggest that these tools are related to increased prosocial behaviors of group member during the session as well as positive outcomes at the conclusion of the program (Corey & Corey, 2005; Greene, 2005; Larson & Lochman, 2002; Stockton & Morran, 1982). Rosie structured discussions, tasks, and transitions, as well as intervened in low-level risky behavior. Corey and Corey (2005) explain that structure and intervention promote prosocial behavior through the development of healthy group norms and that they reduce anxiety among participants, especially during the early stages of a group. As individuals better understand behavioral expectations, they are more able to meet them and feel relaxed in the group environment. Thus, the structure and intervention allow them to take increased advantage of learning opportunities. This may be especially important for youth at-risk during transitions, who typically struggle more than youth not considered at-risk (Greene, 2005). Additionally,

Stockton and Morran (1982) found that leader direction during the early phases of a group fosters the willingness of members to take social risks by being more honest and giving more feedback throughout the course of the group. Thus, structure and intervention allow youth to behave more appropriately and take opportunities to learn while participating in the group.

In addition to increased prosocial behavior during group sessions, structure and intervention are related to increased prosocial outcomes at the conclusion of group interventions (Larson & Lockman, 2002; Stockton & Morran, 1982; Yalom & Lesczc, 2005). Feldman's 1992 study, one of the first highlighting the potential for iatrogenic group outcomes, found that youth in behavioral interventions (vs. insight-oriented or minimal leader contact) decreased their antisocial behavior significantly more than youth in the less-structured groups. It was hypothesized that this was because there was less opportunity for negative, reinforced peer interaction. Additionally, outcome studies on the Coping Power Program, a group intervention for youth struggling with aggression and social rejection, have found decreases in antisocial behavior and increases in prosocial behavior (Breston & Eyberg, 1998; Smith, Larson, Debaryshe, and Salzman, 2000), garnering it one of the few empirically-supported group interventions for youth at-risk. Notably, Coping Power incorporates high levels of structure into this manualized treatment and trains it staff to be quick in intervening in low-level risky behavior. Given the positive outcomes associated with highly structured group interventions, it is not surprising that Rosie's group also demonstrated prosocial outcomes at the conclusion of the intervention.

Although utilizing a different set of tools, the facilitator pair also encouraged

prosocial behavior during the group sessions by working towards building their relationships with the mentees and fellow mentors. Primarily, they asked personal questions, implied intimate knowledge of the mentees, and shared expressions of genuine joy with them. It can be interpreted that these behaviors expressed underlying attitudes of genuineness and unconditional positive regard to the mentees. These attitudes, along with empathy, are theorized by Carl Rogers (1986), father of the person-centered approach to group work, to be the three most important characteristics of group leaders. He argues that by conveying these attitudes, an accepting and trusting climate can be built, allowing the mentees to drop their defenses, tap into their inner resources, and work towards personally meaningful goals. Additionally, it could also be interpreted that the facilitator pair's frequent asking of personal questions, which ranged from simple topics to abstract ideas, were examples of "welcoming the whole person, not just the troubled parts" to the group process. Malekoff (2004) argues that this is an essential principle to effective strengths-based group work with adolescents and can promote empathic connection among them.

Research also suggests that group leaders' relationship-building behaviors are related to prosocial group outcomes. Raskin (1986) conducted a research review that confirmed Roger's theorized attitudes of genuineness, empathy, and unconditional positive regard are, in fact, the foundation for therapeutic change. Additionally, Sexton (1993) found that group members who experience warmth from the group leader had better therapist-ranked improvement and reported experiencing more insight in subsequent sessions. Unfortunately, as the need for empirically supported treatments has encouraged research on manualized treatment programs, there has been a decrease in the

research on the impact of the therapist- client relationship on group therapy outcomes (Corey & Corey, 2007). Despite limited empirical research specifically on the therapeutic relationship, the developers of the evidence-based Coping Power Program emphasize that collaboration (versus top-down instruction) and therapeutic alliance are essential aspects of the intervention (Larson & Lochman, 2002). Thus, the relationship may be, in fact, contributing to the positive outcomes associated with Coping Power. In addition, research on individual therapy suggests that relationship factors are more influential than technique in promoting change (Asay & Lambert, 1999), suggesting that this may, too, be the case for group interventions.

In contrast to Rosie and the facilitator pair, Angela's verbalizations were so infrequent that it appeared as if she did not use a consistent set of proactive tools in order to promote prosocial behavior. Moreover, when compared directly to Rosie and the facilitator pair, her struggle to effectively implement structure and intervention, as well as build relationships, were highlighted. Feldman and colleagues (1983) found that groups that lack structure, in comparison to those with structure, are more likely to result in iatrogenic effects. Additionally, the first studies documenting iatrogenic effects noted that unstructured time, which frequently lacked intervention, seemed to be the most related to negative group outcomes (Gottfredson, 1987; McCord, 1992). It is theorized that unstructured time led to increased opportunities for peer deviancy training (Dishion, Spracklen, Andrews, & Patterson, 1996) and, therefore, the reinforcement of negative behaviors. Additionally, Angela demonstrated fewer behaviors aimed at building relationships than Rosies. The importance of the relationship will be reviewed in a later section.

Reciprocal Prosocial Interactions

Rosie and the facilitator pair's utilization of tools aimed at promoting prosocial behavior during group sessions is important in that it may have initiated a reciprocal loop of positive interactions between the mentees, mentors, and the facilitators. Both Rosie and the facilitator pair employed strategies that increased the likelihood that mentees would demonstrate prosocial behavior. When mentees did, in fact, behave prosocially, the facilitators or mentors had an opportunity to reinforce this behavior. Typically, the facilitator pair reinforced through genuine expressions of joy or laughing, building upon the mentees' sense of competence and connection with the group. In Rosie's group, the reinforcement was more subtle, however, still important. When mentees responded to a question, Rosie typically reflected their answer to build upon for the discussion. Thus, their opinions were taken seriously. Moreover, by meeting Rosie's behavioral expectations, group members were able to capitalize on natural reinforcements, such as spending time with their peers and mentors without disruption. Behavioral theory indicates that, as the prosocial behaviors were reinforced, the mentees in these groups likely increased their use of them (Skinner, 1966).

If, as literature suggests, the mentees increased their prosocial behavior due to its' promotion by the facilitators, then the mentees further contributed to the reciprocating loop of positive interactions present in their groups (Corey & Corey, 2007; Larson & Lochman, 2002). As system theory suggests, a sequence of interactions occurs. It is probable that the prosocial behaviors of the mentees influenced the behavior of the facilitators and mentors. Specifically, it is possible that the adults felt more relaxed and able to focus on relationship development in these groups, versus the constant behavioral

monitoring necessary in a group displaying socially risky behaviors. Moreover, as their relationships advanced, theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002) posits that the connection between the adults and youth may have become its own motivation for behaving in a prosocial manner. Thus, a reciprocal loop of reinforcing, prosocial interactions developed.

This type of feedback loop is supported by the observed behaviors of mentees, facilitators, and mentors in Rosie and the two facilitator's groups. There were minimal instances of behavioral disruption in these groups, in contrast to those evident in Angela's group, suggesting that the prosocial tools successfully promoted positive behavior among the mentees. Moreover, the facilitator pair and Rosie reinforced this prosocial behavior, in contrast to Angela, who reinforced the negative behavior of at least one mentee. As suggested by the natural ease with which they interacted with the youth (which will be discussed further in the following section) and frequent comments aimed at connection and sharing of adult-world ideas, Rosie and the facilitator pair may have been more able to relax and focus on relationship development. Thus, in these groups, there was laughter, collaborative exchanges of ideas, and limited interruptions for behavioral concerns. As such, what appears to be a warm and supportive group culture emerged in the Rosie and the two facilitator's groups, in which prosocial behavior became reinforced and the behavioral norm. It is this type of culture that is associated with improved social outcomes in group interventions (Rogers, 1986; Yalom & Lezcz, 2005) and evidenced in this study by the social gains made by mentees in Rosie and the facilitator pair's groups. As Angela did not employ consistent strategies aimed at promoting prosocial behavior, her group had less opportunity to develop this type of reciprocating loop. Alternatively, it

may have been that the level of the mentees' risk in Angela's group made it more difficult to effectively implement a consistent set of tools.

Notably, throughout the course of the fieldnotes, there was a shift over time in the frequency with which Rosie and the facilitator pair utilized their tools. Although not quantifiable, it seemed that Rosie and the pair decreased their verbalizations later in the year, and the mentors in the groups increased the frequency with which they spoke. Although not coded, it seemed that the mentors in Rosie's group made comments aimed at structure and sharing adult-world ideas, similar to Rosie's style. Moreover, the mentors in the facilitator pairs group seemed to make more comments aimed at relationship building. As such, it may be that these facilitators modeled and taught their mentors how to interact with the youth, further contributing to the prosocial culture.

Authenticity and Confidence

Corey and Corey (2008) define authenticity as not living behind pretenses or hiding behind masks, defenses, or facades. Moreover, they explain that it entails the willingness to appropriately disclose oneself and share feelings and reactions to what is going on in the group. Although their styles were quite different, Rosie and the facilitator pair were similar in that they appeared to be authentic in the way they approached their groups. Specifically, the tools they used during group interactions were reflective of their background and age, making the tools easily accessible to them. Rosie, for instance, was a licensed clinician whose prior experience was primarily working with adjudicated youth. In order to maintain safety and encourage growth in groups of this population, structure and intervention are particularly important (Lochman & Larson, 2002). Thus, these tools were likely quite accessible to her and it was natural for her to use them when

interacting in the YWLP group. The facilitator pair, in contrast, had limited experience, but were young and therefore closer in age to the mentees than many of the other facilitators. As a result, they relied on the tools that were accessible to them, which were all aimed at building relationships. Notably, their ability to develop relationships was likely enhanced over other, older facilitators, as Sara and Dara shared common interests and had a more recent memory of the themes of adolescence. Thus, although the content was quite different, the leadership styles of Rosie and the facilitator pair were similar in that they were natural outpourings of who they were.

Given the ease with which Rosie and the facilitator pair used their respective tools, it is possible that they were perceived by the mentees as being more confident in their role as group leader. The importance of confidence is espoused by many group therapy theorists as an essential quality of a group leader, although they use various terms to capture similar ideas. Corey and Corey (2008) call confidence a "sense of identity," in which a group leader knows what they value and live by these standards, not by what others expect. Thus, group participants cannot sway them or negatively impact their view of themselves. Malekoff (2006) expounds on this by saying that group therapists must "check their ego at the door," as adolescent clients will challenge the worker's self-esteem. He explains that, when chided or given attitude by a participant, a good therapist will resist the urge to replicate the reactions of other adults, including negativity and rejection. She must be able to find the playfulness and humor (with their ego checked) in an adolescent's assaults, as long as they maintain a decent level of respect. Both Rosie and the facilitator pair demonstrated these abilities in the consistency with which they utilized their tools. When chided by a mentee, Rosie intervened, not wavering in her

stance as group leader and maintaining prosocial expectations. Similarly, when mentees withdrew or were withholding in their interactions, the facilitator pair reached out to the mentee in order to continue building the relationship.

In contrast, Angela seemed to demonstrate discomfort in her group interactions. Her discomfort was evidenced by long silences before speaking, broken sentences, and pauses in between her thoughts. Moreover, at least once the observer noted that she was presenting as uncomfortable. One explanation for her discomfort is due to underlying anxiety, which could also explain her limited verbalizations throughout the sessions. Corey and Corey (2008) note that anxiety is typically normal for group leaders with limited experience. They suggest that some anxiety can be helpful for self-appraisal; however, when the negativistic thinking leads to inactivity on the group leaders' part, it can be detrimental to the group. Yalom and Lezscz (2005) also warn that inexperienced group facilitators tend to lack self-confidence, which can lead to difficulties being the primary role model for the group. Thus, their anxiety can lead them to either fall back into a comfortable, professional role, in which they hide behind strict boundaries, or they can abdicate the role of leader and behave more like a group member. Moreover, Malekoff (2006) warns that, when group leaders allow their egos to be hurt, they reinforce the youth's perception that adults are rejecting and negative towards them. This was demonstrated in Angela's discomfort when problem-solving around the mentee who wanted to keep her phone. Thus, Angela's anxiety and lack of verbalizations were actually quite typical of inexperienced group leaders, and may have contributed to the iatrogenic outcomes of her group.

The facilitator pair also had limited experience with group leadership prior to facilitating their group, however, they seemed to be resilient to the typical traps of anxiety and self-doubt expected from inexperienced group leaders. There are multiple reasons why they may have had less anxiety, including diffused responsibility for group interactions and in-the-moment support from the other when there was difficulty in the group. Additionally, they could use each other to help them process and problem-solve in between groups, allowing them opportunities to be reassured and also improve their leadership skills. Alternatively, because of their younger age and increased number of adults, it is possible the facilitator pair's view of group time was highly peer-based, allowing them to relax and be comfortable with themselves. It is also possible that the facilitator pair had a constellation of youth who were less demanding than Angela's and/or they were less naturally anxious individuals than Angela.

Sharing Adult-World Ideas through Relationships

Both Rosie and the facilitator pair shared adult-world ideas frequently in their groups. Allen and Antonishak (2006) posit that adult-world ideas are those that provide opportunities for youth to be socialized to adult norms (versus adolescent norms). Examples include appropriately sharing personal problems, which socialize youth to the challenges and problem-solving techniques of adults, or personal opinions and reflections, which socialize youth to adult perspectives. Again, both Rosie and the facilitator pair utilized different strategies to share their ideas, however, all were authentic to their style. For instance, Rosie shared her ideas through structuring discussions that lead to adult-world ideas, or casually sharing her own opinions about a subject. The

facilitator pair, in contrast, shared adult-world ideas through self-disclosure and modeling adult-world conversations for the youth.

Additionally, Rosie and the facilitator pair were able to communicate adult ideas in the context of their relationships with the youth. In both groups, adult-world ideas were shared in conversations that also evidenced the Facilitator making verbalizations aimed at connection as well as laughter, suggesting that the relationship and positive feelings remained central. Moreover, the ideas were interspersed naturally in conversations and conveyed a sense of collaboration with the mentees, versus the top-down imparting of knowledge, which Lochman and Larson (2002) suggest is crucial. As such, the mentees maintained their interest in talking with the facilitators, evidenced by their engagement and comments that continued the discussion. This is particularly important, as maintaining interest can be difficult when sharing ideas with teenagers. First, adult-world norms can be in conflict with adolescent-world norms (Allen & Antonishak, 2006) and, if not expressed gingerly, the imparting of adult-world ideas can threaten the adolescent's sense of independence (Erikson, 1977). Thus, through their relationships, Rosie and the facilitator pair expressed their adult-world ideas in a manner that was amenable to the mentees in their groups. Allen and Antonishak would posit that this was a key piece to the social gains evidenced by these two groups.

The ease with which the adult-world ideas were transmitted may have been enhanced by the relational development evident in the facilitator pair and Rosie's groups. Due to the facilitators frequent verbalizations aimed at building relationships (especially in the facilitator pair's group), reciprocal loop of prosocial interactions, as well as the authenticity conveyed, the relationships in these groups may have been stronger than

those in other groups. This is likely the case when compared to Angela's group, who made few statements aimed at building relationships.

The importance of the facilitator-mentee relationship is highlighted in both the group intervention and mentoring literature. As discussed in the previous section, *Tools that Promote Prosocial Behavior*, a positive therapeutic relationship between group leader and member is related to prosocial outcomes (Raskin, 1983; Sexton, 1993). Additionally, it is important to note the wide acceptance of group cohesion as being central to the group therapy experience, which is influenced by the leader-to-member relationship (Burlingame, Fuhriman, & Johnson, 2001). Burlingame and colleagues define group cohesion as "involving multiple alliances—member-to-group, member-to-member, member-to-leader, leader-to-group, and leader-to-leader. Its features occur systemically (intrapersonally, interpersonally, and intragroup) and describe a bonding, collaborative, working alliance of the group." Although this study does not examine group cohesion, research suggests that, through modeling prosocial interactions with group members, group cohesion, and thereby positive outcomes, increase. Thus, in the relationships that the facilitator pair and Rosie developed with the mentees, the overall feelings of group cohesion likely increased, as did the prosocial outcomes.

Mentoring theory also posits that the mentee-mentor relationship is central to the social outcomes associated with mentoring. Specifically, Rhodes, Grossman, & Resch (2000) propose that at the heart of effective mentoring is the development of feelings of mutuality, trust, and empathy within the relationship. Additionally, Rhodes (2002) posits that this type of mentoring relationship enables the following proposed pathways towards positive youth development: 1) enhancing youth's social skills which influence their

positive social-emotional development; 2) dialogue and listening which influences youth's cognitive development; and 3) role modeling which influences youth's positive identification and behavior. Notably, the aforementioned dialogue, listening, and role modeling could also be described as sharing adult-world ideas in Allen and Antonishak (2006) language. Thus, Rhodes model also suggests that the relationships are necessary in order to effectively transmit adult-world ideas to adolescents.

Conclusion. Results from this study illuminated several facilitator behaviors that promote prosocial development among groups of adolescent girls in a mentoring program. Specifically, it can be interpreted that speaking frequently and making verbalizations in the four categories delineated in this study (Sharing and modeling adult-world ideas, Promoting prosocial group culture, Preventing peer deviancy training, and Relationship building) are associated with prosocial gains. Additionally, utilizing a consistent set of tools aimed at promoting prosocial behavior is related to increased gains, although there is no one universal set of tools. One adult utilized structure and intervention to promote positive behavior, whereas the other set of adults utilized relationship-building as the foundation for social change. Notably, the adults were both confident and appeared authentic in utilizing these tools, as they were accessible given the adults' background and age, and were implemented with ease.

In both groups, the promotion of prosocial behavior may have instigated a reciprocating loop of reinforcing, prosocial interactions between the facilitators, mentors, and mentees. Thus, the deepening connections may have been mutually fulfilling for both the adults and the youth in the mentoring group. Within the context of these strong relationships, the sharing of adult-world ideas in a natural, conversational way was also

associated with prosocial outcomes. It is possible that, without the strength of the relationships, the transmission of these adult-world ideas may not have been successful.

The results of this study also highlight the adult behaviors that were present in a group with iatrogenic outcomes. Specifically, the facilitator of this group made minimal verbalizations, which may have increased the anxiety of the group participants. The facilitator of this group also implemented little structure, intervention, and made few verbalizations aimed at building relationships. Research suggests that these behaviors are all associated with negative outcomes. Additionally, results from this study suggest that adult demonstrations of anxiety and/or discomfort may be associated with negative effects of a group mentoring program.

Chapter VI: Discussion

Findings from this study contribute to a better understanding of group mentoring for adolescent girls. This line of research is particularly relevant, as the National Research Agenda on Youth Mentoring (Rhodes & Dubois, 2004) describes the need for more empirical studies on the group format as well as special populations, such as adolescent girls. Overall, results from this study suggest that group mentoring is complex, as there are differential outcomes related to both individual and group-level factors. Specifically, in some groups, mentees made social gains at the conclusion of the program whereas, in others, mentees' socially risky behaviors and attitudes increased by the end. Additionally, findings confirm that group outcomes are related to characteristics of the adult leaders, including their pre-existing experience and number of facilitators. Given the possibility for both positive and iatrogenic outcomes, it is especially important for researchers and practitioners alike to understand the relevant adult factors that are related to prosocial change. Findings have implications for the recruitment and training of adult facilitators in group mentoring programs.

Individual Factors

This study examined individual factors related to three types of social outcomes, Changes in Social Adjustment, Changes in Externalizing Behaviors, and Changes in Victimization. The individual factors studied were age, identifying as African-American, identifying as Caucasian, being of low SES, being from a single-adult home, and going to

school in an urban school district. Findings suggest that individual factors play a role in outcomes for Externalizing Behaviors, but not for Social Adjustment or Victimization.

The Externalizing Behavior composite consisted of measures of Risky Behaviors, Behavioral Referrals, and Bullying. Findings suggest that identifying as African-American is related to reductions in externalizing behaviors. One explanation for this difference by race is that research suggests that African-American youth have less access to role models in their natural environment (Carnegie Council of Adolescent Development, 1995) and, therefore, mentoring may be especially beneficial for this population. Moreover, while studies indicate that the importance of a same-race mentor is mixed (Dubois et al., 2002; Rhodes, 2002), the group format of YWLP ensured that each African-American youth was exposed to mentors of both racial majority and minority status. For African-Americans, the relationships with minority mentors may have enhanced the role modeling effect (Sanchez & Reyes, 1999) and/or allowed them access to the adult-world ideas of racial minorities, thereby improving outcomes. On the other hand, their relationships with Caucasian mentors may have helped bridged social distances and challenged negative stereotypes (Blechman, 1992). Thus, the diversity of relationships that the group format offered may have been more novel for African-American youth, thereby leading to reductions in externalizing behaviors. Notably, results from this study indicate that having an African-American facilitator was not related to mentee outcomes for the entire sample or for African-American mentees. This suggests that, if the race of the adults is important, it is the race of the mentors (either the one-on-one or those available due to the group format) that is more influential to African-American mentees than the race of the facilitators. More research in this area is needed.

It is also possible that the improvements that African-American mentees made in externalizing behaviors may be related to a higher level of these behaviors at the outset of the study. Jackson (1997) suggests that African-American youth may, in fact, externalize more than Caucasian youth for reasons ranging from biological (low SES is correlated with less than ideal prenatal care) to societal (cross-cultural conflict between Caucasian teachers and African-American students). Thus, African-American mentees may have made greater strides in this area because there was more room for improvement. Regardless of the explanation, this study highlights that a combined group and one-on-one mentoring approach may be especially beneficial for African-American females.

Findings also indicate that mentees from single-adult homes made more changes in externalizing behaviors than their two-adult counterparts. This difference is likely due to increased impact of the relationship for youth in single-parent homes, as this population has less access to adults than those living with two parents (Cowen & Work, 1988). Notably, this finding is in contrast to Dubois and colleagues' 2002 meta-analysis, which found no difference between outcomes related to family structure. The conflicting findings between this study and Dubois et. al.'s study are likely related to different sample populations (all females vs. mixed-gender) and/or the type of mentoring (combined one-on-one and group vs. one-on-one). It may be that females in single-parent homes derive greater benefits from their mentors than boys in single-parent homes (when compared to those in two-parent homes), as relationships are especially important for adolescent girls (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990). Alternatively, the differences between this finding and Dubois' finding may be due to the group mentoring component of this study, in which mentees were introduced to multiple

adults. The increased relationships with caring mentors may have been especially beneficial for girls who have only one parent, versus two, in their household.

Group Factors

This study examined the group-level factors that are related to social outcomes of a group mentoring program, including Changes in Social Adjustment, Changes in Externalizing Behaviors, and Changes in Victimization. Results indicate that group-level factors are related to variation in Social Adjustment as well as Externalizing Behaviors, but not Victimization. The group-level predictors for this study were all related to the adult leaders, including their characteristics (Academic Self-Worth, General Self-Worth, and Ethnocultural Empathy), pre-existing experience (with groups of youth, with youth at-risk, and program-specific), and demographic variables (African-American, graduate student, having two facilitators). Results indicate that leaders with pre-existing experience working with youth at-risk are related to increased gains in Social Adjustment. Additionally, having two group facilitators, versus one, is also related to gains in Social Adjustment. Although group-factors are indicated in the differential outcomes for Externalizing Behaviors, the adult factors included in this study were not predictive of variation in this domain.

The group-related variation in Social Adjustment and Externalizing Behaviors may be related to presence of peer influence, in which members adopt group behaviors as it socializes individuals around group rules or norms (Moreland & Levine, 1992). The power of peer influence is well-documented and is considered to be an essential aspect of adolescent socialization (Allen & Antonishak, 2006; Cohen, 1983). Current research highlights that behaviors that are most susceptible to this phenomena are those that are

learned and are developmentally appropriate (Dishion, Dodge, & Lansford, 2006), as individuals are primed to observe and imitate behaviors that are congruent with their age and gender. As such, for adolescent girls, research has documented that disordered eating (Beaumont, Russell, & Tuoyz, 1993) and self-injury (Walsh & Rosen, 1988) are both behaviors that can increase as a result of a group intervention. Externalizing behaviors, too, are highly learned and there is much documentation that group interventions aimed at adolescents tend to promote similar outcomes in this domain (Dishion & Dodge, 2006).

The role of peer influence in social adjustment, however, has limited documentation, although the finding is not surprising. Given that social behaviors and attitudes are of primary importance to adolescent girls (Underwood, 2003), theory suggests that the mentees were primed to observe and imitate the social behaviors of their fellow group participants. For example, it may be that a mentee watched another girl say "thank you" when interacting with an adult, in which the mentee copied by also saying "thank you," thereby improving her social skills and relationship with the adult. Thus, as a result of being in the group, mentees learned new ways of thinking or interacting, either in a positive or negative way.

The influence of peers on both Social Adjustment as well as Externalizing outcomes support Herrerra and colleagues (2002) description of group mentoring as a setting that allowed youth to be mentored by at least one adult and a group of peers. Moreover, these results are consistent with research indicating that social skill development is one of the most frequently cited outcomes of group mentoring (Herrerra et al., Jent & Niec, 2009). This study adds, however, that there is also the potential for peers to have a negative influence on mentees' social development, consistent with the

group intervention literature (Dishion & McCourd, 1999). As a result, understanding the factors related to both positive and negative outcomes is essential.

Adult Factors

Results suggest that prior adult experience is of differing import when working with groups of youth. Specifically, this study found that prior adult experiences are not related to differences in externalizing outcomes, whereas previous experience with youth at-risk does play a role in outcomes related to Social Adjustment. The lack of support for differences in Externalizing Behaviors is surprising, as it contrasts both the theory (Dishion & Dodge, 2006; Larson & Lochman, 2002) and research (Feldman, 1992) that suggest adult experience is particularly important for reducing externalizing or risky behaviors such as aggression, smoking, or sexual conduct (Dishion, 2000). It is possible that this study did not include the pertinent adult experiences (specific to working with groups, with youth at-risk, or program specific experience) that impact group outcomes in externalizing behaviors. Or, it may be that experience is only related to male externalizing outcomes, as Feldman's study did not include females. Specifically, it has been proposed that the trajectories for which girls and boys develop and maintain externalizing behaviors are different and, thus, interventions may have different impacts (Keenan & Shaw, 2003). These results highlight that further research on the adult-level factors that impact group outcomes in externalizing behaviors among females is still needed.

Adult competencies. For social adjustment, however, experience with youth at-risk was found to be related to improvements, corroborating the theory suggested by several leaders in the field of group interventions (Dishion, 2000; Prinstein & Dodge,

2009, Larson & Lochman, 2002). Qualitative results found that the facilitator with experience implemented structure and intervened readily, while also engaging in relationships and sharing adult-world ideas. This confirms Larson and Lochman's hypothesis that experience enables practitioners to balance a therapeutic alliance with the necessity of setting firm expectations, monitoring children's behavior, and providing consequences (Lochman et al., 2008), easing the process of transmitting adult-world messages. Additionally, two group facilitators, versus one, was also found to be related to improvements in Social Adjustment. Qualitative results indicate that the facilitator pair made frequent behaviors aimed at relationship-building. In both groups, the facilitators were authentic and confident in their interactions with the youth and their roles as leaders. Thus, they implemented a reciprocal loop of prosocial interactions in which relationships were developed and adult-world messages were transmitted. A comprehensive discussion of the adult competencies, and the processes by which they may promote prosocial change, is included in Chapter VI.

The findings of this study are also suggestive of the adult behaviors that may be related to iatrogenic outcomes for mentoring groups. Specifically, the facilitator for the group that worsened over the course of the year made minimal verbalizations, which is theorized to increase the anxiety of the group participants (Yalom & Lesczc, 2005). Moreover, this facilitator rarely demonstrated behaviors aimed at providing structure or intervention for the group and also made few verbalizations towards building relationships. Research suggests that limited leadership behaviors in these areas are related to negative outcomes (Corey & Corey, 2007; Feldman, 1992). Again, a more

comprehensive discussion of the facilitator behaviors in the group with negative effects is discussed in Chapter V

Social Adjustment for Adolescent Girls

The Social Adjustment composite is comprised of measures of self-esteem in peer, family, academic, and global domains, as well as depression. As research indicates that the disparity between boys and girls in these domains increases significantly during adolescence, improvements in these areas are particularly important for adolescent girls when compared to their male counterparts. Specifically, research indicates that adolescent girls suffer a loss of self-esteem upon entering middle school (Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell, 1999) that is greater than the loss suffered by males (Orenstein, 2002). Moreover, while there are no prepubescent differences between males and females in depression, between the ages of eleven and thirteen, there is a precipitous rise in the depression rates for adolescent girls that are far greater than that of adolescent boys (Cyranowski, Frank, Young, & Shear, 2002). Additionally, by age fifteen, females are twice as likely as males to have experienced a major depressive episode. This difference remains for the next thirty-five to forty years (Cyranowski et al.).

The variability demonstrated by groups in Social Adjustment is important, as self-esteem is related to individual's quality of life. A study by Baumeister, Campbell, Kruger, & Vohs (2003) found that global self-esteem is linked to happiness, and that improvements in domain-specific esteem (such as academics) are related to improved performance in that area. Additionally, researchers have hypothesized that there is a relationship between self-esteem and altruism, in which adolescents with high levels of self-esteem feel more competent to assist others and are also more able to do so than

adolescents with low self-esteem, because their own needs are not being met (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). This relationship is also considered to by reciprocal, as it is also suggested that an adolescent's engagement in prosocial and positive social activities increases their self-esteem (Yates & Youniss, 1996). As such, it is not surprising that the prosocial activities and opportunities for positive interactions that YWLP provided promote improvements in self-esteem in some groups.

Variability in the domain of depression (as part of the Social Adjustment composite) as a result of group mentoring is also important to understand for adolescent girls. Research indicates that social changes, in concert with pubertal changes, are primarily responsible for the increased rates of female depression that begin during adolescence (Brooks-Gunn & Warren, 1989). One of the social changes that occur during this time is the shift in attachment from parents to peers (Cyranowski et al., 2002). A stress in this shift is a likely contributor to depression among adolescent girls and, as such, some group intervention may exacerbate this shift. At the same time, the prosocial group culture of YWLP and the adult mentors may ease the process as girls transition to placing more importance on peers, thereby reducing depression rates. Given the high incidence of depression among adolescent girls, future studies should examine depression alone as an outcome.

Chapter VII: Limitations and Implications

Limitations

This study does not determine the causal relationship between any of the variables of interest. Future long-term prospective studies are needed to explore the causality between pre-existing characteristics of facilitators and mentee prosocial outcomes. Additionally, because of a relatively small sample of groups, there is only a limited number of pre-existing mentor characteristics that were investigated while maintaining sufficient power. Thus, more research is needed to determine if other adult characteristics and experiences are related to mentee prosocial development.

Only a small subset of college women and adolescent girls are enrolled in the Young Women Leaders Program. As there is limited research on this population, the results of this study should contribute significantly to the literature in this area and generalize across similar populations. However, the relatively sample size limits the generalizability across populations and settings. As such, these findings may only be applicable to similar populations of college women mentors. In addition, there are very few programs with the 1:1 youth to adult ratio in group settings, further limiting the generalizability of these results. Moreover, the unique combination of one-on-one and group mentoring also limits the generalizability of the results.

Another limitation of the present study is its reliance on self-report data. This type of data can be complicated by many factors including mood states when answering questions as well as social desirability. When studying adolescents, this is a particular limitation because their moods tend to be more variable and thus the girls may have been in vastly different states when completing the measures (Darling, 2005). Youth's bias

towards social desirability may make them more likely to exaggerate their responses on some measures and inhibit their responses on others (Rhodes, 2002).

Implications

The results of this study enumerate several implications for group mentoring programs. First, mentoring programs must be aware of the benefits and risks associated with group mentoring, including improved social development as well as possible iatrogenic effects. Given the potential for negative outcomes, it is important for program developers and practitioners to be aware of the factors related to negative peer influence, including the composition of the group, age of the mentees, and individual levels of risk and resilience. A review of Dodge and Sherrill's 2006 article "Deviant Peer Group Effects in Youth Mental Health Interventions" provides a comprehensive list of factors related to iatrogenic outcomes. These factors should be carefully attended to whenever a group intervention is developed.

Hiring. It is also important for group mentoring programs to understand the adult factors that are related to positive gains so as to inform their hiring and training practices. Regarding hiring, results from this study highlight that there is not one image of an effective group mentoring leader. Neither race nor academic credentials (ie., current undergraduate or post-undergraduate student) were found to be significant demographic variables related to improved outcomes. Moreover, prior experiences working with groups of youth as well as program-specific experience were also not related to outcomes. In fact, the only pre-existing variable related to outcomes is prior experience working with youth at-risk and, as such, this factor should be favored when making hiring decisions. In addition, this study highlights the benefits of having two

facilitators, versus one, when possible. As personnel and budget constraints may make assigning two facilitators to each group unrealistic, special attention should then be given to the placement of facilitators. Individuals with prior experience with youth at-risk may be placed alone, and those with limited experience will benefit from the addition of a co-facilitator.

Findings also indicate that interviewing candidates and reference checks will be beneficial to the hiring process. As results demonstrate that individuals with good verbal and relationship-building skills may be strong candidates, interviews allow the opportunities to assess these skills. Specifically, attending to a candidate's fluency and flexibility with language during an interview process is important. It may be beneficial to conduct role plays as a means of determining their ability to verbalize in novel situations. In addition to strong verbal skills, facilitators in the groups that made positive gains demonstrated frequent behaviors that were reflective of relationship-building. As such, during an interview, attention should be given to the quality of the candidate's relationships with youth. Reference checks may be especially beneficial in this domain.

Training. While there are some facilitator qualities and behaviors that may be easier to attend to while hiring, there are some facilitator skills that can be taught via direct instruction. As such, consistent training and supervision for group facilitators is key. During training the following skills can be easily taught: 1) scaffolding questions, 2) reflective statements, 3) warnings for transitions, 4) single-step directions, 5) asking personal questions, 6) implying personal knowledge, and 7) expressing positive feelings. It will be beneficial for facilitators to practice these skills in training sessions, as they will likely seem more authentic in using them when they are leading the group sessions.

Ongoing supervision may also be beneficial for group facilitators. This time would allow specific skills to be taught and reinforced, and may also serve as an opportunity to promote facilitator's sense of presence in their group. Specifically, the literature suggests that the ability to verbalize frequently, which increases presence, may be enhanced by leaving other worries and concerns behind when facilitating. As such, supervision allows the opportunity for facilitators to discuss some of their concerns and questions about their leadership style, instead of thinking about them in the presence of the group. Additionally, consistent supervision could also serve as a platform to enhance a facilitator's authenticity through identifying strengths and crafting a natural style.

Evaluation. Results indicate that group mentoring outcomes can be variable and, therefore, evaluation is a key component to responsibly implementing this type of intervention. Evaluations should be conducted on a group-by-group basis as well as the entire program. Mid-year studies may be especially beneficial in identifying groups that are at-risk for iatrogenic outcomes so that changes can be made to promote prosocial improvements.

Appendix

Start Codes

Modeling and sharing adult world ideas.

- Modeling prosocial behaviors and attitudes (i.e., arriving on time, participating in activities, listening to the speaker)
- Modeling social risk behaviors and attitudes (i.e., arriving late, discussing socially risky behaviors such as drinking or missing class, talking while others are talking)
- Talking about personal problems (i.e., sharing real-life personal struggles, length of time will be noted)

Expectations and structure.

- Upholding YWLP structures (i.e., Mentor/Mentees sitting next to each other, Sisters spending Sister time together, Star time, High-Lows, reviewing YWLP 3 R's)
- Setting prosocial expectations for behavior (i.e., reviewing and reminding of prosocial expectations for behavior, including the YWLP 3 R's and Leadership Secrets)
- Providing consequences if expectations not met (i.e., asking mentee to talk in the hall after infraction, calling parents to discuss infractions after group, asking mentee to talk through a conflict that was evidenced inappropriately in group)

Promoting Prosocial Group Culture.

- Questioning risk behavior or attitude (i.e., asking individual about a risk attitude or behavior they presented, asking group about a mentee's risk attitude or behavior)
- Punitive talk after a social risk behavior or attitude (i.e., telling mentee their attitude is wrong, purposely embarrassing mentee after risk behavior or attitude, providing consequence that is too strong for infraction)
- Ignoring social risk attitudes (i.e., not responding when social risk behavior or attitude is displayed)
- Promoting connection among mentor/mentee and mentee/mentee (i.e., labeling similarities between mentees, asking mentees to talk directly to each other, encouraging mentees to ask other mentees for help, encouraging mentees to ask mentors for help)
- Acknowledging prosocial behaviors (i.e., labeling mentees' helpful behavior, noticing and acknowledging mentees' demonstrations of empathy)
- Providing opportunities for mentees to demonstrate prosocial behaviors and attitudes (i.e., encouraging community service, asking mentes for help solving-problems, asking mentees for their opinions on others' social behaviors)

Preventing peer deviancy training.

- Smooth transitioning (i.e., engaging with mentees throughout the transition from one activity to another, engaging with mentees during any down time)

- Intervening when mentees are engaging in social risk behaviors (i.e., separating or talking to mentees are being relationally aggressive towards another mentee, encouraging mentees to engage with group)
- Intervening with youth sending negative messages (i.e., separating mentees who are laughing at others, labeling negative message sending like laughing, eye rolling, or whispering)
- Getting in power struggles (i.e., insisting mentees follow directions based on power differential)
- Monitoring youth at all times (i.e., going to the bathroom with youth, engaging youth during sister time, checking in when mentees are having conversations among themselves)
- Changing courses when negative messages are being sent (i.e., changing content of group discussion when mentees are being reinforced for socially risky behaviors, starting a new activity when intervening with negative message sending is ineffective)

One-On-One Relationship Building.

- Connection between mentor and mentee (i.e., indicating relationship with mentee is important, implying intimate knowledge of mentees, asking mentee to talk about something important)
- Connection between Facilitator and mentees (i.e., saying hello to each mentee, talking to various mentees throughout the group, implying intimate knowledge of mentees)

References

Allen, J. P. & Philliber, S.P. (2001). Who benefits most from a broadly targeted prevention program? Differential efficacy across populations in the Teen Outreach Program. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29,* 637-655.

American Association of University Women. (1992). *The AAUW report: How schools shortchange girls.* Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation and National Educational Association.

Ang, R. P., Chia, B. H., & Fung, D. S. S. (2006). Gender differences in life stressors associated with child and adolescent suicides in Singapore from 1995 to 2003. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 52*(6), 561-570.

Asay, T. P., & Lambert, M. J. (1999). The empirical case for the common factors in therapy:vQuantitative findings. In M. Hubble, B. Duncan & S. Miller (Eds.), The heart and soul of change: What works in therapy (pp. 23–55). Washington, DC: American PsychologicalvAssociation.

Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership and men; research in human relations.* (pp. 177-190). Oxford, England: Carnegie Press.

Baer L., Jacobs D.G., Meszler-Reizes J., Blais M., Fava M., Kessler R., Magruder K., Murphy J., Kopans B., Cukor P., Leahy L., O'Laughlen J., (2000). Development of a brief screening instrument: The HANDS. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 69, 35–41.

Batson, C. D., Duncan, B. D., Ackerman, P., Buckley, T., & Birch, K. (1981). Is empathic emotion a source of altruistic motivation? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40(2),* 290-302.

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier life-styles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4*(1), 1–44.

Bierhoff, H. W., & Muller, G. F. (1999). Positive feelings and cooperative support in project groups. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 58,* 180–190.

Bierhoff, H. W. & Rohmann, E. (2004). Altruistic personality in the context of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *European Journal of Personality, 18,* 351-365.

Bertalanffy, L. von (1968). *General systems theory: Foundations, development, Applications* (Rev. ed.). New York: George Braziller.

Bettridge, B. J., & Favreau, O. E. (1995). Suicidal behavior among adolescent females: The cry for connection. In S. S. Canetto, & D. Lester (Eds.), *Women and suicidal behavior.* (pp. 109-119). New York, NY, US: Springer Publishing Co.

Bobo, L. (2004). Group conflict, prejudice and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes. In J. T. Jost, & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings.* (pp. 333-357). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.

Bogat, G. A., & Liang, B. (2005). Gender in mentoring relationships. In D. L. DuBois, & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring.* (pp. 205-217). London: Sage Publications.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development.* USA: Basic Books.

Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A.S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bukowski, W. M., & Sippola, L. K. (1996). Friendship and morality: (How) are they related? In W. M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep* (pp. 238–261). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Burlingame, G. M., Fuhriman, A., & Johnson, J. E. (2001). Cohesion in group psychotherapy, *Psychotherapy, 38*, 373-384.

Capaldi, D. M., Dishion, T. J., Stoolmiller, M., & Yoerger, K. (2001). Aggression toward female partners by at-risk young men: The contribution of male adolescent friendships. *Developmental Psychology, 37*(1), 61-73.

Cardoos, S. (2006). *Gender differences in deviancy training in a clinical setting.* Unpublished honor's thesis, Connecticut College.

Carlo, G. & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development and validation of a multidimensional measure of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*, 31-44.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2002). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance-United States 2001. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 51*(SS-04), 1-64.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007). 2007 State and Local Youth Risk Behavior Survey. http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/pdf/questionnaire/2007HighSchool.pdf

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). Making sense of qualitative data: complementary research strategies. Sage Publications.

Cohen, J. (1983). Peer influence on college aspirations with initial aspirations controlled. *American Sociological Review, 48*(5), 728-734.

Coie, J.D., & Dodge, K.A. (1997). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N.Eisenberg, (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, fifth edition. Vol. 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 779-862). New York: Wiley.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1994). Cognitive representations of attachment: The structure and function of working models. In K. Bartholomew, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Attachment Processes in Adulthood* (pp. 53-90). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. W. (1984). *Being adolescent.* New York: Basic Books.

Crick, N.R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development, 67,* 2317- 2327.

Culbertson, F. M. (1997). Depression and gender: An international review. *American Psychologist, 52*(1), 25-31.

Darling, N. (2005). Mentoring adolescents. In D. L. DuBois, & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 177-190). London: Sage Publications.

Deutsch,N. L. (2010). *Young Women Leaders Program Observation Protocol,* Charlottesville, VA.

Deutsch, N. L., & Hirsch, B. J. (2002). A place to call home: Youth organizations in the lives of inner city adolescents. In T. M. Brinthaupt, & R. P. Lipka (Eds.), *Understanding early adolescent self and identity: Applications and interventions* (pp. 293-320). New York: State University of New York Press.

Deutsch, N.L., Lawrence, E. & DeBlank, G. (2007). Young Women Leaders: Differential Effects of Mentoring for Middle School Girls. Poster presented as part of symposium *Development and Evaluation of Mentoring Programs for Girls: What's Gender Got to Do With It?* Society for Research on Child Development biennial meeting. Boston, MA, March 29-April 1, 2007.

Dishion, T.J. (2000). Cross-setting consistency in early adolescent psychopathology: Deviant friendships and problem behavior sequelae. *Journal of Personality, 68(6),* 1109-1126.

Dishion, T. J., & Andrews, D. W. (1995). Preventing escalation in problem behavior with hig-risk adolescents: Immediate and 1-year outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63,* 538-548.

Dishion, T. J., Capaldi, D., Spracklen, K. M., & Li, F. (1995). Peer ecology of male adolescent drug use. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*(4), 803-824.

Dishion, T. J. Dodge, K. A. (2005). Peer contagion in interventions for children and adolescents: moving towards an understanding of the ecology and dynamics of change. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 33(3),* 395-400.

Dishion, T. J., Dodge, K. A., & Lansford, J. E. (2006). Findings and recommendations: A blueprint to minimize deviant peer influence in youth interventions and programs. In K. A. Dodge, T. J. Dishion, & J. E. Lansford (Eds.), *Deviant peer influences in programs for youth.* New York: Guilford.

Dishion, T. J., McCord, J., & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. *American Psychologist, 54*(9), 755-764.

DuBois, D.L., Felner, R.D., Brand, S, Phillips, RSC.(1996). Early adolescent self-esteem: A developmental-ecological framework and assessment strategy. *Journal of Research on Adolescence. Vol 6(4), 543-579.*

DuBois, D. L., Holloway, B. E., Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: a meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(2), 157-197.

DuBois, D. L., & Karcher, M. J. (2005). *Handbook of youth mentoring.* London: Sage Publications.

DuBois, D. L., & Karcher, M. J. (2005). Youth Mentoring: Theory, Research, and Practice. In D. L. DuBois, & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 2-11). London: Sage Publications.

DuBois, D. L., Neville, H. A., Parra, G. R., & Pugh-Lilly, A. (2002). Testing a new model of mentoring. In G. G. Noam, & J. E. Rhodes (Eds.), *A critical view of youth mentoring (New Directions for Youth Development; Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 21-57). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eccles, J., Barber, B., Jozefowicz, D., Malenchuk, O., & Vida, M. (1999). Self-evaluations of competence, task values, and self-esteem. In N. G. Johnson, M. C. Roberts & J. Worell (Eds.), *Beyond appearance: A new look at adolescent girls* (pp. 53-83). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Eisenburg, N., Carlo, G., Murphy, B., & Van Court, P. (1995). Prosocial development in late adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 66,* 1179-1197.

Eisenburg, N., & Fabes, R.A. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon (Ed.) & N. Eisenburg (Vol. Ed.) *Handbook of Child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personal development (pp. 701-776).* New York: Wiley.

Eisenberg, N. & McNally, S. (1993). Socialization and mothers' and adolescents' empathy-related characteristics, *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 3, (2) pp. 171–191.

Ennett, S. T., & Bauman, K. E. (1994). The contribution of influence and selection to adolescent peer group homogeneity: The case of adolescent cigarette smoking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 653-663.

Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co..

Feldman, R. A., Caplinger, T. E., & Wodarski, J. S. (1983). *The St. Louis conundrum; The effective treatment of antisocial youths.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Furstenberg, Frank F. Jr. (1993). How families manage risk and opportunity in dangerous neighborhoods. In W. J. Wilson (Ed.), *Sociology and the Public Agenda* (pp. 231-258). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Garber, J., Robinson, N.S., & Valentiner, D. (1997). The relation between parenting and adolescent depression: Self-worth as a mediator. Journal of Adolescent Research, 12, 12-33.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gifford-Smith, M., Dodge, K. A., Dishion, T. J., & McCord, J. (2005). Peer influence in children and adolescents: Crossing the bridge from developmental to intervention science. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 33,* 255-265.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Brown, L. M., & Rogers, A. G. (1990). Psyche embedded: A place for body, relationships, and culture in personality theory. In A. I. Rabin, R. A. Zucker, R. A. Emmons & S. Frank (Eds.), *Studying persons and lives* (pp. 86-147). New York: Springer Publishing Co.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N. P., & Hanmer, T. J. (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Girls Incorporated Web site. (2007). *Girls Inc.* Retrieved September 10, 2007, from http://www.girlsinc.org/ic/page.php?id=1

Girls Incorporated Web site. (2007) *The supergirl dilemma: Girls grapple with the mounting pressure of expectations, 2006.* Retrieved September 12, 2007 from http://www.girlsinc.org/ic/page.php?id=2.1.36

Girl Scout Research Institute. (2006) *The new normal?: What girls say about healthy living.* Retrieved from http://www.girlscouts.org/

Grossman, J. B., & Rhodes, J. E. (2002). The test of time: Predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring relationships. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30,* 199-219.

Grossman, J. B., & Tierney, J. P. (1998). Does mentoring work? An impact study of the Big Brothers Big Sisters program. *Evaluation Review, 22,* 403-426.

Guimond, S. (2000). Group socialization and prejudice: The social transmission of intergroup attitudes and beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*(3), 335-354.

Harter, S. (1986). Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Harter, S., Waters, P., & Whitesell, N. (1997). Lack of voice as a manifestation of false-self behavior among adolescents: The school setting as a stage upon which the drama of authenticity is enacted. *Educational Psychologist, 32(3),* 153-173.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Kosterman, R., Abbott, R., & Hill, K. G. (1999). Preventing adolescent health-risk behaviors by strengthening protection during childhood. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine, 153,* 226-234.

Hawkins, JD, & Lishner, DM (1987). Etiology and prevention of antisocial behavior in children and adolescents. In DH Crowell (Ed.), Childhood Aggression and Violence: Sources of Influence, Prevention and Control (pp. 263-282). New York: Plenum Press.

Henry, D. B., Schoeny, M. E., Deptula, D. P., & Slavick, J. T. (2007). Peer Selection and Socialization Effects on Adolescent Intercourse Without a Condom and Attitudes About the Costs of Sex. *Child Development, 78*(3), 825-838.

Herrera, C., Vang, Z., & Gale, L.Y. (2002). *Group mentoring: A study of mentoring groups in three programs.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures. From The Society of Research in Child Development: Social Policy Report, 2006, XX(III).

Hirsch, B. J., Mickus, M., & Boerger, R. (2002). Ties to influential adults among Black and White adolescents: Culture, social class, and family networks. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*, 289-303.

Hoffman, M. L. (1994). Discipline and internalization. *Developmental Psychology, 30*, 26-28.

Jackson, J. F. (1997). Issues in need of initial visitation: Race and nation specificity in the study of externalizing behavior problems and discipline. *Psychological Inquiry, 8*(3), 204-211.

Jekielek, S. M., Moore, K. A., Hair, E. C., Scarupa, H. J., & Child Trends, Inc., Washington,DC. (2002). *Mentoring: A Promising Strategy for Youth Development. Child Trends Research Brief.*

Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A. G., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I. P., & Surrey, J. L. (1991). *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center.* New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Karcher, M., Nakkula, M., & Harris, J. (2005). Developmental Mentoring Match Characteristics: Correspondence between Mentors' and Mentees' Assessments of Relationship Quality. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 26(2),* 93-110.

Kreft, I. & De Leeuw, J. (1998). *Introducing Multilevel Modeling.* Sage; Thousand Oaks, CA. Larson, J. & Lochman, J. E. (2002). *Helping schoolchildren cope with anger: A cognitive-behavioral intervention.* New York: Guilford Press.

Ladd, G. W., & Mize, J. (1983). A cognitive-social learning model of social-skill training. *Psychological Review, 90*(2),127-157.

Larson, R. W. (1997). The emergence of solitude as a constructive domain of experience in early adolescence. *Child Development, 68*, 80-93.

Leyton, J., Lawrence, E., & Deutsch, N. (2009). *Effective youth mentors: Examining the relationship between mentor characteristics and mentee satisfaction and positive outcomes.* Unpublished Manuscript. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Littleton, H. L. & Ollendick, T. (2003). Negative body image and disordered eating behavior in children and adolescents: What places youth at risk and how can these problems be prevented? *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 6(1)*, 51-66.

Lochman, J. E., Wells, C., & Lenhart, L.A. (2008). *Coping power: Facilitator guide.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mager, W., Milich, R., Harris, M. J., & Howard, A. (2005). Intervention Groups for Adolescents With Conduct Problems: Is Aggregation Harmful or Helpful? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 33*(3), 349-362.

Maxwell, K. A. (2001). *Do friends matter? The role of peer influence on adolescent risk behavior.* US: ProQuest Information & Learning.

Mead, M. (2001). *Gender matters: Funding effective programs for women and girls.* Battle Creek, MI: The W. K. Kellog Foundation.

MENTOR. (2006a). Invest in the Future of America's Children: Support Funding for Mentoring. Retrieved November 21, 2006, from **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**http**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**://**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**www**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**.**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**mentoring**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**.**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**org**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**take**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**_**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**action**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**funding**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**fact**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**_**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**sheet**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**.**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**php.

MENTOR. (2006b). Spanning the gender gap in mentoring. Retrieved January 15, 2007, from http://www.mentoring.org/program_staff/research_corner/spanning_the_gender_gap_in_mentoring.php.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (*2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, J. B. (1991). The Development of Women's Sense of Self. In J. V. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the stone center* (pp. 11-26). New York City: Guilford Press.

Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1988). Group dynamics over time: Development and socialization in small groups. In J. E. McGrath (Ed.), *The social psychology of time: New perspectives.* (pp. 151-181). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Moretti, M. M., Holland, R., & McKay, S. (2001). Self-other representations and relational and overt aggression in adolescent girls and boys. *Behavioral Sciences & the aw, 19*(1), 109-126.

Mynard, H., & Joseph, S. (2000). Development of the Multidimensional Peer-Victimization Scale. *Aggressive Behaviors, 26,* 169-178

Neemann, J., & Harter, S. (1986). Self-perception profile for college students. Manual. University of Denver.

Newcomb, A. F., Bukowski, W. M., & Pattee, L. (1993). Children's peer relations: A meta-analytical review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status. *Psychological Bulletin, 113,* 99-128.

Odgers, C.L. & Moretti, M. M. (2002). Aggressive and antisocial girls: Research update and challenges. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 1(2),* 103-119.

Parra, G., DuBois, D., Neville, H., & Pugh-Lilly, A. (2002). Mentoring Relationships For Youth: Investigation of a Process-Oriented Model. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(4) 367-388.

Prinstein, M.J., & Dodge,K. A. (2008). *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Rhodes, J. E. (2002). *Stand by me: The risks and rewards of mentoring today's youth.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rhodes, J.E. (2005). A Model of Youth Mentoring. In D.L. DuBois & M.J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of Youth Mentoring*, (p. 32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rhodes, J. E., & Dubois, D. L. (2006). Understanding and facilitating the youth mentoring movement. *Social Policy Report: Giving Child and Youth Development Knowledge Away, 20*, 1-19.

Rhodes, J. E., Grossman, J. B., & Resch, N. L. (2000). Agents of change: pathways through which mentoring relationships influence adolescents' academic adjustment. *Child Development, 71*(6), 1662.

Rogers, C., (1951). *Client-Centered Therapy: its current practice, implications, and theory.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Savioe, J. (2000). *Youth violent crime* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE, Vol. 19, no. 3). Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Salmivalli, C., Lappalainen, M., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1998). Stability and change of behavior in connection with bullying in schools: A two-year follow-up. *Aggressive Behavior, 24*(3), 205-218.

Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviour in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*(3), 246-258.

Sánchez, B., Reyes, O., & Singh, J. (2006). A qualitative examination of the relationships that serve a mentoring function for Mexican American older adolescents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 615-631.

Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms.* Oxford, England: Harper.

Silverman, J., Raj, A., Mucci, L., & Hathaway, J. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 286(5)*, 572-579.

Skinner, B.F. (1966). An operant analysis of problem solving. In B. Kleinmuntz (Ed.), Problem solving: Research, method, and theory, 225-257. New York: Wiley.

Snyder, H., & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 National Report.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Solomon, A. (1963). Authoritarian attitude changes and group homogeneity. *Journal of Social Psychology, 59*(1), 129-135.

Statistics Canada. (2001). *Canadian dimensions: Youth and adult crime rates.* Online. Available: http://www. statcan/english/Pgdb/State/Justice/legal.

Underwood, M. K. (2003). *Social Aggression among girls.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Van Vugt, M., Hardy, C. L., Stow, J., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (2007). Laughter as social lubricant: A biosocial hypothesis about the functions of laughter and humour. Unpublished manuscript.

Ventura, S., Abma, J., Mosher, W. & Henshaw, S. (2007). *Recent trends in teenage pregnancy in the United States, 1990-2002.* Retrieved January 18, 2007, from **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**http**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**://**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**www**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**.**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**cdc**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**.**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**gov**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**nchs**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**products**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**pubs**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**pubd**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**hestats**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**teenpreg**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**1990-2002/**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**teenpreg**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**1990-2002.**Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**htm.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, Y., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50,* 221-234.

Walsh, B. W., & Rosen, P. M. (1988). *Self-mutilation: Theory, research, and treatment.* New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Werner, E. E. (1996). Vulnerable but invincible: High risk children from birth to adulthood. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 5,* 47-51.

Wright, J.C., Giammarino, M., & Parad, H. W. (1986). Social status in small groups: Individual-group similarity and the social "misfit." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 523-536.

Yates, M., & Youniss, M. (1996). A developmental perspective on community service in adolescence. *Social Development,* 5(1), 85-111.

Zimmerman, M. A., Bingenheimer, J. B., & Behrendt, D. E. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships. In D. L. DuBois, & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring.* (pp. 143-157)Sage Publications Ltd.