

AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF CHANCE UK's MENTORING PROGRAMME

A REPORT TO CHANCE UK

Peter K Smith and Sharon Howard, Goldsmiths, University of London
[we acknowledge help from Fran Thompson in some analyses]

STUDY ONE: ANALYSIS OF SDQ SCORES OF MENTEES

**STUDY TWO: RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF CASES SELECTED ON BASIS OF
PRIOR SDQ CHANGE SCORES**

STUDY THREE: LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF CURRENT MENTEES

STUDY ONE: ANALYSIS OF SDQ SCORES OF MENTEES

Introduction

Chance UK has kept records of the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire scores (SDQs, Goodman, 1997) of those children who have been through their mentoring process. The aim of this first study was to carry out a retrospective analysis of changes in SDQ scores over the last five years of Chance UK mentoring (2003/04, 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07). This has been the period since the earlier review of St-James Roberts and Singh (2001), and when the mentoring procedures used by Chance UK has been felt to be better embedded.

The SDQ Questionnaire

Goodman's (1997) Strength & Difficulties Questionnaire, which has been widely used as a brief behavioural screening instrument, assesses the child's positive and negative attributes across 5 scales; there are 25 questions, five questions from each subscale. Responses are on a 3-point scale (0 for not true, 1 for somewhat true, 2 for certainly true).

Four of the scales are for Difficulties:

- 1) Hyperactivity-inattention [HA] e.g. *I am restless, I cannot stay still for long.*
- 2) Emotional Symptoms [ES] e.g. *I worry a lot.*
- 3) Conduct Problems [CP] e.g. *I am often accused of lying or cheating.*
- 4) Peer Problems [PP] e.g. *other children pick on me or bully me.*

A fifth scale is for Strengths:

- 5) Prosocial Behaviour [PS] e.g. *I try to be nice to other people. I care about their feelings.*

The range for each scale is 0-10, and for Total Difficulties (HA + ES + CP + PP) it is 0-40. Table 1.1 shows British Normative Data for Goodman's SDQ scores for children 5 to 10 years of age (from Meltzer, Gatward, Goodman & Ford, 2000) for parent and teacher ratings. This data was obtained from a large national survey of child and adolescent mental health, which was taken from a normative sample from Child Benefit records.

| Rater | SDQ subscale | Mean Score | Males Mean | Females Mean |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Parents | | N = 5855 | N = 2901 | N = 2954 |
| | HA | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.1 |
| | ES | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| | CP | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| | PP | 1.4 | 1.5 | 3.1 |
| | Total Difficulties (s.d. in brackets) | 8.5 (5.7) | 9.2 (6.0) | 9.7 (5.4) |
| | PS | 8.6 | 8.4 | 8.9 |
| Teachers | | N = 4801 | N = 2368 | N = 2433 |
| | HA | 3.0 | 3.8 | 2.2 |
| | ES | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| | CP | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| | PP | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| | Total Difficulties (s.d. in brackets) | 6.8 (5.9) | 8.0 (6.2) | 5.5 (5.3) |
| | PS | 7.3 | 6.7 | 8.0 |

Table 1.1 Normative British data on SDQ scores.

The SDQ records at Chance UK

Chance UK use the Total Difficulties scores for the selection of children for their mentoring programme. Their criterion is that a child has to have a Total Difficulties score of 16 or over, by the referrer, to be offered mentoring. Children are referred by either their school or by an educational psychologist. A score of 16 is more than one standard deviation above the mean, in terms of the normative sample above.

The records stored at the Chance UK offices provided usable data for 100 children over the last 4 years. Ideally, all these children would have been evaluated using the SDQ by three independent raters; their parents/carers, referrers/teachers and mentors. All raters should have provided two sets of data: the parents/carers and teachers/referrers before mentoring, and at the end of the child's mentoring; and the mentors three months into the mentoring, and at the end of the mentoring.

In practice, records were incomplete. Table 1.2 shows the numbers of children with acceptable records available from each rater, at both the beginning (T1) and end (T2) of mentoring, from the 100 children. It also shows the number of children for whom difference scores (the change between T1 and T2) could be calculated. Complete data for all 3 raters at both time points is only available for 72 children. However

analyses reported below are always for the maximum number of children consistent with the data available for that particular analysis.

Table 1.2. Numbers of children with each kind of rating data available.

| Children's SDQ scores (N=100) | Parent ratings | Teacher ratings | Mentors ratings | All 3 ratings |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| T1 scores | 99 | 100 | 73 | 73 |
| T2 Scores | 93 | 86 | 98 | 78 |
| Difference (T2 –T1 scores) | 92 | 86 | 72 | 54 |

It also should be borne in mind that whereas the mentor rater is always the same person at T1 and T2, this is not the case for a few parent/carers, and for most teacher ratings.

Sample characteristics

(a) Mentees

The age of the 100 child mentees varied from 6 to 11 years, see Table 1.3. Due to the small numbers of 6 year olds and 11 year olds, for categorical age analyses we have divided the children into two age groups: Younger (6, 7 & 8 years; N = 55) and Older (9, 10 & 11 years; N = 45).

Table 1.3. Sample numbers by age in years

| 6 years | 7 years | 8 years | 9 years | 10 years | 11 years |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| 4 | 20 | 31 | 22 | 22 | 1 |

There were many more boy mentees (N = 86) than girls (N = 14). A breakdown of this by age is shown in Table 1.4.

Table 1.4. Sample numbers by age (younger/older) and gender

| | Younger | Older |
|-------|---------|-------|
| Boys | 52 | 34 |
| Girls | 3 | 11 |

Records were obtained from the following years: 2003/04 (N = 16), 2004/05 (N = 34), 2005/06 (N = 33) and 2006/07 (N = 17). A breakdown by year and age is in Table 1.5.

Table 1.5. Sample numbers by age (younger/older) and year of participation

| | Younger | Older |
|-----------|---------|-------|
| 2003/04 | 13 | 3 |
| 2004/05 | 16 | 18 |
| 2005/06 | 18 | 15 |
| 2006/2007 | 8 | 9 |

(b) Mentors, and mentor-mentee match

There were more female (N = 63) than male (N = 37) mentors. Tables 1.6 and 1.7 show mentor gender, in relation to mentee gender, and age.

Table 1.6. Sample numbers by age (younger/older) of mentee and gender of mentor.

| | Younger mentee | Older mentee |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Male mentor | 23 | 14 |
| Female mentor | 32 | 31 |

Table 1.7. Sample numbers by gender of mentee and gender of mentor.

| | Boy mentee | Girl mentee |
|---------------|------------|-------------|
| Male mentor | 37 | 0 |
| Female mentor | 49 | 14 |

Analyses

In the analyses of the SDQs, we first looked to see how much agreement there was amongst the 3 raters, for an individual child. We then carried out the main analysis of interest – whether SDQ scores changed over the course of mentoring, from T1 to T2, and whether such changes were statistically significant. We then explored the data further to see whether SDQ changes were associated with other characteristics – of the mentee (age, gender), by the year that the mentoring was carried out, and of the mentor (gender), and the mentor-mentee match by gender.

In all the analyses we focus on the *difference scores* (T2 – T1), which indicate whether a mentee has changed (improved, stayed the same, or got worse) over the year of mentoring experience.

(1) Do raters agree?

We carried out correlations between raters (parent, teacher, and mentor), to see the extent to which they agreed on change scores for individual mentees. Tables 1.8-1.12 show the correlations for each SDQ scale.

Table 1.8. Rater correlations for Hyperactivity- inattention [HA]

| Rater | Parent | Teacher |
|---------|--------|---------|
| Teacher | .28** | |
| Mentor | .01 | -.37** |

Table 1.9. Rater correlations for Emotional Symptoms [ES]

| Rater | Parent | Teacher |
|---------|--------|---------|
| Teacher | .05 | |
| Mentor | .08 | -.10 |

Table 1.10. Rater correlations for Conduct Problems [CP]

| Rater | Parent | Teacher |
|---------|--------|---------|
| Teacher | .13 | |
| Mentor | .09 | .09 |

Table 1.11. Rater correlations for Peer Problems [PP]

| Rater | Parent | Teacher |
|---------|--------|---------|
| Teacher | .20 | |
| Mentor | .15 | -.35** |

Table 1.12. Rater correlations for Prosocial Behaviour

| Rater | Parent | Teacher |
|---------|--------|---------|
| Teacher | .08 | |
| Mentor | .07 | .07 |

* significant at 0.05 level ** significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Of the 15 correlations, 12 are small and not statistically significant. Parents and teachers show some level of agreement over HA; and teachers and mentors show some level of *disagreement* over HA and PP. Overall, these findings suggest that parents/carers, teachers, and mentors, are assessing somewhat different aspects of a mentee's behaviour and performance; or that the mentee is behaving differently, in the different environments (home; school; and outside with the mentor). Both explanations are plausible and could act in combination. In any event, it is apparent that the different rater's scores must be treated separately, not combined; so they are kept separate in all subsequent analyses. If different raters are in fact assessing different aspects of the mentee in different environments, then any consistency of findings should indicate very general and reliable aspects of change in mentee behaviour.

(2) Do SDQ scores change over the year of mentoring experience?

Tables 1.13-1.15 show the mean SDQ scores, difference scores, and significance levels of change, over all children; separately by SDQ scale, and by rater.

It can first be commented that mentors have the most favourable view of the mentees; their SDQ scores start lower, and indeed their mean

Difficulty rating is just below 16. Parents come next; and teachers have the least favourable view of the children.

How about changes over time? All four Difficulty scales show decreases in scores, for all 3 raters; and in every case this is statistically significant. In addition, teachers and mentors show significant increases in pro-social behaviour, over the year of mentoring. The greatest changes are registered by teachers. This is particularly interesting, as often a different teacher rated at T2 than at T1, and almost certainly had no knowledge of the T1 ratings; whereas parents/carers and mentors might be 'expecting' an improvement. These 'independent' teacher ratings at T1 and T2 would largely avoid any such bias.

Table 1.13. Changes over time: parent ratings

| Parent | T1 | T2 | Diff | t value | Sig |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| HA | 6.92 | 5.96 | -0.96 | 3.65 | p<.001 |
| ES | 4.09 | 2.78 | -1.31 | 4.52 | p<.001 |
| CP | 4.46 | 3.20 | -1.26 | 5.81 | p<.001 |
| PP | 3.78 | 2.88 | -0.90 | 4.50 | p<.001 |
| T Diff | 19.25 | 14.82 | -4.43 | 7.15 | p<.001 |
| PS | 8.12 | 8.31 | 0.19 | 0.97 | ns |

Table 1.14. Changes over time: teacher ratings

| Teachers | T1 | T2 | Diff | t value | Sig |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| HA | 8.27 | 6.48 | -1.79 | 5.24 | p<.001 |
| ES | 4.88 | 2.71 | -2.17 | 6.13 | p<.001 |
| CP | 5.60 | 3.72 | -1.88 | 6.37 | p<.001 |
| PP | 4.66 | 3.57 | -1.09 | 3.53 | p<.001 |
| T Diff | 23.41 | 16.48 | -6.93 | 8.07 | p<.001 |
| PS | 3.74 | 5.63 | 1.90 | 5.43 | p<.001 |

Table 1.15. Changes over time: mentor ratings

| Mentors | T1 | T2 | Diff | t value | Sig |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| HA | 6.00 | 5.36 | -0.64 | 2.61 | p<.05 |
| ES | 2.70 | 1.94 | -0.76 | 3.19 | p<.05 |
| CP | 3.10 | 2.63 | -0.47 | 1.92 | p<.05 |
| PP | 3.32 | 2.43 | -0.89 | 3.63 | p<.001 |
| T Diff | 15.12 | 12.36 | -2.76 | 4.06 | p<.001 |
| PS | 6.17 | 7.49 | 1.32 | 5.03 | p<.001 |

These are very encouraging findings; the improvements are of the order of one standard deviation (cf. Table 1.1) in Total Difficulties scores (slightly more for teachers, slightly less for parents); improvements are less sizeable for mentors, but that is probably because mentors already start with a more favourable view of the mentees. These findings will be analysed and discussed more below.

Another way of presenting these results is in terms of the numbers of mentees who have moved to being below the threshold of a Total Difficulties score of 16, after the mentoring. Tables 1.16-1.18 show this for the 3 raters. We have categorized children according to whether their difficulties score might be considered within the normal range (<12), higher but below the Chance UK criterion (12-15), just above the Chance UK criterion (16-20), and particularly high (>20). [n.b. these numbers do not rely on matched before and after scores, so the missing values do not correspond to those in Table 1.2].

Table 1.16. Numbers of mentees in each category before and after mentoring:

Parents difficulties ratings.

| Score | Before | After | Difference |
|---------|--------|-------|------------|
| < 12 | 15 | 28 | 13 |
| 12-15 | 7 | 19 | 12 |
| 16-20 | 34 | 27 | -7 |
| > 20 | 43 | 20 | -23 |
| Missing | 1 | 6 | |
| N=100 | 100 | 100 | |

Table 1.17. Numbers of mentees in each category before and after mentoring:

Teachers difficulties ratings.

| Score | Before | After | Difference |
|---------|--------|-------|------------|
| < 12 | 1 | 25 | 24 |
| 12-15 | 1 | 12 | 11 |
| 16-20 | 20 | 28 | 8 |
| > 20 | 78 | 22 | -56 |
| Missing | 0 | 13 | |
| N=100 | 100 | 100 | |

Table 1.18. Numbers of mentees in each category before and after mentoring:

Mentors difficulties ratings.

| Score | Before | After | Difference |
|---------|--------|-------|------------|
| < 12 | 22 | 51 | 29 |
| 12-15 | 19 | 19 | 0 |
| 16-20 | 20 | 16 | -4 |
| > 20 | 14 | 12 | -2 |
| Missing | 25 | 2 | |
| N=100 | 100 | 100 | |

Tables 1.16-1.18 show that many mentees (47 according to parents, 37 according to teachers, 60 according to mentors) are below the threshold of 16 by the end of mentoring. Furthermore, many mentees have moved out of the exceptionally high (>2) difficulties score range (23 according to parents, 56 according to teachers, 2 according to mentors).

(3) What are the predictors of change?

Here, we look at the change scores, for all 5 SDQ scales, in relation to mentee gender; mentee age; year of experience; gender of mentor; and gender match of mentor-mentee.

Mentee gender

We compared the change scores for male and female mentees, with independent t-tests. Of 15 tests (3 raters x 5 scales), there were significant differences for two:

Teacher Conduct Problems (CP) ratings: male mentee scores reduced significantly (mean = -2.18), whereas female mentee scores (mean = -0.08) showed no significant change; $t_{(84)} = 2.53, p < 0.05$.

Mentor Hyperactivity-inattention (HA) ratings: male mentee scores reduced (mean = -0.84), whereas female mentee scores (mean = 0.45) actually showed a slight increase; $t_{(70)} = 1.93, p < 0.05$.

One further difference approached statistical significance: Teacher Prosocial (PS) ratings: male mentee scores increased (mean = 2.14), whereas female mentee scores (mean = 0.33) showed little change; $t_{(84)} = 1.82$, $p < 0.07$.

These gender analyses should be treated with caution, as there were only 11 or 12 girls in each comparison. Both male and female mentees show similar improvement on most measures, but where there is a difference, boys show greater change.

Mentee age

We compared the difference scores for older and younger mentees, with independent t-tests. Of 15 tests, none showed a significant difference in change scores. In addition we correlated actual age in years, with SDQ change scores. Of the 15 correlations, all were very small and none approached statistical significance.

Year of participation

We compared change scores for mentees who participated in different years (2003/04, 2004/05, 2005/06 & 2006/07; see Table 1.5). We carried out three MANOVA (Multiple Analysis of Variance) analyses, over the five SDQ scales difference scores, separately for each rater (as numbers varied between raters). There was no significant effect of year of experience for Parent raters, $F_{(3, 88)} = 0.44$, $p > 0.05$; for Teacher raters, $F_{(3, 82)} = 0.14$, $p > 0.05$; or for Mentor raters, $F_{(3, 68)} = 0.86$, $p > 0.05$. Thus, there is no evidence for differential effects over the last 4 years of Chance UK mentoring.

Gender of mentor

We compared the change scores for male and female mentors, with independent t-tests. Of 15 tests, there was only one significant difference. Mentor Emotional Symptom (ES) ratings: female mentors showed an appreciable reduction on overall mentee ES ratings (mean = -1.16), whereas male mentors showed a much smaller effect (mean = -0.11); $t_{(70)} = 2.24$, $p < 0.05$.

In general, male and female mentors appear to be equally successful as judged by SDQ change scores.

Gender match of mentor-mentee

In these analyses, we compared change scores for three groups (male mentor - male mentee, female mentor - male mentee, female mentor - female mentee; see Table 1.7).

We carried out three MANOVA (Multiple Analysis of Variance) analyses, over the five SDQ scales, separately for each rater (as numbers varied between raters). There was no significant effect for the five SDQ

difference scores, for Parent raters, $F_{(2, 89)} = 0.58, p > 0.05$, or for Mentor raters, $F_{(2, 69)} = 6.17, p > 0.05$.

The overall effect was also not significant for Teacher raters, but it did approach significance, $F_{(2, 83)} = 1.83, p < 0.06$. Post-hoc t-tests found there were significant effects for Conduct Problems (CP) and Prosocial (PS) scales; see Table 19. Female mentor/female mentee pairing showed the least decrease in CP, and the decrease in CP scores mean scores on teacher ratings of CP difference were male mentor/male mentee (mean = -2.32); female mentor/male mentee (mean = -2.07); and female mentor/female/mentee (mean = -0.08). The results indicate that male mentor/male mentee pairing showed most improvement in CP, and the least improvement in PS. However these differences were only found in 2 out of 15 possible tests, and there were only 14 girl mentees. All girl mentees had a female mentor, so these findings essentially replicate those of mentee gender, above. For male mentees, there is no indication of differential effectiveness of male or female mentors.

Table 1.19. Changes in CP and PS scores, by mentor-mentee gender match (teachers ratings)

| Gender match | CP mean difference | PS mean difference |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| male mentor – male mentee | -2.32 | 1.23 |
| female mentor – male mentee | -2.07 | 2.79 |
| female mentor – female mentee | -0.08 | 0.33 |

Summary of findings

This data is on the SDQ scores for 100 children, mainly boys, mainly aged 7 to 10 years, who have participated in Chance UK mentoring over the period 2003 to 2007. Ratings were obtained from three sources: parents, teachers, and mentors.

Generally, mentors had the most favourable view of the children (mentees), followed by parents, with teachers having the least favourable view. We found little agreement between mentors over the scores for particular children. Probably, these three raters are assessing different aspects of these children, in different environments (the home; the school; and visits outside the home). All three contribute to the overall picture, but teacher ratings may be especially valuable. Firstly, they have no 'vested interest' in seeing improvement, as mentors and arguably parents might have; and secondly, it was very often a different teacher doing the second rating at the end of mentoring, almost certainly without any knowledge of the first teacher's rating before mentoring started.

Our main finding, and a most encouraging one, is of a substantial improvement in SDQ scores across the year of mentoring. The Total Difficulties scores decrease (all four subscales decrease), and the Prosocial scores increase. These changes are of the order of one standard deviation, which is quite a substantial effect. Generally speaking, one might say that about half the children have fallen below the Chance UK threshold for needing mentoring, after their year's experience, and the others have generally improved. From the teacher's perspective, the situation has changed from almost all the children being above the Total Difficulties threshold of 16, to at least one-quarter being clearly well below threshold, at least another one-eighth below threshold, and a massive reduction in those seen as having severe problems (score of 20+), see Table 1.17. These are generally 'across the board' changes. They apply irrespective of the child's age; and irrespective of which out of the 4 years studied, the child participated in. On the whole, they also apply irrespective of the gender of mentor, or mentee.

We did find a few differences by mentor or mentee gender, but these should be treated with circumspection, as they typically are in a larger context of many non-significant differences. There were few girl mentees (only 14), and no male mentor/female mentee pairings. Male and female mentors appear to have equally good success with boys (the one difference favouring female mentors is probably a chance result). There are a few indications of boys benefiting more than girls, notably on teacher ratings of Conduct Problems, and Prosocial behaviour; this might reflect boys starting off with worse scores on these measures, than girls.

Overall, it appears that Chance UK mentoring is associated with a substantial overall improvement in SDQ scores, and that this holds true for all 3 raters – parents, teachers and mentors. This suggests an overall improvement in general behaviour, since these raters appear to be responding to different aspects of a child's behaviour, in different contexts. Improvements exceed one standard deviation in the case of teachers, who arguably might be providing the most reliable information. The improvements are found in each year, for male and female mentors, male and female mentees, and across the age range of children participating.

No control group is available for comparison. This was a study using the records available at Chance UK, which only comprise children who participated in mentoring.

Can we confidently ascribe the changes observed, to the mentoring process?

One possibility would be that there is a natural age improvement in SDQ scores, over a one-year period – that there is a normal improvement with age. This is very unlikely. No such age improvement is reported in the literature, and indeed any expectation of age change might be of an

increase in, for example, conduct problems, as adolescence is approached. However as a check, we compared the initial SDQ scores of the younger (6, 7 & 8 years) and older (9, 10 & 11 years) age groups; no significant differences were found.

A second possibility is that since the children in this study were clearly exhibiting severe problems, with very high initial SDQ scores it is possible that there would be a tendency for them to improve, or 'regress to the mean', due to efforts by teachers, parents and others, independently of whether mentoring happened or not. This possibility cannot be excluded without a control group. Indeed, in the earlier evaluation, St-James Roberts and Singh (2001) found improvements in SDQ scores in the Chance UK children, but also in a comparison group. Examination of Table 7 in their report, of SDQ scores by teachers, shows improvements in both mentored and comparison children. However, the improvements found for teachers ratings in the current study (our Table 1.14) indicate *greater* improvements on all scales, except peer problems (PP), than was reported by St-James Roberts and Singh. Indeed the improvements found after mentoring, of the order of one standard deviation, are likely to be more substantial than one might expect from any natural improvement.

STUDY TWO: RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF CASES SELECTED ON BASIS OF PRIOR SDQ CHANGE SCORES

The aim of this study was to examine the 100 cases where we had analysed SDQ scores (Study One), and select n=40 for further study. Twenty would be cases where SDQ change scores indicated considerable improvement in most or all areas; twenty would be cases where there was little or no improvement, or it was very patchy. We then planned to get further insight into the causes of relatively successful, or unsuccessful, outcome, by interviewing, retrospectively, (a) the mentor, (b) the child who was mentored, (c) the parent or parents, and (d) the child's teacher at the time.

Selection of cases and sample characteristics

We firstly examined the difference SDQ change scores for overall difficulties, for the cases analysed in Study 1. As most children had improved, it proved impossible to select 20 children showing little or no improvement. [Also, Chance UK was still in the process of collating the last 40 children's SDQs start and end scores - the 100th child's scores were only received in January 2008 - so this selection was from the initial 60 cases]. After some consideration, in June 2007 we selected 30 children for further study (29 boys and 1 girl). These children were selected on the basis of change in SDQ difficulties scores from T1 (start of mentoring) to T2 (end of mentoring). Scores were available from their parents/carers, teachers and mentors. These scores were averaged to give a total change score. 20 cases were children whose SDQ difference change scores showed considerable improvement in most or all areas; 10 cases were children who showed little or no improvement.

All parent/carers of these 30 children were contacted initially by phone and then by letter to ask for their participation. Only 16 parents/carers gave their consent; the other 14 parent/carers were unobtainable. In addition, two who had agreed to participate, were not at home at the arranged interview time. Probably due to the nature of many of the children's home lives, a higher proportion of parents of children in the improved group were able to be contacted. Our final total of children was 10 improvers and 4 who showed little/no improvement. All were boys, and their mean age was 7.6 years. Details are shown in Table 2.1, with the 4 children showing little or no improvement labelled L1 to L4, and the 10 children showing considerable improvement labelled H1 to H10.

Table 2.1: The 14 children interviewed, showing year of mentoring, age and gender of mentor.

| Child Number | Year of mentoring | Age of child (yrs) | Gender of mentor |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Little improvement | | | |
| Child L1 | 04/05 | 10 | Male |
| Child L2 | 03/04 | 7 | Female |
| Child L3 | 05/06 | 8 | Female |
| Child L4 | 05/06 | 7 | Female |
| Considerable improvement | | | |
| Child H1 | 05/06 | 7 | Female |
| Child H2 | 04/05 | 10 | Female |
| Child H3 | 06/07 | 6 | Female |
| Child H4 | 05/06 | 7 | Male |
| Child H5 | 05/06 | 7 | Female |
| Child H6 | 04/05 | 9 | Male |
| Child H7 | 05/06 | 6 | Female |
| Child H8 | 04/05 | 7 | Male |
| Child H9 | 05/06 | 9 | Female |
| Child H10 | 05/06 | 7 | Male |

Table 2.2 shows the actual SDQ change scores for these children; for each difficulties subscale, and for the total score (over the three raters). A minus indicates a reduction in difficulties score, that is, the child's behaviour had improved. In the little improvement group, the range of overall scores is from 1 (very slightly worse) to -4 (a small improvement). In the considerable improvement group, the range of scores is from -9 to -33.

Table 2.2: Changes in SDQ difficulties scores for the 14 children interviewed. [HA = Hyperactivity- inattention; ES = Emotional Symptoms; CP = Conduct Problems; PP = Peer Problems]

| Child Number | HA change | ES change | CP change | PP change | Overall change |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Little improvement | | | | | |
| Child L1 (Final teacher rating missing) | 2 | 2 | -2 | -1 | 1 |
| Child L2 | -4 | 0 | 2 | -1 | -3 |
| Child L3 (Final mentor rating missing) | 1 | -1 | -3 | 1 | -2 |
| Child L4 | -2 | -7 | -1 | 6 | -4 |
| Considerable improvement | | | | | |
| Child H1 | -6 | 1 | 3 | -10 | -13 |
| Child H2 | -9 | -3 | -2 | 0 | -14 |
| Child H3 (Final mentor rating missing) | -2 | -3 | -6 | 0 | -11 |
| Child H4 | -11 | -9 | -6 | -7 | -33 |
| Child H5 | -4 | -3 | -6 | 4 | -9 |
| Child H6 | 3 | -3 | -10 | -7 | -17 |
| Child H7 | -1 | -14 | -10 | -6 | -31 |
| Child H8 | -8 | -1 | -6 | -3 | -18 |
| Child H9 | -1 | -9 | -1 | -3 | -14 |
| Child H10 | -10 | -3 | -5 | -3 | -21 |

The Children and Parent/Carers Interviews

To get a further insight into the causes of relatively successful, or unsuccessful, outcomes, we interviewed (a) the child who was mentored, and (b) the parent or carer. The interviews were conducted in the homes of the 14 children and their parent/carers. The interviews were semi-structured and worked through seven largely open ended questions (see Appendix 1). We asked the child how he/she felt about having a mentor, if they enjoyed it, if it changed them in any way. We asked the parents whether or not their child modified his/her behaviour, and if the relationship brought any improvement at home and in the every day life; we also assessed how much a parent wanted to collaborate in the education of his/her child. It was usually possible to interview the child and the parent separately.

A sample question in the child and parent/carer interviews: What do you think you (or your child) have learnt from your (their) mentor?

The Mentor and Teacher Questionnaires

The past mentors and the child's teacher at the time of mentoring were asked to complete a short posted or on-line questionnaire (see Appendix 2). In this, we

asked the mentor how he/she felt about the relationship, if any changes had been achieved with the child and how and whether or not they would have liked more assistance or training to help the child. The teacher was asked whether or not the child had improved his/her behaviour in social relationships and academically.

A sample mentor's question: Do you believe that your mentoring has had an affect on your mentee's behaviour at school?

A sample referrers'/teachers' question: Has the mentoring process had any effect on the parent/carers involvement with their child's schooling?

Complete records could not be obtained for all 14 children. Only 12 out of the 14 children were interviewed; one parent felt that their child would be distressed by the interviews as they still missed their mentor and one child was absent when the researcher visited the family. Only 13 out of the 14 parent/carers interviews were conducted because one child's mother was unable to complete the interview. Only 8 out the 14 mentors replied to the questionnaires despite numerous attempts to contact them by phone, e-mail and by letter. Finally, only 11 out of the 14 teacher questionnaires were received; two schools did not reply, and one child was home educated during their period of mentoring so no teacher rating questionnaire could be obtained. [8 children whose schools replied came from the high improvement group and 3 children came from the low to little improvement group].

Analyses

We used a similar content analysis procedure for the children and parent/ carer's interviews, and the mentor questionnaires. Due to the somewhat different nature of the teacher's questionnaire and their responses, these are analysed separately.

For the child, parent/carer and teacher data, the categories used are shown below. These categories were agreed upon by two researchers after a considerable process of familiarising with the material, and discussion. A high level of agreement was reached between them. There are 4 major categories, and within each of these a number of sub-categories.

Categories

(A) Personal (improved relationship with self)

- 1) Self esteem
- 2) Learning new skills/experiences (physical & educational skills)
- 3) Behavioural control
- 4) Emotional expressivity
- 5) Openness to new experiences

(B) Interpersonal (improved relationship with peers & adults)

- 1) Self esteem
- 2) Learning new skills / experiences (physical & educational skills)
- 3) Behavioural control
- 4) Emotional expressivity
- 5) Social skills /Communicative skills

(C) Comments/criticisms of Chance UK:

- 1) Policies
- 2) Mentor training
- 3) Communication with family & schools
- 4) Ambiguous
- 5) Negative
- 6) Positive
- 7) Assistance with parenting

(D) Mentors

- 1) Money/allowances
- 2) Choice of activity
- 3) Personality match for mentee and family
- 4) Consistent positive role model
- 5) Reliability
- 6) Patience

Results for Children, Parent/carers and Mentors

The tables below show how many times children (C), parents/carers (P) and mentors (M) commented within a specific category. A minus sign (-) indicates a negative comment regarding that specific category; an (m) indicates that a comment is in regard to the mentor rather than specifically about the child. Categories which were mentioned four or more times by any of the three raters are shown in bold, and discussed with examples of the comments made.

1. What have been the best things about your (child's, mentees) mentoring?

| rater | Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | |
|-----------|----------|-----------|----|----|----|---------------|----------|------|------|----------|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----------|-----------|----|----------|-----------|
| | a1 | a2 | a3 | a4 | a5 | b1 | b2 | b3 | b4 | b5 | c1 | c2 | c3 | C4 | c5 | c6 | c7 | d1 | d2 | d3 | d4 |
| C (n=12) | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| P (n= 13) | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 |
| M (n= 8) | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | (1m) | (1m) | (2m) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | (1m) 2 |

Personal learning of new skills/experiences (physical/educational): a2

100% (12/12) of the children and 46% of parent/carers (6/13) commented positively regarding the personal learning of new physical/educational skills/experiences.

H4 (child): I like tennis because it was fun.

L3 (parent): She (the mentor) helped him to learn to tie his shoelaces.

Personality match: d3

62 % of parent/carers (8/13) gave positive comments on this.

H3 (parent): She had a really bubbly mentor, a bit hyperactive like him but very bubbly. She was lovely.

Assistance with parenting: c7

38% of parent/carers (5/13) gave positive comments assistance with parenting

L1 (parent): He (the mentor) took him out of my hair, which was a good thing at the time.

Interpersonal - learning new skills: b2

31% of parent/carers (4/13) commented on this.

H8 (parent): He (the mentor) introduced him to football and since then he has been playing really well.

Interpersonal – social / communicative skills: b5

31% of parent/carers (4/13) commented on this.

H9 (parent): The mentor was like another little mum; he looked up to her like she was a mum. He would talk to her; they really connected well.

Mentors – Positive role model: d4

31% of parent/carers (4/13) commented on this.

H3 (parent): She (the mentor) was good with him; she was adaptable and took into consideration his wants and needs; so was good and understanding.

In summary, all children and nearly half the parent/carers felt that the mentees had furthered their personal learning of new skills/experiences. Many parents felt that there had been a good personality match between the mentor and the mentee, that their child had improved in their interpersonal learning of new skills/experiences (physical/educational), and that the mentoring had been of help to their own parenting.

2. What did not go so well in your (child's, mentees) mentoring?

| Rater | Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|-----|-----|-----|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|
| | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b 3 | b 4 | b 5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | c 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d 4 |
| C (n=12) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 1 | 0 |
| P (n=13) | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | -3 | 2 | -3 | 1 | -1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| M (n=8) | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | -3 | 1 |

There were relatively few negative comments (shown with a minus sign in the table), and in fact more positive comments were elicited even by this question. No negative cell entries exceeded 3; a few examples of these comments are given:

Chance UK policies: c1

H5 (parent): I would have liked some more reading and stuff.

Negative communication between the family and school: c3

H2 (parent): There was something but I cannot remember what they were saying (Chance UK), something that they were not allowed to do at school. I was not happy knowing there was a problem; think it was about school.

Negative choice of activity: d2

H2 (child): The awful trip to the museum because it was not exciting; saw some good things like the inside of a car dangling from the ceiling but other than that it was not very interesting because it was a museum.

The main positive comments appeared in the following:

Personal - learning new skills: a2

31% of the parent/carers (4/13) mentioned positive comments regarding the personal learning of new physical/educational skills/experiences.

H8 (parent): He would take him to the museum and places and he really enjoyed it.

Chance UK – Positive comment: c6

33% (4/12) of the children and 31% (4/13) of their parent/carers made general positive responses about Chance UK's mentoring programme.

L3 (child): Nothing. It was brilliant. It was better than excellent.

H8 (parent): If there were another chance to take up this opportunity again we would take it.

3. How did you (your child/mentee) get on with (you) your mentor/mentee?

| rater | Very good | Good | Ok | So-so | Not very good |
|-------|-----------|------|----|-------|---------------|
| C | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| P | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| M | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

58% of the children (7/12), 69% of the parent/carers (9/13), and 62.5% of the mentors (5/8), stated that they felt that the mentor/mentee relationship was a very good one. Overall 82% of raters

believed that the mentor/mentee match was good or very good, and none rated it worse than OK.

4. Please tell me why you chose this rating (for the question above)?

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| Rater | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b 3 | b 4 | b 5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | c 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d 4 | |
| C (n=12) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | |
| P (n=13) | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1- 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| M (n=8) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | |

Interpersonal – social / communicative skills: b5

31% (4/13) of parent/carers commented positively on this.

H6 (parent): Because there were things he would talk to his mentor about which he would not talk to me about; they would sort out problems together.

As did 50% (4/8) of mentors.

H4 (mentor): He (the child) needed a confidante and a “best friend”. We agreed that this is what I (the mentor) would be: his “best friend in the world”.

There was a high agreement between the three raters on a successful personality match for the mentee and the family.

50% (6/12) of children commented on this:

H1 (child): We got on well.

As did 85% (11/13) of parent/carers:

H2 (parent): Very good because they (mentor and child) got on really well; he was happy to go with her; he was happy more than ever.

And 88% (7/8) of the mentors:

H2 (mentor): Very good because I think my mentee and I were very well matched.

Mentors – Choice of activity: d2

33% (4/12) of children commented positively on the choice of activity

H5 (child): Because she (the mentor) took me to fun places and I never got bored.

Mentors- Consistent role model: d4

54% (7/13) of the parent/carers felt that the mentor had become a consistent role model to their child

H4 (parent): He enjoyed having a male role model as he didn't have one; someone to play football with; a man in his life; as I am a woman so he needed this in his life.

5. What do you think you (your child, mentee) have learnt from (their/you) your mentor?

| Rater | Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | |
|----------|----------|----|----|----|----|---------------|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------|----|----|----|
| | a1 | a2 | a3 | a4 | a5 | b1 | b2 | b3 | b4 | b5 | c1 | c2 | c3 | c4 | c5 | c6 | c7 | d1 | d2 | d3 | d4 |
| C (n=12) | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| P (n=13) | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| M (n=8) | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Personal - behavioural control: a3

There were high levels of agreement on an improvement in the child's personal behavioral control.

50 % (6/12) of the children commented on this:

H5 (child): She taught me not to be so hyper and stuff. She taught me not to run up and down all the time.

As did 54% (7/13) of parent/carers:

H5 (parent/carer): He is also not so cheeky and it has calmed him down a bit, which is nice.

And 63% (5/8) of mentors:

H8 (mentor): He seemed calmer.

Interpersonal behavioural control: b3

There were also high levels of agreement that mentees behaviour had improved in interpersonal behavioural control.

33 % (4/12) of children felt this:

H1 (child): Yes, I have learnt to be nice to every one else except for ghosts because I do not like them.

As did 46% of parent/carers (6/13)

H5 (parent/carer): I think he learnt to be calm and not to bully, you understand?

And 50% (4/8) of mentors

H2 (mentor): I think he also learnt how to control himself better when he wanted to fight at school.

Personal - learning new skills: a2

42 % (5/12) of children positively commented on an enhancement to their personal learning of new skills/experiences.

H2 (child): I have learnt you should try things you would never usually do.

6. Do you feel that your (your child/mentees) behaviour has changed at school because of your (their) mentoring?

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | | |
|----------|--------|--------|----------------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|----------------|--------|---------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Rater | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b 3 | b 4 | b 5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | c 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d 4 |
| C (n=12) | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| P (n=13) | 1 | 2 | -2 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | -1 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| M (n=8) | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | -1 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Personal - behavioural control: a3

Children and parent/carers agreed that their or their child's behaviour had improved in their personal behavioural control.

67% (8/12) of children felt this

L1 (child): No. My behaviour is ok though sometimes it is bad, and it still is sometimes.

As did 31% (4/13) of parent/carers

H8 (parent/carers): His behaviour is better in mainstream schools than in his unit but this is maybe because of too much peer pressure there (in his unit where he goes twice a week; three times a week to mainstream school).

Interpersonal - behavioural control: b3

All three raters agreed on an improvement of interpersonal behavioural control.

42% (5/12) of children.

L2 (child): Yes, I used to be bad but when my mentor came I used to be good.

And 46% (6/13) parent/carers

H4 (parent/carer): Now he sticks up for himself. He now knows how to answer back.

And 50% (4/8) of mentors

L4 (mentor): But I understood through Chance that he was showing more discipline at school.

7. Do you feel that your (child's/mentees) behaviour has changed at home because of your (their) mentoring?

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | | |
|-----------|--------|--------|----------------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Rate | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b 3 | b 4 | b 5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | c 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d 4 |
| C (n= 12) | 0 | 1 | -1 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| P (n=13) | 1 | 0 | -1 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| M (n=8) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | -1 1 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |

Personal - behavioural control (a3)

Children and parent/carers agreed that this had improved.
67% (8/12) of children

Child H9 (child): Sometimes; I have learnt to keep my temper
And 46% (6/13) of parent/carers

Child H2 (parent/carer): Yes the targets helped again. If he was set targets and because he promised to do so then it helped.

Interpersonal - behavioural control: b3

Children and parent/carers also agreed on an improvement in interpersonal behavioural control.
33% (4/12) of children

H6 (child): I was worse at school. I was good at home and only had problems at school.
And 38% (5/13) of parent/carers

L2 (parent/carer): Yes, he was fine when he was with her.

Mentor only question

8. Would you have liked more assistance in training for your mentoring sessions?

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|-----|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| rate | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b 3 | b 4 | b 5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | c 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d 4 |
| M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | |

Chance UK – Mentor Training: c2

63% (5/8) of mentors positively commented on their mentoring training; most felt that the training they received from Chance UK equipped them with the ability to mentor effectively.

Child H8 (mentor): No, Chance UK were great.

9. Do you want to say anything more on your (your child's or your) experience with your/their mentor (mentee)?

| Rater | Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|-----|----|-----|-----|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|-----------|-----|----------|-----|
| | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b3 | b 4 | b 5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | c 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d 4 |
| C (n=12) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| P (n=13) | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -1 | -2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| M (n=8) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |

Chance UK - Positive comments: c6

33% (4/12) of children had positive comments to add to their mentoring experience.

H6 (child): I liked it. (The child said 'Hi' to his mentor).

Mentors – Personality match: d3

42% (5/12) of children felt that the mentor personality match was a successful one.

L1 (child): No, I have nothing to add. I was happy when it finished but sad that I was not going to see him again.

The Teachers Questionnaires

Content analyses were used to analyse the 11 teacher questionnaires obtained, using the same categories as we had previously used in the children, parent/carers interviews and mentor's questionnaires. H indicates that the child was from the considerable improvement group (n=8) and L that they were from the little improvement group (n=3)

Teachers were first asked to rate whether there had been any improvement in their pupils behaviour since mentoring, on eight measures.

1) Are you aware of any improvement in (child's name) behaviour since mentoring in any of the following?

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Attentiveness | 0 | 6 (66%) 6H | 1 (11%) 1H | 2 (22%) 2L | 2 (22%) 1H 1L |
| Ability to follow instructions | 0 | 6 (66%) 5H 1L | 2 (22%) 2H | 2 (22%) 2L | 1 (11%) 1L |
| Relationship with peers | 0 | 6 (66%) 5H 1L | 2 (22%) 1H 1L | 2 (22%) 1H 1L | 1 (11%) 1L |
| Relationship with adults | 0 | 5 (55%) 4H 1L | 3 (33%) 3H | 2 (22%) 1L 1H | 1 (11%) 1L |
| Academic achievement | 0 | 2 (22%) 2H | 4 (44%) 3H 1L | 3 (33%) 3H 1L | 2 (22%) 2L |
| Ability to manage emotions appropriately | 0 | 5 (55%) 4H 1L | 1 (11%) 1H | 2 (22%) 2H | 3 (33%) 1H 2L |
| Self-esteem | 1 (11%) 1H | 1 (11%) 1H | 4 (44%) 3H 1L | 2 (22%) 2H | 3 (33%) 1H 2L |
| Punctuality | 2 (22%) 2H | 4 (44%) 3H 1L | 2 (22%) 2H | 0 | 3 (33%) 1H 2L |

A majority of teachers agreed that their pupil's behaviour had improved in punctuality, attentiveness, their ability to follow instructions,

and relationships with peers. They were less impressed by changes in self-esteem, academic achievement.

Improvements in behaviour appear greater in the H children; the L children appear more often in the disagree categories. This is not unexpected, as teacher SDQ ratings were one of the three scores defining the H and L groups.

Of the 11 teachers, only 6 answered the following questions. We have highlighted the responses that were commented upon twice or more. A minus (-) indicates a negative comment, an (m), a comment in regards to the mentor, and an (s), a comment about the mentee's sibling.

2) What do you think your pupil has learnt anything else from their mentoring experience?

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---------|-----|---------------|-----|-----|----|----|---------------------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|----------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| rate | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b3 | b4 | b5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | C 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d4 |
| T n=6 | | | 1 -1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 -1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 1 | |

Communication with family and schools: c3

Two teachers commented that there was positive communication between the school and Chance UK (i.e. the mentor).

L2 (teacher): The programme did try very hard to help and the deputy head used to speak to the mentor on a regular basis and forward them attendance figures.

Positive comments: c6

Two of the teachers made positive comments on Chance UK's Mentoring Program.

H1 (teacher): He certainly enjoyed his time with his Chance mentor.

3) Please tell me if the mentoring process has had any effect on the parent/carers involvement with their child's schooling

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|-----|-----|----|----|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| rate | a 1 | a 2 | a 3 | a 4 | a 5 | b 1 | b 2 | b3 | b4 | b5 | c 1 | c 2 | c 3 | C 4 | c 5 | c 6 | c 7 | d 1 | d 2 | d 3 | d4 |
| T N=6 | | | | | | -1 | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | -3 | | | | | | | | |

Communication with family and schools: c3

Two teachers commented positively on this:

H2 (teacher): Yes he had a proactive mother who sought out advice or support.

But three commented negatively:

H7 (teacher): No obvious support. The pupil still does not return his homework or PACT folder regularly.

4) **Do you have any further comments on your pupils mentoring experience?**

| Personal | | | | | Interpersonal | | | | | Comments/criticisms | | | | | | | Mentoring/ | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|---------------|----|----|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|------------|----|----|----|----|---|
| rate | a1 | a2 | a3 | a4 | a5 | b1 | b2 | b3 | b4 | b5 | c1 | c2 | c3 | c4 | c5 | c6 | c7 | d1 | d2 | d3 | d4 | |
| T | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | | -2 | | | | | -1 | | | | | | | -1s | | | | | | | |

Personal behavioural control: a3

Two teachers commented negatively, on their pupil's lack of personal behavioural control, especially in connection to the ending of the mentoring, which may suggest that some children found the end of the mentoring more problematic than others.

H1 (teacher): he does not like change and endings. His behaviour deteriorated when he was told (in good time) that CHANCE involvement would cease.

Interpersonal social/communicative skills: b5

Two teachers did comment positively on an improvement in their pupils' interpersonal social/ communicative skills.

H5 (teacher): He now takes part in discussions/lessons more readily and is more confident of his answers.

Case Studies of the Four Boys in the Little Improvement Group

The general picture from the first study, on SDQ change scores, was of considerable improvement in most of the children who experienced Chance UK mentoring. There is therefore particular interest in examining why some children showed little or no improvement. We finally had only 4 children in this L group (the greater difficulty in getting participation from such children and their families, probably reflecting the more difficult circumstances they had). Here, we give some case study observations on each of these 4 children, to attempt to throw light on why the effects of Chance UK mentoring appeared to be negligible or absent (so far as ascertained by SDQ scores).

Child L1

There was no teacher questionnaire as this child was not at school all of the time of mentoring. Also no mentor questionnaire was received. This child had had problems at school, which indicated a lack of communication between the school and the parent.

The mother stated that she was frustrated because she believed that her son had learning difficulties which were not addressed by the school; and that this created fundamental problems for her and her son, both emotionally and financially:

Parent: At school he had problems; I told them he had learning difficulties (-c3). He got something he could do at home so I had to take redundancy. We had a lot of problems so that's why he went to boarding school. He is doing well at boarding school; still mouthy, but doing much better now (c3/b3).

After the mentoring, this child went to a boarding school; however his behaviour could still at times be disruptive:

Child: No. My behaviour is ok (at school) though sometimes it is bad, and it still is sometimes (a3).

Additionally the child believed that the choice of activities presented to him by his mentor was not really stimulating or challenging enough for his age (he was 10-11 years old during his mentoring).

Child: I started to get bored of it and I did not want to go out. I got bored because I wanted to be on my own and do things. I just used to say I did not want to come out with him (a1/a4). I was aged 10 to 11 years old so I was getting to that age (d2/a4).

The parent agreed that her son did not want to do the activities with his mentor, although she believed this was because he was not open to new challenges:

Parent: OK because sometimes he did not want to do the things the mentor wanted him to do (a3). He wanted to do what he wanted to (a3), getting us both upset. He never wanted to broaden his horizons (-a5).

Child L2

No mentor questionnaire was received for this child. This family had problems coming to terms with the fundamental changes which occurred when their young mother had multiple strokes.

The first strokes occurred in the early years of development of the mother's two sons:

Parent: Yes and no; the reports before and after the stroke showed that it affected him (c5). I noticed his brother used to go to school and everything but he did not go to school (-c3). I paid £100 each because of them not going to school. His father messed up and went to prison when my son was about 5 and his brother was 9. He realises now how bad his behaviour was (and his brother does). I had a meeting at the school; we both went and he has a care order until 18 (c3). Someone else said the teacher had said that he would be dead in 2 years time if he carried on (-c3). Both of them were kind of let down by the system and everyone. Officers came round which was

not nice seeing all that all because of his brother (his brother was arrested). There was only one that was good and she was the only one to do with his brother's behaviour that understands me. She does not talk down to me (d3). I was on top of it all.

The family also believed that the child may have ADHD:

Child: That is a hard one. They think I have ADHD, so I am not given a chance (a3/b3).

Parent: He is outgoing and sociable and cannot keep still; he cannot be constrained at school, or watch TV and sometimes he doesn't wash. We went to family services and they said he does not have ADHD and asked how he was when he was a baby but his behaviour only started after my first stroke; before that he was fine. We were in court and a woman who had four children said he did have ADHD. We have been to a specialist and are still trying to find out and he is having tests. When he is not at home and at school he is with the Learning Support Officers, not with the teacher. He goes around with older kids, who pick on him and take the mickey out of him and upset him and so sometimes he comes in crying (c4, b5-).

His teacher believed that this child's progress was not indicative of the work of Chance UK.

Teacher: This child is not the reflection by the work done by Chance UK. The program did try very hard to help and the deputy head used to speak to the mentor on a regular basis and forward them attendance figures.

Teacher: Only saw the parent twice, who had long-term health issues and found it difficult to control the child.

The teacher believed that he also had an inappropriate role model who influenced his behaviour and that there was a lack of parental control at home:

Teacher: This child had major attendance problems which however hard everyone tried, were not resolved. He also had siblings who were bad role models and saw this as an example to follow. This child was also known to the behavioural team in Hackney.

Child L3

No mentor questionnaire was received for this child. The school made no further comments on this child after Question 1 behavioural scales.

The parent suggested that this child had problems which had arisen through bullying which they believed had an impact upon his behaviour.

Parent: When he was young he was getting bullied for 2 years. Going out with her made it go out of his head (d3/d4). I told him to tell her but he was more interested in doing the actions. Recently he has been hitting back; he gets caught but they do not, so he gets into trouble (-b3). When

he went out with her he would be in a better mood and his attitude would change (b3/d3). Certain things she was doing which teaches him how to behave with other kids in the class and how to ignore the other kids and how to behave (b2/b3/d3/d4). Sometimes he loses it when the mentor came and they said: "Is she your mental?" Or he loses it when some guy whistles at me (-a3). He was getting help from me and the mentor and other teachers (c3). He has not gone back, as he is not allowed to play outside and he does not run outside anymore (a3).

Parent: When he was getting bullied at school, he would take it out on me, whereas now he tries to take it out on them rather than me (a1/a3).

Child L4

There was no child or parent interview for this child. Additionally the teacher made no further comment after question 1. The mentor suggested that there were problems in the family because of the demands this child made of his mother, who had several other children (there were seven children). She felt that maybe the mentoring was also seen by this child as a reward for problem behaviours.

Mentor: The mentoring did give him some space away from the home where an adult was concentrated exclusively on him (d3/d4), and this may have made him less demanding of his Mum's time at home (c7).

Mentor: Sometimes I wondered whether the sessions were in fact offering anything more than a day out (something that seemed a little unfair when other siblings who had not shown any behavioural problems were not treated to such treats (-c1). However, as most of the sessions were not focused on treats, but structured around quite mundane activities, this wasn't a very powerful feeling (d2). I learnt a lot about how I might mentor differently if I were to do it again! (c1/c6).

Summary of overall findings from Study Two

This data was obtained from 14 children, 10 of whom had improved considerably on their SDQ scores during mentoring, and 4 of whom showed little or no such improvement. Ratings and comments were obtained (where possible) from the mentored child, their parent/carers, their mentors and their teachers at the end of mentoring.

Generally there was some agreement between the children, their parent/carers and the mentors, indicative of an improvement in the children's behaviour after their participation in Chance UK's mentoring programme. Many comments mentioned an improvement in the mentees' behaviour after mentoring, specifically in personal and interpersonal behavioural control. This is an interesting and very positive finding because many of these children were referred to Chance UK originally because of their lack of behavioural control, especially in regards to their behaviour at school.

Teacher questionnaire ratings showed that they thought the mentored children's behaviours improved after mentoring in some areas, notably punctuality, attentiveness, and their ability to follow instructions, and to some extent in their interpersonal relationships with peers and adults, and their ability to manage emotions appropriately. As noted in Study One, teachers had no vested interest in indicating an improvement in the mentored children's behaviour (unlike parent/carers and mentors). However teachers did not consistently see any improvement in academic progress, or, perhaps surprisingly, self-esteem. The further comments from a small number of teachers indicated good communication between the school, Chance UK and the mentored child; but there were some negative comments on the lack of communication between the parent and the school/teacher in regards to the child's education, and the child's actual participation in the Mentoring Program.

The teacher, parents/carers and the children's comments were generally positive in regard to the Chance UK mentoring programme itself, other than in respect to their policies surrounding the end of mentoring, which indicated that a small number of children, who had abandonment issues before mentoring, found the end of mentoring difficult. For example:

H5 (parent): "I only have one complaint that they took her away too quick. I felt that the year was not enough time. When you build up a relationship with a child and then they drop you, the child believes that they have done something wrong. I think and believe that they should give him extra help as I wanted a longer space. I know it is the system but it seems to reward good behaviour by taking away the help".

H9 (parent): "I do not like endings though. I understand why they have endings as everyone has to get on with their lives, whereas some want to stay in touch. If I was a mentor I would."

H10 (parent): commented that she felt unable to grant permission for her son to be interviewed in this study because he still had problems adjusting to the loss of his mentor, even though Chance UK had increased his mentoring to counteract for his abandonment issues.

Several other parent/carers and children commented that they believed that overall Chance UK's mentoring programme was a good experience but did not understand the rationale behind no contact with the mentor after the mentees' graduation.

H8 (parent): "We would like to have a follow up to get in touch with his mentor, as he believes that he introduced him to football and he would like him to be there. He would like to give him a Christmas present, which he is unable to do. He has built up a relationship with his mentor that he is unable to carry on with which I do not like. He misses him so badly".

Nevertheless many parent/carers and teachers did state that they felt that Chance UK had done all they could to prepare these children for the end of their mentoring experience.

H10 (parent): "He had more than a year (of mentoring) to help with the settling in period at mainstream school but he found it (the end) very difficult".

H9 (parent): "My other son's mentor, a lovely woman, travelling everywhere in her life; she was definite - no contact."

It is difficult to generalise as to why some children did not do so well. We only ended up with 4 children (all boys) in our little improvement group, and even then, none of these had complete data sets from all four raters. This was not for want of trying, and likely reflects particularly difficult circumstances that these families face, and/or a lack of motivation to participate, which may also be a reflection of their difficulties. Of the four cases studies of such children that we could make, interviews with three indicated that there were fundamental communication problems between the school, the child and their parent/carer. Child L1 parent had major problems in getting the school to understand that the behavioural problems her son showed at school were founded upon his learning difficulties. Child L2 had problems with attendance, which were unable to be addressed because of the parent's inability because of serious ill health to cope with her sons severe behavioural problems. Child L3's parent stated that he was being bullied at school, but the school seemed unwilling to acknowledge us in their questionnaire.

Chance UK did communicate with Child L2's school, through the mentor. A suggestion is that Chance UK should mediate more closely with all schools as certain schools seem to be under the belief that after the child has been referred by them and accepted by Chance UK, their communication can cease. If a pyramid (i.e. a three-way interaction between the school, the family and Chance UK) is continued throughout the mentoring, difficulties can be addressed at all levels of the child's life; this may bring more potential for long term improvement in difficult cases and after the mentoring ceases, because a communication channel between the family and the school will have been opened.

An additional problem seems to be with the activities chosen by some mentors. Certain children had attentional problems and were susceptible to boredom, posing a challenge to any mentor. Activities needed to be based upon that child's specific problems, but also reasonably age-appropriate.

There are certain serious behavioural problems that a mentoring scheme such as Chance UK would not realistically be able to address. For example Child L2 was known by the Hackney Behavioural Team, had poor school attendance, and there were chronic parenting and health issues. Chance UK's mentoring approach may be unable to produce any long term improvement on such children, although it may still give the child and their family a respite from the fundamental problems occurring.

Overall however this retrospective study on a sample of mentored children reveals positive comments regarding improvements in personal and interpersonal behavioural control and in the learning of new skills/ experiences (physical and educational). There is some agreement here amongst the children, the parent/carers and the mentors. Moreover teachers generally rated an improvement in behaviours such as concentration and behavioural/emotional control and in the pupils' relationship with peers and adults. This suggests that an overall improvement in the mentored children's general behaviour across their every day life across various contexts and environments (e.g school, home and outside).

STUDY THREE: LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF CURRENT MENTEES

Introduction

Children and Parent/Carers Interviews

Five year long longitudinal studies began in October 2006, with the assistance of monthly semi-structured interviews that focused on the quality of the mentor-mentee relationship. The interviews took place in North London on monthly basis of visits to the homes of the five families (e.g. parent/carers and their children). Each interview was recorded (when permission was granted) and transcribed. The interviews evaluated the children's and their families' satisfaction of the ongoing mentoring and aimed to establish whether or not there had been an improvement in the child's behaviour. The interviews started before, during mentoring and a month after the child's graduation ceremony. In addition SDQ scores for each child, obtained in the usual way by ChanceUK, were analysed.

Sample characteristics

All the five children in the longitudinal study were boys with a mean age of 8.6 years.

Child A was 9 years of age at the start of mentoring and of Afro-Caribbean ethnicity. He lived in North London with his mother who was in poor health (overweight & suffering from respiratory difficulties). He had been statemented at school and had special needs. He found it difficult to make friends or to relate to his two younger siblings who were twins (1 male, 1 female). He was matched with a female mentor.

Child B was nearly 8 years old at the start of mentoring and of white British ethnicity. He lived with his mother (who was pregnant at the time) in North London and saw his father on Mondays and Saturdays. He was very close to his mother but had a difficult relationship with his father. He lashed out and got angry when he was not believed and found it difficult to bond with others. He was matched with a male mentor.

Child C was 9 years old at the start of mentoring and his ethnicity was white British. He had lived with his grandfather and aunt for the last two and a half years. He had a younger sister who has been adopted. He had SEN special needs and emotional difficulties. He could be moody and did not know his own strength and he could get rough in the playground with peers. However, he did get on with peers and liked adults. He was matched with a female mentor.

Child D was aged 8 and of African ethnicity. He lived with his mother, a younger brother and his elderly grandmother in North London. He displayed challenging and inappropriate behaviours. He was able to interact with adults but had problems with his peers. He had poor academic achievement specifically in reading and he received drama therapy at school. He came from a religious background and

went to church regularly. He was initially matched with a male mentor but this was not successful and ceased after the fifth month in April 2007 because of the mentor's family problems. Child D was then successfully re-matched with a female mentor and as a result his mentoring had not finished at the end of this evaluation.

Child E was nearly 11 years old at the start of mentoring and of Afro-Caribbean ethnicity. He lived with his mother, two older brothers and an older sister in North London. He initially had problems at school, was aggressive towards peers, was not academically focused and did not work well within groups or in 1:1 relationships. He had poor academic achievement and poor short-term memory. He was matched with a female mentor.

Table 3.1. Descriptive data for the five children and their families

| Child | Gender | Age | Ethnicity | Parent/carer | Siblings | Mentor |
|----------|--------|-------|----------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|
| A | Male | 9 | Afro Caribbean | Mother | 2 | Female |
| B | Male | 7 | White British | Mother | 0 | Male |
| C | Male | 9 | White British | Granddad & Aunt | 1 | Female |
| D | Male | 8 | African | Mother & Grandmother | 1 | Male/Female |
| E | Male | 10/11 | Afro Caribbean | Mother | 3 | Female |

Analyses of SDQ scores

Table 3.2 shows the SDQ scores, before and after mentoring, for each of the five boys, from the four raters. Of main interest are the 'difference' or change scores; an improvement is indicated by negative changes (decreases) in the Difficulties scores (HA, ES, CP and PP), and a positive change (increase) for the Strengths score (PS).

Table 3.2. SDQ scores before and after mentoring for the five boys; ratings from the child (C), their parent/carer (P), teacher (T) and mentor (M). HA = Hyperactivity- inattention, ES = Emotional Symptoms, CP = Conduct Problems, PP = Peer Problems; and PS = Prosocial Behaviour.

Child A

| SDQ | C Before | C After | diff | P Before | P After | diff | T Before | T After | diff | M Before | M After | diff | All raters mean diff |
|--------------------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------------------|
| HA | 4 | 0 | -4 | 7 | 5 | -2 | 8 | 0 | -8 | 8 | 6 | -2 | -4.00 |
| ES | 1 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -8 | 6 | 3 | -3 | -3.00 |
| CP | 3 | 0 | -3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | -5 | 5 | 3 | -2 | -2.50 |
| PP | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | -3 | 7 | 0 | -7 | 5 | 5 | 0 | -2.50 |
| Total diffs | 10 | 2 | -8 | 18 | 13 | -5 | 22 | 0 | -28 | 24 | 17 | -7 | -12.0 |
| PS | 9 | 7 | -2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | +2.75 |

Child A's SDQ change scores (before - after mentoring) indicate that overall he has shown a very substantial and across-the-board improvement by the completion of the mentoring programme. The Difficulties scores (HA, ES, CP & PP) show an average decline of 3.0; and the Strengths (PS) an improvement of 2.75.

Child B

| SDQ | C Before | C After | diff | P Before | P After | diff | T Before | T After | diff | M Before | M After | diff | All raters mean diff |
|--------------------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------------------|
| HA | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | -1 | 9 | 1 | -8 | 9 | 8 | -1 | -2.00 |
| ES | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | -5 | 4 | 1 | -3 | 6 | 0 | -6 | -3.50 |
| CP | 4 | 2 | -2 | 3 | 0 | -3 | 6 | 3 | -3 | 4 | 3 | -1 | -2.25 |
| PP | 1 | 4 | -3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 3 | -4 | 6 | 3 | -3 | -2.50 |
| Total diffs | 8 | 11 | -3 | 15 | 6 | -9 | 26 | 8 | -18 | 25 | 14 | -11 | -10.25 |
| PS | 9 | 8 | -1 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | -1 | +1.00 |

Child B's SDQ change scores (before - after mentoring) indicate that overall he has shown a substantial and across-the-board improvement by the completion of the mentoring programme. The Difficulties scores (HA, ES, CP & PP) show an average decline of 2.56; and the Strengths (PS) an improvement of 1.0.

Child C

| SDQ | C Before | C After | diff | P Before | P After | diff | T Before | T After | diff | M Before | M After | diff | All raters mean diff |
|--------------------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------------------|
| HA | 3 | 2 | -1 | 5 | 3 | -2 | 10 | 7 | -3 | 9 | 6 | -3 | -2.25 |
| ES | 4 | 0 | -4 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 7 | 1 | -6 | 8 | 5 | -3 | -3.50 |
| CP | 6 | 4 | -2 | 9 | 4 | -5 | 7 | 6 | -1 | 6 | 4 | -2 | -2.50 |
| PP | 2 | 0 | -2 | 2 | 0 | -2 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | +0.50 |
| Total diffs | 15 | 6 | -9 | 17 | 7 | -10 | 26 | 21 | -5 | 29 | 22 | -7 | -7.75 |
| PS | 8 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 1 | -0.75 |

Child C's SDQ change scores (before - after mentoring) indicate that overall he has shown some improvement by the completion of the mentoring programme. The Difficulties scores (HA, ES, CP & PP) show an average decline of 1.94 (but with a small worsening in PP, peer problems); however the Strengths (PS) showed a slight decline of 0.75.

Child D

| SDQ | C Before | C After | diff | P Before | P After | diff | T Before | T After | diff | M Before | M After | diff | All raters mean diff |
|--------------------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------------------|
| HA | 4 | 3 | -1 | 8 | 6 | -2 | 8 | 6 | -2 | 8 | 7 | -1 | -1.50 |
| ES | 4 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | +0.25 |
| CP | 6 | 2 | -4 | 4 | 3 | -1 | 7 | 1 | -6 | 7 | 2 | -5 | -4.00 |
| PP | 4 | 0 | -4 | 2 | 0 | -2 | 3 | 0 | -3 | 3 | 1 | -2 | -2.75 |
| Total diffs | 18 | 8 | -10 | 14 | 9 | -5 | 18 | 7 | -11 | 19 | 13 | -6 | -8.00 |
| PS | 6 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 1 | +3.50 |

Child D's SDQ change scores (before - after mentoring) indicate that overall he has shown some improvement by the completion of the mentoring programme. The Difficulties scores (HA, ES, CP & PP) show an average decline of 2.00; this is especially marked for CP (conduct problems), but there is a slight worsening of ES (emotional symptoms). The Strengths (PS) show a very substantial improvement of 3.5.

Child E

| SDQ | C Before | C After | diff | P Before | P After | diff | T Before | T After | diff | M Before | M After | diff | All raters mean diff |
|--------------------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------|---------|------|----------------------|
| HA | 5 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 10 | 9 | -1 | 10 | 6 | -4 | -2.00 |
| ES | 2 | 1 | -1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 4 | -3 | +0.75 |
| CP | 4 | 3 | -1 | 5 | 2 | -3 | 10 | 6 | -4 | 6 | 4 | -2 | -2.50 |
| PP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | -2 | 8 | 3 | -5 | -1.00 |
| Total diffs | 11 | 7 | -4 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 26 | 23 | -3 | 31 | 17 | -14 | -4.75 |
| PS | 10 | 9 | -1 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | +1.25 |

Child E's SDQ change scores (before - after mentoring) indicate that overall he has shown some modest improvement by the completion of the mentoring programme. The Difficulties scores (HA, ES, CP & PP) show an average decline of 1.12 (but with a slight worsening of ES, emotional symptoms); and the Strengths (PS) an improvement of 1.25.

Summary of SDQ changes

All 5 children showed overall improvement in their SDQ scores, after mentoring was completed as compared to before. However there were variations in the breadth and extent of this. Overall, Child A improved the most, and Child E the least.

Child A showed substantial improvement in all areas.

Child B showed good improvement in all areas.

Child C showed good improvement in HA, ES and CP, but fell back slightly in PP, and PS.

Child D showed some improvement in HA and PP and especially in CP and PS; but fell back slightly in ES.

Child E showed some improvement in HA, CP and PP, and PS, but fell back slightly in ES.

The Children and Parent/Carers Interviews

To get further insight into the causes of relatively successful or unsuccessful outcomes, we interviewed, longitudinally,

(a) the child who was mentored

(b) the main parent or carer

In the interviews we asked the child how he felt about having a mentor, if they enjoyed it, and if it changed them in any way. We asked the parent/carers whether or not their child had modified his behaviour, and if the mentoring relationship brought any improvement at home and in their everyday life; we also assessed how much a parent wanted to collaborate in the education of his/her child. Interviews were conducted in the homes of the five boys and their parent/carers.

The first and final interviews were held before mentoring started, and a month after mentoring ceased (see Appendix 1). They consisted of seven largely open ended questions (see appendix 1), in a semi-structured format.

A sample question: *"How well do you feel you (or your child) are doing in your (their) lessons at school (e.g. in your reading, writing, spelling & maths)?"*

After the mentoring had begun the children and their parent/carers were given a monthly semi-structured seven question interview (see Appendix 2).

A sample question: *"What have been the good things about you (or your child's) mentoring?"*

The interviews were coded using content analysis; the categories used were the same as used in the retrospective Study 2. All ratings were agreed upon by two raters.

Appendix A gives detailed analyses of the interview material from Child A, and Child E. Appendix B gives shorter accounts of Child B, Child C and Child D, based on the initial and final interviews. What follows are summary comparisons, based on this more detailed material.

Summary of the five boys' progress over the year

Child A (the child who had shown the greatest improvement in their final difficulties scores) in the first and final interviews indicated that he had generally improved in his overall problem behaviours. This improvement was found in his academic abilities as he was doing well at all his subjects at school (e.g. reading, writing and maths). He did not have existing problems relating to his peers or adults before mentoring commenced, but reported having numerous friendships with his peers; the only significant problem commented upon regarded where his home was situated, next to a main road, which made it difficult for him

to go out due to safety reasons. There was an improvement in Child A's interpersonal emotional expressivity after mentoring as he felt better equipped to discuss problems not only with his mother but also with his teacher.

After completion of the mentoring there were still certain aspects of Child A's lack of behavioural control noted by the parent, such behaviours seemed to be dependent upon the child's mood state and at times his inability to show appropriate emotional expressivity. Additionally he still had a tendency to become easily bored (a suggestion is that the Chance UK mentoring programme should address ways that the children can entertain themselves when they are alone, so that even after mentoring ceases they are able to counteract their boredom and the problem behaviours which can result from such a lack of stimulation). There had been a gain in his personal self-esteem, indicated by his confidence and an improvement in the personal learning of new skills/experiences such as healthy cooking.

In the longitudinal interviews, he indicated that the good things about his mentoring had been the activities provided by the mentor, which were very varied and stimulating. These involved a lot of child A's favourite activity, football. For example:

"My favourite thing was the football" and "Arsenal was the best in the whole wide world".

and also new healthy cooking skills:

"We all ate (my) the lasagne even my mentor".

There were no negative comments about the mentoring over the period and many positive comments:

"No I liked everything". His mother also had no negative comments:

"No not really I can not think of anything".

The relationship between child A and his mentor was consistently seen as very good, both by Child A:

"Because the really, really, really, special face is the nicest way to describe her"

and by his mother:

"He is always pleased to go out with her and to seeing her"

The improvement of Child A's academic achievement was commented on by him:

"Yes I have learnt reading with my mentor"

and there was generally an improvement in the parent /child relationship, the mother commenting that

"He is sometimes more obedient"

She also thought that his self-esteem had improved:

"He is surprised what he can do".

Overall Child A and his mother indicated throughout their interviews that Chance UK had built upon the child's strengths (e.g. football) as well as addressing his weaknesses (e.g. self-esteem, behavioural control and academic achievement). This in turn enhanced the child's view about himself, which resulted in a reduction in his problem behaviours.

Child E (the child who had shown the least improvement in their final difficulties scores) in the first and final interviews indicated that there had been an improvement in his reading and writing. Child E reported numerous friends at school and at home. However there was one incident where child E had problems at school, which had been rectified before mentoring began.

There were conflicting responses from Child E and his mother regarding his behavioural control before and after mentoring; the mother stated that child E was being bullied and that he could on occasion be a provocative victim. There were also problems with the child's ability to display appropriate emotional expressivity towards others.

Both Child E and his mother agreed that even after mentoring, the child had problems entertaining himself and was prone to boredom especially at home. There were problems around the child arriving at school with the same clothes that he had worn the day before. It should be noted that this child went from primary school to secondary school during the final part of his mentoring and had problems adjusting. This resulted in him not wanting to attend the new school.

Child E stated before mentoring commenced that he wanted to find out about going to the library and going to the museum. In contrast his final comments suggested that he had learnt to dive but nothing else, which suggests that he did not feel that he had successfully achieved all of the original goals.

In the longitudinal interviews, child E mentioned one of the good things about their mentoring was swimming:

"I really liked the swimming"

However there were problems regarding the amount of time with their mentor, which the child felt was not sufficient:

"I do not know how much time I need though".

There were no negative comments regarding the actual mentoring, and many of the comments were positive, both from the child:

"No not at all" (no problems)

and the mother

"No I do not think so everything is alright".

The mother thought that the mentoring had had no effect upon improving her relationship with her son:

"No he has not changed towards me".

Child E often stated that his relationship with his mentor was 'OK', which was not especially positive; but some comments were more positive:

"I choose OK because I have only just met her and I am still getting to know her"

but later

"Very good, because we get on well"

The mother generally regarded her son's relationship with his mentor as very good.

"Very good because when she comes she has a nice spirit and no attitude"

When asked what he felt that he had learnt from his mentor, child E was rather evasive, but did say that she had helped him in his swimming abilities:

"Yes when I was swimming she has shown me how to swim so showed me how to position my arms to do the front stokes".

However in his final interview he said:

"No nothing".

Nevertheless his mother believed that her child's personal behaviour had been improved by the positive example that the mentor was showing towards him:

"Yeah, he was stubborn and she talks to him about it "

She also thought that he had learnt some new things:

"Yes, he has learnt a lot by going to a lot of places that he has never been before".

Overall Child E and his mother indicated throughout their interviews that Chance UK had built upon the child's strengths, which the child stated were swimming; and both agreed that the mentoring had had an improvement on Child E's academic abilities. However there were uncertainties as to what specifically the child had learnt, with the mother saying that he had experienced new and novel activities and in contrast Child E stating that their mentor had only improved their existing skills. Additionally there were many fundamental changes in Child E's life (i.e. going to secondary school and bullying), which may have had an effect upon his limited improvement in his final SDQ difficulties scores after completing Chance UK's mentoring programme.

Comparisons between Child A and Child E

Comparisons between Child A and Child E suggest that factors such as compatibility with the activities supplied by Chance UK may have affected the success of the mentoring. Whereas Child A was very

happy and felt that he had achieved new goals, child E felt that he had not achieved any new skills but only enhanced the ones that he already possessed. Moreover Child A's relationship with his mother seemed to have improved as she felt that her son had matured, but in contrast Child's E relationship with his mother stayed relatively the same (there seemed to be little interaction between the mother and the child before or after mentoring). Child A improved academically and behaviourally at school (as was indicated by his zero final SDQ difficulties scores as rated by his teacher), but Child E moved to a new secondary school which he found rather problematic and felt that he did not fit into his new school environment; this very probably had an impact upon his final SDQ scores. Nevertheless Child E did show an improvement (albeit a small one) on most of his SDQ difficulties scores after completing the mentoring programme.

Comparisons between Children B, C and D

Comparisons between the three boys and their parent/carers suggested generally that they were very equal in their opinion of the success of Chance UK's mentoring. This was reflected in their final SDQ difficulties scores with all showing reasonable improvement. All of them had shown improvements in their academic abilities across the main subjects (reading, writing and maths), especially Child C.

Child B had major issues regarding his attendance (he was unable to settle in his classroom and the school had to continually phone for parental assistance); but this was improved when he attended a pupil referral unit, in addition to his regular schooling, which helped the child in his behavioural problems and advised the school on how to improve the class environment. This in turn alleviated the pressures upon Child B's mother who was heavily pregnant at the end of her son's mentoring.

All three boys showed great improvements in their behavioural control, especially towards their parent/carers, other than Child D who had problems with anger management towards his peers both at school and at home. One problem which comments suggested still existed was that all the boys seemed unable to entertain themselves and had a proneness to boredom, even by the end of mentoring.

Overall the interviews with the child and their parent/carer, together with the changes in SDQ scores, indicated that the mentoring had been successful in improving the children's behaviour and in their outlook of themselves, increasing their self-esteem and confidence by its focus upon their existing strengths.

Summary of overall findings from Study Three

The longitudinal interviews obtained from the five boys and their parent/carers showed that overall there was substantial improvement in all of the boys SDQ scores after completing Chance UK's mentoring. Ratings by the children and their parent/carers generally showed an agreement between the raters on an improvement of personal academic achievement. There was also an improvement in their personal and interpersonal behavioural control.

This was especially true of **Child A**, who had zero scores from his teacher's final SDQ difficulties ratings, indicating a major improvement across all difficulties scores specifically at school. This was borne out by a number of interview comments:

"Reading I am doing very good and with my writing and my spelling is good. With my maths I am doing very good" (Child A)

"In reading he is doing good, fine actually, he has come a long way."(mother)

Child A showed an improvement in personal and interpersonal behavioural control:

"Ignore them if they annoy me" (Child A)

and in his interpersonal self-esteem/confidence and learning new skills

"Maturity sometimes, confidence, and a wide range of skills such as cooking and life skills and football" (mother)

"She has taught me how to play bowling. She taught me how to use the bowling ball which was the pink one which is especially for children because it is the lightest" (Child A)

Such positive comments indicated that Child A had matured and grown through his mentoring experience, reflected in an overall improvement on his final SDQ scores as indicated by all raters.

Child B's SDQ Scores showed quite good improvement on all categories. This was reflected in interview comments on his academic abilities:

"I think he is doing fantastically well, he has really improved since before Christmas" (mother)

and behavioural control:

"He is doing the right thing more and more now" (mother)

"There are not a lot of incidences where he is not doing the right thing." (mother)

However there were factors holding back Child B's improvement; both his mother and his school believed that he had ADHD:

"It is believed that he is borderline ADHD and I am going to get him assessed" (mother)

Her son went to a pupil referral unit in addition to his regular school; this was reported to have a positive effect upon his personal and interpersonal behavioural control:

"He is getting a lot better at walking away...He is doing the right thing more and more now". (mother: final interview)

Moreover the mother commented that she believed that the mentor had been a very positive role model for her son, indicating that it had been a very successful match:

"He was trusting, he respected my son and for him to know that there are men like his mentor... he saw him as a positive role model" (mother)

Child C showed general improvement in SDQ scores other than on Peer Problems and Prosocial scales. This seemed to reflect Child C's problems relating to and socialising with certain peers. This appeared to be dependent upon how Child C was feeling at the time of a specific incident:

"The twins across the road start on me and were calling me a fat sausage" (Child C: first interview)

"As I had an argument with the black boy and the two teenage girls said hit him" (Child C: final interview)

"I will ignore them or walk away or sometimes I get angry, it depends how much they are annoying me" (Child C: final interview)

Child D showed general improvement in SDQ scores, notably so for Conduct Problems and Prosocial scales, but not for Emotional Symptoms. This latter may have been affected by Child D being diagnosed with ADHD before his mentoring began, and having problems adapting to his medication and consequently his ability to handle his emotions.

"He calmed down from lashing out but he cries more" (mother: first interview)

It should be noted that child D was not at the end of mentoring when his final interview was undertaken as he had a change of mentor half way through his first year, because his original mentor had family problems and needed to leave the programme. This makes it difficult to surmise what may specifically have had an impact upon his emotional symptoms SDQ scores other than the problems mentioned above.

Finally **Child E** showed some improvement in SDQ scores, except on Emotional Symptoms. This latter, and the generally lesser progress of Child E (compared to the other four boys), may have been due to him attending a new secondary school during the mentoring process. This removed him from the comfort zone of his primary school, which may have led to him experiencing problems adapting to his new environment.

"He still says that he does not want to go to school" (mother: final interview)

Child E also stated that he wanted his mentoring to continue; this may have affected him emotionally as another major area of his life (i.e. mentoring as well as school) was changing/ending.

"I would also like to have more mentoring but I know that is not going to happen." (Child E: final interview)

In the main (other than in Child E), relationships between the children and their parent/carers seemed to have been enhanced especially in their communicative interactions.

"We have got closer than we were which is good" (Child C: final interview)

Comments generally regarding all of the boy's attentional levels indicated that they were unable even after mentoring to overcome a tendency to boredom. A possible suggestion for future mentoring would be to focus upon some activities that the child can continue to do by themselves after mentoring ceases. This will hopefully alleviate many of the pressures caused between the child, their parent/carers and other family members. Moreover while generally the children's activities were modelled on the child and their parent/carers desired list, Child E did not seem to gain what he had hoped

he would through mentoring and complained that he was only repeating the activities he had already experienced through school trips.

"She took me to loads of places but to the same places like the farm, cinema, the swimming pool the same things all the time as I went to the farm with my primary school" (Child E: final interview)

Overall, the responses from both raters showed an agreement that all of the boys had generally improved across domains as assessed by the SDQ scores, and the interview questions. This, and the generally positive ratings of the mentors and comments on the mentor-mentee relationship suggest that the five children did benefit specifically from the mentoring process and that Chance UK had had a positive effect on many aspects of the children's lives.

Overall Recommendations to Chance UK based on the three studies

- 1) Chance UK should try to ensure that their SDQ records are completed and updated (for all raters) to allow reflection and comparison to be observed of improvements or changes in the mentored child behaviours.
- 2) Additional SDQ scores could be taken six months into the mentoring from the mentored children, their parent/carer and the mentor; this will allow a review of the progress of the child and to ascertain whether or not specific aspects of the child's behaviour need to be focused upon through the remainder of their mentoring.
- 3) The activities chosen should reflect both the children's and parent's "Hope to gain list" where possible and also be appropriate for the children's age and temperament.
- 4) Activities should be introduced that are cheap and able to be done by the child, to alleviate common issues of boredom; and to maximise continuing impact after mentoring ceases. (Examples might be: boy scouts, brownies, football clubs, youth clubs, drama, music and arts clubs etc). This will help reduce the impact of mentoring ending.
- 5) An additional question should be asked at the child's and their parent/carer's initial interview and updated by the mentor, regarding the activities the child has recently experienced on their school trips. This will help avoid repetition in the mentoring activities.
- 6) A triangle should be set up during mentoring between the parent/carers, the child and their school so that after mentoring finishes the parent/carer feels more equipped to communicate and have a continuous relationship with their child's school.
- 7) Retrospective follow-ups of mentored children could be conducted to investigate whether or not their SDQ scores have maintained or continued improvement over time, which will in turn provide useful information on the continuity of effects of the Chance UK mentoring programme.
- 8) Children who have completed Chance UK Mentoring and their families should be given information of other sister organisations who provide mentoring. This is especially important for the children and families who felt that one year was not sufficient.
- 9) An internet messaging board such as a moderated registered forum could be added to the Chance UK web page which can be accessed by the children who have graduated, and their mentors. This would allow messages to be posted, and accessed after Chance UK has monitored the content for the child's protection and safety.

References

- Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38, 581-586.
- Meltzer, H., Gatward, R., Goodman, R. & Ford, T. (2000). *Mental health of children and adolescents in Great Britain*. Office for National Statistics, The Stationary Office, London.
- St James-Roberts, I. & Singh, C.S. (2001). Can mentors help primary school children with behaviour problems? Home Office Research Study 233, November.