a model role
evaluation of mosaic mentoring programmes

Jamie Bartlett

February 2012

DEMOS

A Model Role

Evaluation of the Mosaic mentoring programmes

Jamie Bartlett

DEMOS

In collaboration with Business in the Community

www.bitc.org.uk

Published by Demos 2012

Third Floor
Magdalen House
136 Tooley Street
London SE1 2TU

T 0845 458 5949
F 020 7367 4201

hello@demos.co.uk
www.demos.co.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mentoring occurs informally in every society. But in recent years it has taken on a more formal sense, becoming a technique to help young people develop competencies to enable them to overcome barriers in education, employment and participation in society. Most have in common the idea of a trusting relationship that involve a more experienced person acting as a role model, helping someone less experienced.

Mosaic was founded by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in 2007. Mosaic links young people with positive role models to boost their confidence, self-efficacy and long-term employability. It provides mentoring support by inspirational role models, tailored to the needs of particular groups: primary school students; secondary school students; and ex-offenders.

Demos undertook research into Mosaic, which assessed the value of mentoring programmes in raising aspirations in young people from black and Minority Ethnic (BME) backgrounds; assessed the impact of the Mosaic mentoring programme for both mentors and mentees; and determined how the mentoring programmes could be improved. This was all in relation to secondary school children.

This evaluation had three components.

In part I, we undertook a detailed literature review from a range of disciplines relating to mentoring and aspirations and achievement. In part II, we evaluated the mentors' attitudes about the programme. In part III, we ran a 12-month longitudinal evaluation of the effect of the programme on the mentees.

Part I: Literature review

Our literature review revealed that:

- Positive aspirations play an important role in educational and professional achievement for all young people. This is a powerful rationale for programmes such as Mosaic, which aims at improving aspirations.
- Although the precise relationship between aspirations and ethnicity remains unclear, BME groups in particular find it difficult to turn their aspirations

into reality – this is called 'the aspirations-attainment gap'. This gap is at least partly caused by a lack of information about how to realise those ambitions, too few role models, and importantly, no contacts (or 'social capital') to bridge into other professions.

- 'Soft skills' – personality traits, social graces, communication, language, personal habits, friendliness, and optimistic outlook – are increasingly important for success at school and in the current job market. They can mitigate other socio-economic disadvantages.

- Although there is growing recognition of the potential of mentoring, most evaluations of mentoring programmes have not found significant changes to participants' immediate behaviour or direct outcomes (such as school grades). We believe this is because these evaluations have not measured the things that mentoring might be expected to impact: aspirations, a sense of agency, and soft skills. This evaluation is one of the first independent evaluations designed specifically to measure the effect of mentoring on these attributes.

Part II: Mentor evaluation

The purpose of the mentor survey was to gain a deeper understanding of the aspirations, motivations, and needs of the mentors; to assess the benefits of the scheme for the mentors on a personal and professional level; and to conduct a statistical analysis of what factors might account for a successful mentoring relationship.

Mentors were asked to fill in a response survey about their experience of the mentoring scheme. The questions covered a range of topics including the mentor's views about the programme, the benefits of taking part, and the mentor's perceived effect on the mentee. In total, 61 mentors returned the survey, between December 2009 and December 2010.

- **On the whole it appears that the Mosaic schemes are very well run and respond to the needs of the mentors who take part.** Three-quarters of mentors either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with the statement: 'I feel supported in this mentoring programme'. Almost everyone thought that the initial mentoring brief offered at the start of the programme was either 'useful' or 'very useful' – only two thought that it was not useful. Similarly, the majority said the mentoring training offered to them in assisting them in their role as mentor was 'useful' or 'very useful'.

- **98 per cent of the mentors would recommend that other people become mentors, and 96 per cent said they would consider mentoring with Mosaic again.** This should be set against research findings in other mentoring programmes which consistently show that mentor 'burn-out' or fatigue is a major problem, and often causes high drop out levels which is bad for both mentor and mentee.[1]

- **87 per cent of the mentors (52 out of 60) said that the mentoring programme had met their expectations.** Of the 52, eight went further, saying it had exceeded their expectations. Only seven said that it hadn't met their expectations.

- **The overwhelming majority reported that being a mentor had given them extra personal and professional skills**, most notably a better understanding of young people today; a feeling that they are giving something back; improved communication skills; and improved personal well-being.[2] The majority reported improvements in professional skills.[3] Notably, good networking opportunities; improved interpersonal skills; increased motivation; and help to build a CV.

- **The majority reported that they felt their mentoring role had made a difference to the mentee.[4]** Most significantly in improving their mentee's motivation; opening new horizons; creating a more positive attitude toward work; and creating a more positive attitude toward learning.

  Mentors join the Mosaic programme for a variety of reasons, but the most common answers related to improving young people's aspirations in life and making a difference. As such, they appear to take part for mainly altruistic reasons. Importantly, mentors reported that these aspirations were largely met: 80 per cent of mentors reported that they felt they were 'giving something back'. As noted above, mentors themselves did claim to have noticed improvements in their mentees too. That mentors' reasons for joining were on the whole fulfilled is an extremely positive find.

  In our survey, we identified areas which – although not statistically significant – do seem to have an impact on the success of the scheme. This includes:

- The longer an individual has been a mentor, the better the improvements in personal and professional improvements for the mentee

- Mentoring for more hours increases the mentee's motivation and confidence, and also increases a number of professional/personal skills

- A good match between the mentor and mentee tends to result in improvements in the personal and social skills and a more positive attitude towards work by the mentee. It also improves the mentee's personal skills and possibly by giving a more positive attitude to lifelong learning.

- If the mentor felt that the mentee had an 'about right' expectation about the mentor, the mentee was more likely to have an educational benefit across several measures.

- If the mentor felt the goals and objectives of the programme were clearly defined, the mentee benefited personally and professionally compared to those who did not.

Part III: Mentee evaluation

We undertook a 12 month longitudinal survey of mentees. In particular we examined the affect the mentoring had on mentees' aspirations for the future, attitudes towards work and careers, and personal agency.

Participants were surveyed twice: a baseline survey (wave 1) at the outset of the programmes, and a final survey (wave 2). Wave 1 was carried out between November 2009 and March 2010, when mentees were about to start the mentoring programme. Wave 2 was carried out 12 months later.

In order to test the effect the programme has on participants more effectively, we also created a 'control' group of non-participants who were not mentored, and surveyed them on the same questions. This allows for more rigorous examination of the effects of the programmes, because it allows researchers to capture changes in the responses and compare them to the control group. It is considered the best way to robustly assess the affects of any given project of this type. The control group was surveyed at the same time as the mentored group.

In wave 1 we received 203 returns from mentored students, and 56 from the non-mentored control group. In wave 2 we received 63 returns from the mentored group, and 31 returns from the non-mentored control group.

The survey revealed a number of improvements in specific areas of mentees' lives that we consider was a direct result of the mentoring programme.

- **Overall, there were noticeable increases in a range of positive outcomes for mentees.** Being mentored contributed to a noticeable, but not quite statistically significant, increase in the likelihood that the mentees would like to attend university, be more confident and happier in 12 months time, improve their views on school, and enhance their general happiness and sense of well being.

- **Being on the mentoring programme was associated with a 10.7 per cent increase (relative to their starting point) in the likelihood of mentees wanting to go university after being on the mentoring programme**, but it is not possible to show this with statistical confidence. However, it is important to note that the control group (those not on the mentoring programme) witnessed a slight decrease in the likelihood of wanting to attend university.

- **Mentees demonstrated a 17 per cent relative increase in their view of the likelihood of getting in to a university if they applied, and a 9.8 per cent relative increase in the mentees' views that they would be happier in 12 months time.**

- **The correlation between receiving free school meals and low levels of personal expectations is reduced over the course of the programme.** The correlation between having free school meals and a range of negative beliefs (such as confidence in finding a job on leaving school and attitudes toward school) wore off over the course of the programme. One of the key benefits to the mentees from being mentored is that it mitigates against the belief that economic disadvantage is a barrier to achievement.

  Finally, it is worth pointing out that in none of the areas surveyed was mentoring responsible for any negative impacts in the mentees' lives. Surveys of other mentoring programmes have sometimes revealed that poorly designed mentoring programmes can result in negative outcomes for participants. That is not the case here.

  The results also revealed some specific attributes of the programme that were correlated to positive outcomes:

- The more face to face time the mentor and mentee spent together, the greater the mentees' belief they would be happier in 12 months' time; and the greater the positive impact on mentees' attitudes to school.

- Having a mentor they described as 'inspirational' increased the likelihood that mentees would want to go to university following the programme.

- Having a mentor they described as 'successful' had a strong impact on the mentees' confidence in finding a job. This also had a significant impact on whether mentees felt they faced barriers to what they could achieve in life .

It is important to state that these analyses should be interpreted with some prudence. Most statistical tests assume a 'normal distribution' (otherwise known as a bell curve), which these data do not have. This means that many students were grouped at one end of the spectrum, often scoring quite high on many measures. The skewed distribution of our sample (i.e. that the mentees scored positive results on most of our questions before starting the programme) suggests that there was less room for improvement between wave one and wave two, and this might explain why the improvement might not have been as visible as expected. The poor response rates from schools with less aspirational students is an important factor here. This, we believe, may have implications for how the mentoring programme is targeted in future and certainly on the design of any future evaluation. Moreover, there were some high correlations between the 'dependent variables' (in this case the outcomes we were looking for) and the independent variables (such as religion and ethnicity). A bigger sample group would allow us to be more confident in isolating the effect of the mentoring.

Implications

Overall, we recommend that the mentoring programme continue, because there are a number of positive outcomes associated with it for both mentees and mentors. This is particularly true given the positive effect the mentoring has on various measures of aspiration and agency, which our research demonstrated are extremely important for long-term achievement.

However, there are a number of specific recommendations that could improve the positive impact of the scheme:

- Mentoring programmes must be tightly targeted at individuals who can benefit most from the mentoring relationship in order to maximise effectiveness. Clarity about the impacts that the mentoring programme has, and for whom, as supported by this research, should be used to identify with schools those participants most in need of such support.

- Increasing the frequency of face-to-face contact between mentor and mentee will improve the impact for mentors and mentees alike. Seventy-one per cent of mentors reported they spent less than one hour a week with their mentee. Although the programme scored well in every area we asked about, the mentors agreed least with the statements that 'the time commitment for each interaction is just right' (3.2/5) and 'we meet regularly' (3.2/5). (It is to be noted, however, that both scores are still positive.)

- Use the evidence of the skills, qualities and motivations of mentors most associated with positive outcomes in this research to drive recruitment and selection of mentors (such as the important of being viewed as successful)

- Use the positive evidence of the benefits to mentors' professional skills identified in this paper – particularly the good networking opportunities, improved interpersonal skills and increased motivation - in corporate recruitment drives.

This evaluation also provides important lessons for other providers of mentoring programmes:

- Mentoring programmes should focus on helping people develop soft skills, aspirations, and create bonding capital**.** Many mentoring programmes focus on 'hard' indicators of behaviour change or educational attainment, but should also include more achievable aims such as the development of soft skills, higher aspiration and a greater sense of personal agency. These skills take time to translate into changes in individual outcomes, but as noted above, are an increasingly important part of success in today's society.

- Programmes must ensure that there is a positive benefit associated for the mentor as well as the mentee. The majority of mentors surveyed reported that being a mentor improved their own personal skills and professional skills. This may explain why burnout rate, often a problem in other mentoring schemes, is not a problem for Mosaic – and why so many mentors expressed an desire to continue mentoring, and to recommend it to others.

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND

In order to inform the research into mentoring programmes, we undertook a detailed literature review in a range of disciplines relating to the importance of aspirations and other 'soft skills', and what impact mentoring and other aspiration raising programmes can have in this regard. The focus on Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, aspirations and soft skills is taken because of its relevance for the Mosaic projects.

Professional and academic aspirations

As a whole, BME groups constitute some of the most deprived and disadvantaged communities in the UK, although the pattern is not uniform.

The percentage of pupils in the UK gaining five or more A*-C at GCSE was lowest among Carribean (41.7 per cent), Pakistani (43.2 per cent) African (48.3 per cent) and Bangledeshi (52.7 per cent). Men of Bangledeshi and black Carribean ethnicity were the least likely to have a degree (11 per cent for each group). Pupils from black Carribean and other black groups were also among the most likely to be exluded from school. [5] However, this obscures a complex picture. Research undertaken by the Runnymede Trust in 2009 found that 'poor white' boys perform worse in school than black and Asian boys of a similar socio-economic background, which prompted a political debate about how far class was a more important barrier to social advancement than race or ethnicity.[6]

For Muslim students, academic performance is low, but improving. Explanations are usually given in terms of poverty, social deprivation and language difficulties, but there are further obstacles to their full achievement of potential that relate more specifically to their experiences as Muslims. These might include the lack of Muslim role models in schools, the low expectations that some teachers have of Muslim students, and the lack of recognition of students' Muslim identity.[7]

BME children also experience high levels of the risk factors associated with child poverty, which also impacts academic and professional achievement. Fifty-three percent of all BME households are the most severely overcrowded.[8] For Muslims at school, 42 per cent live in crowded accommodation, compared to 12 per cent for the population overall, and over one third are growing up in households where there are no adults in employment compared to 17 per cent for all dependent children.[9] Muslims

are more likely to live in socially rented housing than all other faith groups and report the highest rates of illness of all faith groups, and have the highest rates of disability.[10]

In terms of unemployment, men from Black Carribean, Black African, Bangledeshi, and mixed ethnic groups have the highest unemployment rate, typically around three times that of White British men.[11] Muslims are the most disadvantaged faith group in the British labour market: Bangladeshi and Pakistani women have the highest working-age economic inactivity rates in Great Britiain (75 per cent and 69 per cent respectively).[12] Muslims aged 16 to 24 years were over twice as likely as Christians of the same age to be unemployed – 28 per cent, compared with 11 per cent.

Of those that are employed, job prospects are not high. The groups with the lowest proportions of managers or professionals in the workplace were Black Carribeans, Black Africans, and Bangladeshis (between 19-22 per cent).[13] For Muslims, it is estimated that 40 per cent are in the lowest occupation groups, are among the least likely to be in a managerial or professional job and the most likely to be in low skilled jobs.[14]

This short review does not permit us to assess the underlying causes behind these figures, and caution is advised. In respect of Muslims, it also encompasses a balance between the desire to retain their religious identity and integrate successfully into British society.[15] Some academics argue that organisational culture in the UK favours people who are prepared to work long hours, spend time away from home and go out drinking with colleagues and clients, which many Muslim men and women find difficult to do.[16] Other research, however, contradicts the view that there is a conflict between Muslim cultural values and the ability to succeed in employment/education. Indeed, research undertaken by the University of Bristol suggests that Muslim identity/values can be an impetus to succeed. For many young Muslims their religious practice and particularly their reading of the Quran gives them a strong motivation for pursuing education and to perform well academically.[17] As a result, it is important to avoid generalisations about Muslim cultures, as the report concludes: 'Islam in Britain is finely poised between a religion of a ghetto and a religion of social mobility a kind of Protestant work ethic capable of sustaining the hope and discipline that the taking up of opportunities required.'

Aspirations and soft skills

While a considerable amount of work has been dedicated to understanding the structural and socio-economic deprevation underlying these figures, more recent work has focussed on the importance of young people's aspirations and soft skills.

Aspirations

Educational and career aspirations developed during adolescence have life-long significance. Young people with higher educational aspirations, or whose parents have greater expectations of them, are more motivated and tend to attain higher levels of education than their peers.[18] Increasingly, 11-14 is recognised as a key age range, when young people move from idealistic to more realistic ambitions.[19]

The power of aspirations to mitigate socio-economic disadvantage was first explored expansively in the National Child Development Study. This was a longitudinal study of children started in 1958. It collected over 13,000 essays written by children when they were 11 in 1969 asking them to imagine their life at 25, their interests, home life, as well as to complete a survey on their current expectation on leaving school. The essays were later compared with the lives of the 42 year old 'former children'. The study found a clear a link between what people aspired to do at 11 years of age and what they ended up doing late in life. Of those with professional aspirations at 11, half were in professional occupations at 42, with only 29 per cent of those who had no professional aspirations (after controlling for wealth, background, and so on).[20] Given the importance of aspirations, it is of concern that a 2009 Prince's Trust poll of over 2000 young people found that one in ten think that their life has no meaning or purpose – and this is especially true of people who are not in education, employment or training. [21]

Establishing precise causality between aspirations and attainment is difficult because high aspirations are both a cause and effect of prior achievement: '[aspirations] are both a predictor and a product of one's abilities, personal attributes, socialisation and experiences'.[22] People from wealthy backgrounds tend to have higher aspirations, which compounds any advantages they already have. Indeed, a 2008 Cabinet Office study found that parents with few financial resources tend to hold lower educational expectations for their children and that young people from socially disadvantaged backgrounds also tend to have lower expectations.[23]

The aspirations of young people in the United Kingdom are varied. Some studies suggest that, on the whole, White working class boys have the lowest aspirations of all groups, and their educational attainment is failing to improve at the rates of ethnic minorities. A recent report by the Department for Children, Families and Schools found that *more* young people from lower income groups want to go to higher education than higher income groups. The report suggests, as a result, that social background is not always shaping aspirations the way that some theories predict – at least in terms of income.[24] Often the neighbourhood is as important as the ethnicity. Young people in certain types of neighbourhood – principally deprived ones – are less likely to develop high aspirations. However, not all deprived communities are the same. In some very deprived communities – often ethnically diverse, mobile, urban neighbourhoods – young people tend to have high aspirations for the future. [25]

This suggests the difference between aspirations and attainment (dubbed the 'aspirations-attainment gap') is extremely important. This gap is prevalent for all ethnicities, but is especially noted among minority students, and may be a contributing factor in post-secondary education participation disparities.[26] Previous studies, primarily in US urban schools, have attributed this phenomenon to a lack of information, lack of academic preparation, and students' perceptions on a lack of return of education. Many do not know the pathways to their ambitions, nor do they know the support available to them at their institutions of higher education. Frustrated ambitions can lead to discouragement and pointless drifting.[27]

In the UK, an Equal Opportunities Commission paper (2007) concluded that organisational discrimination is also a cause of the aspirations-attainment gap, particularly for women. Their research suggests that in the UK, young Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Black Caribbean women share the ambitions of white females – and are doing well academically – but their employment and pay hopes are not commensurate. [28]

Aspirations are not always about exam results and going to university. This has been demonstrated in respect of entrepreneurial aspiration. There are higher aspirations to start up in business amongst BME groups, especially Black African (35 per cent) and Black Caribbean (18 per cent) groups (compared with 10 per cent for White British Counterparts), but 'conversion' to start-ups remains very low.[29]

Aspirations are more likely to be acted on when one thinks they could be realised: the level of motivation to take action towards real life and everyday goals is largely governed by our expectations that such action will result in success.[30] Aspirations need to be accompanied by a sense of autonomy or, as it is often called in psychological literature, a 'locus of control'.[31] This refers to a person's belief about what causes good or bad things in his or her life and how far an individual controls it.[32] This is often associated with a closely related concept 'application', which is the ability to concentrate, motivate, and discipline oneself in persevering to complete any given task. This could, in part, explain the prevalence of the aspirations-attainment gap.

The capacity to exercise control over the nature and quality of one's life is a strong determinant of self-development, adaptation and self-renewal. Bandura's social-cognitive theory of self-efficacy, for example, states that unless people believe that they can produce desired outcomes by their actions, they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties: 'students' belief in their efficacy to regulate their own learning and to master academic activities determine their aspirations, level of motivation, and academic accomplishments.'[33]

This sense of agency is also important at the group level. The stronger the perceived collective efficacy, the higher the group's aspirations and motivational investment in their undertakings, the stronger their staying power in the face of impediments and setbacks, the higher their morale, and the greater their performance accomplishments.[34] While it has not been studied extensively, it is possible that this collective sense of agency acts as a negative influence on Muslim and other BME groups.

Soft skills

A number of studies in the last decade have shown that the secret to success is not necessarily high intelligence, but having passion, motivation and capacity to persist. [35] These are often referred to as 'soft skills' or the 'emotional intelligence quotient'. They are the cluster of personality traits, social graces, communication, language, personal habits, friendliness, and optimistic outlook, which are often more important than the technical requirements of a job. Success at school and in the current job market is dependent on these skills.

Soft skills do not negate the importance of traditional 'hard skills' such as literacy and numeracy, but act as an addition and can mitigate the lack of them. These skills, as well as being important for academic and professional

success, are also correlated positively with other, more general, measures of well-being and happiness, financial responsibility, and health.[36]

The long-term shift in the UK economy (principally towards services) has put an increased premium on certain soft skills, for example the ability to work well in a team. [37] The Institute for Public Policy Research compared longitudinal studies from 1958 and 1970 and found that in just over a decade, personal and social skills became 33 times more important in determining relative life chances – but that the opportunities to develop these capabilities appears to have narrowed in lower income households.[38]

Young people are more likely to achieve positive outcomes when they develop ambitious, achievable aspirations, combined with the self-esteem, self-efficacy, information and inspiration they need to persevere towards their goals. This is lacking for many young people, particularly in lower income households. Indeed, the knowledge that year 7 students have of the relationship between occupations and the qualifications they require is very low, as is the understanding of educational pathways post-14, across all groups.[39]

There remains a tension between how important individual agency/control is for someone to achieve their aims in life and the extent to which the wider socio-economic environment prevents or enables them to do so. Indeed, it is important to recognise the contextual influences of issues such as social class, intelligence, sex, ethnicity, race and racism. Both are clearly important, and the relative 'weight' of each cannot be precisely determined and varies from person to person.

Aspiration, agency and soft skills can be developed in a range of settings. School is not the only place, though it is important. Family and wider support to encourage young people to think higher aspirations are important too. Recent Cabinet Office research suggests that attitudes, values, aspirations and sense of self-efficacy are developed by our interaction with the immediate environment around us: our parents, peers and role models.[40]

A lack of information, ideas, and personal contacts can hinder people from turning aspirations into concrete plans. Many young people and parents lack information about how to achieve their goals, which can be particularly problematic when combined with other disadvantage. An absence of a broader and more diverse network of contacts outside the immediate neighbourhood can mean that young people lack access to valuable sources

of inspiration, information and opportunity.[41] This is sometimes referred to as 'bridging' social capital – those links with people outside their own immediate circle who can help them. While ethnic minority groups tend to have high 'bonding' social capital (within groups), it is the lack of a bridge outside it which can a barrier.

Interest in the issue of social capital has grown in recent years. While it has not been studied extensively, the question of bridging social capital is clearly significant. A recent Young Foundation report analysed the employment experience of second generation British Muslim women. They concluded that British Muslim women do not have ready access to support helping them understand and enter the labour market, job searches, interview techniques, mentoring support, awareness of training, and employment opportunities. It is of particular interest that 45 per cent of those who were in work had learned about their first job through a family member or friend – highlighting the importance of social networks.[42] Other recent (small scale) research has also found that middle class Muslim parents have broader social networks which are cross class and cross ethnic – in contrast to working class Muslim parents, whose networks are co-ethnic.[43]

Mentoring and aspirations

Mentoring and aspiration-raising programmes cover many, often quite different, types of intervention. Most have in common 'the idea of a trusting relationship that involves a more experienced person helping and providing a role-model for someone less experienced'.[44]

Mentoring occurs of course informally in every society, but in recent years it has taken a more formal sense, and become a tool for helping to deliver basic competencies that enable young people to participate in society and overcome barriers especially within education and employment. It has become especially popular with policy makers as an intervention with disadvantaged young people. As one scholar points out, 'the very word mentor has acquired a mythical status'.[45]

In response to the growing recognition of the importance of mentoring, the National Mentoring Network was established in 1994 to promote local mentoring schemes and the development of a national infrastructure. Where once mentors used to be almost exclusively amateur, there is now a growing tendency towards professionalisation with the development of college and even university courses in mentoring and youth work. The Mentoring &

Befriending Foundation estimates there are over 5000 mentoring programmes in the United Kingdom, including 600 member organisations.

In recognition of its potential, the Department for Children, Schools and Families in 2009 launched a new strategy to expand initiatives to help vulnerable groups of young people to get the most out of mentoring and work experience placements, including £10 million that will be made available to support organisations that respond to the needs of young people, especially those who provide new approaches to linking business to schools, increasing access to the world of work and professions.[46]

There is a wealth of anecdotal evidence about the benefits of mentoring: that it can improve the likelihood that young people will stay in learning post 16, that it can help engage young people, and can significantly impact on aspirations and achievement, especially in respect of improving sources of information and advice.

However, there remains a lack of independently researched, robust data about mentoring schemes in the UK. This is particularly true of broader aspiration programmes, which although often asserted to be positive, have rarely been tested. There is also very little written on Muslim specific youth work aside from Muslim parenting manuals, religious activism worker training materials, and information from Islamic websites.

Three recent large scale studies offer some indication of the expected benefits of mentoring work. (More detail about the three studies, and the schemes to which they refer, can be found in the Annex). These evaluations suggest that mentoring works for some of the people some of the time – but what it can achieve should not be exaggerated. Overall, mentoring programmes have produced only modest benefits for participating youth: structural constraints continue to exert a powerful influence on the trajectories of such vulnerable young people, in particular the influence of poverty, early childhood difficulties, inequalities, gender stereotypes, and racism. These continue to influence to a large extent an individual's outlook and prospects.[47] With such entrenched difficulties, the evaluations recommend that mentoring is part of a wider package of support.

However, the relatively minor benefits recorded in these evaluations may partly due to what is being measured. Many of the benefits of mentoring are not measurable (or at least have not been attempted to be measured). It is telling that one thing comes out strongly: in general the kids themselves find

mentoring to be a positive experience and they enjoy benefits that are often unanticipated.[48]

These unanticipated benefits are rarely captured because they are not factored into the assessment process formulated at the creation of the scheme. For example, the Youth Justice Board reviewed programmes, which aimed explicitly at reducing recidivism, showed that 55 per cent of mentored young people committed further offences within one year. However, the projects succeeded in other respects, such as reintegrating the targeted young people into education, training and the community, none of which were part of the stated aims. Likewise, in the *Mentoring Plus* evaluation, most of the projects identified other gains, including improvements in attendance and behaviour at school, increases in literacy and numeracy and improvements in family relationships. Increased involvement in community activities such as sports, clubs, social groups and voluntary organisations at school or in the community was reported for 50 per cent of BME mentees overall.[49] In many cases, the unintended consequences can end up being more beneficial than the stated aims.

For the mentor, too, there are well documented benefits, including enhanced coaching, counselling listening and modelling skills; a sense of worth; work experience for a future career; and a sense of personal satisfaction.

Summary

The review reveals that BME groups constitute some of the most deprived and disadvantaged communities in the UK in respect of professional and academic achievement, although the pattern is not uniform. Overall, however, in terms of many of the most basic indicators (performance at GCSE level, numbers of exclusions, holding a degree, unemployment levels, proportion of managers and professionals) Black Caribbean, Black African, Pakistani and Bangladeshi in particular fare poorly. When broken down according to religion, Muslims are the most disadvantaged of all faith groups.

It is increasingly recognised that aspirations play an important role in educational and professional achievement for all young people. The precise relationship between aspirations and ethnicity remains unclear, as income and neighbourhood are also important. In fact, some research hints that BME groups have on average *higher* aspirations than other groups.

However, BME groups in particular find it difficult to turn their aspirations into reality – this is called 'the aspirations-attainment gap'. This gap is at least partly caused by a lack of information about how to realise those ambitions, too few role-models, and importantly, no contacts (or 'social capital') to bridge into other professions.

Emerging research has also demonstrated that 'soft-skills' – personality traits, social graces, communication, language, personal habits, friendliness, and optimistic outlook – are increasingly important for success at school and in the current job market. They can mitigate against other socio-economic disadvantage.

In respect of mentoring, there is growing recognition within government of the potential of various types of mentoring programmes, most recently signalled by the Department for Children, Schools and Families' new *Quality Choice and Aspirations* strategy. However, on the whole, there remains a lack of robust evaluations with which to test the efficacy of mentoring programmes, and those that have been undertaken tend to find fairly limited benefits in terms of immediate behaviour change and improved performance.

CHAPTER 2: SURVEY OF MENTORS

The purpose of the mentor survey was to get a deeper understanding of the aspirations, motivations, and needs of the mentors; to assess the benefits of the scheme for the mentors on a personal and professional level; and to conduct a statistical analysis of what factors might account for a successful mentoring relationship.

Other research into mentoring schemes have shown that the recruitment, matching, and well-being of mentors is a vital component of any successful scheme. Indeed, research findings in other mentoring programmes consistently show that mentor 'burn-out' or fatigue is a major problem, and often causes high drop out levels which is bad for both mentor and mentee.[50]

Mentors were asked to fill in a response survey about their experience of the mentoring scheme. The questions covered a range of topics including the mentor's views about the programme, the benefits of taking part, and the mentor's perceived effect on the mentee. In total, 61 mentors returned the survey, between December 2009 and December 2010.

This analysis was conducted through basic vital statistics (calculating percentages). The more complex task of working out what aspects of the programme had a positive effect on the mentee was done through cross-tabulations. This means identifying the relationship between a dependent variable, in this case whether the mentor perceived that they had 'made a difference to the mentee', and an independent variable, which will include the number of hours tutoring a week and the reasons the respondent chose to be a mentor.

Section one is comprised of the baseline characteristics of mentors; section two is comprised of the mentors' views about the programme; and section three is an analysis of what factors might account for a successful mentoring scheme.

Personal information

Demographics

While the most commonly occurring age is 22 (excluding the 'not stated'), the average (mean and median) age of the mentors is 32 (excluding the 'not stated'). In terms of gender profile, 46 per cent of the mentors are male. A majority of the mentors were Asian or Asian British, with Pakistani being the

largest single ethnic category. White British was the second largest single category.

Employment

Mentors were asked what their current status was. 56 out of 61 reported themselves as working. Of the remaining five, one was unemployed and the other four were studying. Of the 56 working mentors, 53 stated whether or not they were employees or self-employed. Forty one (77 per cent) were employees; the remaining 12 were self-employed. Fifty of the working mentors were working full-time, with the remaining 6 working part-time. Two of the four students also stated that they worked part time. Only three mentors, all working full time, responded to a question about their weekly take home pay, so we will not include results.

Qualifications

Mentors were asked about the qualifications they hold. Responses to this question can sum to over 100 per cent because mentors were able to list as many different types of qualification as they held. The mentors are a highly qualified group on average. Thirty-nine of the group have undergraduate degrees and 18 postgraduate degrees. None of the mentors had no qualifications at all. From the pattern of responses it looks like some of the mentors just listed the highest qualification they had rather than all their qualifications (the questionnaire being unclear on what the correct way to fill in the question was) – hence it is likely that more than 46 of the group have GCSEs, for example.

Language

Fifty-nine of the 61 mentors listed English as one of one of their first languages. Eighteen were bilingual, while 41 listed English as their only first language.

Religion

The mentors were asked whether they were practising Muslims. 51 out of the 61 mentors answered this question. Of those, 2 said they were ‘not sure’. Of the remainder who did answer, 38 were practising Muslims whereas 11 were not.

Mentors’ length of service

The table below gives the mentors’ responses to the question ‘how long have you been a mentor’

Table: Mentors’ length of service

How long a mentor	Mentor group	
	Number	%
Less than one week	1	1.6
Between one week and one month	4	6.6
Between one month and six months	32	52.5
Over 6 months	24	39.3
Total respondents	61	100.0

Most of the mentors had been mentoring for at least a month. A substantial minority (39 percent) had been mentoring for over 6 months.

Views about the programme

Why the mentors chose to take part

The table below gives mentors' responses to the question 'why did you choose to take part?' Mentors were allowed to tick as many reasons as they wished, so these responses sum to more than 100 per cent. One mentor failed to complete this question and so have not been included in this table.

Table: Why mentors chose to take part in the programme

Why did you choose to take part?	Mentor group	
	Number	%
Personal development	28	46.7
Professional development	16	26.7
I feel I can make a difference	42	70.0
To be a positive role model	40	66.7
To improve young people's aspirations in life	49	81.7
Good networking opportunities	17	28.3
Other	0	0.0
Total respondents	60	100.0

The most commonly cited reasons for taking part were 'to improve young people's aspirations in life', 'I feel I can make a difference', and 'to be a positive role model'.

Mentors' assessments of their mentees' expectations

Mentors were asked to give their opinion of their mentees' expectations of them. Three mentors did not answer this section. A majority of mentors felt their mentees' expectations of them were positive. The next most common responses were that the mentees' expectations were 'about right' or 'realistic'. Relatively few mentors said they were too low or too high.

Table: Mentors' assessment of mentees' expectations of them

Do you feel in general, your mentees' expectations of you are?	Mentor group	
	Number	%
Positive	36	62.07
Realistic	15	25.86
Too low	5	8.62
Too high	0	0.00
About right	20	34.48
Total respondents	58	100.0

Time spent on mentoring

Table: Time spent on mentoring

Hours per week spent on mentoring	Mentor group	
	Number	%
Less than 1 hour	43	71.7
1-3 hours	14	23.3
4 hours or more	3	5.0
Total respondents	22	100.0

The mentoring programme takes up relatively little time in most cases – less than one hour a week.

Mentors' opinions of the programme

Mentors were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements regarding the mentoring programme. Their responses to each statement could range from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). All the statements were positive about some aspect of the programme; this means that if a high proportion of mentors agreed with each statement, which suggests that they have a positive view of the programme.

Table: Mentors' opinions of the mentoring programme

	% of respondents in category						
Statement	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Average**	**N**
Goals/objective clearly defined	1.6	11.5	14.8	49.2	23	**3.8**	61
I feel supported in this mentoring programme	0	4.9	21.3	42.6	31.1	**4**	61
The time commitment for each interaction is just right	3.3	23	36.1	31.1	6.6	**3.2**	61
The match	3.3	10	40	38.3	8.3	**3.4**	60

between my mentees works							
The overall expected outcomes for the programme are realistic	0	7	31.6	50.9	10.5	**3.7**	60
The programme works for me	0	13.1	18	50.8	18	**3.7**	61
The match between my mentees and I meets my needs	1.7	11.9	39	37.3	10.2	**3.4**	59
We meet regularly	3.3	25	35	20	16.7	**3.2**	60
We come prepared to use the time effectively	0	8.2	21.3	47.5	23	**3.9**	61
We are confident about what to do when we start	0	8.6	20.7	37.9	32.8	**4**	58
My mentees understand what I am saying	0	5	5	60	30	**4.2**	60
We have meaningful conversations	0	3.3	16.7	53.3	26.7	**4**	60
I am in control of the things we talk about	0	4.9	19.7	55.7	19.7	**3.9**	61

Notes: 1 = disagree strongly; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = agree strongly

The results suggest that mentors have a positive view of the programme overall. There was only a response of 'strong' disagreement for five of the statements and this was at maximum by two respondents out of 60. For all but two responses the proportion of mentors agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statements was at least 40 per cent. The two cases where it was lower was concerning time commitments and meeting regularly.

Things the mentor has gained from the programme

Mentors were asked whether the mentoring programme had given them extra personal skills. Thirty-nine of the 61 mentors said it had, 5 that it hadn't, and the other 17 that it was too early to say. For the 39 mentors who

said the programme had given them extra skills, the table below analyses the particular skills that they listed.

Table: Personal skills gained from the programme

Personal skills gained from the programme	**Mentor group**	
	Number	%
Better understanding of young people today	29	74.4
Feel that I'm giving something back	31	79.5
Increased confidence	8	20.5
Increased motivation	11	28.2
Improved communication skills	12	30.8
Better personal well-being	11	28.2
Other	2	5.1
Total respondents	39	100.0

By far the most commonly cited skills were better understanding of young people today and the feeling that the mentor was giving something back. Mentors were also asked whether the mentoring programme had improved their understanding and awareness of certain key concepts relating to it (whether it had given them extra personal skills or not). The table below details the responses to this question.

Table: ways in which the programme has improved mentors' understanding and awareness

Overall the mentoring programme has made me...	**Mentor group**	
	Number	%
More aware of education and school-related issues	28	45.9
Better able to understand and appreciate the issues students face	32	52.5
Better able to understand and appreciate the issues teenagers face	25	41
Better able to relate to teenagers	22	36.1
More aware of my own values and better able to understand them	19	31.1
Feel better about myself for having participated	20	33.3
Value the contact with fellow mentors	23	37.7
Total respondents	61	100.0

The most common improvements were being better able to understand and appreciate the issues students face, being more aware of education and school-related issues and being better able to relate to teenagers.

Mentors were also asked whether being a mentor had given them extra *professional* skills. Mentors broadly said that it had (with two respondents not answering). 23 mentors said that it had, 15 that it hadn't, and 21 that it was too early to say. For the 23 mentors who had gained extra professional skills, the table below lists which ones.

Table: Professional skills gained from the programme

Professional skills gained from the programme	**Mentor group**	
	Number	%
Good networking opportunities	13	56.5
Helps to build a CV	10	43.5
Improved interpersonal skills	13	56.5
Increased confidence	9	39.1
Increased motivation	12	52.2
Other	0	0
Total respondents	23	100.0

Networking opportunities and improved interpersonal skills were the most commonly cited professional skills enhanced by the programme. Mentors who had not gained extra professional skills from the programme were asked why not and given several options (e.g. it takes up too much of my time, don't have the skills/training, etc.) but only one respondent answered this question so the response rate is too small to be analysed.

Mentors' assessments of benefits of mentoring to the mentees

Mentors were asked whether they thought their mentoring role had made a difference to the mentee. Thirty-two said that it had, 2 that it hadn't, 25 said it was too early to say. Those who said it had were asked what the specific benefits of mentoring to the mentees were. Responses are shown in the table below.

Table: Mentors' assessments of benefits of programme to the mentees

Suggested benefits of programme to the mentees	**Mentor group**	
	Number	%
Educational:		
Improved concentration at school	7	21.9
More motivated	22	68.8
More likely to succeed	12	37.5
Opened new horizons for them	20	62.5
More confidence	18	56.3
Happier at school	4	12.5
Happier at home/with friends	2	6.3
Getting better grades at school	6	18.8

Total respondents (education section)	32	100.0
Professional/personal:		
More positive attitude towards work	14	50.0
Greater awareness of the importance of customers	6	21.4
Greater understanding of employers' needs	5	17.9
Improved self-presentation	8	28.6
Better self-esteem	11	39.3
More positive attitude toward lifelong learning	14	50.0
Better interview skills	3	10.7
Total respondents (professional/personal section)	28	100.0

The most commonly perceived educational benefits of the programme were more confidence and more motivation. The most commonly cited professional benefit was a more positive attitude towards work and towards lifelong learning.

Mentors were asked how useful the initial mentoring brief was. Almost everyone (57) said it was either useful or very useful. Eighteen said it was very useful. Only two said it wasn't useful at all. Two mentors didn't respond. Sixteen mentors said that the training offered in assisting them in their role as a mentor was very useful, 38 that it was useful, and only five said that it wasn't useful. Two mentors didn't respond.

Forty-four mentors said that the mentoring programme had met their expectations. Eight went further, saying it had exceeded their expectations. Only seven said that it hadn't met their expectations. Two mentors didn't respond. Almost all the mentors (58) said they would recommend that other people become a mentor; only two said they wouldn't recommend this. Fifty-seven said that they would consider mentoring with Mosaic again.

What helps make a good mentoring programme?

'What works' in respect of mentoring programmes is a contentious subject. From the available literature on the subject, it appears that the following general principles are significant:

- Mentoring needs to start from the needs of young people and answer directly their needs and abilities. Schemes also need to provide genuine incentives for young people to take part;
- The needs and motivations of mentors must also be taken into account, and mentors and mentees must be carefully matched;

Mentoring needs to be part of a package of care – it is most effective when it is part of a rich structure of provision at the local level. This will also help to attract those people to mentoring who would not normally be interested;

- Longevity and trust is key to the success of mentoring schemes. Relationships must be built on trust rather than objectives, and funding needs to be long-term and sustained.

Our survey has allowed us to test some of the factors that might account for a positive mentoring relationship. This analysis is conducted through cross-tabulations. This means identifying the relationship between a dependent variable, in this case whether the mentor perceived that they had 'made a difference to the mentee', and an independent variable, which includes the number of hours tutoring a week and the reasons the respondent chose to be a mentor.

Due to the limited response rate, it is only possible to create a broad idea around the factors that lead to an improvement in the mentee. Furthermore, we do need to bear in mind that we use the mentors' *perception* of improvements in their mentees as a proxy measure for success.

Length of time an individuals had been a mentor

In the questionnaire, mentors were asked how long they had been mentoring for. Most respondents stated that they had been a mentor for either between 'one month and six months', or 'over six months'. Taking these as the two main groups, this section looks at the perceived difference a mentor makes on a mentee if we look at how long the mentor has been a mentee for.

Table: Does the amount of time a person has been mentoring for affect the educational improvement of the mentee?

	More motivated (%)	**Opened new horizons (%)**	**More confidence (%)**	**Number**
Between one month and six months	72.2	61.1	55.6	18
Over 6 months	71.4	71.4	57.1	14

Table: Does the amount of time a person has been mentoring for affect the professional/personal improvement of the mentee?

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	More positive attitude towards work (%)	More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)	Number
Between one month and six months	55.6	50.0	44.4	18
Over 6 months	70.0	60.0	70.0	10

The results show that the length of time an individual has been a mentor does not contribute to their making a perceived difference to mentees educationally. However, the longer an individual has been a mentor for does tend to have a positive association in making a perceived professional and personal difference.

Relationship between reasons for being a mentor and perceived difference in the mentee

The questionnaire asked respondents for their reasons for becoming a mentor. The most popular responses were 'to improve aspirations', 'be a positive role model' and because the mentor 'feels that they can make a difference'. This section looks at whether these three factors contribute to the respondent feeling that they have made a perceived difference to the mentee in educational or professional/personal terms.

Table: does feeling that 'I can improve aspirations' lead to the mentee improving educationally?

	More motivated (%)	Opened new horizons (%)	More confidence (%)	Number
Improve young people's aspirations in life	71.4	67.9	50.0	28
Not stated as a reason	66.7	33.3	83.3	6

These results show that if the mentor stated that they wanted to improve young people's aspirations they were more likely to state that they perceived they had 'opened new horizons' for their mentee. However, they were also less likely to say that they had had noticed an improvement in the confidence of the mentee.

Table: whether the mentee feels they can improve aspirations makes a difference to the mentee

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	**More positive attitude towards work (%)**	**More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)**	**Number**
Improve young people's aspirations in life	61.5	57.7	53.8	26
Not selected as reason	60.0	40.0	40.0	5

In terms of perceiving that they had made a difference professionally/personally to the mentee, respondents were more likely to state that they had noticed a more positive attitude towards work and lifelong learning if they had stated that one of their reasons for become a mentor was to improve young people's aspirations in life.

Table: Whether becoming a mentor in order 'to provide a role model' makes a difference to the mentee

	More motivated(%)	**Opened new horizons(%)**	**More confidence(%)**	**Number**
Provide role model	69.6	60.9	56.5	20
Not stated as reason	72.7	63.6	54.5	11

These results show that there is no real difference arising from the fact that, the respondent chose to become a mentor because they wanted to provide a role model, on the perceived difference educationally of the mentee.

Table: whether becoming a mentor 'to provide a role model' makes a professional/personal difference to the mentee

	Improved personal and social skills(%)	More positive attitude towards work (%)	More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)	Number
Provide role model	65.0	55.0	45.0	20
Not stated as reason	54.5	54.5	63.6	11

These results show that if a mentor joined to become a 'role model', the mentor was slightly less likely to perceive an improvement in the mentee's attitude to lifelong learning. For the other results there is no real statistical difference arising from the fact that, the respondent chose to become a mentor because they wanted to provide a role model, on the perceived difference in educational of the mentee.

Table: whether becoming a mentor because they feel that they can 'make a difference' has an effect on the mentee

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	More positive attitude towards work (%)	More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)	Number
Make difference	63.6	59.1	50.0	22
Not stated as reason	50.0	37.5	62.5	8

These results show that entering the mentor scheme because 'I feel I can make a difference' was related to being more likely to perceive a more positive attitude towards work by the mentee.

Perceived expectations of mentees about the mentor

This section looks at whether the expectations of the mentor affect the success of the programme.

Table: how the mentor perceives the mentee sees them, compared to making an educational difference to the mentee

	More motivated (%)	Opened new horizons (%)	More confidence (%)	Number
Positive	70.8	54.2	58.3	24
Realistic	66.7	44.4	55.6	9
About right	81.8	81.8	63.6	11

These results show that if the mentor felt that the mentee had an 'about right' expectation about the mentor, the mentor is most likely to identify an educational improvement in their mentee across several measures.

Table: whether the mentee's perception affects the success of the programme

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	More positive attitude towards work (%)	More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)	Number
Positive	63.6	59.1	40.9	22
Realistic	50	37.5	50	8
About right	50	50	80	10

These results show that if the mentor felt that the mentee had an 'about right' expectation about the mentor, then the mentor is more likely to identity a more positive attitude to lifelong learning in their mentee.

Time spent mentoring

This section looks at whether the amount of time mentors tutored for each week made a perceived difference to the mentee.

Table: Does the amount of time a mentor tutors for make an educational difference to the mentee?

	More motivated	Opened new horizons	More confidence	Number

	(%)	(%)	(%)	
Less than an hour	65.2	56.5	52.2	20
One-3 hours	87.5	62.5	62.5	9

Similarly, the results show that it is likely that tutoring for more hours increases motivation, but the number of respondents is too small to be significant.

Table: Does the amount of time a mentor tutors for make a professional/personal difference to the mentee?

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	More positive attitude towards work (%)	More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)	Number
Less than hour	55.0	45.0	45.0	20
1-3hours	77.8	77.8	55.6	9

The results suggest that tutoring for more hours increases a number of professional/personal skills: especially a positive attitude towards work and improved personal and social skills.

How the programme operated

The questionnaire asked the mentors to rate the mentoring programme. This section looks at the relationship between those results and perceived differences in the mentees. However, because of the low level of responses it is difficult to conclude on the statistical significance of these relationships.

Table: If the mentor believes that the time commitment for each interaction is just right perceive a difference in the mentee's personal/professional performance?

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	More positive attitude towards work (%)	More positive attitude to lifelong learning	Number

			(%)	
Agree that time commitment for each interaction is just right	66.7	75	58.3	12
Neutral or disagree that time commitment	57.9	42.1	47.4	19

These results suggest that having that agreeing that the time commitment is just right is positively associated with identifying a more positive attitude towards work amongst mentees.

Table: If the mentor believes that the 'match between my mentees works' do they perceive a difference in the mentee's personal/professional performance?

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	**More positive attitude towards work (%)**	**More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)**	**Number**
Agree that match between my mentees works	71.4	52.9	58.8	17
Neutral or disagree that match between my mentees works	52.9	57.1	42.9	14

The results give some support to the claim that having a good match between the mentees works, in terms of improved personal skills and possibly by giving a more positive attitude to lifelong learning.

Table: If the mentor believes that the 'programme works for me' do they perceive a difference in the mentee's educational performance?

	More motivated (%)	**Opened new horizons (%)**	**More confidence (%)**	**Number**
Agree that the 'programme works for me'	70.4	59.3	51.9	27

Neutral or disagree that the 'programme works for me'	71.4	71.4	71.4	7

These results suggest no real significant effect of feeling that the 'programme works for me' on whether the mentor perceives an educational difference in the mentee except possibly in terms of confidence.

Table: If the mentor believes that the 'match between my mentees and me meets my need' do they perceive a difference in the mentee's personal/professional performance?

	Improved personal and social skills (%)	**More positive attitude towards work (%)**	**More positive attitude to lifelong learning (%)**	**Number**
Agree that match between my mentees and I meets my needs	68.75	68.8	50	16
Neutral or disagree that match between my mentees and I meets my needs	50	42.9	50	14

The results give some broad support to the claim that having a good match between the mentor and mentee tends to lead to a perceived improvement in the personal and social skills and a more positive attitude towards work by the mentee.

These results suggest that the effect of feeling that the 'the match between my mentees and I meets my needs' on whether the mentor perceives an educational difference in the mentee is increasing confidence but reducing feeling that they have 'opened new horizons'.

Table: If the mentor agrees with the statement 'we meet regularly' do they perceive a difference in the mentee's personal/professional performance?

	Improved personal and	**More positive attitude**	**More positive**	**Number**

	social skills (%)	**towards work (%)**	**attitude to lifelong learning (%)**	
Agree that mentor meets regularly with mentee	70	40	40	10
Neutral or disagree that meet regularly	57.1	61.9	57.1	21

Surprisingly, the results do not seem to support the argument that meeting regularly is associated with a perceived improvement in the personal/professional performance of mentee.

CHATPER 3: SURVEY OF MENTEES

Method

Participants were surveyed twice: a baseline survey (wave 1) at the outset of the programmes, and a final survey (wave 2). Wave 1 was carried out between November 2009 – March 2010, when mentees were about to start the mentoring programme. Wave 2 was carried out 12 months later.

In order to test the effect the programme has on participants more effectively, we also created a 'control' group of non-participants who were not mentored, and surveyed them on the same questions. This allows for more rigorous examination of the effects of the programmes, because it allows researchers to capture changes in the responses and compare them to the control group. It is considered the best way to robustly assess the affects of any given project of this type. The control group was surveyed at the same time as the mentored group. In wave 1 we received 203 returns from mentored students, and 56 from the non-mentored control group. In wave 2 we received 63 returns from the mentored group, and 31 returns from the non-mentored control group.

It is important to state that these analyses should be interpreted with some prudence. First, most statistical tests assume a 'normal distribution' (otherwise known as a bell curve), which these data do not have, as many students were grouped at one end of the spectrum in the first wave (for example, most were already more likely to attend university than not). Second, there were some high correlations between the 'dependent variables' (in this case the outcomes we were looking for) and the independent variables (such as religion and ethnicity). A bigger sample group would allow us to be more confident in isolating the effect of the mentoring. Therefore, the statistical tests we ran can only give a general idea in the affect of the mentoring.

We ran three tests. To combat the unequal distribution of the data we used something called 'Pillai's trace value', which is used on 'left skewed distribution' data-sets. We used multi-variate analysis of covariance ('Mancova') tests to determine what factors made a difference in the outcomes between wave one and wave two, uni-variate analysis of covariance ('Ancova') tests to assess the relative impact of different factors at time 2, and used paired sample t-tests to examine statistical differences in the mean values of the outcomes for time 1 and time 2. (However this test does not assess the effect of each independent variable on the final results). Finally, we compared the results from the treatment group tests to those of the

control group, to assess if the results were reliable and due to the treatment. The full results for each test conducted are available in Annex I.

Did mentoring have an effect on students' aspirations?

We asked a series of questions about the mentees' views about their future education and job prospects.

Likelihood of going to university

We asked participants in wave one and wave two whether they thought they would go to university.

Being on the mentoring programme was associated with a 10.7 per cent increase (relative to their starting point) in the likelihood of mentees wanting to go university after being on the mentoring programme. However, this is not possible to show with statistical confidence (p=.365). However, it is important to note that the control group (those not on the mentoring programme) witnessed a slight *decrease* in the likelihood of wanting to attend university, while those on the treatment group did not.

The analysis also shows a significant effect of 'hardworking' mentors on the student's likelihood of attending university at time 2 (F=7.559, p=.009). This shows that students who viewed their mentors as hard-working had the strongest likelihood of believing they will attend university at time 2 alone, suggesting that mentor type does make a difference on this measure.

Likelihood of getting into university

Mentees demonstrated a 17 per cent relative increase in their view of the likelihood of getting in to a university if they applied, although it is not possible to show with statistical confidence (p=.164). The comparison with the control group model did not reach significance, so no assessment of association between time 1 and time 2 on the outcome may be made.

The only significant measure found to cause a difference in control group students' feelings on going to university between time 1 and time 2 occurred for 'religion' – with those describing themselves as religious being more likely to think they will get into university. This variable had more of an impact on the students' belief at time 1 (F=64.232, p=.0001) than at time 2 (F= 7.154, p= .013). This was quite noticeably stronger at time 1, although the impact was apparent at time 2 as well.

Confidence of finding a job when they leave school

Being on the mentoring programme was associated with an 18 per cent increase in pupils' confidence of finding a job when they leave school. The t-test approached statistical significance (p=.059) on this measure. Comparison to the control group, however, found no statistically significant results.

When examining these within the model, it was found that ethnicity and whether the child was in receipt of free school meals had a significant impact at time 1 (F=8.315, p=.006; F= 15.419, p=.0001) and lost significance at time 2. Those receiving school meals before the programme started were less likely to believe they would find a job when they leave school – but after being on the programme, this was no longer the case. Religion played a significant role in this outcome too – with those who described themselves as religious more likely be confident of finding a job on leaving school. However the impact was larger at time 1 (F= 9.058, p=.004) than time 2 (F=6.840, p=.012).

Belief they will be happier in 12 months than they are now

Mentors were asked if they thought they would be happier in 12 months that they were at the time of the questionnaire being issued. This is a standard measure of general optimism.

Those on the mentoring programme reported a 10 per cent relative increase in whether they would be happier in 12 months time. This was approaching, but did not achieve, significant (p=0.133). No statistical correlation was found comparing with the control group.

There was a moderate correlation between the mentored student's belief that they will be happier in the future at time 1 and time 2 (r=.311, p=.023). This indicates that while some students maintained their beliefs from time 1 until time 2, others changed theirs for the better.

Whether the mentor was 'inspirational' found significance when assessing the variable's impact at time 2 alone (F=7.365, p=.010). This impact was moderate, and shows that if a mentor was deemed inspirational at time 2, the student had a significantly highly likelihood of responding that they were confident in being happier in the future at time 2. This suggests that an inspirational mentor had an impact on this measure.

Significant differences were also found in the mentored students' response on future happiness between time 1 and time 2 due to ethnicity and how long

they were in the programme. Length of time in the programme was significant at time 1 (F= 8.379, p=.006) and time 2 (F=8.323, p=.007), and played a role in the outcome variable at both times. This showed that the longer they were in the programme, the more likely the mentor responded that they believed they would be happier in 12 months' time.

Did mentoring have an effect on perceived barriers in life?

The mentees' views on the 'barriers preventing them from achieving their goals in life' were assessed by a composite indicator, made up by combining a number of the survey questions together. This measure exhibited little change overall between pre- and post- mentoring. Further analysis of this finding indicates, however, that certain students (namely females and those receiving meals from school) did not significantly improve their views on 'barriers in life' after the mentoring, although many other students did.

Significant differences occurred between the 'barrier index' outcome at time 1 and 2 according to gender, whether the child was in receipt of free school meals and if the mentor was deemed 'successful'. Within the model, gender had a significant impact on the 'barrier index' at both times, but was found to be stronger at time 2 (F= 6.003, p=.019) than time 1 (F=4.232, p=.046). If the student received school meals and deemed the mentor successful played a significant role only at time 2 (F=8.798, p=.005; F= 6.376, p=.016), but both factors were large at that time.

The sex of the student, if the mentor was deemed 'realistic', and 'successful' had a significant impact of feeling 'barriers' at time 2 for the treatment group. Each was moderately strong, indicating that if the student was female rather than male (F=4.083, p=.050), if the mentor was realistic (F= 4.373, p=.043) or successful (F= 6.364, p=.016) rather than not, the student was more likely to not feel barriers at time 2. The mentor being viewed as 'successful' had the strongest impact.

Did mentoring have an effect on effort at school?

Attitudes towards school were measured using a composite indicator made up of a number of questions about schooling. This measure did not change significantly post-mentoring. However, this appears to be because of the generally positive attitude that most mentees held on schooling at the outset of the programme. Nonetheless, those with poor initial views about school did see an improvement after being on the mentoring programme, while those in the control group did not.

The mentored students' index of school views at time 1 and 2 were significantly affected by whether the student received free school meals, was religious, the length of time the student was mentored, and if the mentor was deemed 'positive'.

Whether the student received free school meals had a significant impact on their attitudes to school at time 1 (F=7.902, p=.007), but not at time 2. Again, this suggests that before the mentoring programme pupils on free school meals had a more negative attitude toward school, but this wore off during the course of the mentoring programme. Religion played a role at both times, with time 2 being larger (F=7.591, p=.008) than time 1 (F=4.707, p=.035), and again religious was positively correlated with positive attitudes towards school. The length of time spent with the mentor had the largest impact on the student's views of school, and was extraordinarily larger at time 2 (F=20.070, p=.0001) than time 1 (F=12.120, p=.001). If the student deemed the mentor to be positive played a significant role at time 1 and 2, but was again larger at time 2 (F=12.615, p=.001) than time 1 (F=5.708, p=.021).

Did mentoring have an effect on sense of self-esteem?

Finally, we created a composite indicator of self-esteem, based on the agency questions included in the questionnaire (known as Rosenberg's scale). There was only a mild correlation found between this outcome at time 1 and time 2 (r= .252; p=.052). This indicates that there was not a strong level of stability in the students' answers on this question between time 1 and time 2. The paired samples t-test was not significant, and no conclusions on the comparison of meals between time 1 (m=3.65) and time 2 (m=3.72) could be drawn.

However, it is worth noting that the other statistical tests mentioned above reveal that the correlation between having free school meals and a range of negative beliefs (such as confidence in finding a job on leaving school and attitudes toward school) wore off over the course of the programme. This suggests that a greater sense of agency – a similar trait to self-esteem – in the pupil was instilled through the programme.

The mentored students' self esteem scores at time 1 and 2 were significantly affected by the student's religion, length of time the student was mentored, and if the mentor was deemed 'positive'. Religion seemed to have an important role in the outcome at both time 1 (F=5.743, p=.026) and time 2 (F=8.661, p=.008), though the impact was larger at time 2. The length of time spent with the mentor again had an impact on the pupils self-esteem,

though this time it was larger at time 1 (F=15.067, p=.0001) than time 2 (F=10.726, p=.004). If the student deemed the mentor to be positive played the most significant role in the difference in pupils' self-esteem at time 1 and 2, and was nearly equal at time 1 (F=17.479, p=.0001) and time 2 (F=17.497, p=.0001).

ANNEX I: FULL RESULTS FOR MENTEES

Notes: Chapter 1: Background

These analyses should be interpreted with caution. For one, these tests assume a normal distribution in the variables, which this data does not have. Most students were already far at one end of the spectrum already (thinking they are more likely to attend University than not), etc. Additionally, these tests perform better when there is less correlation between the DV's and IV's of interest. However in this case, both the DV's and IV's are highly inter-correlated. For instance, a test showed that ethnicity, language, and meals were related, many of the traits of the mentors were related, and the DV's were also related (also indicating most students did not change their responses from time 1 to time 2, which also may be why these tests are not finding significance.)

To combat the unequal distribution of the groups, I used Pillai's trace value instead of Wilks' Lambda to interpret homogeneity (a required assumption to use the test) in the MANCOVA. I also used uni-variate ANCOVA tests to look just at the effect of variables from time 1's effect on feelings at time 2 alone, to help account for the correlation between the DV's at time 1 and 2 found in the MANCOVA. I also used a paired sample t-test to examine statistically significant differences in means between the outcome variables at time 1 to time 2, without any input from the independent variables and controls. This gives a crude idea of the change in the means, but does not take these other (sometimes inter-correlated) factors into account. Finally, I compared the results for the treatment tests to those of the controls, in order to assess if the results were reliable and due to the treatment (mentoring), or if they were just fluke occurrences that are seen in the control groups as well.

DID MENTORING HAVE AN EFFECT ON STUDENTS'…

Likelihood of going on to University?

Multivariate MANCOVA analysis of co-variance/tests of between-subject effects
Results: The only significant factors found to result in differences in the mentored students' feelings of the likelihood that they will go on to university between time 1 and time 2 were the variables 'meals' and 'inspirational'. The first covariate (if the student was supplied with school

meals) significantly influenced whether or not the student would likely go on to University at both time 1 (F=6.442, p=.015) and time 2 (F=7.850, p=.008), though the influence was greater at time 2 than time 1. The inspirational factor was found to only be significant at time 1 (F= 6.898, p=.012), perhaps because it was unable to stand out when controlling for all other factors influencing the outcomes at time 1 and 2.

Multivariate Tests						
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.046	.997a	2	41	0.378
	Wilks' Lambda	0.954	.997a	2	41	0.378
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.036	.758a	2	41	0.475
	Wilks' Lambda	0.964	.758a	2	41	0.475
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.075	1.652a	2	41	0.204
	Wilks' Lambda	0.925	1.652a	2	41	0.204
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.196	4.985a	2	41	0.012
	Wilks' Lambda	0.804	4.985a	2	41	0.012
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.117	2.728a	2	41	0.077
	Wilks' Lambda	0.883	2.728a	2	41	0.077
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.009	.188a	2	41	0.829
	Wilks' Lambda	0.991	.188a	2	41	0.829
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.014	.291a	2	41	0.749
	Wilks' Lambda	0.986	.291a	2	41	0.749
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.011	.220a	2	41	0.804
	Wilks' Lambda	0.989	.220a	2	41	0.804
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.064	1.412a	2	41	0.255
	Wilks' Lambda	0.936	1.412a	2	41	0.255
HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.015	.318a	2	41	0.73
	Wilks' Lambda	0.985	.318a	2	41	0.73
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.144	3.437a	2	41	0.042
	Wilks' Lambda	0.856	3.437a	2	41	0.042
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.124	2.889a	2	41	0.067
	Wilks' Lambda	0.876	2.889a	2	41	0.067
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.05	1.075a	2	41	0.351
	Wilks' Lambda	0.95	1.075a	2	41	0.351
GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.03	.631a	2	41	0.537

	Wilks' Lambda	0.97	.631a	2	41	0.537

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	DVHow likelyT1	242.220a	14	17.301	7.587	0
	HowlikelyT2	191.607b	14	13.686	8.166	0
SexT1	DVHow likelyT1	4.092	1	4.092	1.794	0.188
	HowlikelyT2	1.668	1	1.668	0.995	0.324
EthnicgroupT1	DVHow likelyT1	2.614	1	2.614	1.146	0.29
	HowlikelyT2	1.73	1	1.73	1.032	0.315
LangT1	DVHow likelyT1	0.454	1	0.454	0.199	0.658
	HowlikelyT2	3.537	1	3.537	2.11	0.154
MealsT1	DVHow likelyT1	14.691	1	14.691	6.442	0.015
	HowlikelyT2	13.157	1	13.157	7.85	0.008
ReligionT1	DVHow likelyT1	12.34	1	12.34	5.411	0.025
	HowlikelyT2	2.949	1	2.949	1.759	0.192
IVHowlongT2	DVHow likelyT1	0.671	1	0.671	0.294	0.59
	HowlikelyT2	0.411	1	0.411	0.245	0.623
positiveT2	DVHow likelyT1	0.794	1	0.794	0.348	0.558
	HowlikelyT2	0.078	1	0.078	0.047	0.83
realisticT2	DVHow likelyT1	0.002	1	0.002	0.001	0.974
	HowlikelyT2	0.603	1	0.603	0.36	0.552
Encouraging T2	DVHow likelyT1	5.064	1	5.064	2.22	0.144
	HowlikelyT2	3.065	1	3.065	1.829	0.183
HumorousT2	DVHow likelyT1	0.082	1	0.082	0.036	0.85
	HowlikelyT2	0.687	1	0.687	0.41	0.525
Inspirational T2	DVHow likelyT1	15.732	1	15.732	6.898	0.012
	HowlikelyT2	0.857	1	0.857	0.511	0.479
SuccessfulT2	DVHow likelyT1	13.497	1	13.497	5.919	0.019
	HowlikelyT2	1.584	1	1.584	0.945	0.336
GivesusefuladviceT2	DVHow likelyT1	4.427	1	4.427	1.941	0.171
	HowlikelyT2	0.015	1	0.015	0.009	0.924
Goodlistener T2	DVHow likelyT1	1.017	1	1.017	0.446	0.508

	HowlikelyT2	2.071	1	2.071	1.236	0.273
Error	DVHow likelyT1	95.78	42	2.28		
	HowlikelyT2	70.393	42	1.676		
Total	DVHow likelyT1	338	56			
	HowlikelyT2	262	56			

Compared to control group:
Results: The only significant measures found to associate with differences in the control group students' likelihood of going on to university between time 1 and time 2 occurred for 'religion'. This variable had more of an impact on the students' belief at time 1 (F= 10.748, p=.003) than at time 2 (F=7.397, p=.012).

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.001	.013a	2	23	0.987
	Wilks' Lambda	0.999	.013a	2	23	0.987
SexC1	Pillai's Trace	0.072	.891a	2	23	0.424
	Wilks' Lambda	0.928	.891a	2	23	0.424
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.016	.186a	2	23	0.832
	Wilks' Lambda	0.984	.186a	2	23	0.832
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.021	.247a	2	23	0.783
	Wilks' Lambda	0.979	.247a	2	23	0.783
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.34	5.933a	2	23	0.008
	Wilks' Lambda	0.66	5.933a	2	23	0.008

Multivariate Tests

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	How likelyC1	79.288a	5	15.858	9.831	0
	HowlikelyC2	90.827b	5	18.165	7.494	0

EthnicgroupC1	How likelyC1	0.035	1	0.035	0.022	0.884
	HowlikelyC2	8.83E-05	1	8.83E-05	0	0.995
SexC1	How likelyC1	0.311	1	0.311	0.193	0.664
	HowlikelyC2	2.008	1	2.008	0.828	0.372
LangC1	How likelyC1	0.624	1	0.624	0.387	0.54
	HowlikelyC2	0.264	1	0.264	0.109	0.744
MealsC1	How likelyC1	0.002	1	0.002	0.001	0.975
	HowlikelyC2	0.994	1	0.994	0.41	0.528
ReligionC1	How likelyC1	17.337	1	17.337	10.748	0.003
	HowlikelyC2	17.93	1	17.93	7.397	0.012
Error	How likelyC1	38.712	24	1.613		
	HowlikelyC2	58.173	24	2.424		
Total	How likelyC1	118	29			
	HowlikelyC2	149	29			

a. R Squared = .672 (Adjusted R Squared = .604) b. R Squared = .610 (Adjusted R Squared = .528)

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Uni-variate ANCOVA analysis of co-variance/tests of between-subject effects Results: This analysis shows a significant effect of 'hardworking' mentors on the student's likelihood of attending university at time 2 (F=7.559, p=.009). This shows that students who viewed their mentors as hard-working had the strongest likelihood of believing they will attend University at time 2 alone. This differs from the MANCOVA analysis as it only examines this single time, and does not look at the relative impact of a variable when comparing it's effect between two times. It is a snapshot, rather than a longer running movie. However, it still shows that at time 2, this measure plays an important role.

Dependant Variable – How Likely

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	29.344a	15	1.956	1.447	0.173
Intercept	4.269	1	4.269	3.157	0.083
IVHowlongT2	2.36	1	2.36	1.745	0.194

SexT1	0.906	1	0.906	0.67	0.418
EthnicgroupT1	1.014	1	1.014	0.75	0.392
LangT1	0.107	1	0.107	0.079	0.78
MealsT1	4.815	1	4.815	3.561	0.066
ReligionT1	0.819	1	0.819	0.606	0.441
positiveT2	2.232	1	2.232	1.651	0.206
realisticT2	1.998	1	1.998	1.477	0.231
EncouragingT2	0.053	1	0.053	0.039	0.844
HumorousT2	1.506	1	1.506	1.114	0.298
HardworkingT2	10.221	1	10.221	7.559	0.009
InspirationalT2	0	1	0	0	0.985
UnderstandingT2	1.415	1	1.415	1.046	0.313
SuccessfulT2	0.791	1	0.791	0.585	0.449
GivesusefuladviceT2	2.1	1	2.1	1.553	0.22
Error	54.085	40	1.352		
Total	262	56			
Corrected Total	83.429	55			
a. R Squared = .352 (Adjusted R Squared = .109)					

Paired samples t-test

Results: No significantly reliable difference was found in the means for the likelihood of mentored students feeling like they will go on to university between time 1 and time 2 in the paired sample t-test. However there is still a slight, but unreliable difference between the means at time 1 (m=1.95) and time 2 (m=1.76). The correlation between the variables at the two times was moderate (r= .364, p=.005), indicating some, but not all, students maintained their stance from time 1 to time 2.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	DVHow likelyT1	1.95	59	1.502	0.196
	HowlikelyT2	1.76	59	1.208	0.157

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	DVHow likelyT1 - Howlikely T2	0.186	1.548	0.202	-0.217	0.59	0.925	58	0.359

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	DVHow likelyT1 & HowlikelyT2	59	0.364	0.005

Compared to control group:
Results: Paired sample statistics for the control group indicate a very high correlation between time 1 and time 2 (r= .457, p=.011), much higher than the treatment group for this same outcome. This provides some indication that the treatment is having more effect than the effect of time alone.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 10	How likelyC1	1.63	30	1.159	0.212
	HowlikelyC2	1.73	30	1.437	0.262

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 10	How likelyC1 & HowlikelyC2	30	0.457	0.011

Likelihood of getting in to a University If they apply?

MANCOVA Results: No significant differences in the mentored students' feelings of the likelihood that they will go on to university if they applied were found for any covariates for between time 1 and time 2.

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.026	.525a	2	40	0.595
	Wilks' Lambda	0.974	.525a	2	40	0.595
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.06	1.278a	2	40	0.29
	Wilks' Lambda	0.94	1.278a	2	40	0.29
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.082	1.784a	2	40	0.181
	Wilks' Lambda	0.918	1.784a	2	40	0.181
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.109	2.449a	2	40	0.099
	Wilks' Lambda	0.891	2.449a	2	40	0.099
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.078	1.692a	2	40	0.197
	Wilks' Lambda	0.922	1.692a	2	40	0.197
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.09	1.974a	2	40	0.152
	Wilks' Lambda	0.91	1.974a	2	40	0.152
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.034	.710a	2	40	0.498
	Wilks' Lambda	0.966	.710a	2	40	0.498
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.043	.907a	2	40	0.412
	Wilks' Lambda	0.957	.907a	2	40	0.412
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.051	1.072a	2	40	0.352
	Wilks' Lambda	0.949	1.072a	2	40	0.352
HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.019	.382a	2	40	0.685
	Wilks' Lambda	0.981	.382a	2	40	0.685
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.003	.070a	2	40	0.933

	Wilks' Lambda	0.997	.070a	2	40	0.933
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.033	.676a	2	40	0.514
	Wilks' Lambda	0.967	.676a	2	40	0.514
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.021	.430a	2	40	0.654
	Wilks' Lambda	0.979	.430a	2	40	0.654
GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.079	1.706a	2	40	0.195
	Wilks' Lambda	0.921	1.706a	2	40	0.195

Compared to control group

Results: Once again, the only significant measure found to cause a difference in control group students' feelings on going to university between time 1 and time 2 occurred for 'religion'. Again, this variable had more of an impact on the students' belief at time 1 (F=64.232, p=.0001) than at time 2 (F= 7.154, p= .013). This was quite noticeably stronger at time 1, although the impact was apparent at time 2 as well. No other variables reached significance for the control group.

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.031	.369a	2	23	0.695
	Wilks' Lambda	0.969	.369a	2	23	0.695
SexC1	Pillai's Trace	0.195	2.791a	2	23	0.082
	Wilks' Lambda	0.805	2.791a	2	23	0.082
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.054	.652a	2	23	0.531
	Wilks' Lambda	0.946	.652a	2	23	0.531
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.073	.907a	2	23	0.418
	Wilks' Lambda	0.927	.907a	2	23	0.418
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.728	30.791a	2	23	0
						0

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

Model	How likely2C1	91.406a	5	18.281	66.533	0
	How likel2C2	152.677b	5	30.535	12.784	0
EthnicgroupC1	How likely2C1	0.141	1	0.141	0.512	0.481
	How likel2C2	0.118	1	0.118	0.05	0.826
SexC1	How likely2C1	0.783	1	0.783	2.85	0.104
	How likel2C2	11.664	1	11.664	4.883	0.037
LangC1	How likely2C1	0.117	1	0.117	0.425	0.521
	How likel2C2	3.076	1	3.076	1.288	0.268
MealsC1	How likely2C1	0.448	1	0.448	1.631	0.214
	How likel2C2	2.067	1	2.067	0.865	0.362
ReligionC1	How likely2C1	17.649	1	17.649	64.232	0
	How likel2C2	17.087	1	17.087	7.154	0.013
Error	How likely2C1	6.594	24	0.275		
	How likel2C2	57.323	24	2.388		
Total	How likely2C1	98	29			
	How likel2C2	210	29			

a. R Squared = .933 (Adjusted R Squared = .919) b. R Squared = .727 (Adjusted R Squared = .670)

ANCOVA Results: No significant difference within treatment group outcomes occurred at time 2 as a result of the measures included in this analysis.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: How likely2T2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	34.251a	15	2.283	1.146	0.351
Intercept	2.132	1	2.132	1.07	0.307
IVHowlongT2	0.077	1	0.077	0.039	0.845
SexT1	1.189	1	1.189	0.597	0.444
EthnicgroupT1	1.549	1	1.549	0.778	0.383
LangT1	2.27	1	2.27	1.14	0.292
MealsT1	0.205	1	0.205	0.103	0.75
ReligionT1	2.446	1	2.446	1.228	0.275
positiveT2	5.368	1	5.368	2.695	0.109

realisticT2	2.291	1	2.291	1.15	0.29
EncouragingT2	0.177	1	0.177	0.089	0.767
HumorousT2	3.541	1	3.541	1.778	0.19
HardworkingT2	4.557	1	4.557	2.288	0.138
InspirationalT2	0.194	1	0.194	0.098	0.756
UnderstandingT2	4.221	1	4.221	2.119	0.153
SuccessfulT2	3.334	1	3.334	1.674	0.203
GivesusefuladviceT2	1.092	1	1.092	0.548	0.463
Error	77.676	39	1.992		
Total	324	55			
Corrected Total	111.927	54			

Paired samples t test

Results: There was a mild correlation found between this outcome at time 1 and time 2 (r= .264; p=.045), indicating that there was not strong stability in the students' answers on this question between time 1 and time 2. This means that many students changed their answers after receiving the mentoring at time 2. No statistically reliable measure was found for the paired t test, but there was a slight difference between the means of the outcome measure at time 1 (m=2.26) and time 2 (m=1.93).

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	How likely2T1	2.26	58	1.505	0.198
	How likely2T2	1.93	58	1.413	0.185

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	How likely2T1 & How likely2T2	58	0.264	0.045

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences	t	df	Sig.

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				(2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	How likely2T1 - How likely2T2	0.328	1.771	0.233	-0.138	0.793	1.409	57	0.164

Compared to control:

Results: The control group model did not reach significance, so no assessment of association between time 1 and time 2 on the outcome may be made.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 11	How likely2C1	1.8	30	0.407	0.074
	How likel2C2	2.4	30	1.589	0.29

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 11	How likely2C1 & How likel2C2	30	0.181	0.337

Confidence of finding a job when they leave school?

Multivariate MANCOVA analysis of co-variance/tests of between-subject effects

Results: Significant differences in the mentored students' feelings of the likelihood that they will go on to university between time 1 and time 2 occurred by ethnicity, language, 'meals', religion, if the mentor was deemed 'successful' and a 'good listener'.

When examining these within the model, it was found that ethnicity and 'meals' had a significant impact at time 1 (F=8.315, p=.006; F= 15.419, p=.0001) and lost significance at time 2. Conversely, language had a

significant impact on confidence finding a job only at time 2, not time 1 (F= 8.430, p=.006). Religion played a significant role in this outcome both times, however the impact was larger at time 1 (F= 9.058, p=.004) than time 2 (F=6.840, p=.012).

With regards to the mentors' traits, being viewed as successful and a good listener had a statistically significant impact on the student's confidence in finding a job at time 1 (F= 6.915, p=.012; F= 4.640, p=.037), but not at time 2. To investigate the effects at time 2 further, a uni-variate analysis of time 2 was conducted.

Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.08	1.728a	2	40	0.191
	Wilks' Lambda	0.92	1.728a	2	40	0.191
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.188	4.636a	2	40	0.015
	Wilks' Lambda	0.812	4.636a	2	40	0.015
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.172	4.158a	2	40	0.023
	Wilks' Lambda	0.828	4.158a	2	40	0.023
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.287	8.049a	2	40	0.001
	Wilks' Lambda	0.713	8.049a	2	40	0.001
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.247	6.554a	2	40	0.003
	Wilks' Lambda	0.753	6.554a	2	40	0.003
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.037	.763a	2	40	0.473
	Wilks' Lambda	0.963	.763a	2	40	0.473
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.022	.452a	2	40	0.64
	Wilks' Lambda	0.978	.452a	2	40	0.64
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.043	.889a	2	40	0.419

	Wilks' Lambda	0.957	.889a	2	40	0.419
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.079	1.726a	2	40	0.191
	Wilks' Lambda	0.921	1.726a	2	40	0.191
HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.092	2.022a	2	40	0.146
	Wilks' Lambda	0.908	2.022a	2	40	0.146
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.106	2.382a	2	40	0.105
	Wilks' Lambda	0.894	2.382a	2	40	0.105
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.178	4.336a	2	40	0.02
	Wilks' Lambda	0.822	4.336a	2	40	0.02
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.129	2.963a	2	40	0.063
	Wilks' Lambda	0.871	2.963a	2	40	0.063
GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.136	3.136a	2	40	0.054
	Wilks' Lambda	0.864	3.136a	2	40	0.054

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	How confidentT1	215.689a	14	15.406	17.888	0
	HowconfidentT2	145.733b	14	10.409	19.167	0
SexT1	How confidentT1	2.883	1	2.883	3.347	0.075
	HowconfidentT2	0.005	1	0.005	0.009	0.926
EthnicgroupT1	How confidentT1	7.162	1	7.162	8.315	0.006
	HowconfidentT2	1.404	1	1.404	2.585	0.116
LangT1	How confidentT1	0.049	1	0.049	0.057	0.812
	HowconfidentT2	4.578	1	4.578	8.43	0.006
MealsT1	How confidentT1	13.28	1	13.28	15.419	0

	HowconfidentT2	1.667	1	1.667	3.07	0.087
ReligionT1	How confidentT1	7.802	1	7.802	9.058	0.004
	HowconfidentT2	3.715	1	3.715	6.84	0.012
IVHowlongT2	How confidentT1	0.222	1	0.222	0.257	0.615
	HowconfidentT2	0.805	1	0.805	1.481	0.231
positiveT2	How confidentT1	0.738	1	0.738	0.857	0.36
	HowconfidentT2	0.004	1	0.004	0.008	0.931
realisticT2	How confidentT1	0.764	1	0.764	0.887	0.352
	HowconfidentT2	0.687	1	0.687	1.266	0.267
EncouragingT2	How confidentT1	1.493	1	1.493	1.733	0.195
	HowconfidentT2	1.33	1	1.33	2.449	0.125
HumorousT2	How confidentT1	3.238	1	3.238	3.76	0.059
	HowconfidentT2	0.511	1	0.511	0.941	0.338
InspirationalT2	How confidentT1	4.119	1	4.119	4.782	0.035
	HowconfidentT2	0.281	1	0.281	0.517	0.476
SuccessfulT2	How confidentT1	5.956	1	5.956	6.915	0.012
	HowconfidentT2	1.897	1	1.897	3.494	0.069
GivesusefuladviceT2	How confidentT1	1.795	1	1.795	2.084	0.156
	HowconfidentT2	2.704	1	2.704	4.978	0.031
GoodlistenerT2	How confidentT1	3.996	1	3.996	4.64	0.037
	HowconfidentT2	1.597	1	1.597	2.941	0.094
Error	How confidentT1	35.311	41	0.861		
	HowconfidentT2	22.267	41	0.543		
Total	How confidentT1	251	55			
	HowconfidentT2	168	55			

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.031	.369a	2	23	0.695
	Wilks' Lambda	0.969	.369a	2	23	0.695
SexC1	Pillai's Trace	0.195	2.791a	2	23	0.082
	Wilks' Lambda	0.805	2.791a	2	23	0.082
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.054	.652a	2	23	0.531
	Wilks' Lambda	0.946	.652a	2	23	0.531
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.073	.907a	2	23	0.418
	Wilks' Lambda	0.927	.907a	2	23	0.418
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.728	30.791a	2	23	0

Compared to control:

Results: For the third time, the control group students' outcome for time 1 and time 2 was significantly affected by the students' religion. Again, this variable had more of an impact on the students' belief at time 1 than time 2. No other variables reached significance for the control group.

ANCOVA Results: No variables found significance when assessing their impact at time 2 alone.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable:HowconfidentT2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7.092a	15	0.473	0.933	0.537
Intercept	2.746	1	2.746	5.421	0.025
IVHowlongT2	0.022	1	0.022	0.043	0.837
SexT1	0.023	1	0.023	0.045	0.832
EthnicgroupT1	0.242	1	0.242	0.478	0.493
LangT1	1.914	1	1.914	3.778	0.059
MealsT1	0.381	1	0.381	0.752	0.391
ReligionT1	0.457	1	0.457	0.902	0.348
positiveT2	0.316	1	0.316	0.624	0.434
realisticT2	0.743	1	0.743	1.467	0.233
EncouragingT2	0.839	1	0.839	1.656	0.206
HumorousT2	0.247	1	0.247	0.488	0.489
HardworkingT2	0.004	1	0.004	0.007	0.932

InspirationalT2	0.064	1	0.064	0.126	0.724
UnderstandingT2	0.979	1	0.979	1.932	0.172
SuccessfulT2	0.551	1	0.551	1.087	0.303
GivesusefuladviceT2	0.345	1	0.345	0.682	0.414
Error	20.265	40	0.507		
Total	172	56			
Corrected Total	27.357	55			

a. R Squared = .259 (Adjusted R Squared = -.019)

Paired samples t-test

Results: Neither the correlation between the measures at time 1 and time 2, or the paired t-test found statistically significant results. The t-test approached statistical significance (p=.059), though the difference in means at time 1 (m=1.86) and time 2 (m=1.59) are not yet reliable.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 2	How confidentT1	1.86	58	1.017	0.133
	HowconfidentT2	1.59	58	0.702	0.092

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	How confident2T1 & HowconfidentT2	53	0.311	0.023

Compared to control:

Results: Control group also found no statistically significant results.

Paired Sample statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 13	How confident2C1	2.07	27	0.73	0.14
	How confident2C2	2.26	27	0.764	0.147

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 13	How confident2C1 & How confident2C2	27	-0.105	0.603

Belief that they will be happier in 12 months then they are now?

MANCOVA Results: Significant differences were found in the mentored students' response on future happiness between time 1 and time 2 due to ethnicity and how long they were in the program.

Within the model, ethnicity again had a significant impact only at time 1 (F=5.276, p=.028), not at time 2. Length of time in the program was significant at time 1 (F= 8.379, p=.006) and time 2 (F=8.323, p=.007), and played a role in the outcome variable at both times.

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.021	.382a	2	35	0.685
	Wilks' Lambda	0.979	.382a	2	35	0.685
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.157	3.250a	2	35	0.051
	Wilks' Lambda	0.843	3.250a	2	35	0.051
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.019	.341a	2	35	0.713
	Wilks' Lambda	0.981	.341a	2	35	0.713
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.091	1.759a	2	35	0.187
	Wilks' Lambda	0.909	1.759a	2	35	0.187
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.062	1.158a	2	35	0.326
	Wilks' Lambda	0.938	1.158a	2	35	0.326
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.254	5.965a	2	35	0.006
	Wilks' Lambda	0.746	5.965a	2	35	0.006
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.002	.036a	2	35	0.965
	Wilks' Lambda	0.998	.036a	2	35	0.965
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.003	.047a	2	35	0.954
	Wilks' Lambda	0.997	.047a	2	35	0.954
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.037	.674a	2	35	0.516
	Wilks' Lambda	0.963	.674a	2	35	0.516

HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.002	.036a	2	35	0.965
	Wilks' Lambda	0.998	.036a	2	35	0.965
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.111	2.181a	2	35	0.128
	Wilks' Lambda	0.889	2.181a	2	35	0.128
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.025	.445a	2	35	0.644
	Wilks' Lambda	0.975	.445a	2	35	0.644
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.02	.359a	2	35	0.701
	Wilks' Lambda	0.98	.359a	2	35	0.701
GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.054	.994a	2	35	0.38
	Wilks' Lambda	0.946	.994a	2	35	0.38

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	How confident2T1	221.720a	14	15.837	26.793	0
	HowconfidentT2	195.368b	14	13.955	25.59	0
SexT1	How confident2T1	0.008	1	0.008	0.014	0.908
	HowconfidentT2	0.329	1	0.329	0.604	0.442
EthnicgroupT1	How confident2T1	3.119	1	3.119	5.276	0.028
	HowconfidentT2	2.046	1	2.046	3.752	0.061
LangT1	How confident2T1	0.001	1	0.001	0.002	0.967
	HowconfidentT2	0.345	1	0.345	0.632	0.432
MealsT1	How confident2T1	1.819	1	1.819	3.078	0.088
	HowconfidentT2	0.949	1	0.949	1.74	0.195
ReligionT1	How confident2T1	0.436	1	0.436	0.738	0.396
	HowconfidentT2	1.236	1	1.236	2.267	0.141
IVHowlongT2	How confident2T1	4.953	1	4.953	8.379	0.006
	HowconfidentT2	4.539	1	4.539	8.323	0.007
positiveT2	How confident2T1	0.033	1	0.033	0.056	0.814
	HowconfidentT2	0.024	1	0.024	0.045	0.834
realisticT2	How	0.042	1	0.042	0.072	0.79

	confident2T1					
	HowconfidentT2	0.002	1	0.002	0.003	0.958
EncouragingT2	How confident2T1	0.687	1	0.687	1.162	0.288
	HowconfidentT2	0.377	1	0.377	0.692	0.411
HumorousT2	How confident2T1	0.014	1	0.014	0.024	0.878
	HowconfidentT2	0.013	1	0.013	0.023	0.88
InspirationalT2	How confident2T1	0.261	1	0.261	0.441	0.511
	HowconfidentT2	1.459	1	1.459	2.676	0.111
SuccessfulT2	How confident2T1	0.14	1	0.14	0.237	0.629
	HowconfidentT2	0.192	1	0.192	0.351	0.557
GivesusefuladviceT2	How confident2T1	0.342	1	0.342	0.578	0.452
	HowconfidentT2	0.005	1	0.005	0.01	0.923
GoodlistenerT2	How confident2T1	0.05	1	0.05	0.084	0.773
	HowconfidentT2	1.085	1	1.085	1.989	0.167
Error	How confident2T1	21.28	36	0.591		
	HowconfidentT2	19.632	36	0.545		
Total	How confident2T1	243	50			
	HowconfidentT2	215	50			

a. R Squared = .912 (Adjusted R Squared = .878) b. R Squared = .909 (Adjusted R Squared = .873)

Compared to control:
Results: As always before, the only significant difference found in control group students' outcomes between time 1 and time 2 was due to religion. However, this time the impact on the students' belief for time 1 (F= 23.694, p=.001) and time 2 (F= 23.175, p=.0001) were strong, and about equal. No other variables reached significance for the control group.

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.228	2.954a	2	20	0.075

	Wilks' Lambda	0.772	2.954a	2	20	0.075
SexC1	Pillai's Trace	0.082	.898a	2	20	0.423
	Wilks' Lambda	0.918	.898a	2	20	0.423
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.069	.744a	2	20	0.488
	Wilks' Lambda	0.931	.744a	2	20	0.488
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.064	.687a	2	20	0.515
	Wilks' Lambda	0.936	.687a	2	20	0.515
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.666	19.982a	2	20	0
	Wilks' Lambda	0.334	19.982a	2	20	0

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	How confident2C1	109.084a	5	21.817	38.448	0
	How confident2C2	123.493b	5	24.699	25.292	0
EthnicgroupC1	How confident2C1	3.173	1	3.173	5.591	0.028
	How confident2C2	1.084	1	1.084	1.11	0.304
SexC1	How confident2C1	0.163	1	0.163	0.288	0.597
	How confident2C2	1.389	1	1.389	1.423	0.246
LangC1	How confident2C1	0.876	1	0.876	1.543	0.228
	How confident2C2	0.079	1	0.079	0.081	0.779
MealsC1	How confident2C1	0.009	1	0.009	0.016	0.899
	How confident2C2	1.408	1	1.408	1.442	0.243
ReligionC1	How confident2C1	13.444	1	13.444	23.694	0
	How confident2C2	22.631	1	22.631	23.175	0
Error	How confident2C1	11.916	21	0.567		
	How confident2C2	20.507	21	0.977		

Total	How confident2C1	121	26			
	How confident2C2	144	26			

a. R Squared = .902 (Adjusted R Squared = .878) b. R Squared = .858 (Adjusted R Squared = .824)

ANCOVA Results: Whether the mentor was 'inspirational' found significance when assessing the variable's impact at time 2 alone (F=7.365, p=.010). This impact was moderate, and shows that if a mentor was deemed inspirational at time 2, the student had a significantly highly likelihood of responding that they were confident in being happier in the future at time 2.

Paired samples t-test

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable:HowconfidentT2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	8.864a	15	0.591	1.192	0.319
Intercept	3.429	1	3.429	6.916	0.012
IVHowlongT2	0.666	1	0.666	1.343	0.254
SexT1	0.039	1	0.039	0.078	0.781
EthnicgroupT1	0.621	1	0.621	1.252	0.27
LangT1	0.001	1	0.001	0.002	0.961
MealsT1	0.018	1	0.018	0.037	0.848
ReligionT1	0.014	1	0.014	0.028	0.867
positiveT2	0.679	1	0.679	1.369	0.249
realisticT2	0.032	1	0.032	0.065	0.799
EncouragingT2	0.056	1	0.056	0.112	0.739
HumorousT2	0	1	0	0.001	0.981
HardworkingT2	0.262	1	0.262	0.528	0.472
InspirationalT2	3.651	1	3.651	7.365	0.01
UnderstandingT2	0.219	1	0.219	0.441	0.511
SuccessfulT2	0.665	1	0.665	1.341	0.254
GivesusefuladviceT2	0.169	1	0.169	0.34	0.563
Error	18.84	38	0.496		
Total	228	54			
Corrected Total	27.704	53			

a. R Squared = .320 (Adjusted R Squared = .052)

Results: There was a moderate correlation between the mentored student's belief that they will be happier in the future at time 1 and time 2 (r=.311, p=.023). This indicates that while some students maintained their beliefs from time 1 until time 2, others changed theirs for the better. Again, the paired samples t-test did not find statistical significance in the slight difference in outcomes at time 1 (m=2.11) and time 2 (m=1.92).

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	How confident2T1	2.11	53	0.8	0.11
	HowconfidentT2	1.92	53	0.73	0.1

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	How confident2T1 & HowconfidentT2	53	0.311	0.023

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	How confident2T1 - HowconfidentT2	0.189	0.9	0.124	-0.059	0.437	1.526	52	0.133

Compared to control:
Results: No statistical significance was found.

Paired sample statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 13	How confident2C1	2.07	27	0.73	0.14
	How confident2C2	2.26	27	0.764	0.147

Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.139	3.230a	2	40	0.05
	Wilks' Lambda	0.861	3.230a	2	40	0.05
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.037	.778a	2	40	0.466
	Wilks' Lambda	0.963	.778a	2	40	0.466
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.096	2.129a	2	40	0.132
	Wilks' Lambda	0.904	2.129a	2	40	0.132
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.177	4.298a	2	40	0.02
	Wilks' Lambda	0.823	4.298a	2	40	0.02
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.126	2.887a	2	40	0.067
	Wilks' Lambda	0.874	2.887a	2	40	0.067
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.109	2.443a	2	40	0.1
	Wilks' Lambda	0.891	2.443a	2	40	0.1
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.015	.303a	2	40	0.741
	Wilks' Lambda	0.985	.303a	2	40	0.741
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.093	2.061a	2	40	0.141
	Wilks' Lambda	0.907	2.061a	2	40	0.141
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.107	2.390a	2	40	0.105
	Wilks' Lambda	0.893	2.390a	2	40	0.105
HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.011	.214a	2	40	0.808

	Wilks' Lambda	0.989	.214a	2	40	0.808
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.059	1.248a	2	40	0.298
	Wilks' Lambda	0.941	1.248a	2	40	0.298
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.154	3.646a	2	40	0.035
	Wilks' Lambda	0.846	3.646a	2	40	0.035
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.108	2.425a	2	40	0.101
	Wilks' Lambda	0.892	2.425a	2	40	0.101
GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.047	.977a	2	40	0.385
	Wilks' Lambda	0.953	.977a	2	40	0.385

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 13	How confident2C1 & How confident2C2	27	-0.105	0.603

Barriers to achieving things they want in life?

MANCOVA Results: Significant differences occurred between the 'barrier index' outcome at time 1 and 2 according to gender, 'meals', and if the mentor was deemed 'successful'.
Within the model, gender had a significant impact on the 'barrier index' at both times, but was found to be stronger at time 2 (F= 6.003, p=.019) than time 1 (F=4.232, p=.046). If the student received school meals and deemed the mentor successful played a significant role only at time 2 (F=8.798, p=.005; F= 6.376, p=.016), but both factors were large at that time.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	barriersT1	326.723a	14	23.337	11.809	0
	barriersT2	347.847b	14	24.846	18.222	0
SexT1	barriersT1	8.364	1	8.364	4.232	0.046
	barriersT2	8.185	1	8.185	6.003	0.019

EthnicgroupT1	barriersT1	1.91	1	1.91	0.967	0.331
	barriersT2	2.011	1	2.011	1.475	0.232
LangT1	barriersT1	0.042	1	0.042	0.021	0.885
	barriersT2	4.346	1	4.346	3.187	0.082
MealsT1	barriersT1	6.439	1	6.439	3.258	0.078
	barriersT2	11.996	1	11.996	8.798	0.005
ReligionT1	barriersT1	8.602	1	8.602	4.353	0.043
	barriersT2	6.758	1	6.758	4.956	0.032
IVHowlongT2	barriersT1	8.353	1	8.353	4.227	0.046
	barriersT2	4.969	1	4.969	3.644	0.063
positiveT2	barriersT1	0.671	1	0.671	0.339	0.563
	barriersT2	0.807	1	0.807	0.592	0.446
realisticT2	barriersT1	2.94	1	2.94	1.488	0.23
	barriersT2	5.759	1	5.759	4.223	0.046
EncouragingT2	barriersT1	6.987	1	6.987	3.535	0.067
	barriersT2	5.671	1	5.671	4.159	0.048
HumorousT2	barriersT1	0.812	1	0.812	0.411	0.525
	barriersT2	0.073	1	0.073	0.054	0.818
InspirationalT2	barriersT1	2.713	1	2.713	1.373	0.248
	barriersT2	3.34	1	3.34	2.45	0.125
SuccessfulT2	barriersT1	0.718	1	0.718	0.363	0.55
	barriersT2	8.694	1	8.694	6.376	0.016
GivesusefuladviceT2	barriersT1	1.341	1	1.341	0.678	0.415
	barriersT2	6.404	1	6.404	4.696	0.036
GoodlistenerT2	barriersT1	3.958	1	3.958	2.003	0.165
	barriersT2	0.915	1	0.915	0.671	0.417
Error	barriersT1	81.027	41	1.976		
	barriersT2	55.903	41	1.363		
Total	barriersT1	407.75	55			
	barriersT2	403.75	55			

a. R Squared = .801 (Adjusted R Squared = .733) b. R Squared = .862 (Adjusted R Squared = .814)

Compared to control:

Results: Again, religion was highly significant in the difference in the control group's outcomes at time 1 and time 2. This impact was much stronger at time 1, however (F= 18.962, p=.0001) compared to time 2 (F=5.091, p=.034). No other demographics resulted in significant change in the control group between measures. Testsb

Multivariate testb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.098	1.147a	2	21	0.337
	Wilks' Lambda	0.902	1.147a	2	21	0.337
SexC1	Pillai's	0.057	.633a	2	21	0.541

	Trace					
	Wilks' Lambda	0.943	.633a	2	21	0.541
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.017	.186a	2	21	0.832
	Wilks' Lambda	0.983	.186a	2	21	0.832
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.011	.119a	2	21	0.888
	Wilks' Lambda	0.989	.119a	2	21	0.888
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.485	9.899a	2	21	0.001
	Wilks' Lambda	0.515	9.899a	2	21	0.001

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	barriersC1	149.646a	5	29.929	12.822	0
	barriersC2	128.013b	5	25.603	14.541	0
EthnicgroupC1	barriersC1	0.032	1	0.032	0.014	0.908
	barriersC2	4.142	1	4.142	2.353	0.139
SexC1	barriersC1	0.405	1	0.405	0.174	0.681
	barriersC2	1.609	1	1.609	0.914	0.35
LangC1	barriersC1	0.495	1	0.495	0.212	0.65
	barriersC2	0.169	1	0.169	0.096	0.76
MealsC1	barriersC1	0.558	1	0.558	0.239	0.63
	barriersC2	0.079	1	0.079	0.045	0.835
ReligionC1	barriersC1	44.262	1	44.262	18.962	0
	barriersC2	8.964	1	8.964	5.091	0.034
Error	barriersC1	51.354	22	2.334		
	barriersC2	38.737	22	1.761		
Total	barriersC1	201	27			
	barriersC2	166.75	27			

a. R Squared = .745 (Adjusted R Squared = .686) b. R Squared = .768 (Adjusted R Squared = .715)

ANCOVA

Results: The sex of the student, if the mentor was deemed 'realistic', and 'successful' had a significant impact of feeling 'barriers' at time 2 for the treatment group. Each was moderately strong, indicating that if the student was female rather than male (F=4.083, p=.050), if the mentor was realistic (F= 4.373, p=.043) or successful (F= 6.364, p=.016) rather than not, the student was more likely to not feel barriers at time 2. The mentor being viewed as 'successful' had the strongest impact.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable:barriersT2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	30.232a	15	2.015	1.759	0.077
Intercept	12.593	1	12.593	10.99	0.002
IVHowlongT2	0.247	1	0.247	0.216	0.645
SexT1	4.678	1	4.678	4.083	0.05
EthnicgroupT1	0.269	1	0.269	0.234	0.631
LangT1	1.298	1	1.298	1.133	0.293
MealsT1	3.734	1	3.734	3.259	0.078
ReligionT1	1.275	1	1.275	1.112	0.298
positiveT2	0.505	1	0.505	0.441	0.511
realisticT2	5.011	1	5.011	4.373	0.043
EncouragingT2	1.444	1	1.444	1.26	0.268
HumorousT2	0.048	1	0.048	0.042	0.838
HardworkingT2	0.403	1	0.403	0.352	0.556
InspirationalT2	0.923	1	0.923	0.806	0.375
UnderstandingT2	0.108	1	0.108	0.094	0.76
SuccessfulT2	7.292	1	7.292	6.364	0.016
GivesusefuladviceT2	3.435	1	3.435	2.998	0.091
Error	46.978	41	1.146		
Total	426	57			
Corrected Total	77.211	56			

a. R Squared = .392 (Adjusted R Squared = .169)

Pair sample t-tests

Results: There was a significant and quite strong correlation between barriers results for both time 1 and time 2 (r= .547, p=.000). No significant results for the control. However no statistically reliable inference can be made about the difference in means for the treatment or control group outcomes between time 1 and 2.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 4	barriersT1	2.4386	57	1.28893	0.17072
	barriersT2	2.4912	57	1.18958	0.15756
Pair 16	barriersC1	2.2857	28	1.43649	0.27147

	barriersC2	2.1607	28	1.17105	0.22131

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	barriersT1 & barriersT2	57	0.547	0
Pair 2	barriersC1 & barriersC2	28	0.071	0.72

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 4	barriersT1 – barriersT2	-0.05263	1.18278	0.15666	-0.36647	0.2612	-0.336	56	0.738
Pair 16	barriersC1 - barriersC2	0.125	1.78795	0.33789	-0.56829	0.81829	0.37	27	0.714

Scaled questions on schooling/jobs?

MANCOVA Results: The mentored students' index of school views at time 1 and 2 were significantly affected if the student received 'meals', had a certain religion, length of time the student was mentored, and if the mentor was deemed 'positive'.

If the student received meals had a significant impact on their 'school index' views at time 1 (F=7.902, p=.007), but not at time 2. Religion played a role at both times, with time 2 being larger (F=7.591, p=.008) than time 1 (F=4.707, p=.035). The length of time spent with the mentor had the largest impact on the student's views of school, and was extraordinarily larger at time 2 (F=20.070, p=.0001) than time 1 (F=12.120, p=.001). If the student deemed the mentor to be positive played a significant role at time 1 and 2, but was again larger at time 2 (F=12.615, p=.001) than time 1 (F=5.708, p=.021).

Multivariate Testsb

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.

SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.005	.102a	2	43	0.903
	Wilks' Lambda	0.995	.102a	2	43	0.903
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.124	3.034a	2	43	0.059
	Wilks' Lambda	0.876	3.034a	2	43	0.059
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.015	.332a	2	43	0.719
	Wilks' Lambda	0.985	.332a	2	43	0.719
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.18	4.717a	2	43	0.014
	Wilks' Lambda	0.82	4.717a	2	43	0.014
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.147	3.709a	2	43	0.033
	Wilks' Lambda	0.853	3.709a	2	43	0.033
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.313	9.810a	2	43	0
	Wilks' Lambda	0.687	9.810a	2	43	0
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.229	6.386a	2	43	0.004
	Wilks' Lambda	0.771	6.386a	2	43	0.004
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.01	.218a	2	43	0.805
	Wilks' Lambda	0.99	.218a	2	43	0.805
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.008	.164a	2	43	0.849
	Wilks' Lambda	0.992	.164a	2	43	0.849
HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.014	.304a	2	43	0.739
	Wilks' Lambda	0.986	.304a	2	43	0.739
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.054	1.229a	2	43	0.303
	Wilks' Lambda	0.946	1.229a	2	43	0.303
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.04	.892a	2	43	0.417
	Wilks' Lambda	0.96	.892a	2	43	0.417
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.063	1.434a	2	43	0.249
	Wilks' Lambda	0.937	1.434a	2	43	0.249

GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.033	.735a	2	43	0.485
	Wilks' Lambda	0.967	.735a	2	43	0.485

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	SchIdxT1	820.836a	14	58.631	53.224	0
	SchIdxT2	819.176b	14	58.513	76.027	0
SexT1	SchIdxT1	0.06	1	0.06	0.055	0.816
	SchIdxT2	0.002	1	0.002	0.003	0.955
EthnicgroupT1	SchIdxT1	5.505	1	5.505	4.997	0.031
	SchIdxT2	4.582	1	4.582	5.953	0.019
LangT1	SchIdxT1	0.747	1	0.747	0.678	0.415
	SchIdxT2	0.351	1	0.351	0.456	0.503
MealsT1	SchIdxT1	8.705	1	8.705	7.902	0.007
	SchIdxT2	1.52	1	1.52	1.974	0.167
ReligionT1	SchIdxT1	5.185	1	5.185	4.707	0.035
	SchIdxT2	5.842	1	5.842	7.591	0.008
IVHowlongT2	SchIdxT1	13.351	1	13.351	12.12	0.001
	SchIdxT2	15.446	1	15.446	20.07	0
positiveT2	SchIdxT1	6.288	1	6.288	5.708	0.021
	SchIdxT2	9.709	1	9.709	12.615	0.001
realisticT2	SchIdxT1	0.127	1	0.127	0.116	0.735
	SchIdxT2	0.005	1	0.005	0.007	0.933
EncouragingT2	SchIdxT1	0.132	1	0.132	0.12	0.731
	SchIdxT2	0.241	1	0.241	0.313	0.579
HumorousT2	SchIdxT1	0.063	1	0.063	0.057	0.813
	SchIdxT2	0.058	1	0.058	0.075	0.785
InspirationalT2	SchIdxT1	2.191	1	2.191	1.989	0.165
	SchIdxT2	1.87	1	1.87	2.43	0.126
SuccessfulT2	SchIdxT1	1.05	1	1.05	0.953	0.334
	SchIdxT2	1.39	1	1.39	1.806	0.186

GivesusefuladviceT2	SchIdxT1	9.58E-05	1	9.58E-05	0	0.993
	SchIdxT2	0.841	1	0.841	1.092	0.302
GoodlistenerT2	SchIdxT1	1.184	1	1.184	1.075	0.305
	SchIdxT2	1.147	1	1.147	1.491	0.229
Error	SchIdxT1	48.47	44	1.102		
	SchIdxT2	33.864	44	0.77		
Total	SchIdxT1	869.307	58			
	SchIdxT2	853.04	58			

a. R Squared = .944 (Adjusted R Squared = .927) b. R Squared = .960 (Adjusted R Squared = .948)

Compared to controls:
Results: Yet again, religion was found to have a significant, and extremely large, effect on the outcome variable, while no other demographics mattered significantly. Again, religion's effect remained relatively stable between time 1 (F=64.027, p=.001) and time 2 (F=68.294, p=.001), indicating that it mattered to the outcome, but the outcome did not change much between time 1 and 2 because of it.

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.067	.820a	2	23	0.453
	Wilks' Lambda	0.933	.820a	2	23	0.453
SexC1	Pillai's Trace	0.07	.862a	2	23	0.436
	Wilks' Lambda	0.93	.862a	2	23	0.436
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.104	1.342a	2	23	0.281
	Wilks' Lambda	0.896	1.342a	2	23	0.281
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.017	.205a	2	23	0.816
	Wilks' Lambda	0.983	.205a	2	23	0.816
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.775	39.501a	2	23	0
	Wilks' Lambda	0.225	39.501a	2	23	0

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	SchIdxC1	383.228a	5	76.646	77.869	0
	SchIdxC2	403.704b	5	80.741	74.477	0
EthnicgroupC1	SchIdxC1	1.668	1	1.668	1.695	0.205
	SchIdxC2	0.516	1	0.516	0.476	0.497
SexC1	SchIdxC1	0.131	1	0.131	0.133	0.718
	SchIdxC2	1.687	1	1.687	1.556	0.224
LangC1	SchIdxC1	2.755	1	2.755	2.799	0.107
	SchIdxC2	1.059	1	1.059	0.977	0.333
MealsC1	SchIdxC1	0.406	1	0.406	0.413	0.527
	SchIdxC2	0.255	1	0.255	0.236	0.632
ReligionC1	SchIdxC1	63.021	1	63.021	64.027	0
	SchIdxC2	74.038	1	74.038	68.294	0
Error	SchIdxC1	23.623	24	0.984		
	SchIdxC2	26.019	24	1.084		
Total	SchIdxC1	406.851	29			
	SchIdxC2	429.722	29			

a. R Squared = .942 (Adjusted R Squared = .930) b. R Squared = .939 (Adjusted R Squared = .927)

ANCOVA Results: If the student deemed the mentor positive played a significant role on the view of school at time 2. This indicates that if the mentor was positive rather than not the student was more likely to feel better about school in the school index at time 2 (F=5.741, p=.021).

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable:SchIdxT2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	6.377a	15	0.425	1.466	0.163
Intercept	22.825	1	22.825	78.703	0
IVHowlongT2	0.329	1	0.329	1.136	0.293
SexT1	0.839	1	0.839	2.892	0.096
EthnicgroupT1	0.432	1	0.432	1.491	0.229
LangT1	0.445	1	0.445	1.534	0.222
MealsT1	0.612	1	0.612	2.111	0.154
ReligionT1	0.03	1	0.03	0.102	0.751
positiveT2	1.665	1	1.665	5.741	0.021
realisticT2	0.004	1	0.004	0.013	0.91
EncouragingT2	0.017	1	0.017	0.06	0.808
HumorousT2	0.025	1	0.025	0.085	0.772

HardworkingT2	0.158	1	0.158	0.546	0.464
InspirationalT2	0.086	1	0.086	0.295	0.59
UnderstandingT2	0.104	1	0.104	0.359	0.552
SuccessfulT2	0.001	1	0.001	0.004	0.951
GivesusefuladviceT2	0.03	1	0.03	0.104	0.748
Error	12.18	42	0.29		
Total	853.04	58			
Corrected Total	18.557	57			

a. R Squared = .344 (Adjusted R Squared = .109)

Paired samples t-test

Results: Surprisingly, a rather strong and significant correlation was found in the mean value of the students' views of school at time 1 and time 2 (r=.466, p=.000). Also, no significance was found in the paired samples t-test for differences in the outcomes' means for both times. This may be due to the fact that most students feel a certain way about school and maintained their view despite their mentoring, but that is not true for all the students. And as most students were seen to feel positively about school at time 1, there was little or no positive change to have occurred for time 2. The few students that did have poorer views may have changed, and we must rely on the results from the MANCOVA and ANCOVA to assess what measures may have played a role in those students change.

Compared to control group:

Results: No significance was found for the correlations or paired sample t-test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	SchIdxC1	3.7178	30	0.77002	0.14059
	SchIdxC2	3.8333	30	0.69205	0.12635

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	SchIdxT1 - SchIdxT2	-0.01038	0.64336	0.08237	-0.17515	0.15439	-0.126	60	0.9

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	SchIdxT1 & SchIdxT2	61	0.466	0

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	SchIdxC1 & SchIdxC2	30	0.282	0.131

Scaled questions on happiness/well-being?

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	SchIdxC1 - SchIdxC2	-0.11556	0.87834	0.16036	-0.44353	0.21242	-0.721	29	0.477

MANCOVA

Results: The mentored students' index of happiness and wellness at time 1 and 2 were significantly

affected by the student's religion, length of time the student was mentored, and if the mentor was deemed 'positive'. Religion seemed to have an important role in the outcome at both time 1 (F=5.743, p=.026) and time 2 (F=8.661, p=.008), though the impact was larger at time 2. The length of time spent with the mentor again had an impact on the student's index of happiness/wellness, though this time it was larger at time 1 (F=15.067, p=.0001) than time 2 (F=10.726, p=.004). If the student deemed the mentor to be positive played the most significant role in the difference in students' feelings of happiness/wellness at time 1 and 2, and was nearly equal at time 1 (F=17.479, p=.0001) and time 2 (F=17.497, p=.0001).

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
SexT1	Pillai's Trace	0.155	1.741a	2	19	0.202
	Wilks' Lambda	0.845	1.741a	2	19	0.202
EthnicgroupT1	Pillai's Trace	0.253	3.214a	2	19	0.063
	Wilks' Lambda	0.747	3.214a	2	19	0.063
LangT1	Pillai's Trace	0.123	1.335a	2	19	0.287
	Wilks' Lambda	0.877	1.335a	2	19	0.287
MealsT1	Pillai's Trace	0.084	.875a	2	19	0.433
	Wilks' Lambda	0.916	.875a	2	19	0.433
ReligionT1	Pillai's Trace	0.308	4.224a	2	19	0.03
	Wilks' Lambda	0.692	4.224a	2	19	0.03
IVHowlongT2	Pillai's Trace	0.44	7.457a	2	19	0.004
	Wilks' Lambda	0.56	7.457a	2	19	0.004
positiveT2	Pillai's Trace	0.508	9.792a	2	19	0.001
	Wilks' Lambda	0.492	9.792a	2	19	0.001
realisticT2	Pillai's Trace	0.02	.197a	2	19	0.822
	Wilks' Lambda	0.98	.197a	2	19	0.822
EncouragingT2	Pillai's Trace	0.041	.402a	2	19	0.674

	Wilks' Lambda	0.959	.402a	2	19	0.674
HumorousT2	Pillai's Trace	0.013	.123a	2	19	0.885
	Wilks' Lambda	0.987	.123a	2	19	0.885
InspirationalT2	Pillai's Trace	0.115	1.236a	2	19	0.313
	Wilks' Lambda	0.885	1.236a	2	19	0.313
SuccessfulT2	Pillai's Trace	0.171	1.965a	2	19	0.168
	Wilks' Lambda	0.829	1.965a	2	19	0.168
GivesusefuladviceT2	Pillai's Trace	0.118	1.270a	2	19	0.304
	Wilks' Lambda	0.882	1.270a	2	19	0.304
GoodlistenerT2	Pillai's Trace	0.031	.307a	2	19	0.739
	Wilks' Lambda	0.969	.307a	2	19	0.739

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	WellSclT1	465.950a	14	33.282	76.519	0
	WellSclT2	498.132b	14	35.581	84.385	0
SexT1	WellSclT1	1.155	1	1.155	2.655	0.119
	WellSclT2	1.453	1	1.453	3.445	0.078
EthnicgroupT1	WellSclT1	2.038	1	2.038	4.685	0.043
	WellSclT2	2.727	1	2.727	6.467	0.019
LangT1	WellSclT1	0.375	1	0.375	0.863	0.364
	WellSclT2	1.146	1	1.146	2.717	0.115
MealsT1	WellSclT1	0.385	1	0.385	0.885	0.358
	WellSclT2	0.777	1	0.777	1.843	0.19
ReligionT1	WellSclT1	2.498	1	2.498	5.743	0.026
	WellSclT2	3.652	1	3.652	8.661	0.008
IVHowlongT2	WellSclT1	6.553	1	6.553	15.067	0.001
	WellSclT2	4.522	1	4.522	10.726	0.004
positiveT2	WellSclT1	7.603	1	7.603	17.479	0
	WellSclT2	7.378	1	7.378	17.497	0
realisticT2	WellSclT1	0.001	1	0.001	0.002	0.965
	WellSclT2	0.078	1	0.078	0.185	0.672
EncouragingT2	WellSclT1	0.057	1	0.057	0.132	0.721
	WellSclT2	0.311	1	0.311	0.738	0.4
HumorousT2	WellSclT1	0.005	1	0.005	0.011	0.919
	WellSclT2	0.034	1	0.034	0.081	0.778
InspirationalT2	WellSclT1	0.736	1	0.736	1.693	0.208

	WellSclT2	1.066	1	1.066	2.529	0.127
SuccessfulT2	WellSclT1	1.568	1	1.568	3.605	0.072
	WellSclT2	1.437	1	1.437	3.409	0.08
GivesusefuladviceT2	WellSclT1	0.049	1	0.049	0.112	0.741
	WellSclT2	0.805	1	0.805	1.908	0.182
GoodlistenerT2	WellSclT1	0.003	1	0.003	0.007	0.936
	WellSclT2	0.168	1	0.168	0.398	0.535
Error	WellSclT1	8.699	20	0.435		
	WellSclT2	8.433	20	0.422		
Total	WellSclT1	474.649	34			
	WellSclT2	506.565	34			

a. R Squared = .982 (Adjusted R Squared = .969) b. R Squared = .983 (Adjusted R Squared = .972)

Compared to control group:
Results: For the first time something other than religion alone had an effect on the outcome measure for the control group between time 1 and 2. For the wellness index outcome, the significant covariates were the students' ethnicity, as well as religion. Ethnicity played a larger role at time 1 (F= 7.473, p=.012) than time 2 (F=5.218, p=.032), while religion was uniformly massive, though noticeably larger at time 2 (F=63.541,p=.001) than time 1 (F=46.906, p=.0001).

Multivariate Testsb

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
EthnicgroupC1	Pillai's Trace	0.254	3.740a	2	22	0.04
	Wilks' Lambda	0.746	3.740a	2	22	0.04
SexC1	Pillai's Trace	0.254	3.754a	2	22	0.04
	Wilks' Lambda	0.746	3.754a	2	22	0.04
LangC1	Pillai's Trace	0.138	1.767a	2	22	0.194
	Wilks' Lambda	0.862	1.767a	2	22	0.194
MealsC1	Pillai's Trace	0.049	.570a	2	22	0.574
	Wilks' Lambda	0.951	.570a	2	22	0.574
ReligionC1	Pillai's Trace	0.746	32.251a	2	22	0
	Wilks' Lambda	0.254	32.251a	2	22	0

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	WellIdxC1	345.858a	5	69.172	109.432	0
	WellIdxC2	363.946b	5	72.789	110.849	0
EthnicgroupC1	WellIdxC1	4.724	1	4.724	7.473	0.012
	WellIdxC2	3.426	1	3.426	5.218	0.032
SexC1	WellIdxC1	4.944	1	4.944	7.821	0.01
	WellIdxC2	2.053	1	2.053	3.126	0.09
LangC1	WellIdxC1	2.239	1	2.239	3.543	0.073
	WellIdxC2	1.598	1	1.598	2.434	0.132
MealsC1	WellIdxC1	0.744	1	0.744	1.178	0.289
	WellIdxC2	0.441	1	0.441	0.672	0.421
ReligionC1	WellIdxC1	29.649	1	29.649	46.906	0
	WellIdxC2	41.724	1	41.724	63.541	0
Error	WellIdxC1	14.538	23	0.632		
	WellIdxC2	15.103	23	0.657		
Total	WellIdxC1	360.396	28			
	WellIdxC2	379.049	28			

a. R Squared = .960 (Adjusted R Squared = .951) b. R Squared = .960 (Adjusted R Squared = .951)

ANCOVA

Results: If the student received meals from the school played a significant role on the student's happiness/wellness level index at time 2. This indicates that if the not receiving meals rather than not the student was more likely to feel better in the wellness index at time 2 (F=5.217, p=.027).

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable:WellIdxT2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4.176a	15	0.278	1.152	0.344
Intercept	24.842	1	24.842	102.83	0
IVHowlongT2	0.182	1	0.182	0.755	0.39
SexT1	1.98E-05	1	1.98E-05	0	0.993
EthnicgroupT1	0.014	1	0.014	0.058	0.811

LangT1	0.383	1	0.383	1.587	0.215
MealsT1	1.26	1	1.26	5.217	0.027
ReligionT1	0.06	1	0.06	0.249	0.62
positiveT2	0.738	1	0.738	3.053	0.088
realisticT2	0	1	0	0.002	0.968
EncouragingT2	0.644	1	0.644	2.664	0.11
HumorousT2	0.292	1	0.292	1.207	0.278
HardworkingT2	0.009	1	0.009	0.036	0.85
InspirationalT2	1.50E-05	1	1.50E-05	0	0.994
UnderstandingT2	0.009	1	0.009	0.037	0.849
SuccessfulT2	0.005	1	0.005	0.02	0.888
GivesusefuladviceT2	0.013	1	0.013	0.054	0.817
Error	10.147	42	0.242		
Total	819.759	58			
Corrected Total	14.323	57			

a. R Squared = .292 (Adjusted R Squared = .039)

Paired sample t-test

Results: There was only a mild correlation found between this outcome at time 1 and time 2 (r= .252; p=.052). This indicates that there was not a strong level of stability in the students' answers on this question between time 1 and time 2. The paired samples t-test was not significant, and no conclusions on the comparison of meals between time 1 (m=3.65) and time 2 (m=3.72) could be drawn.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	WellIdxT1	3.6564	60	0.45975	0.05935
	WellIdxT2	3.7288	60	0.50407	0.06508

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	WellIdxT1 & WellIdxT2	60	0.252	0.052

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	WellIdxT1 - WellIdxT2	-0.07239	0.59041	0.07622	-0.22491	0.08013	-0.95	59	0.346

Compared to control:
Results: No significance was found in the control group for correlations between time 1 and 2, or the paired sample t-test, so no conclusions may be reliably drawn.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	WellIdxC1	3.5327	29	0.50121	0.09307
	WellIdxC2	3.6723	29	0.41699	0.07743

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	WellIdxC1 & WellIdxC2	29	-0.015	0.937

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	WellIdxC1 - WellIdxC2	-0.13955	0.65693	0.12199	-0.38943	0.11033	-1.144	28	0.262

ANNEX II: TEMPLATE SURVEY

Please tell us about yourself. Feel free to leave blank or put a line through any questions you would rather not answer. If you make a mistake, just cross through the wrong answer and tick the right answer. This should take about 15 minutes to complete.

All the information you provide will remain anonymous and confidential and no-one else will receive this. This means we will not tell anyone what your answers are unless we feel that you or somebody else is at risk or harm. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

You are under no obligation to complete this survey and can withdraw at any time. That said, any information you do provide will be used in a Demos report so it is important that you answer as honestly as you can.

I understand my rights (if not please ask a teacher(s) present) and I agree for the information I give to be used to contribute to the research.

☐ Yes

☐ No

This questionnaire is part some long-term research Demos is doing, and we'd like to send you another questionnaire some time again in the future. If you are happy to do this even if you have left school, please write your home address here:

None of this information will be shared.

Part 1: about you

These questions are about you.

What is your name?

How old are you?

What sex are you?

☐ Male ☐ Female

What is your ethnic group?

☐ White – British

☐ White – Irish

☐ Any other White background

(Please write in)

☐ Asian or Asian British – Indian

☐ Asian or Asian British – Pakistani

☐ Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi

☐ Any other Asian background

(Please write in)

.....

☐ Chinese

☐ Any other ethnic background

☐ Prefer not to say

☐ Black or Black British – Caribbean

☐ Black or Black British – African

☐ Any other Black background

(Please write in)

☐ Mixed – White and Black Caribbean

☐ Mixed – White and Black African

☐ Mixed – White and Asian

☐ Any other mixed background

(Please write in)

If you are at schools what are you studying for?

☐ GCSE

☐ A-levels

☐ GNVQ foundation/intermediate (do we want to differentiate between these?)

☐ NVQ level 1 or 2

☐ OCR (level 1 or 2 equivalent)

☐ BTEC, Edexcel or LQL Certificate (level 1 or 2 equivalent)

☐ City and Guilds (level 1 or 2 equivalent)

☐ None

☐ Other (please specify)

Do you have any of the following?

☐ GCSE (will anyone have A levels or are they too young?)

☐ GNVQ foundation/intermediate (do we want to differentiate between these?)

☐ NVQ level 1 or 2

☐ OCR (level 1 or 2 equivalent)

☐ BTEC, Edexcel or LQL Certificate (level 1 or 2 equivalent)

☐ City and Guilds (level 1 or 2 equivalent)

☐ None

☐ Other (please specify)

Is English your first or main language?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I am bilingual

Do you have a long-standing disability or a health problem?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Do you have free school meals?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Are one or both of your parents working?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Do you live with your parents?

☐ Yes – with both

☐ Yes – with my mum

☐ Yes – with dad

☐ Yes – with step/foster parents

☐ No

Do you have a brothers and/or sisters?

☐ Older brother(s)/sister(s)

☐ Younger brother(s)/sisters

☐ No

What is your religion?

☐ Christian

☐ Muslim

☐ Hindu

☐ Sikh

☐ None

☐ Other (please state)

Part 2: about the mentoring

If you are at the start of your mentoring experience, just answer what you can

How long have you be part of the mosaic mentoring programme (you can tick one answer):

☐ Less than a week

☐ Between one week and one month

☐ Between one month and six months

☐ Between six months and one year

☐ Over one year

Why did you choose to take part? (please tick all that apply)

☐ Thought it would improve my chances of getting work after leaving school

☐ Thought it would improve my chances of getting on a degree course

☐ Thought it would improve my self-esteem

☐ Seemed like it would be fun

☐ Friends were taking part

☐ People I know who had been on it before found it useful

☐ Other (please specify):.....

Do you feel that in general, your mentor's expectations of you are … (you can tick more than one answer):

☐ Positive?

☐ Realistic?

☐ Too low?

☐ Too high?

☐ About right?

☐ Too soon to say?

What characteristics best describe your mentor (you can tick more than one answer):

☐ Encouraging

☐ Charismatic

☐ Humorous

☐ Hard-working

☐ Inspirational

☐ Strict

☐ Easy going

☐ Understanding

☐ Friendly

☐ Successful

☐ Lots of experience of the world

☐ Gives useful advice

☐ Good listener

☐ Good religious knowledge

Please read the following statements, and circle one answer that most reflects your view.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

The goals and objectives of the programme were clearly defined

1 2 3 4 5

I felt supported in this mentoring programme

1 2 3 4 5

The time commitment for each interaction was just right

1 2 3 4 5

The match between my mentoring partner and I worked

1 2 3 4 5

The overall expected outcomes for the programme were realistic

1 2 3 4 5

The programme worked for me

1 2 3 4 5

The match between my mentoring partner and I met my needs

1 2 3 4 5

We met regularly

1 2 3 4 5

We came prepared to use the time effectively

1 2 3 4 5

We were confident about what to do when we started

1 2 3 4 5

My mentor understood what I was saying

1 2 3 4 5

We had meaningful conversations

1 2 3 4 5

I was in control of the things we talked about

1 2 3 4 5

Thinking about the answers you've just given... if you had the chance to make three changes, what would they be?

1).....
.....
.....
.....

2).....
.....
.....
.....

3).....
.....
.....
.....

Part 3: your future

What would you like to do when you can leave school?

☐ Continue in full time education

☐ Start learning a trade/get a place on a training scheme

☐ Start an apprenticeship

☐ Get a full time paid job

☐ Be unemployed/sign on

☐ Travel

☐ Something else

☐ Don't know

How likely is it that you will go on to university and do a degree at some point in the future?

☐ Very likely

☐ Fairly likely

☐ Neither likely nor unlikely

☐ Fairly unlikely

☐ Very unlikely

☐ Don't know

How likely do you think it is that if you do apply to university you will get in?

☐ Very likely

☐ Fairly likely

☐ Neither likely nor unlikely

☐ Fairly unlikely

☐ Very unlikely

☐ Don't know

How confident do you feel that you will find a job when you leave school?

☐ Very confident

☐ Quite confident

☐ Neither confident nor unconfident

☐ Not very confident

☐ Very unconfident

Other (please write in):

How confident are you that you will be happier in 12 months' time than you are now?

☐ Very confident

☐ Quite confident

☐ Neither confident nor unconfident

☐ Not very confident

☐ Very unconfident

Other (please write in):

Please read the following statements, and circle one answer that most reflects your view.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

I need to have a university degree to get the kind of job I want to do

1 2 3 4 5

The best jobs go to people who have been to university

1 2 3 4 5

Most of my friends are planning to go to university

1 2 3 4 5

People like me don't go to university

1 2 3 4 5

Having any kind of job is better than being unemployed

1 2 3 4 5

Having a job or career in the future is important to me

1 2 3 4 5

Having a job that leads somewhere is important

1 2 3 4 5

I don't really think much about what I might be doing in a few years' time

1 2 3 4 5

I'll just wait and see where I end up

1 2 3 4 5

My faith is a barrier to me achieving the things I want in life

1 2 3 4 5

My ethnicity is a barrier to me achieving the things I want in life

1 2 3 4 5

Part 4: what you do at the moment

How happy are you at school at the moment?

☐ Very happy

☐ Quite happy

☐ Neither happy nor unhappy

☐ Quite unhappy

☐ Very unhappy

How much effort do you put into your classes at the moment?

☐ A lot of effort

☐ Quite a lot of effort

☐ Average

☐ Not much effort

☐ Hardly any effort at all

During an average week in term time, on how many evening do you do any homework?

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5 +

How good are your grades at school at the moment?

☐ Very good

☐ Quite good

☐ Average

☐ Quite bad

☐ Very bad

How often do you misbehave or cause trouble in your classes?

☐ In most or all of them

☐ Less often but in more than half of them

☐ In about half of them

☐ Now and then

☐ This has not been a problem at all

6. In the last 12 months, have you ever played truant, that is missed school without permission, even if it was only for a half day or a single lesson?

☐ Yes

☐ No Less often but in more than half of them

☐ Don't know

☐ I don't want to answer

7. Please read the following statements, and circle one answer that most reflects your view.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

School is a waste of time for me

1 2 3 4 5

On the whole I like being at school

1 2 3 4 5

I work as hard as I can in school

1 2 3 4 5

I am bored in lessons

1 2 3 4 5

I find it hard to concentrate on my schoolwork

1 2 3 4 5

I find it hard to keep motivated to study

1 2 3 4 5

8. Do you have any out of school activities? Please tick as many as you want

☐ Dance

☐ Language

☐ Speech or drama

☐ Religious activity

☐ Sport

☐ Volunteering

☐ Other

9. How often do you do these things?

☐ 3-4 times a week or more

☐ More than once a week

☐ Once a week

☐ Less then once a week

☐ One off

☐ Never

10. Which of the following things have you been to or done in the last four weeks?

☐ Gone to a political meeting/march, rally or demonstration

☐ Done community work (such as helping elderly, disabled or other dependent people; cleaning up the environment; helping volunteer organisations or charities)

☐ Gone to a youth club or something like it (including scouts or girl guides)

☐ Just hung around/messed about near to your home

☐ Just hung around/messed about in the high street or the town/city centre

☐ All of these

☐ None of these

11. How well or badly would you say you get on with your family?

☐ Very well

☐ Fairly well

☐ Fairly badly

☐ Very badly

☐ Don't know

☐ Don't want to answer

12. How well or badly would you say you get on with your friends?

☐ Very well

☐ Fairly well

☐ Fairly badly

☐ Very badly

☐ Don't know

☐ Don't want to answer

13. Please read the following statements, and circle one answer that most reflects your view.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself

1 2 3 4 5

At times I think I am no good at all

1 2 3 4 5

I am able to do things as well as most other people

1 2 3 4 5

I certainly feel useless at times

1 2 3 4 5

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure

1 2 3 4 5

I take a positive attitude toward myself

1 2 3 4 5

I have just lately:

Been able to concentrate on whatever I am doing

1 2 3 4 5

Felt capable of making decisions about things

1 2 3 4 5

Been able to face up to my problems

1 2 3 4 5

Been feeling reasonably happy all things considered

1 2 3 4 5

Been able to enjoy my normal day-to-day activities

1 2 3 4 5

Felt that I am playing a useful part in things

1 2 3 4 5

Lost much sleep over worry

1 2 3 4 5

Felt constantly under strain

1 2 3 4 5

Felt that I couldn't overcome my difficulties

1 2 3 4 5

Been feeling unhappy and depressed

1 2 3 4 5

Been losing confidence in myself

1 2 3 4 5

Been thinking of myself as a worthless person

1 2 3 4 5

Do you think that most of the time it's not worth trying hard because things never turn out right anyway?

1 2 3 4 5

Are people good to you no matter how you act towards them?

1 2 3 4 5

Are you a person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?

1 2 3 4 5

Are you often blamed for things which just aren't your fault?

1 2 3 4 5

Do you find it easy to get up in the morning?

1 2 3 4 5

When someone is very angry with you is it impossible to make him/her your friend again?

1 2 3 4 5

When bad things happen to you is it usually someone else's fault?

1 2 3 4 5

When nice things happen to you is it only good luck?

1 2 3 4 5

When you get into an argument is it usually the other person's fault?

1 2 3 4 5

Thank you very much for taking part in this questionnaire. If you have any questions or would like some more information, please get in touch with Jamie at Demos:

Jamie.Bartlett@demos.co.uk or 0207 3674200

ANNEX III: THREE STUDIES OF MENTORING PROGRAMMES

A) Michael Shiner, Tara Young, Tim Newburn, and Sylvie Groben (2004) Mentoring disaffected young people: An evaluation of Mentoring Plus, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

The study focused on a set of programmes, known as Mentoring Plus. These projects were run by Crime Concern and Breaking Barriers. They target disaffected young people and sought to build their basic education, employment skills and confidence through a one-to-one mentoring relationship with an adult volunteer drawn from the local community and a structured education and careers programme.

Each programme runs for ten to twelve months and typically starts with a residential course which aims to build trust between young people and mentors through a mixture of physical outdoor activities and indoor sessions. Following the matching, the young people and mentors are expected to meet once a week for the duration of the programme. The aim is to provide positive and supportive role models to young people who have previously experienced very difficult relationships with adults. The education/training programme aims to provide the young people with the complementary practical life skills and educational/training opportunities needed to support their new personal goals. Classes are designed and led both by in-house project staff and in partnership with existing local providers. Young people have the option of receiving accreditation for their work. During the period covered by the evaluation

The evaluation was conducted from July 2000 to September 2003), and was based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. In total, 378 young people who participated were studied.

B) Youth Justice Board (2005) National Evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes 2001-4

This looked at 39 community mentoring schemes which work with offenders or at 'high-risk' individuals. The groups were: black minority ethnic, or 'hard to-reach' young people and young people with literacy and numeracy needs were the target groups.

The mentor programmes evaluated here were 'competency focused'. That is, they set out to teach basic literacy, numeracy, social, or life skills, in the hope

that such skills would help the young people to interact better with their social and physical environments, and so improve their prospects.

The evaluation studied projects that differed greatly in the length and form of their mentor programmes. Some of the projects employed the conventional model of mentoring, involving one-to-one meetings between a mentor and young person in a community setting once per week. However, some met daily, some projects delivered mentoring on the project premises and a few brought mentors and mentees together as a group. The length of mentor programmes was designed to vary widely, from three months to a year.

C) Kate Philip, Carole King and Jane Shucksmith (2004) Sharing a laugh? A qualitative study of mentoring interventions with young people, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

This research looked at the impact of mentoring on young people in three settings: a housing project and an education project where paid keyworkers acted as mentors and a befriending scheme where volunteers acted as mentors.

The research took place in three settings: a befriending project in a large city, a housing project for young homeless people and an alternative education project for young people who were excluded from mainstream schools. Within the befriending project, volunteers were matched one-to-one with a young person. A paid co-coordinator recruited, trained, matched and supported these volunteers. Within the other two projects, paid staff were employed as keyworkers and worked on both an individual and a group basis.

The young people involved in the study were variously described as 'socially excluded', 'vulnerable' or 'disaffected'. Many had experienced family problems and most had grown up in poverty. Within the education and housing projects, many had been excluded from school and this had been the reason for referral for mentoring. Within the befriending project, family difficulties and social isolation were more likely to lead to referral.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

'*1000 sisters' voices'. a survey* carried out by Sisters and Ummah food, 2008

Abbas, T (2007) 'British Muslim Minorities Today: Challenges and Opportunities to Europeanism, Multiculturalism and Islamism' *Sociology Compass, 1 (2)*

Balance (2002) *Existing Mentoring Schemes in the United Kingdom*

Bandura, A (1993) 'Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning', *Educational Psychologist, 28(2)*

Bandura, A (2001) 'Social cognitive theory: an agentic perspective' *Annual Review of Psychology, January 2001*

Baylis, N (2005) 'Relationship with reality – and its role in the wellbeing of young adults' in Huppert, F Baylis, N and Keverne B, *The Science of well-being*, (Oxford University Press)

Cabinet Office, (December, 2008) *Aspirations and attainment amongst young people in deprived communities,* London

Colley, H (2003*) Mentoring for Social Inclusion. A Critical Approach to Nurturing Mentoring Relationships*, Routledge

Department for Children Families and Schools, (2009) *Quality, Choice and Aspirations*, London

Dwyer, C., Modood, T., Sanghera, G., Shah, B., & Thapar-Bjorkert, S (2006) *Ethnicity as social capital? Explaining the differential educational achievements of young British Pakistani men and women Bristol,* Paper presented at the 'Ethnicity, Mobility and Society' Leverhulme Programme Conference at University of Bristol, 16-17 March, 2006

Gutman, L. & Akerman, R., (2008), *Aspirations and Attainment, a review for the Social Exclusion Taskforce,* Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning/Cabinet Office, London

Hamid, S 'Models of Muslim Youth Work: Between reform and empowerment' in *Youth & Policy*, *number 92* (2006)

Home Office Research Study 232 (2001) *Dalston Youth Project Part II (11-14) An Evaluation*

Hussain, T (2006) 'Working Islamically with Young People or working with Muslim Youth', *Youth & Poverty*, *number 92*

Jones, A 'Life Meaningless for one in ten young adults' *The Independent,* 5 January 2009

Khan, M (2006) 'Towards a National Strategy for Muslim Youth Work, *Youth & Policy*, number 92

Layard, R (2005) *Happiness: Lessons from a new science,* Penguin: London

Margo, J (2007) *Freedom's Orphans*, Institute for Public Policy Research, London

Megginson, D & Clutterbuck, D (1995) *Mentoring in Action: A Practical Guides for Managers*, Kogan Page

Morrow, V & Elliott, J, 'Imagining the future: preliminary analysis of NCDS essays written by children aged 11', *CLS working paper 2007/1* (London: Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2007).

Muslim Youth Helpline (2004) *Youth Matters*

National Literacy Trust, (2006) *Literacy and education levels by ethnic group and populations* (on-line)

Open Society Institute, (2005) *British Muslims and Education*, available from: http://www.eumap.org/topics/minority/reports/britishmuslims/sections/education/7_Education.pdf;

Philip, K., King, C., & Shucksmith, J (2004) *Sharing a laugh? A qualitative study of mentoring interventions with young people*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Reeves, R & Lexmond, J (2009) *Building Character*, London; Demos.

Roderick, M. (2006). *Closing the aspiration-attainment gap: Implications for high school reform*, London

Rotter, J (1975) 'Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement' *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 43, 56-67.*

Ryan, R & Deci, E (2000) 'Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being' *American Psychologist, 55*

Runnymede Trust (2009) *Who cares about the white working class?* London

Schoon, I. & Parsons, S., (2002), 'Teenage Aspirations for Future Careers and Occupational Outcomes' in *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 60, 262-288, Elsevier Science, USA

Schneider, B., & Stevenson, D. (1999). The ambitious generation. *Educational Leadership, 57*(4), 22-25.

Seldon, A 'Lessons in Life' *The Independent, 19 April 2006*

Shiner, M., Young, T., & Newburn, T & Groben., W (2004) *Mentoring disaffected young people: An evaluation of Mentoring Plus*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

The Government's Response to the Ethnic Minority Business Task Force, 2009. Available from: http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53440.pdf

Youth Justice Board (2005) *National Evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes*

Young Foundation & London Development Agency (2008*) Valuing Family, Valuing Work: British Muslim Women and the Labour market,* London

Youthnet 'Fear and hoping in the UK', 25 November 2008 at www.youthnet.org/mediaandcampaigns

Demos – Licence to Publish

The work (as defined below) is provided under the terms of this licence ('licence'). The work is protected by copyright and/or other applicable law. Any use of the work other than as authorized under this licence is prohibited. By exercising any rights to the work provided here, you accept and agree to be bound by the terms of this licence. Demos grants you the rights contained here in consideration of your acceptance of such terms and conditions.

1 Definitions

a 'Collective Work' means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Work in its entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole. A work that constitutes a Collective Work will not be considered a Derivative Work (as defined below) for the purposes of this Licence.

b 'Derivative Work' means a work based upon the Work or upon the Work and other pre-existing works, such as a musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Work may be recast, transformed, or adapted, except that a work that constitutes a Collective Work or a translation from English into another language will not be considered a Derivative Work for the purpose of this Licence.

c 'Licensor' means the individual or entity that offers the Work under the terms of this Licence.

d 'Original Author' means the individual or entity who created the Work.

e 'Work' means the copyrightable work of authorship offered under the terms of this Licence.

f 'You' means an individual or entity exercising rights under this Licence who has not previously violated the terms of this Licence with respect to the Work,or who has received express permission from Demos to exercise rights under this Licence despite a previous violation.

2 Fair Use Rights

Nothing in this licence is intended to reduce, limit, or restrict any rights arising from fair use, first sale or other limitations on the exclusive rights of the copyright owner under copyright law or other applicable laws.

3 Licence Grant

Subject to the terms and conditions of this Licence, Licensor hereby grants You a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive,perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright) licence to exercise the rights in the Work as stated below:

a to reproduce the Work, to incorporate the Work into one or more Collective Works, and to reproduce the Work as incorporated in the Collective Works;

b to distribute copies or phonorecords of, display publicly,perform publicly, and perform publicly by means of a digital audio transmission the Work including as incorporated in Collective Works; The above rights may be exercised in all media and formats whether now known or hereafter devised.The above rights include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. All rights not expressly granted by Licensor are hereby reserved.

4 Restrictions

The licence granted in Section 3 above is expressly made subject to and limited by the following restrictions:

a You may distribute,publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work only under the terms of this Licence, and You must include a copy of, or the Uniform Resource Identifier for, this Licence with every copy or phonorecord of the Work You distribute, publicly display,publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform.You may not offer or impose any terms on the Work that alter or restrict the terms of this Licence or the recipients' exercise of the rights granted hereunder.You may not sublicence the Work.You must keep intact all notices that refer to this Licence and to the disclaimer of warranties.You may not distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work with any technological measures that control access or use of the Work in a manner inconsistent with the terms of this Licence Agreement.The above applies to the Work as incorporated in a Collective Work, but this does not require the Collective Work apart from the Work itself to be made subject to the terms of this Licence. If You create a Collective Work, upon notice from any Licencor You must, to the extent practicable, remove from the Collective Work any reference to such Licensor or the Original Author, as requested.

b You may not exercise any of the rights granted to You in Section 3 above in any manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation.The exchange of the Work for other copyrighted works by means of digital filesharing or otherwise shall not be considered to be intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation, provided there is no payment of any monetary compensation in connection with the exchange of copyrighted works.

C If you distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work or any Collective Works,You must keep intact all copyright notices for the Work and give the Original Author credit reasonable to the medium or means You are utilizing by conveying the name (or pseudonym if applicable) of the Original Author if supplied; the title of the Work if supplied. Such credit may be implemented in any reasonable manner; provided, however, that in the case of a Collective Work, at a minimum such credit will appear where any other comparable authorship credit appears and in a manner at least as prominent as such other comparable authorship credit.

5 Representations, Warranties and Disclaimer

A By offering the Work for public release under this Licence, Licensor represents and warrants that, to the best of Licensor's knowledge after reasonable inquiry:

i Licensor has secured all rights in the Work necessary to grant the licence rights hereunder and to permit the lawful exercise of the rights granted hereunder without You having any obligation to pay any royalties, compulsory licence fees, residuals or any other payments;

ii The Work does not infringe the copyright, trademark, publicity rights, common law rights or any other right of any third party or constitute defamation, invasion of privacy or other tortious injury to any third party.

B except as expressly stated in this licence or otherwise agreed in writing or required by applicable law,the work is licenced on an 'as is'basis,without warranties of any kind, either express or implied including,without limitation,any warranties regarding the contents or accuracy of the work.

6 Limitation on Liability

Except to the extent required by applicable law, and except for damages arising from liability to a third party resulting from breach of the warranties in section 5, in no event will licensor be liable to you on any legal theory for any special, incidental,consequential, punitive or exemplary damages arising out of this licence or the use of the work, even if licensor has been advised of the possibility of such damages.

7 Termination

A This Licence and the rights granted hereunder will terminate automatically upon any breach by You of the terms of this Licence. Individuals or entities who have received Collective Works from You under this Licence,however, will not have their licences terminated provided such individuals or entities remain in full compliance with those licences. Sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 will survive any termination of this Licence.

B Subject to the above terms and conditions, the licence granted here is perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright in the Work). Notwithstanding the above, Licensor reserves the right to release the Work under different licence terms or to stop distributing the Work at any time; provided, however that any such election will not serve to withdraw this Licence (or any other licence that has been, or is required to be, granted under the terms of this Licence), and this Licence will continue in full force and effect unless terminated as stated above.

8 Miscellaneous

A Each time You distribute or publicly digitally perform the Work or a Collective Work, Demos offers to the recipient a licence to the Work on the same terms and conditions as the licence granted to You under this Licence.

B If any provision of this Licence is invalid or unenforceable under applicable law, it shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the terms of this Licence, and without further action by the parties to this agreement, such provision shall be reformed to the minimum extent necessary to make such provision valid and enforceable.

C No term or provision of this Licence shall be deemed waived and no breach consented to unless such waiver or consent shall be in writing and signed by the party to be charged with such waiver or consent.

D This Licence constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the Work licensed here.There are no understandings, agreements or representations with respect to the Work not specified here. Licensor shall not be bound by any additional provisions that may appear in any communication from You.This Licence may not be modified without the mutual written agreement of Demos and You.

[1] Colley, H (2003*) Mentoring for Social Inclusion. A Critical Approach to Nurturing Mentoring Relationships*

[2] It is around two thirds, and once those who responded with 'it is too early to say' are excluded, this increases to over 90 per cent

[3] Sixty per cent, once 'too early to say' is excluded

[4] Thirty-two said it had, and only two that it had not. Twenty-five said it was too early to say.
[5] National Literacy Trust, (2006) *Literacy and education levels by ethnic group and populations:* http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/Database/STATS/EALstats.html

[6] Runnymede Trust (2009) *Who cares about the white working class?* London

[7] Open Society Institute, (2005) *British Muslims and Education*, available from: http://www.eumap.org/topics/minority/reports/britishmuslims/sections/education/7_Education.pdf; Abbas, T (2007) 'British Muslim Minorities Today' *Sociology Compass, 1 (2)*

[8] ODPM (2003) *Housing and Black Minority Ethnic Communities: Review of the evidence base,* London: ODPM

[9] Open Society Institute, *British Muslims*

[10] Ibid.

[11] http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=462

[12] http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=462

[13] http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=463

[14] Open Society Institute, *British Muslims*

[15] Abbas, *British Muslim Minorities*

[16] '*1000 sisters' voices': a survey* carried out by Sisters and Ummah food, 2008

[17] Dwyer, C., Modood, T., Sanghera, G., Shah, B., & Thapar-Bjorkert, S (2006) *Ethnicity as social capital? Explaining the differential educational achievements of young British Pakistani men and women Bristol,* Paper presented at the 'Ethnicity, Mobility and Society' Leverhulme Programme Conference at University of Bristol, 16-17 March, 2006

[18] Cabinet Office, (December, 2008) *Aspirations and attainment amongst young people in deprived communities,* London

[19] Schoon, I. & Parsons, S., (2002), 'Teenage Aspirations for Future Careers and Occupational Outcomes' in *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 60, 262-288, Elsevier Science, USA ; Gutman, L. & Akerman, R., (2008), *Aspirations and Attainment a review for the Social Exclusion Taskforce,* Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning/Cabinet Office, London

[20] Morrow, V & Elliott, J, 'Imagining the future: preliminary analysis of NCDS essays written by children aged 11', *CLS working paper 2007/1* (London: Institute of Education, Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2007).

[21] Jones, A 'Life Meaningless for one in ten young adults' *Independen*t 5 January 2009

[22] Gutman, & Akerman, (2008), *Aspirations and Attainment*

[23] Cabinet Office, (December, 2008) *Aspirations and attainment amongst young people in deprived communities,* London

[24] DCFS (2009) *How Young People Formulate Their Views About the Future Exploratory Research,* London

[24] Cabinet Office, *Aspirations*

[25] Open Society Institute, *British Muslims*

[26] Roderick, M. (2006). *Closing the aspiration-attainment gap: Implications for high school reform.*

[27] Schneider, B., & Stevenson, D. (1999). The ambitious generation. *Educational Leadership, 57*(4), 22-25.

[28] Commission for Integration (2007) www.edf.org.**uk**/.../CommissionforIntegrationEOCConsultationResponse19Jan07.doc

[29] *The Government's Response to the Ethnic Minorit Business Task Force, 2009. http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53440.pdf*

[30] Baylis, N (2005) 'Relationship with reality – and its role in the wellbeing of young adults' in Huppert, F Baylis, N & Keverne B, *The Science of well-being*, (Oxford University Press)

[31] Ryan, R & Deci, E (2000) 'Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being' *American Psychologist, 55*

[32] Rotter, J (1975) 'Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement' *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 43, 56-67.*

[33] Bandura, A (1993) 'Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning', *Educational Psychologist, 28(2)*

[34] Bandura, A (2001) 'Social cognitive theory: an agentic perspective', *Annual Review of Psychology, January 2001*

[35] Seldon, A 'Lessons in Life' *The Independent, 19 April 2006*

[36] Layard , R (2005) *Happiness: Lessons from the new science,* London, Reeves, R & Lexmond, J (2009) *Building Character*, London; Demos.

[37] Margo, J (2007) *Freedom's Orphans*, Institute for Public Policy Research, London

[38] Ibid.

[39] DCFS (2009) *How Young People Formulate Their Views About the Future Exploratory Research,* London

[40] Cabinet Office, (2008) *Aspirations and attainment*

[41] Ibid

[42] Young Foundation & London Development Agency (2008*) Valuing Family, Valuing Work: British Muslim Women and the Labour market,* London

[43] Dwyer, C., Modood, T., Sanghera, G., Shah, B., & Thapar-Bjorkert, S (2006) *Ethnicity as social*

capital? Explaining the differential educational achievements of young British Pakistani men and women Bristol, Paper presented at the 'Ethnicity, Mobility and Society' Leverhulme Programme Conference at University of Bristol, 16-17 March, 2006

[44] Youth Justice Board (2005) *National Evaluation of Youth Justice Board Mentoring Schemes*

[45] Colley, H (2003) *Mentoring for Social Inclusion. A Critical Approach to Nurturing Mentoring Relationships*, p. 1

[46] DCFS, (2009) *Quality, Choice and Aspirations*, London

[47] Ibid., p. 30

[48] For the JRF study, 37 per cent felt the mentors had been very helpful; 33 per cent fairly helpful.

[49] Philip, K., King, C., & Shucksmith, J (2004) *Sharing a laugh? A qualitative study of mentoring interventions with young people*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

[50] Colley, H (2003*) Mentoring for Social Inclusion. A Critical Approach to Nurturing Mentoring Relationships*

Demos undertook an evaluation of the Mosaic mentoring programmes, to measure its success in raising aspirations in young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. The evaluation comprised two parts. The first part is an evaluation of the mentors' attitudes about the programme, based on survey responses from 61 mentors. The second is a 12-month longitudinal evaluation of the effect of the programme on the mentees, which measured mentees' aspirations, attitudes and soft skills before and after they took part in the programme.

The results suggest that the Mosaic schemes are very well run and respond to the needs of the mentors who take part. The overwhelming majority reported that being a mentor had given them extra personal and professional skills, and nearly all would recommend other people to take part. For the mentees, the evaluation found noticeable increases in a range of positive outcomes, including an increase in the likelihood that the mentees would like to attend university, be more confident and happier in 12 months time, improve their views on school, and enhance their general happiness and sense of well-being.

The evaluation recommends that Mosaic's mentoring programme continue, and that they ensure it is tightly targeted at individuals who can benefit most from the mentoring relationship in order to maximise effectiveness. It also confirms that the Mosaic programme, and similar mentoring programmes more generally, should focus on helping people develop soft skills, aspirations, and create bonding capital that can help them turn those aspirations into education and work opportunities.

Jamie Bartlett is head of the Violence and Extremism programme at Demos.

978-1-906693-95-4

£10