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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Mentoring students has become one of the frequently used strategies across the nation to help young people (Crockett and Smirk 1991, 7). Several decades ago, young people looked to their parents or other close relatives as role models, while today, the nuclear family is almost nonexistent (Potomac News [Woodbridge] 1994). Family members are no longer close and nearby. Family role models are not available for young children which has increased an emerging need for mentoring (Slaughnesey 1991, 95).

The concept of mentoring is used in schools, businesses, industries, and universities. Since today’s economy requires both family partners to work to earn a stable and sufficient income, parents are no longer spending adequate time with their children. The high divorce rate also increased single parent families. These factors have helped establish a need for mentoring.

Several national organizations were identified for providing excellent mentoring programs for adolescents (U.S. Congress, Senate, 1994, 30). Some of these organizations were American Associations of Retired Persons (AARP), Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America International Center for Mentoring, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), National Urban
League, and Young Women Christian Association (YWCA) of the United States of America. Mentors from these organizations helped young people make a transition during critical times in their lives (Crockett et al. 1991, 17).

A good mentor is able to bond with a youth showing the youth that he/she cares (Wilson 1992, 62). According to Anderson (1994), all good mentors possessed similar characteristics. These characteristics were:

(1) Ability to communicate

(2) Interpersonal skills

(3) Commitment

(4) Maturity

Initially, schools were the primary focus of mentoring programs (White-Hood 1993, 76). Schools contained a population that needed targeting and there were many resources presented within the school system to be used for identification, referral, monitoring, and measurement. After White-Hood (1993) implemented a mentoring program in a suburban middle school, she noticed an increase in students' assessment scores in reading and writing.

Other researchers studied the effects of mentoring on African American students' achievement in urban school districts such as Sandra Taylor (1994) when she implemented a mentoring program for high school students within an urban city, students' grade point average and study skills improved. Margaret Beale (1991) studied the effects of mentoring on school aged African American males' self esteem. She concluded that black boys self esteem was lower than that of black girls. Dekalb
County Schools reported favorable gains in grades, attendance, and improved conduct for junior high school students after the implementation of a mentoring program (Mentoring Minutes 1996, 1).

Some social scientists were critical about mentoring. Anderson (1994) implied that these social scientists believed that mentoring was another fashionable approach to the problems of youth. Yet, other social scientists (Styles and Morrow 1992) acknowledged that if mentoring were to be a viable option in youth servicing practices, the ability to reach large numbers of youth in critical need must be demonstrated.

Mecartney, Styles and Morrow (1994), reported a pilot study in 1990 by Public Private Ventures. Public Private Ventures chose the juvenile justice system to test the ability of mentoring to serve large numbers of at-risk youth in a public serving institution. Saint Louis, Missouri and Atlanta, Georgia were the two specific sites chosen for this study.

It was hypothesized that mentoring was not a "stand in" for comprehensive services, but may serve as a vital component of an agency or program. Mecartney and colleagues (1994) indicated that the majority of mentors at both sites were black (77% in Saint Louis and 83% in Atlanta), while the remaining mentors were white. Mentors and mentees formed matches. Half of these matches (42%) met sporadically, while the majority of the matches (56%) lasted six months or less. Only 41 matches (26%) met regularly for more than six months and 24 matches (15%) continued their meetings after the project was completed. Thirteen of the matches
successfully transitioned to the community. Significant findings in the pilot study demonstrated a need for mentoring in the juvenile justice system (Mecartney et al. 1994, 37).

Both juvenile justice agencies planned to continue a mentoring component. Several recommendations were made by Public Private Ventures to make mentoring a feasible component for the rehabilitation for adjudicated youth. The Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services (DCYS) and the NAACP Southern Regional Office adopted the pilot study in 1993 (Department of Children and Youth Services 1997, 33). The project is the Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project and is currently operated through a collaborative effort between DCYS and the NAACP.

**The Evolution of the Problem**

Currently, the Friend-To-Friend Mentor project is utilized by DCYS as a component of the rehabilitative process for first and second time juvenile offenders (Vickers 1997). The mentors are volunteers who sign a contractual agreement and are matched on an individual basis with youth. All mentors must be at least twenty-one years old and are matched with youth in various programs operated by DCYS (Vickers 1997).

The goal of the Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project is to build self esteem, increase academic achievement, and establish social interactions through an individual mentor/mentee relationship. Derwin Ross (1997), Project Director for the NAACP’s Regional Office Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project, stated that the project initially
started at the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus. Now, the project has expanded to all the programs throughout the state that are operated by the DCYS.

Ray Gavin (1997), Public Information Specialist for the DCYS, explained that there is no empirical data to support the success of the mentoring component. The only data used to support the success of sustained relationships are based on mentor and mentee logs. Ross and Gavin are in the process of designing a method to collect empirical data to support the success of these matches.

Researchers noted the disparity in student achievement for African American students and their white counterparts (Majors and Billson 1992, 13; Simmon and Grady 1992, 60; Wilson 1992, 52). African American males were reported to be two to three years academically behind African American females, white females, and white males (Lyman, Moffitt, and Southhamer 1993, 188). This study indicated that school achievement for these males affected their delinquency.

There is a need to determine if a mentoring program can improve the academic achievement of adjudicated African American juvenile males. If the achievements of these males improved, their chance of a smooth transition into the community increases and their chance of recidivism decreases when released by the juvenile justice agency. There is very little empirical data to support mentoring as an effective intervention to improve academic achievement for adjudicated youth. The DCYS and the NAACP have started an initial phase of collecting data to support the positive effects of mentoring with this population.
Statement of the Problem

Will mentoring increase the academic achievement of adjudicated African American juvenile males with learning and behavioral problems?

Educational Significance

The Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services will continue to investigate the efforts of mentoring with adjudicated youth. It has been established by policymakers, practitioners, advocates, and researchers that youth need positive and consistent relationships with adults to facilitate their transition to adulthood (Mecartney et al. 1994, 1). Mentoring has grown over the past decade to help form these relationships.

The bond between adult and youth needs to be studied in regard to the impact of an increase of student achievement for the adjudicated African American youth. Lee (1994) explained that this bond with Americans of African descent stresses harmony among people and harmony between people and their external environment. Lee added, on-going bonding fosters self and group development through behavioral expressiveness. This is one way African American males learn to enhance their abilities in survival strategies, coping mechanisms, and forms of resistance to the racial and gender bias that confront them daily in our American society.

If student achievement is positively effected by the implementation of a mentoring program for adjudicated juveniles, this will increase the chances of the juvenile offenders being successful in their transition back into the community, and
decrease their chances of recidivism (NAACP Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project 1997, 15).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a positive effect between mentoring and student achievement for adjudicated African American juvenile males with learning and behavioral problems.

**Research Questions**

Whatever the complex reasons may be for the delinquent behavior of some adjudicated African American juvenile males who have been identified as having learning problems, there is consistent evidence that this population is overrepresented in the juvenile court system (Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A Report 1995, 10; U. S. Congress, Senate 1994, 3). There is some evidence that mentoring is an effective intervention which will assist these youth in making a successful transition into their communities and decrease their chances of recidivism when released by juvenile justice agency. However, there is little evidence showing that mentoring improves academic achievement for at-risk youth served by a large scale institution. The general goal of this study addressed the following research questions:

1. Will mentoring increase adjudicated African American juvenile male’s achievement scores in reading?

2. Will mentoring increase adjudicated African American juvenile males’ achievement scores in math?
Research Hypotheses

The null hypotheses tested in this study are:

1. There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored African American adjudicated juvenile males' pre and post achievement scores in reading.

2. There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored African American adjudicated juvenile males' pre and post achievement scores in math.

Description of Subject Selection Procedure

The researcher chose the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus (located in Atlanta) as the site for the selection of the subjects. The population of this campus ranges from 106 to 120 and includes approximately 86 to 90 African American males between the ages of 12 and 17. Eighty percent of these males have been identified as having a deficit of two years or more in reading and math. Twenty subjects were selected for the study - ten for the research group and ten for the control group. The Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project Director selected the research group and the control group was selected from a remaining group of offenders not receiving that form of mentoring.

Data Analysis Procedure

The researcher used an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the statistical significance of the difference between the mean test scores of the experimental and control groups before and after the mentoring intervention. A multiple regression was
used to determine if the intervening variables of age, severity and type of offense, and length of stay affected the pre and post test reading and math scores.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. It may be difficult to make generalizations from the findings of this study because the sample size is small. The sample size consists of subjects from one youth development campus in Georgia.

2. Since the expansions of the different forms of mentoring, it will be extremely difficult to find subjects who have not been exposed to some form of mentoring.

3. The differences in the subjects' offenses may affect how the subjects relate to their mentors in a mentor/mentee relationship.

**Description of the Instrument**

The Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) was used to assess the achievement of the adjudicated juvenile offenders. The Georgia DCYS uses forms 7 and 8 of the test to assess all of the adjudicated juveniles. Locator Forms 7 and 8 of the test were used to determine the appropriate level of the Survey Edition used for assessment. The assessment process lasted approximately two hours. The TABE skills consist of five levels that assess grade equivalent skills from 1.6 to 12.9 and cover reading, mathematics, language, and spelling (McGraw-Hill 1995, 21). The TABE was developed by examining current curriculum guides, textbooks, and instructional programs obtained from adult educational programs throughout the country (McGraw-Hill 1995, 41). According to McGraw-Hill (1995), development of this test included
extensive review for potential bias against African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians which is the sole basis for the validity of the test. The test was utilized for its potential usage with a variety of populations such as adult offenders, juvenile offenders, and vocational technical school employees. For the purpose of this study, Survey Editions covering reading and math were utilized.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined according to their usage in the study:

**Adjudication:** The process of a juvenile court reaching a decision or sentence regarding an offense committed by a juvenile delinquent. The juvenile court may choose one of the four options listed to serve a sentence for a youth: residential placement, probation or other nonresidential disposition, and aftercare (release).

**GED:** Graduate equivalent diploma.

**Juvenile offenders:** Juveniles ranging in age from 12 to 17 years old, who are characterized by antisocial behavior. These juveniles lag at least one to two grade levels behind academically. They have committed violent, serious, and minor offenses that are in violation of the law.

**Incarceration:** The act of detaining someone to a prison or to a prison-like environment (such as youth development campus facility as a result of a violation of the law).

**Mentoring:** A support relationship between a youth and someone who offers support, guidance, and concrete assistance as the younger partner goes through a
difficult transitional period, enters a new area of experience, takes on important tasks, and corrects earlier problems.

Violation of a Parole (VOAP): Violation of a parole; when a juvenile violates a conditional release by the courts for a minor or serious offense.

Youth Development Campus: A facility which juvenile offenders are detained for up to 18 months. In this facility, juveniles are held under restrictive physical security and receive limited outside community contact.

Summary

The concept of mentoring has become one of the frequently used strategies to help young people in America. Since today’s family members are distant, the need for role models has increased. Several organizations have provided excellent mentors for adolescents.

Social scientists hypothesized that mentoring may serve as a vital component of an agency or program which serves at-risk youth. Mecartney and colleagues (1994) found that mentoring was a feasible component in the juvenile justice system. Currently, there is no empirical data to support the success of a mentor/mentee relationship on improving the academic achievement of adjudicated juvenile offenders.

The researcher was interested in studying the effects of mentoring on the academic achievement of adjudicated African American juvenile males. The males selected were from a population of adjudicated African American juvenile males at the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus in Atlanta, Georgia.
CHAPTER 2
THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the review of pertinent and related literature under four major categories:

1. Incarceration of African American Males
2. Academic Achievement of African American Males
3. Mentoring
4. Mentoring in the Juvenile Justice System

Incarceration of African American Males

Policymakers, researchers, advocates, and citizens are concerned about the overrepresentation of African American males incarcerated in the United States. Despite previous efforts to ameliorate this problem, African American males’ incarceration rate has rapidly increased within the last five years (Mincy 1994, 8; U. S. Congress, Senate 1994, 13). A large percentage of prison inmates experienced their first criminal offenses during their adolescence (The Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report 1995, 10). Mincy (1994), a noted senior research associate at the Urban Institute in Washington, D. C. stated that in the seventies, tens
of thousands of African American men were incarcerated, while today's prisons and other juvenile secure facilities have locked up hundreds of thousands of African American juvenile males. Mincy concluded by comparing the incarceration of African American male youth to the "crushing of baby cockroaches daily" (p.7).

The Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report (1995) and the 1996 Update on Violence (1997) revealed alarming statistics on the crimes committed by juveniles as related to ethnicity, age, sex, and initial offenses. Two studies included in these reports clearly indicated that when African American males commit offenses at an earlier onset during their juvenile years, the chances were greater for the number of violent and serious offenses committed before their eighteenth birthday.

According to law enforcement agencies in 1994, statistics indicated that African American juveniles constituted 43% of the 1,300,000 adjudicated juveniles. This population accounted for 59% of the murder arrests compared to 39% for whites of the 3,700 murder offenses committed in 1994. Out of the 748,100 property crimes committed by juveniles, African Americans accounted for 41% of motor vehicle thefts compared to 56% for the whites. All of these adjudicated juveniles included a disproportionate number of minorities confined in public juvenile facilities. The proportion of this population in custody in public facilities increased significantly between 1987 and 1991 (Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report 1995, 16). When the adjudicated juveniles were reviewed for the number of juveniles confined to public juvenile facilities, a disproportionate number of minorities was confined to these facilities.
The juvenile offender population is considered to be the number of juveniles ages 10 through 18, and under the jurisdiction of the juvenile courts. A study in Denver on 69,000 adjudicated youth indicated that a juvenile's law violating career usually involved a variety of offenses (Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A Report 1995, 49). Data concluded that 42% of African American juvenile males came in contact with law enforcement before their eighteenth birthday and 37% of juveniles committed a violent or serious offense before their eighteenth birthday. This study summarized that the sequencing of law violating behaviors in the careers of these violent offenders were diversified, whereas the delinquency career continued more serious behaviors were added to the juvenile's offenses. A similar study on juvenile males in Philadelphia revealed that 63% of the juvenile offenders were African Americans (Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report 1995, 50). This study concluded that the age and the related increase in physical activity, and access to delinquent peers, weapons, drugs, and situations led to an increase in law violating behaviors for these juveniles.

In Georgia, African American males were the most prevalent juvenile offenders of violent crimes (Atlanta Journal [Atlanta], 10 April 1994). Some characteristics of juvenile offenders in Georgia were:

1. youth between the ages of 15-17, have not completed school;
2. youth who live in metro Atlanta or Savannah were without a father or father figure at home;
3. youth committed such violent crimes as murder or burglary; and
4. youth were from a poor family with a mean monthly income of $929.

Also, the DCYS (1997) reported an increase in crime from 1987 to 1995 by Georgians age 17 and younger. This resulted in a 300% increase in the number who were committed to the state's detention center. Criminal offenses committed by youth that increased significantly were: kidnapping by teens leaped by 200%; aggravated sodomy and rape 200%; murder by 100 percent, and voluntary manslaughter by a whopping 400%.

The DCYS was created by law in 1992 by the Georgia General Assembly (Vickers 1997). The purpose of the legislation was to create a separate department to provide for the supervision, detention, and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents committed to the state's custody; to operate and provide assistance for prevention programs; to provide treatment for juvenile offenders with specialized needs; and to provide duties and functions of the Department, the Board and the officials thereof (Department of Children and Youth Services 1997, 1). During the fiscal year of 1996, 109,145 youth were served by DCYS. This was an increase of 10,000 over the fiscal year of 1995.

**Academic Achievement of African American Males**

Current research revealed that the socially deviant behavior of at-risk youth needs addressing and restructuring (Juvenile Offenders and Victim: The 1996 Update of Violence, 91; Mincy 1994, 15; U.S. Congress, Senate 1994, 5). It was indicated that these youth's negative attitudes resulted from issues such as attention deficit
disorders, low self esteem, mental and physical abuse, and lack of family supervision. These issues stem from socio-economic problems and cause a cycle of crime, poverty, educational failure, and chronic unemployment (U.S. Congress, Senate 1994, 5). These factors contributed to most youth becoming totally dysfunctional members of society before they become adults.

Findings (Cotton 1991) indicated that "the under-achievement of African American students has been persistent, pervasive, and disproportionate" (p. 1). Surprisingly, the problem remains true for African American students who live in the suburbs, when an alarming number of these students' achievement levels were significantly lower than their white counterparts (Polite 1993, 338). The suburban African American youth tended to leave school by dropping out early and lacked adequate skills to succeed in middle class employment, or for entrance in post secondary schools.

Research indicated that there is a disparity in student achievement for African American students and their white counterparts (Majors et al. 1992, 13; Wilson 1992, 51). Many African American children, by sixth grade, trailed their peers by more than two years in reading, mathematics, and writing skills, as measured by standardized tests (Cotton 1991, 1). Jackson-Allen and Christenbury (1994) stated that "African American children comprised only 17% of all public school students, but they comprised 41% of those placed in special education programs" (p. 4). Even when African American youth graduated from high school, they lacked adequate skills to enter college or the ability to pursue jobs with promising careers because
many of these graduates were enrolled in remedial courses or low level academic courses when compared to while male students (Simmons and Grady 1992, 48).

A review of the literature revealed common variables which negatively affected student achievement for African American male students (Jackson-Allen 1994, 1). They included: (1) Eighty-five percent of the African American children in special education programs were males. (2) African American juvenile males expressed lower concepts of themselves than African American females, white females, and white males. (3) African American juvenile males were suspended from school three times more often than their white counterparts, and their suspensions were for longer periods of time. (4) African American male students received corporal punishment at rates that were higher than white males. (5) African American juvenile males were tracked into slower classes at disproportionate rates, resulting in their rates of college eligibility and attendance being among the lowest. (6) There is a lack of appropriate role models in the community and the schools.

Educators explored the factors responsible for the disproportionate placement of African American males in special education classes. White teachers and some middle class African American teachers, counselors, and school administrators lacked cultural sensitivity for these students (Majors et al. 1992, 14), while public schools generally lacked a multi-ethnic curriculum to foster acceptance and diversity of all students (Obiakor et al. 1994, 3). Garcia and Williams (1993) implied that educators’ lack of knowledge about various cultures within their classes hindered communication and the understanding of values for minority students while these differences
predisposed students from culturally diverse backgrounds to fail in traditional classrooms that have not been designed to accommodate their strengths or needs (Voltz 1995, 2). Consequently, these factors resulted in many referrals for African American males to special education programs.

A negative self esteem displayed by many at-risk African American males was positively related to poor school performance (Howerton, Enger, and Cobbs 1992, 3; Jackson-Allen 1994, 4; Obiakor et al. 1994, 3). Jackson-Allen (1994) studied a cohort of at-risk African American males in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades to measure the relationship between self esteem and academic achievement, and found that most of the students displayed low self esteem. When The Stanford Achievement Test was used to measure these males' performance, their scores fell .5 to .8 below the mean, and grade comparison for these males indicated they had lower grades in science and math classes than their white peers. It was found that a teacher's race had some influence on his or her perceptions of the student (Obiakor et al. 1994, 4). These researchers implied that perceptions of white and some African American teachers tended to explicitly or implicitly develop a negative self esteem form African American males. Consequently, African Americans represented 16.2% of the children in public schools, but only 6.9% of the teachers (Obiakor et al 1994, 5).

Within the last ten years, suspensions and expulsions of African American males soared across the country (Major et al. 1992, 14). The study by Polite (1993) found that African American males in suburban public schools experienced a sixty-eight percent higher rate of suspensions than whites, while many African American
males are suspended for fighting just as many are suspended for culture specific behaviors i.e. strutting, rapping, woofing, playing the dozens, using slang, wearing hats or expressive clothes or wearing pants with loosened belts. In other words, these students are sometimes suspended for behavior they consider to be stylish or cool.

African American juvenile males were overrepresented at all stages of the juvenile justice system (Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report 1995, 3). The national report implied that for minority youth, differential actions throughout the juvenile justice system may account for minority overrepresentation. However, it was indicated that disparity and overrepresentation can result from factors other than discrimination, whereas factors related to the nature and volume of crimes committed by minority youth may also explain disproportionate minority confinement.

This line of reasoning suggested that if minority youth committed proportionately more crime than white youth, were involved in more serious incidents, and had more serious extensive criminal histories, they will be overrepresented in secure facilities, even if no discrimination occurred by system decision makers. Also, findings from this study support the issue that the high school diploma earned by many for our nation’s African American students leave them ill equipped to enter college or pursue jobs with promising career paths after high school (Simmon et al. 1992, 64).

Further analyses substantiated factors that cause the overrepresentation of African American juveniles in our nation’s secured facilities. The Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A Focus on Violence (1996) revealed that between 1985 and 1994,
these youth were arrested for such crimes as murder, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault. This serious type of criminal behavior was found to be a result of the high rate of African American juveniles' gang membership and, involvement in drug sales, which is directly associated with gun ownership. Boys were ten times more likely to commit homicides than girls.

When statistics were compared for African American and white juveniles between 1984-1991, white juveniles murder offenses increased by 64%, while the African American juveniles' increased by 211%. A comparison of the treatment for drug offenses for African Americans and white juveniles indicated that white juveniles face less severe sentences than African Americans (Horne 1996, 10). There were increased penalties for possession and trafficking of crack cocaine, which tend to be the choice for many low income African American (resulting in these juveniles participation in delinquent group activities), while white juveniles received less severe penalties for powdered cocaine.

Academic tracking was discovered as an ineffective practice for any ethnic group of students (Cotton 1991, 4; Davis 1994, 211). Cotton (1991) highlighted three significant facts about tracking: (1) African Americans, other minorities, and poor students are overrepresented in low ability groups and nonacademic tracks; (2) research indicated that tracking did not produce great learning gains than those obtained from heterogeneous grouping structures; and (3) research showed that assignment to long-term ability groups and tracks was often harmful to students. It was suggested that this educational potential for white students heightened quantitative
(e.g. grades and test scores) and qualitative (exposure to various courses) differences in the school achievement for the white students.

Ramon C. Cortines, Chancellor for New York Public Schools, initiated a study of the secondary programs to promote support for upgrading the academic standards for all students (Office of Educational Research 1994, 2). The study indicated that minorities were often tracked into lower level courses and introductory courses. Also, the report provided information about the racial and ethnic characteristics of students in the five types of secondary schools: comprehensive, vocational-technical, total option, specialized, and alternative. Findings that resulted from the study of the schools are as listed:

**Comprehensive High Schools**

African Americans and Hispanics each made up about one third (63%) of the enrolled students, yet only 18 to 22% of the African American and Hispanic students in upper grades took at least one advanced science class.

**Vocational-Technical Schools**

Hispanic and African American students made up slightly more than 80% of the population in these schools, but the percentage of these students who took at least one advanced mathematics or science course in these schools was lower than in the comprehensive schools.
Total Option Schools

African Americans were the lowest ethnic group (45%) in these schools followed by Hispanics (25%), while the latter group of students lagged behind the other ethnic groups who took advanced courses.

Specialized High Schools

Asian/Pacific Islanders made up one-third (33%) of the population in these schools. The percentage of all ethnic groups who took advanced courses was higher than any other types of schools.

Alternative High Schools

The percentage of African Americans and Hispanics in these schools was 80% of the student body; and had the lowest percentage of students who took advanced mathematics or science courses.

Urban and suburban cities that are densely populated with minorities (especially African American youth) fail to provide these adolescents with caring relationships with responsible and successful African American males (Majors et al. 1992, 106; Polite 1993, 349). Mingo (1994), an urban school principal in Chicago, was quoted in the Potomac newspaper: "Normally in a community, you have different sectors...store owners, firemen, police. What we have is poor people. Some of the best images we have are drug dealers and pimps. It looks like they're the most powerful people" (Potomac News [Woodbridge] 1994). Mincy (1994) and other academic and professional contributors (Hahn 1994; Jeff 1994; Pittman and Zeldin 1994; Quinn 1994) agreed that an overwhelming majority of low income
African American communities have been infested with drug gangs and street hustlers who have become the role models that children imitate.

Mincy described his childhood in the Patterson's project as a rare scene where stably employed adult black males established relationships with partners and children. One scenario that remained vivid in his childhood memory summed the black men's sense of responsibility to a family. Mincy overheard a man boast in the barbershop one day, "Every time I pass by the schoolyard, I reach in my pocket and take a few pennies and throw them over the fence. Who knows? Some of these children could be mine!" (p. 3) After hearing these comments, Mincy thought about his own absent father. He indicated the need to be able to find an older man to clarify or refute this viewpoint.

Many researchers expressed concern over the shortage of African American teachers in urban and surrounding suburban schools and its effect on African American male students' success in school (Ford 1997, v; Obiakor et al. 1994, 4; U.S. Congress, Senate 1994, 13). Holland (1997), Director of Project 2000 in Washington, D. C., revealed from his past studies and his current project that first grade African American males were reluctant to engage in certain learning activities such as pantomiming skits, participation in conflict resolution activities where males openly talk to others about techniques to prevent fighting in everyday living, and writing about males that depicted these males bonding together for a positive cause, because it is not considered a "male thing." Polite (1993) included in his recommendations from his longitudinal study of African American male students at a
suburban high school that as teaching vacancies occurred, qualified African American males (and non-African Americans) who were sensitive and responsive to the cultural, social, economic, and educational conditions and aspirations of African Americans must be hired. As a result of school reform efforts, which included hiring more African American males and other minority teachers, incidents of violence and crime within the school diminished significantly (Polite 1993, 343).

**Mentoring**

Mentoring students has become one of the frequently used strategies across the nation to help young people (Crockett and Smirk 1991, 7). Several decades ago, young people looked to their parents or other close relatives as role models, while today, the nuclear family is almost nonexistent (Potomac News [Woodbridge] 1994). Family members are no longer close and nearby, and family role models are not available for young children which has increased an emerging need for mentoring (Slaughnesey 1991, 95).

The origins of mentoring can be traced back to the ancient Greeks (Slaughnessy 1991, 95). The concept of mentoring has been described as a highly idealized relationship that has been captured in many accounts, actual, and mythological. In Homer's Odyssey, Mentor was a wise and faithful friend of Odyssey to whom the king entrusted his entire household, including his son Telemachus, when he sailed. Mentor took on the role as we now know it when he bade Telemachus a safe and successful journey giving Telemachus support and confidence as Telemachus proceeded towards adulthood (Anderson 1994, 54).
The concept of mentoring emerged in schools, businesses, industries, and universities throughout the country. Papers, journals, and conferences have reviewed components of mentoring continuously. According to Slaughnessy (1991), Dr. Paul Tolerance, a noted contributor to the field of mentoring stated, "Mentors in a very real sense, make a difference" (p. 96). Many parents are so busy, and so many single parent families exist that kids cry out for intimacy and moral support. The mentor may be a "Big Brother or a special friend" (Slaughnessy 1991, 96). The national need for mentoring prompted the United States Department of Health and Human Services (1992) to develop a guideline for adult mentoring as a strategy for the prevention of youth violence.

Several national organizations were identified for providing excellent mentoring programs for young people (U.S. Congress, Senate 1994, 30). Some of these organizations were: American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America International Centre for Mentoring, NAACP, National Urban League, and Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) of United States of America. The National Urban League of Greenville, South Carolina matched minority students in grades ten through twelve with African American professionals from the community. Seventy-eight percent of students made a smooth transition from school to the workplace (Crockett et al. 1991, 11). The Big Brothers Program in Washington, DC reported in 1991 that 53% of their mentees believed their mentors helped them resist illegal drugs (Crockett et al. 1991, 11).
Mentoring requires a degree of bonding between a caring or trusted adult and a youth (Wilson 1992, 62). Young people are influenced through their relationships with others. Mentors provide youth with the role models needed to become proficient in planning and working for the future. According to Anderson (1994), similar characteristics were noted for successful relationships between mentor and mentee.

These common characteristics for mentors were:

1. *Ability to communicate* - A mentor must be able to listen effectively and respond in a non-judgmental manner. Then, the mentor needed to know when and how to express himself/herself clearly.

2. *Interpersonal Skills* - A mentor must relate well and get along with others. He or she is flexible and adaptable. A mentor may suggest but never dictate.

3. *Commitment* - A mentor must accept responsibility and personal obligations for the mentee.

4. *Maturity* - A mentor must possess the psychological ability to make responsible decisions on a personal and professional level. He or she must accept the mentee's right to make suitable or unsuitable decisions. A mentor may offer information, but allows the mentee to choose. The mentor must be adaptable to deal with youthful vagaries. The mentor needs to be older (Anderson 1994, 69).

Schools were the most frequent focus of mentoring programs (White-Hood 1993, 26). First, schools contained a significant population that needed targeting. Second, there were many resources already present within the system that could be used for identification, referral, monitoring, and measurement. White-Hood (1993) posited that many African American children experienced roadblocks to learning; and these roadblocks resulted in the disparity of achievement for African American students and white students. She suggested that poor home situations, the "put
downs" associated with failing grades, and the number of out-of-school suspensions and referrals all contributed to African American students barrier to achievement.

After White-Hood implemented a mentoring program at a middle school in Prince George's County, Maryland, she observed a significant increase in students' assessment scores for writing and reading. Attendance increased, suspensions decreased, and more cooperative learning and teaching were observed in the classroom as students developed better social skills.

Sandra Taylor (1993) supported the concept that school aged African American students' achievement improved when a mentoring program was implemented. This study was conducted on 27 African American students who attended a depressed high school located in Atlanta, Georgia. Among the twenty-seven juveniles studied in the mentoring program, 67% (n=18) were females and 33% (n=9) were males.

Eleven of the students showed a significant increase in grade point average and improved study skills. Three students indicated they experienced an improved attitude toward academics in particular and life in general. Five students indicated that they were "staying out of trouble" and had fewer conduct related problems. Other findings revealed that twenty-six (96.3%) of the students indicated that they would like to be a mentor one day themselves. Twelve of the students perceived hard work as a major criteria for success. Finally, an overwhelming majority of the students (92.6%) stated that if given a choice, they would prefer being smart to being rich.

Spencer (1991) noted several significant findings from a similar study. The overall mean self esteem score for males was lower than the mean score for females
at either time one or two. At time two, boys showed an increase in viewing themselves as less competent students when compared with African American girls. Further analyses indicated the older transition group at time two had a significant decrease in academic self-esteem as they entered adolescence. Spencer implied that the black child’s normal experience of cognitive egocentrism appears to serve as a psychological protector against low self-esteem. The decrease in measures of both student self and intellectual self for the older transition group suggested that African American girls experienced fewer school-based problems than African American boys. Boys scored significantly lower than girls in relation to perception of self as healthy. When compared to girls, boys demonstrated a decrease in fear of things. Spencer suggested the finding of fear deserved further investigation since health impairment due to accident and injury continues to be a major problem for males generally.

Spencer (1991) cited findings from previous and current projects suggested similar patterns for each older transition group. It was proposed that mentoring should start early and continue in developmentally specific and appropriate ways for African American adolescent males. Her policies concluded that a mentoring program should (a) focus on competence specifically as it related to school, (b) acknowledge the quality of life most often linked with minority status, such as, the chronic stress which is associated with economic abuses, (c) demonstrate an awareness of racism and its consequence, and (d) focus on these variables
simultaneously with an awareness of healthy orientation patterns, stress reactivity, and coping patterns.

DeKalb County Schools Mentoring Program reported significant gains in grades, attendance, and conduct for junior high students who participated in the program for the 95-96 school year (Mentoring Minutes 1996, 29). Four hundred eighty students were enrolled in the program and had a mentor during all three quarters. A review of the data on the percent of students who improved spring quarter over fall quarter showed the following: (a) grades 40%, (b) attendance 28%, and (c) conduct 46%. Also, teachers rated all of the mentees each quarter in five areas. These areas were classroom participation, assignment completion, school activity participation, peer interactions, and teacher interactions. Students were rated 1, 2, or 3 by each of their teachers in each area each quarter and three was the highest score. In June, 53% of the 480 had higher ratings third quarter than in the first quarter.

**Mentoring in the Juvenile Justice System**

After the resurgence of mentoring showed favorable outcomes for at-risk youth, more critical assertions about mentoring needed verification. Some social scientists (Anderson 1994) believed that mentoring was another fashionable approach to the formidable problems of youth. Other social scientists (Mecartney et al. 1994) acknowledged that if mentoring was to be a viable policy option in youth serving practice, it must demonstrate the ability to reach large numbers of youth in critical need. Thus, mentoring growth was dependent on its practices in the integration into
services of large-scale public servicing institutions.

In 1990, Public Private Ventures designed a pilot project to answer questions about mentoring usefulness (Mecartney et al. 1994, 3). As a way of testing mentoring's ability to serve large numbers of at-risk youth, Public Private Venture targeted large-scale, public servicing institutions. It was hypothesized that mentoring was not a "stand in" for comprehensive services, but may serve as a vital component of an agency or program. Public Private Ventures chose the juvenile justice system as the focus of this demonstration. Four reasons were cited for choosing the juvenile justice system:

1. The system serves a large number of youth. An estimated 1,264,800 youth were adjudicated in 1990.

2. Theory and program experience suggested that introducing a mentor during a time of transition as when juvenile offenders residential programming returned them to their communities, eased youth’s stress and promoted prosocial behavior.

3. The juvenile justice systems nationally were looking for ways to improve their programming and were interested in community based efforts. Thus, they were particularly receptive to the introduction of mentoring.

4. Finally, youth involved in the juvenile justice system represented populations at heightened risk, not only of future incarceration, but of failing in school, and experiencing difficulty gaining employment (Mecartney et al., 2)

The juvenile justice system faced serious problems: a reduced budget, extremely large caseloads, and the need to provide rehabilitative services to youth (National Research Council Panel on High Risk 1993, 3). Public Private Ventures realized that mentoring could not be integrated into the juvenile justice agencies unless
it could be done at little additional cost, with few additional resources, and with little additional burden on staff.

Two participating sites, Atlanta, Georgia and St. Louis, Missouri were selected through a Request for Proposal process conducted during the spring and summer of 1991 (Greim 1992, 5). Both sites served adjudicated youth in the care of the state’s juvenile justice agencies. The St. Louis program was operated by the Missouri Division of Children and Youth Services (MDCYS); the Atlanta program was jointly operated by The Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services (GDCYS) and The Southeast Regional Office of The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The GDCYS was responsible for the operation of the program, while the NAACP was responsible for recruiting adult volunteers. Each site received a $65,000 grant from Public Private Ventures to help defray the cost of implementing the model. The project was conducted from October 1991 through October 1993.

Following is a brief description of the participating facilities and personnel used in the pilot study:

*St. Louis, Missouri:* The following facilities participated in the mentoring program.

**Hogan Street Rational Youth Center.** The thirty bed facility is located in an inner city neighborhood and housed juvenile males from the region who were charged with the most serious offenses.
Missouri Hills. The Missouri Hills campus is thirty minutes from downtown St. Louis. Three facilities housed on the campus participated in the program. The facilities were (1) Fort Bellfontaine, a two-building facility serving 48 boys; (2) Twin Rivers, and all female facility housed in a single building with 24 beds; and (3) Spanish Lakes, a 24 bed, all male facility housed in a single building. Each building contained two large dormitory-style bedrooms, a kitchen, living room areas and staff offices.

Babler Lodge. This facility is located approximately thirty miles from St. Louis, and has capacity to house 24 boys.

Each of these facilities was organized among "group" units, with each unit consisting of ten to twelve youth supervised by one group leader with assistance from six youth specialists. An Individual Treatment Program (ITP) was prepared for each youth after he or she was institutionalized for thirty days. The ITP specified the youth's strengths and weaknesses, as well as goals, objectives and strategies for addressing the youth's problems; mentoring was not specified as a strategy in the ITP.

Usually, the youth as an individual and the group as a whole were classified according to their maturity and level or responsibility. Ratings helped to define treatment goals and objectives, and the levels of privilege youth had, especially for off-site visits. During institutionalization, youth attended school and treatment activities and was evaluated on a monthly basis until facility staff recommended that
he or she was ready for release. On the average, a youth spent six months in a facility. After release, youth were placed under the supervision of an aftercare worker for approximately six months. The amount of contact between the aftercare worker and the youth varied depending on the youth and his or her needs for supervision.

*Atlanta, Georgia*

The Atlanta mentoring program included youth served by two different types of rehabilitative programming. The Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus served 106 male youth as the only residential institution of its kind in Atlanta and one of four residential facilities in the state. The least secure of the four Georgia Youth Development Campuses, the Lorenzo Been facility received youth from around the state, with approximately thirty to thirty-five percent from the metropolitan Atlanta area. The Atlanta residents were included in the program.

The Lorenzo Benn Campus consisted of three residential cottages that housed twenty youth each and one large dormitory that housed the remaining youth. Each cottage had a cottage live supervisor who served as the youth's caseworker and counselor, and five youth development workers who directly supervised the youth. A proportionate number of supervisors and development workers served in the dormitory. A court service worker was assigned to visit the
youth at least quarterly in the institution and prepared options for the youth's return to the community.

Youth attended a facility-based school year round, and received group counseling and individual counseling sessions with their cottage life supervisor several times weekly. Based on their behavior, youth received a severity classification rating that determined their level of privilege, including off-campus trips. Many youth's privilege levels rose and fell erratically (Mecartney et al. 1994, 36). Also, youth received a written treatment plan that specified their needs and objectives for treatment, but mentoring was not included in the written treatment plan. Youth were sentenced for a minimum of three months while the average sentence was six months. Once released, youth were supervised by a court service worker. Although youth were formally placed in state custody for two years, they were frequently released from aftercare before that period was over.

Due to the limited number of Atlanta youth housed at the Lorenzo Benn Campus, adjudicated youth who participated in the nonresidential community-based programs were also included in the pilot study. The mentoring program used in the pilot study incorporated the following goals and features:

1. *Scale.* The program was intended to create 100 matches between adult volunteers and at-risk youth within the first six months of the 20 pilot study. The matches were to last one year, with pairs of adults and youth meeting for a minimum of one to two hours each week.
2. *Elders as mentors.* Half of the adult volunteers at each site were to be 55 years of age or older. Public Private Ventures was testing the growing segment of the retired population as an untapped resource of serving at-risk youth.

3. *Decentralized supervision.* Caseworkers were assigned the responsibility of mentoring and supporting the mentoring relationships involving youth on their caseloads. Public Private Ventures tested whether the function could be subsumed into their current duties without great burden.

4. *One-on-one meetings.* The program model called for mentors to meet with youth one-to-one. Meetings were to be held initially in the facility and continued once youth were released, with the goal of facilitating the youth's successful transition to community life (Mecartney et al., 1994).

There were three main types of data sources used in this research (Mecartney et al. 1994). The range and types of data collected and analyzed for the study are described in the following sections:

1. *Mentor logs.* Mentors were asked to complete weekly contact logs that were organized to allow documentation of whether the pair met during the week, and the nature of the contact.

2. *Program Records.* The program sites supplied information about when matches were made and terminated, and when youth were discharged from the facilities.

3. *Questionnaires.* Mentors and youth completed questionnaires when they entered the program, and after participation in the program (Mecartney et al., 9).

A total of 161 youth volunteered for the mentoring project and were matched with mentors. The youth ranged in ages from 11 to 18 with the majority being 15 and 16, male and black. Forty-nine percent of the youth had been adjudicated or referred to the courts before they reached age 14. Youth age 14 and 15 years old
accounted for 37% of first offenders. In Atlanta, the average age of first adjudication was 12.7 years.

The majority of the mentors at both sites were black (77% in St. Louis and 83% in Atlanta) and the remaining mentors were predominantly white (Mecartney et al. 1994, 26). The two sites differed markedly in their gender ratios. In St. Louis, 58% of the mentors were women, while in Atlanta, men outnumbered women by more than two to one (68% to 32%). With the help of the NAACP, Atlanta was able to recruit African American men to mentor African American boys. Project-wide, 56% of the mentors were male and ranged in ages from 20 to 76, with a median age of 33. A majority of the mentors had one or more children. After analysis of the data each match was assigned to one of four categories:

(a) sporadic-matches that met on three occasions or less during the life of the match.

(b) regular-matches that met less than two times a month on an average across the relationship.

(c) regular then sporadic-matches that met at least twice a month for the first two months of the relationship before coming less frequent.

(d) regular continuous-matches that met on an average, at least twice a month over the course of the match (Mecartney et al., 36).

Nearly half of the matches (42%) met sporadically while the majority of the matches (56%) lasted six months or less. Thirty-one matches (20%) met three times or less, and 54 (34%) met for three months or less before ending the relationship. Only 41 matches (26%) met on a regular continuous basis for more than six months. Twenty-four matches (15%) continued their meetings after the project was completed.
Thirteen of these matches originated in the facility and successfully transitioned to the community. There were no major differences between sustained and discontinued matches in respect to the age of the mentor or youth, mentor’s educational level, nor where the match was cross or same-race, or cross or same gender.

Findings from this study indicated suggestive relationships between the variables of race and gender, and the causes mentoring relationships ended. Female mentors were less likely than male mentors to be in sustained relationship, while 33% of matches involving male mentors were sustained. It was found that 13 (41%) of the 32 matches involving white youth were sustained; and 23 (19%) of the 96 matches with African American youth were sustained (Mecartney et al. 1994, 37). Thirty-three percent of the relationships ended before the youth was released from the youth development center. In depth interviews with mentors revealed that work was the primary reason mentors ended their relationships (47%).

Public Private Ventures indicated a need for mentoring in the juvenile justice system (Mecartney et al. 1994, 65). This perception was shared by the Georgia and Missouri systems. Since the youth in both sites indicated that they appreciated a mentor’s effort, both sites planned to continue a mentoring component. At this time, Public Private Ventures made several recommendations for a feasible mentoring component:

1. Increase the number of volunteers gradually.
2. Screen out adults who have over-committed their time.
3. Increase the length, content, and practicality of mentor training.
(4) Provide supervision and support to volunteers.

(5) Adjust institutional rules.

(6) Establish aftercare systems within which the mentoring program can be continued after the youth's release.

The Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services and the NAACP Southeastern Regional Office adopted the pilot study in the 1993 (Department of Children and Youth Services 1997, 33). The name of the project is Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project, which is currently operated through a collaborative effort between the agency and the association. Vickers (1997), the mentor coordinator for the DCYS, described the Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project as a component of the rehabilitative process for first and second time juvenile offenders who are committed to the state.

A mentor is a volunteer who signs a voluntary contractual agreement; then, the mentor is matched individually with a youth. All mentors must be at least twenty-one years old to participate and they are required to complete an application, undergo a State of Georgia security background investigation, and complete a four-hour training session. After completion of this process, the volunteers are placed in facilities that are within close proximity of their homes (Department of Children and Youth Services 1997, 33).

Volunteer mentors are matched with youth in various multi-service centers and community treatment centers that are located throughout the Atlanta metropolitan area (Vickers 1997). Other state operated facilities, such as community schools, and the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus serve as alternative placements for volunteers. Below is a description of these facilities:
The Multi-Service Centers are state run facilities that offer services in the evening and on weekends to maximize the support and supervision provided to the client. An emphasis is placed on transitional aftercare for youth who are returning from youth development campuses and non-residential placement facilities.

The Community Treatment Centers are nonresidential community based programs for disobedient and unruly youth. These centers provide recreational programs, group counseling, and other structured activities designed to enhance the youth’s ability to interact in positive ways within their home communities.

Community Schools are nonresidential, community based and oriented alternative schools for delinquent and unruly juvenile offenders. Youth attending these schools undergo the necessary academic and social skills training which allow them to successfully re-enter the local public school setting.

Youth Development Campuses are residential placement institutions that provide education and treatment for those youth committed to the GDCY Services by the Juvenile or Superior Courts. The youth development campuses are also designed to provide vocational training, academic development, and medical service, professional counseling, and religious guidance are also provided to the youth.
The goal of the Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project is to use the mentoring process as a tool to build self-esteem, increase academic achievement, and establish interactions throughout an individual mentor/mentee relationship (The Department of Children and Youth Services 1997, 33). These volunteer mentors work to modify negative attitudes into positive behavior by encouraging their mentees to set personal goals and objectives (i.e., return to school, employment/skills training program, building self-esteem, etc.), allowing for a successful transition back into the community. The Friend-to-Friend Project Director for the NAACP works in collaboration with the GDCYS by:

(1) recruiting concerned and committed community volunteers;
(2) identifying at risk youth within the department to participate in the project;
(3) developing and maintaining parental and mentor support groups;
(4) designing a monitoring and evaluation program for the project;
(5) providing cultural, social, and educational activities to reinforce mentor/mentee relationships;
(6) allowing the mentor to work as a team member with the service worker, and/or Cottage Live Supervisor, and legal guardian;
(7) enlisting the support and involvement of the NAACP branch members, churches, community organizations, businesses, and other institutions; and
(8) developing a project advisory committee consisting of influential members of every major sector of society. These representatives include members from the medical, political, religious, education, media, non-profit, major corporations, and business sectors of the community (Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project 1997, 16).
The Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project is one of the variations of mentoring used by the GDCYS (Vickers 1997). There are other types of mentoring programs for volunteers who are not able to commit to a one-to-one relationship, but who can contribute time at the facilities. These programs are:

Community Mentors. These are volunteers who assist the youth in a one-to-one match within community programs division. These are youth who are affiliated with programs such as transitional aftercare group, alternate plan, community schools, and special placements.

Campus Mentors. These are mentors who work in one-to-one matches with students detained in the youth development campuses. These activities designed for matches are structured toward providing tutorial assistance, job skill enhancement, and other activities to improve students’ performance.

Institutional Mentors. These are volunteers who work directly with youth who serve as basic tutors for youth who are placed on the detention by the Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services.

Tutorial Mentors. These are volunteers who serve as basic tutors for youth who are committed to youth development campuses, transitional aftercare, alternative plan community schools, and special placements.
According to Vickers (1997), mentoring was proven to be a successful component to the rehabilitative process for adjudicated youth. She reports that since the inception of the Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project in 1993, there have been sixty-sustained matches. However, the Public Information Specialist for the GDCYS explained that currently, there is no empirical data to support the success of the mentoring program (Gavin 1997). Gavin and Ross are designing a method to collect data to support the success of sustained mentor/mentee relationships. Currently, the success of sustained relationships are based on mentor and mentee logs.

Mentoring is advocated by the Atlanta Public Schools for middle grades students who are expelled or adjudicated. The Positive Action Center (PAC), which is funded by the Atlanta Public Schools, is an alternative program for adjudicated and expelled middle school students which includes a mentoring component. The mentoring component is perceived to be a successful intervention (Tinsley 1997).

The majority of students at PAC are from Atlanta with a few students from neighboring counties. The program has the capacity to serve at least sixty students at one time. According to Tinsley (1997), students in the program do not receive school credit because the center is a program. The program provides tutorial assistance for G.E.D. classes, counseling, boot camp experiences, and mentoring. This is an alternative for the adjudicated or expelled youth to receive positive experiences versus "hanging on the streets." The center has been in existence for almost two years. Mentors are recruited from Morehouse and Morris Brown Colleges on a semester basis. The mentors serve as tutors and some mentors serve in the role of counselors.
Summary

Policymakers, researchers, advocates, and citizens are concerned about the overrepresentation of the African American males incarcerated in this country. Studies indicated that African American juvenile males were more at risk to commit violent crimes than their white counterparts. In Georgia, the profile of the most prevalent violent juvenile offenders were: (1) African American ethnicity between the ages of 15 and 17, (2) youth who did not complete school, (3) youth that committed violent crimes such as murder or burglary or theft, and (4) youth from a poor family with a median monthly income of $929. Crimes committed by these at risk juveniles leaped extremely high within the last eight years.

Research indicated that there is a disparity in student achievement for African American juvenile males and their white counterparts. One study indicated that poor student achievement contributed to the delinquency of African American juvenile males. Variables that negatively effected student achievement for these males were discussed.

Mentoring has become one of the fastest growing strategies across the nation to help young people. The concept of mentoring is used in schools, businesses, industries, and universities and throughout the country. Several organizations were identified as providing excellent mentoring programs for young people. A few longitudinal studies indicated that mentoring positively effected student achievement for school aged children and youth.
The Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services collaborated with the Southeastern Regional Office of the NAACP to establish the Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project. The goal is to use the mentoring process as a tool to build self-esteem, increase student achievement, and establish social interactions through a mentor/mentee relationship for adjudicated youth. Since the project was established in 1993, it has been expanded throughout the state to all programs operated by the DCYS. The only data used to support the success of sustained relationships were mentor and mentee logs. There is no data available on the relationship of mentoring to academic achievement. Current efforts by the agency and association personnel are directed at designing methods to collect empirical data.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subject Description

The subjects were selected from the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus which is located in southwest Atlanta. The researcher selected twenty subjects yielding ten for the research group and ten for the control group. The Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project Director selected the research group and the control group was selected from a remaining group of offenders. Subjects for the research and control groups were matched according to the following variables: similar academic levels, similar offenses, and similar detention frequencies. The research group received mentoring for at least six months, while the control group did not receive mentoring. The Volunteer Coordinator at Lorenzo Benn noted that both groups received little or no contact with their families during their detainment at Lorenzo Benn.

Instrumentation

The Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) was used for this study. The TABE is currently being used by the DCYS to assess juvenile offenders. Survey Edition forms 7 and 8 of the TABE were used to assess the subjects’ reading and math. The TABE 7 and 8 assessments are based on the curriculum philosophies
found in the most progressive adult education programs (McGraw-Hill 1995, 41).
The Survey offers norm scores and competency information. The pre-test of the
Survey Edition produced both group and individual results with these scores, while
the post test revealed differences in norm scores for a better comparison. Due to the
validity of the TABE, it is not included in the appendices.

Data Analysis

The task for data analysis measured the significant difference between the
mean scores for the research group and the control group after pre-testing and post-
testing for each group. Further analysis determined the significant difference between
variables.

An ANOVA was used to test the statistical significance of the difference
between the mean test scores of the research and control groups before and after the
mentoring intervention. A multiple regression was used to determine if the
intervening variables of age, severity and type of offense, and length of stay affected
the pre and post tests reading and math scores.

Summary of Research Methodology

The study determined the effect between mentoring and student achievement
for adjudicated African American males with learning and behavioral difficulties. A
descriptive research design was used for collection of data. This causal-comparative
study determined the effect of the independent variable (mentoring) on the dependent
variable (student achievement). The researcher attended a four hour follow-up session
with mentors to become acquainted with responsibilities of the mentors participating in the Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project. Subjects were selected from the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus in Atlanta, Georgia. Twenty subjects were selected with ten for the experimental group and ten for the control group. All of the subjects were African American males, ages 12 to 17, and with at least a two year deficit in reading and/or math. An ANOVA was used to test the statistical significance of the difference between the mean test scores for both groups. A multiple regression was used to determine the effect of the intervening variables.

Description of the Setting

The researcher attended a four hour orientation class for perspective mentors at the Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project location. Derwin Ross briefly explained the project, and its mission with the adjudicated youth that the mentors will be mentoring for at least six months to a year, and the personal commitment expected by each mentor. Angela Hill described the different forms of mentoring and the role it provides for the Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services. Then, William Holley was introduced as the facilitator for this orientation class.

Each person was asked the following questions: name, birthplace, residence, and their personal reasons for wanting to become a mentor to an adjudicated youth. Afterwards, each person was asked to reflect on their adolescence and to remember their most rebellious experience during adolescence that really changed their lives.

When these experiences were shared with the group, the group was asked to give that individual a nickname which was acceptable by today's youth based on the
shared experience. The group continued to repeat each individual’s nickname in unison after each individual’s experiences were shared. Once this activity was completed, Dr. Holley explained that this activity would help perspective mentors relate to the adjudicated youth. Then, perspective mentors were given rap tapes by Mr. Ross. Mr. Ross asked each individual to listen to the tapes because the youth identified so well with the music; therefore, this will help the mentors to understand the youth. The orientation ended with applications being presented to the perspective mentors.

Next, the researchers attended a follow-up session with mentors who expressed relevant issues about their mentor/mentee relationships. This was a two hour session with 15 mentors. The mentors’ concerns were based on feasible activities to involve the mentees based on their restrictions and their frustrations with their mentees lack of trust, and the lack of parental support. Mr. Ross provided words of encouragement and a list of upcoming activities for the mentors and mentees to enjoy together.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive research design. This is a causal-comparative study that determined the effect the independent variable (mentoring) had on the dependent variable (student achievement). This research method was appropriate because the data determined the significant effect of an intervention when paired with a dependent variable after a specified time (Borg et al. 1989, 537).
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter contains the review of the research questions, hypotheses, and the presentation of collected data resulting from pre and post test scores on adjudicated African American male juveniles. These subjects were detained at the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus during the 1996-1997 school years.

The Test of Adult Basic Education (McGraw-Hill 1995) was used as pre and post tests to assess reading and math scores. Both the research and control group consisted of juvenile offenders with serious offenses. The research group received a special form of mentoring for at least six months, and the control group did not receive this form of mentoring.

Research Questions

1. Will mentoring increase adjudicated African American male juveniles’ achievement scores in reading?

2. Will mentoring increase adjudicated African American male juveniles’ achievement scores in math?

Null Hypothesis #1

There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles’ pre and post achievement scores in reading.
Null Hypothesis #2

There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles' pre and post achievement scores in math.

Descriptive Analysis

The F-Ratio (1,18) or 3.4638 was not significant when tested at the .05 level of significance on the ANOVA scale. Therefore, null hypothesis #1 is accepted.

There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles' pre and post achievement scores in reading (Table 1).

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>3.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>3.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.510</td>
<td>3.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.470</td>
<td>3.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F-Ratio (1,18) of 3.4638 was not significant when tested at the .05 level of significance on the ANOVA scale. Therefore, null hypothesis #2 is accepted. There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles’ pre and post achievement scores in math (Table 2).

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.820</td>
<td>2.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.450</td>
<td>2.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.150</td>
<td>2.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>2.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stepwise multiple regression was used to determine if the intervening variables of age, severity, type of offense, and length of stay affected the pre and post test reading and math scores. The variables could not be loaded in the equation; therefore, they were not a contributing factor in the pre and post test reading and math scores.
### TABLE 3

**AGES FOR THE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.025</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.634</td>
<td>1.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4

**OFFENSES FOR THE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOAP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5
LENGTH OF DETAINMENT FOR GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Group Stay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.667</td>
<td>5.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group Stay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.500</td>
<td>2.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6
DETENTION FREQUENCIES FOR GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Group Detention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>1.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group Detention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>2.150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Research Group Pre-Math Test Scores

Fig. 2. Research Group Post-Math Test Scores
Fig. 3. Research Group Pre-Reading Test Scores

Fig. 4. Research Group Post-Reading Test Scores
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the effects of mentoring on the academic achievement of African American adjudicated juvenile males. More studies will be designed to investigate the effects of mentoring on the adjudicated juvenile offender population. Specifically, this study sought to determine the effects of mentoring on the African American adjudicated male juveniles' achievement in reading and math.

Data Collection

This study was based on test scores from an identified group of adjudicated African American male juveniles during the 1996-1997 school years. The TABE was administered as a pre-test upon each subject's commitment to the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus and as a post-test before the subject's release from the campus. The Locator Forms 7 and 8 of the TABE were used to determine the appropriate level of the Survey Edition used for assessment. The assessment process lasted approximately two hours.
Interpretation and Discussion

This section of the study presents a summary of collected and analyzed data and discussion of related variables. The hypotheses and a brief summary of each are:

1. There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles’ pre- and post-achievement scores in reading.

2. There is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles’ pre- and post-achievement scores in math.

Data at the .05 level of significance on the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) scale indicate that there is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles’ pre- and post-test scores in reading.

Data from the .05 level of significance on the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) scale indicate that there is no significant difference between the mentored and nonmentored adjudicated African American male juveniles’ pre- and post-test scores in math.

The majority of adjudicated African American juvenile males that participated in the study came from a single parent family. Many of these families received financial assistance from the State of Georgia’s Welfare Department. Only one subject in the research group and one in the control group were from a nuclear family.

Many of the subjects were identified as disabled students prior to their commitment to the youth development campus. The research group consisted of six
disabled subjects: 2 learning disabled (LD), 3 emotional behavior disordered (EBD), and 1 mild intellectual disabled (MID). The control group consisted of five disabled subjects: 1 LD, 3 EBD, and 1 MID. One of the EBD subjects from the research group was diagnosed as attention deficit hyperactive disordered (ADHD).

Some of the subjects had multiple offenses when they were adjudicated. Five subjects from the research group had three or more offenses, while one subject from the control group had three offenses. These offenses were categorized as burglary/robbery and sexual.

There were six sexual offenders from the research group and four from the control group. These sexual juvenile offenders reported that they were victims of sexual abuse. It was noted in their files that five of them committed offenses toward their own relatives that were younger than them. Three offenders committed offenses toward relatives of the same gender.

Conclusions

The test scores of the twenty subjects revealed assessment information that was directly related to the testing of the hypotheses. The research and control group scores indicated achievement in reading and math. Both groups showed the most positive gain in reading and the least positive gain in math.

The mean pre-reading grade level score for the research group was 3.0 grade equivalent (GE) and the mean post-test grade level score was 5.0 GE. The mean pre-reading grade level score for the control group was 4.5 GE and the mean post-test grade level score was 5.2 GE.
The mean pre-math grade level score for the research group was 3.8 GE and the mean post-test grade level score was 4.5 GE. The mean pre-math level score for the control group was 5.1 GE and the post-test grade level score was 5.3 GE.

**Implications**

It is very difficult to make generalizations about this population and the effects of mentoring on student achievement, since the study consisted of twenty subjects (ten for the research group and ten for the control group). Also, this study was conducted at one of the state of Georgia’s eleven youth development campuses, which is an indication of a small sample of the juvenile offender population that is adjudicated and detained in Georgia annually.

There are five variations of mentoring available at the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus, which made it almost impossible to find a subject that was not exposed to mentoring with a role model figure. The data collected from the control group could have been affected by all the subjects’ opportunities for exposure to some form of mentoring.

The research group consisted of many subjects with multiple offenses. Since these subjects’ offenses indicated that they had behavioral problems, this could have affected their trust during the mentor/mentee bonding relationship. If the subject did not trust their mentor, their negative attitude could have affected their performance during pre-testing assessment.
Recommendations

Additional research needs to investigate the effects of mentoring on the adjudicated African American male juveniles’ academic achievement. This research should investigate a larger sample that is representative of the juvenile offender population that are adjudicated and detained in Georgia’s eleven youth development campuses.

Longitudinal research needs to examine the transition for this population when they re-enter society. Variables that positively affect their success for academic achievement and appropriate interpersonal skills need to be examined closely. Time segments for the research should be scheduled on an annual basis.

Factors on juvenile offenders with second and third offenses that suggest a criminal career lifestyle should be investigated closely. Then, research on reducing the high recidivism for these juveniles must focus on strategies to maintain them within the societal structure.

The Friend-to-Friend Mentor Project must expand to all of Georgia’s DCYS facilities such as youth development campuses, regional detention centers, community treatment centers, and community schools. Each facility will need a project designee, to supervise the mentor/mentee relationship and to collect data on successful relationships. The project designee should coordinate the mentor’s and mentee’s activities with the DCYS volunteer directors.

The NAACP’s Friend-to-Friend Project Director should continue to recruit concerned and committed community volunteers. Training sessions for the mentors
should be ongoing to help establish a minimum two-year bonding relationship between mentor and mentee. The project director should explore the cultural, social, and educational activities for the different regions in Georgia. Then, these activities should be shared with the project designees’ at each facility.

When efforts are made to prepare the mentors for the mentees’ lifestyle, mentors should be advised on the impact they could have on decreasing these juveniles recidivism. Potential mentors’ participation in role playing scenarios would be helpful in orientating them about these juveniles and their distrust with society. Mentors need to obligate their friendship to the juveniles for at least two years and agree to meet at least bi-monthly for the first year and at least once a month for the second year.
September 9, 1997

Ms. Iris Smith
Deputy Commissioner for Programs
Department of Juvenile Justice
2 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30303-3139

Dear Ms. Smith:

I am writing in response to your letter dated August 22, 1997, regarding the proposal I submitted entitled "The Relationship Between Achievement and Mentoring for Adjudicated African-American Juvenile Males". I ask that you reconsider my proposal. I hope the concerns raised by the DJJ Human Subjects Review Committee will be addressed in this letter.

After meeting with various personnel at the Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus, I was enlightened to ways which would make the empirical data collection in my research more reliable and valid. Mrs. Murray, the Assistant Director at Lorenzo Benn, said that the youth at the campus are selected for the Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project because they receive little or no contact with their families. Therefore, subjects for the experimental group and the control group will be matched according to the following variables: receiving little or no contact with their families, similar academic levels, similar offenses, and similar detention frequencies once placed at Lorenzo Benn. Subjects detention occurs as a result of their assaultive behavior, continuous refusal to obey rules, terrorist threats toward students and staff, and inappropriate sexual behavior. Mrs. Murray informed me that subjects' academic levels can be accessed from the behavior specialist's office, and subjects' offenses can be accessed from the student data base within the administrative office.

When I spoke to Dr. Lowe about the usage of the test of Adult Basic Skills (TABE), as a pre-test and a post-test, he directed me to Ms. Donna Hansmann. Ms. Hansmann told me that the TABE is administered to the students at Lorenzo Benn as a pre-test and post-test after six months. This process started April 1997. She said the results of the pre-test and post-test for each student are listed on a comparison sheet. Therefore, I will not administer the TABE to get a post-test score. Instead, I will need access to Ms. Hansmann's comparison pre-test/post-test sheet for the students.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, and I look forward to hearing from you soon regarding your decision.

Sincerely,

Edith B. Sistrunk
Graduate Student, Clark Atlanta University
Dear ____________________:

I am a graduate student at Clark Atlanta University. I am conducting research for my thesis. My research is a study of the relationship between student achievement and a mentoring program for detained youth. If your son is willing to participate, he will be required to complete the Test of Adult Basic Education. The test will be administered during the day hours. The testing time is approximately two (2) hours.

The information will be confidential as no names will be used. Your son may withdraw from the study at any time. It is not expected that this project will be of any risk or discomfort to your son. Since your son’s participation is voluntary, failure to participate in this study will not effect services at the Regional Youth Detention Center. Through your son’s participation, there may be increased knowledge about the effects of mentoring on student achievement for detained youth. This knowledge may be helpful for the future success of these youth in the community.

Any questions you may have concerning the procedure may be asked by calling me at the phone number in the return address above, or by writing me at the above address. Please return this signed consent to me by ____________________.

I have read the above and consent for my son to participate in this study if he wishes.

__________________________________________
Parent/Guardian Signature & Date

Respectfully yours,

Edit B. Sistrunk
Researcher
Title of Research Project: The Relationship Between Achievement and Mentoring for Adjudicated African American Juvenile Males

Date Research Will Begin: August 17, 1997 End: September 5, 1997

Funding Source (if any): Funding will be provided by the researcher.

Investigator(s): Edith Benford Sistrunk, J.D. Sistrunk, and Alicia Walker

Supervisor (if investigator is a student): Dr. Brenda Rogers.

Mailing Address of Investigator:
P.O. Box 16775
Atlanta, GA 30315

Telephone Number of Investigator: 404-635-9269

Date Application Submitted: July 17, 1997

I. DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH:

A. Statement of the Problem:

Will mentoring increase the academic achievement of adjudicated African American juvenile males with learning problems?

B. Research Method(s):

Thirty subjects will be selected from The Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus--15 for the experimental group and 15 for the control group. The experimental group will be selected by the Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project Director and identified as juveniles who have received mentoring for at least
six months, while the control group will be selected randomly from the remaining group of juveniles not receiving that form of mentoring. If there is a limited number of youth receiving mentoring at The Lorenzo Benn Campus, youth who have been adjudicated to nonresidential community based programs will be included in this study. The subjects will be assessed by the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) in the areas of reading and math. In the essence of time, each group will be assessed in a group setting.

C. Nature of Data to be Gathered:

The relationship between mentoring and student achievement will be examined for the research group. If the mean scores for the research group are higher than the control group, a relationship between mentoring and student achievement may be established.

D. Data Collection Method(s):

The TABE will be used to assess the subjects in reading and math, and the Locator Test will determine the appropriate level of the test to assess each subject. Then, Survey Editions of the TABE 7 and 8 will be used for assessment, and compared to pre-test scores of the same test for each subject. Subjects will be given the Locator Test individually and each group will be administered the Survey Edition in a group setting.

E. Data Analysis:

The T-Test will be used to test the significant differences between the mean scores at the .05 level to help determine if there is a positive relationship between the independent variable (mentoring) and the dependent variable (student achievement). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used to indicate the significant differences between the mean of the various factors represented in both experimental and control groups (age, type of offenses, and whether the subjects lived in an urban, suburban or rural environment).

F. Instruments to be used (attach copy):

The TABE is currently being used by The Department of Juvenile Services; therefore, the TABE will be used for assessment since the department has pre-test scores.

G. Method(s) to Recruit Participants:

Subjects which will be recommended by the Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project Director and other subjects which will be randomly selected, will be
given a brief discussion about the study and how it can help the mentoring program. Then, the researcher will tell them about the planned reception for those subjects who complete the assessment.

H. Participant Eligibility Criteria:

Age(s):

The ages for the subjects selected will range from 12 to 17.

Gender:

Only male subjects of African American ethnicity will be used.

Other:

Subjects will have at least a two-year learning deficit.

I. Number of Participants:

A total of thirty participants will be used in the study. The research group will consist of 15 male subjects and the control group will consist of 15 male subjects.

J. Incentives, Compensations to be used:

After the research project is completed, a small reception will be given for the participants.

K. Follow-up:

A follow-up is not necessary for this study.

II. Risk to Participants: Provide detailed description of any stress or psychological, social, legal or physical harm that might occur to participants. How will these be minimized? What, if any, remediation is offered?

There are no risks involved with this study.
III. Benefits: Provide detailed description of the potential benefit(s) to the participants, the Department, the field of juvenile justice, science or society in general.

There are potential benefits for providing a mentoring program to adjudicated African American juvenile males. Currently, the Friend-To-Friend Mentor Project Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice have started an initial phase of collecting empirical data to justify the continuation of the mentoring program. The study can aid the project and the department by providing empirical data on the effect mentoring has on student achievement. The purpose of the mentoring program is to reduce recidivism for juvenile offenders and to help these youth make a smooth transition into the community by establishing a special friendship with an adult.

IV. Consent: How will legal informed consent be obtained from participants and their parent(s) or guardian(s) in the case of minors? Include form(s) to be used.

Each subject’s parent or guardian will be mailed a letter explaining the proposed study and asking for their consent for their son’s participation in the research. A self-addressed stamped envelope will be included. Also, there will be another letter given to each subject explaining the proposed study and asking for their consent to participate in the study.

V. Confidentiality: How will participants be protected from any potentially harmful use of the data collected for the project? Describe measures planned to ensure anonymity or confidentiality. How long will files or video and/or audio tapes be kept? How will they be stored? How will any identifying information be handled?

A coding system will be used to assure confidentiality. The coding system will be a four number code given to each subject that chooses to participate in the study. The name of each participant will not be used or revealed. The information concerning the subject’s educational achievement will remain with the researcher until necessary statistical analysis has been completed. Afterwards, the researcher will destroy all personal information concerning the subjects.

VI. Illegal Activities: Do the data to be collected relate to illegal activities? If so, how will this information be handled?

The data to be collected will not be related to any illegal activities.
VII. Location of Research:

I would like to conduct this research at The Lorenzo Benn Youth Development Campus, and I would like to include subjects from a nonresidential community-based program only if there is a limited number of youth receiving mentoring at The Lorenzo Benn Campus.

VIII. Access to Services: Will research project disrupt regular service delivery to participants? If so, how will this be remedied?

Since the Group will be assessed by The Survey Editions of the TABE, there probably will be a slight interruption of the subjects' day classes. The Locator Test will be given to the subjects during regular tutorial session, since it is a short timed test. The results of the assessment will assist educators in the appropriate curriculum planning for the subjects.

The above statements provide an honest and accurate description of my proposed research project. If approved, I agree to implement the project as described in the proposal. If there should be any reason to change the project design, I agree to notify the IRRB in advance and request approval before making the necessary changes. I also agree to sign a statement of confidentiality, to abide by the research policies of the Department and to provide the IRRB a copy of the final report for review prior to its release.

________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Investigator                        Date

________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Supervisor (if applicable)          Date


*Atlanta Journal Constitution (Atlanta).* 10 April 1994


Dekalb County Public Schools, Department of Research. *Mentoring Minutes.* Decatur: Dekalb County Public Schools, 1996.


Simmons, Warren and Grady, Michael. Black Males Achievement: From Peril to Promise. Paper presented to The Superintendent’s Advisory Committee on Black Male Achievement, Prince Georges County Public Schools, Upper Marlboro, Md., 1992, Dialog, ERIC, ED 333054.


Tinsley, Thomas, Director of the Positive Action Center. Interview by author, 10 February 1997, Atlanta. Tape recording. Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta.


Vickers, Jackie, Director of Mentoring Programs. Interview by author, 3 February 1997, Atlanta. Tape recording. Georgia Department of Children and Youth Services, Atlanta.
