TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF SELECTED STUDIES OF EFFECTS OF GROUP MENTORING

OUTCOME KEY: **+** Positive effect; **-** Unfavorable effect; **x** No effect or nonsignificant finding
MEN= Mentoring program or naturally occurring mentoring relationship

CONVENTIONAL GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS						
Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	Question 2: Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	Question 3: Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Arches	*Goal:* Reduce recidivism for justice-involved youth *Setting:* Community *Duration:* 6–12 months *Format:* Group and one-to-one *Mentors:* Adults from similar backgrounds to youth in program *Mentees:* Youth (16–24) on probation	Mentors given training to facilitate group mentoring sessions using interactive journaling curriculum based on cognitive-behavioral principles and are also available for additional one-to-one meetings; group and individual meetings based on motivational interviewing concepts. Full curriculum involves 48 group sessions and 4 journaling course books.	*Design:* QED *Sample:* 279 Arches participants and 682 comparison youth who began probation at the same time (but did not participate in program) *Mentoring:* Arches compared with matched comparison group *Outcome:* Assessed arrests and convictions at 12 and 24 months after beginning probation.	**+** Felony reconviction at 12 and 24 months **+** Felony arrests at 12 months (trend) **x** Overall arrests		
Bridges to the Future	*Goal:* Increase economic assets and opportunities *Setting:* Uganda Duration: 9 months (school year) *Format:* Small groups matched to one mentor *Mentors:* University students *Mentees:* Youth in primary school	All eligible youth (including control) received usual care for orphaned and vulnerable children. In the mentoring program, youth were provided with a matched savwwings account (one-to-one matched ratio for Bridges and two-to-one ratio for Bridges Plus), microenterprise workshops, and one-hour monthly mentoring programming following a nine-session curriculum.	*Design:* RCT *Sample:* Primary schools assigned to control (16 schools, 496 participants), standard Bridges program (16 schools, 402 participants) or Bridges Plus program (16 schools, 512 participants) *Mentoring:* Bridges and Bridges Plus compared with control condition *Outcome:* Data collected at baseline and at 12, 24, 36, and 48 months included academic performance (standardized exam scores), school transition (secondary/vocational school).	**+** Academic performance (standardized test scores) **+** Greater likelihood of transitioning to postprimary education		

CONVENTIONAL GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Type of Mentoring		Study Methods & Findings			
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Buddy System	*Goal:* Prevent juvenile delinquency *Setting:* Community *Duration:* 1 year *Format:* 3 youth per "buddy" (mentor) *Mentors:* Adults who had preexisting relationships with youth and recruited from community (paid mentors) *Mentees:* youth (11–17) at risk for delinquency	Mentors (called mediators) trained and supervised by consultants. Mediators met weekly with mentees and engaged in social activities contingent on youth behavior.	*Design:* RCT *Sample:* 553 youth assigned to Buddy System or no-treatment control; 475 assessed at long-term follow-up *Mentoring:* Buddy System Mentoring compared with no-treatment control *Outcome:* Improvement in referred (problem) behaviors and arrests assessed both during program and at long-term follow-up (35 years).		**+** MEN X Prior arrests→among youth with arrests prior to referral, significantly fewer program participants arrested both at short-term and long-term (adult) follow up **-** MEN X Prior arrests→among youth without an arrest prior to referral, significantly more program participants arrested; additional interaction with gender in long-term follow-up (more arrests for female program participants)	
CyberMentor	*Goal:* Encourage girls' participation in STEM education *Setting:* online *Duration:* 6 months Format: Many-to-many *Mentors:* Adult female academics (graduate students or professionals) *Mentees:* Girls enrolled in high-achiever track education in Germany	Mentors communicated with youth online via email, online chat, or forums.	*Design:* QED *Sample:* 347 who participated in one-on-one (156) or group (191) version of CyberMentor program *Mentoring:* Group mentoring compared to one-on-one mentoring *Outcome:* Assessed proportion of STEM communication (in email/message contents), STEM-related networking (number of STEM contacts), and academic/professional intentions in STEM.	**+** Greater proportion of STEM communication in grwwwoup mentoring condition **+** Greater number of STEM-related network contacts in group mentoring condition **+** Increased elective intentions for STEM after six months for group mentoring condition (compared to one-to-one) mentoring condition		

CONVENTIONAL GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings		
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes link-ing mentoring to youth outcomes?
Eye to Eye	*Goal:* Socioemotional development *Setting:* School *Duration:* Academic year *Format:* Multi-mentor *Mentors:* High school and college students with Learning Disabilities and/or Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (LD-ADHD) *Mentees:* Elementary and middle school students with LD-ADHD	Mentors undergo background checks and complete training conducted by program staff on the curriculum, program objectives, and how to be an effective mentor. Each group of mentors is supervised by a student leader who undergoes and intensive five-day training. Mentors engage in art projects and other activities to meet social-emotional objectives, including discussing strengths and challenges associated with having LD-ADHD.	*Design:* QED with data collected at the beginning and end of the academic year *Sample:* 234 youth in three conditions: 99 mentored youth with LD/ADHD participating in Eye to Eye, 51 LD/ADHD youth not in the program (control-NM condition), and 84 youth without LD/ADHD diagnosis (control-TD condition) *Mentoring:* Eye to Eye compared with Control-NM and Control-TD groups *Outcome:* Assessments were conducted at the beginning and end of the school year via youth self-report. Outcomes included subscales of the Behavior Assessment System for Child Second Edition (BASC-2): anxiety, depression, interpersonal relations, and self-esteem. Covariates assessed were family affluence, mentoring relationship quality, and demographic and diagnostic information (collected from youth and parents).	**+** Self-esteem **+** Interpersonal relations **+** Symptoms of depression **✗** Symptoms of anxiety		
Go Girls!	*Goal:* Encourage girls to adopt and maintain healthy lifestyles *Setting:* School/after school *Duration:* 7 weeks *Format:* One-to-many *Mentors:* Adult female volunteers *Mentees:* Adolescent girls (11–14)	Girls participate in seven two-hour weekly sessions run by two female volunteers. Group size ranged from 4–15 girls. Session topics focused on physical activity, healthy eating, and encouraging girls to feel positively about themselves.	*Design:* QED time series (7 weeks prior, baseline, end of program, 7 weeks following program completion) *Sample:* 344 girls *Mentoring:* change over time compared to pre-program *Outcome:* Physical activity and healthy eating behaviors and attitudes; program belonging	**+** Physical activity **+** Healthy eating **-** Attitudes toward physical activity		

CONVENTIONAL GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Peer Group Connection	*Goal:* Support students through transition from middle to high school *Setting:* School *Duration:* 34 weeks *Format:* Many-to-many *Mentors:* Older high school students *Mentees:* Entering ninth grade students	*Curriculum focus:* enhance school attachment, form connections with prosocial peers, develop decision-making skills, resist negative influence, set realistic goals, manage anger and stress, develop belief system consistent with an achievement orientation. Peer leaders (mentors) work in pairs with groups of 10–12 youth.	**2015 Study** *Design:* RCT *Sample:* Students from two high schools (157 and 269 youth) randomly assigned to program (97 and 94 students) or control (60 and 175) *Mentoring:* Peer Group Connection compared with control *Outcome:* High school graduation **2019 Study** *Design:* RCT *Sample:* Students randomly assigned to program (1,525) or control (1,531) *Mentoring:* Peer Group Connection compared to control *Outcome:* School engagement	**+** School engagement (2019 study)	**+** MEN X Gender X at-risk status → males with characteristics at program start indicating lower likelihood of high school graduation were more likely than others to have graduated four years later (2015 study)	
Project Arrive	*Goal:* Facilitate adaptation to high school for youth at risk of dropout and juvenile justice system involvement *Setting:* School *Duration:* Academic year *Format:* Multi-mentor *Mentors:* School staff or community partners *Mentees:* Ninth grade students	Two co-mentors met weekly with groups of six to eight students during school hours for 50-minute sessions. A full-time program coordinator conducts a four-hour training for mentors, assists with recruiting and enrolling students, meets monthly with mentoring teams, provides match and logistical support, and serves as a liaison between each school and the district's student support programs office. Mentors receive a binder with program procedures, contact information, and curricular materials, and access to a website with activities that address common adolescent issues. Mentors select activities or work with their mentees to develop activities and discuss topics in line with overall program goals.	*Design:* QED with data collected at five time points: pre-intervention plus the end of fall and spring semester for two years *Sample:* Survey sample (n = 114 students in Project arrive, n = 71 students comparison) and Academic sample of 1,219 youth attending schools meeting criteria to participate in program (n = 240 Project Arrive, n = 983 comparison) *Mentoring:* Project Arrive compared to demographically similar students *Outcome:* External resources: school support, school belonging, school meaningful participation, peer caring relationships, prosocial peers, home support, home meaningful participation Internal assets: Self-efficacy, empathy, problem-solving, self-awareness. *Academic outcomes:* GPA, credits earned *Juvenile offenses:* arrest records	**+** Teacher and peer support **+** School belonging **+** Meaningful involvement in school and at home **+** Engagement with prosocial peers **+** Problem-solving skills **+** Attendance & credits earned **X** Home support **X** Empathy **X** Self-efficacy **X** Self-awareness **X** Juvenile offenses	**+** MEN X Group Size → smaller group size associated with more positive perceptions of group climate and mentor relationship quality **+** MEN X Group Size → smaller mentee-to-mentor ratio associated with increases in GPA relationship quality	**+** MEN → (+) Positive relationships with mentors→ (+) GPA (+) Credits earned **+** MEN → (+) Positive group climate→ (+) Credits earned (+) Self-efficacy (+) School belonging

CONVENTIONAL GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Type of Mentoring			Study Methods & Findings			
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Reading for Life	*Goal:* Diversion program for nonviolent offenders; reduce recidivism by promoting moral development and character education *Setting:* Community *Duration:* 10 weeks *Format:* Multi-mentor *Mentors:* Adult volunteers *Mentees:* Nonviolent offenders (often first-time) aged 11–18	Groups comprised of up to five youth (based on reading ability) work with two mentors. Mentors undergo initial training with ongoing training and supervision; volunteers shadow experienced mentors prior to leading groups themselves. Groups select a novel from a list and 60-minute mentoring sessions include oral readings, journaling and discussion. Groups also choose a one-day community service project that coincides with themes from their novel. The program ends with a final presentation for youths' parents, mentors, and staff.	*Design:* RCT, measured yearly for four years *Sample:* Nonviolent offenders ages 11–18 (n = 194 treatment; n = 214 controls) *Mentoring:* Randomly assigned to mentoring or 25 hours community service *Outcome:* Counts for arrests, misdemeanors, and felonies	+ Arrests + Misdemeanor offenses + Felony offenses	+ MEN X SES → lower rates of recidivism for youth from low-income families compared to higher income peers	
Room to Read	*Goal:* Life skills development *Setting:* School *Duration:* School year Format counsellors One-to-many *Mentors:* Adult female volunteers with high school completion *Mentees:* Girls beginning in grade 6 in India	Biweekly life skills classes conducted in school combined with group mentoring sessions (small group discussions focused on topics from classes).	*Design:* RCT *Sample:* 2,459 girls *Mentoring:* Comparison of girls in schools randomly assigned to implement the Room to Read program with control condition (non-program schools) *Outcome:* Life skills (10 indices), freedom of movement, educational and employment aspirations, marital expectations	+ Socioemotional support + Empowerment + Future planning + Gender norms X Freedom of movement X Educational and employment aspirations		Qualitative study embedded within experimental evaluation found that program helped girls form closer relationships with peers in school, which in turn, contributed to increased valuing of school.

CONVENTIONAL GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Type of Mentoring		Study Methods & Findings			
Name	Structure	Processes/ Activities	Methodology	Question 1: Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	Question 2: Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	Question 3: Intervening processes link-ing mentoring to youth outcomes?
Soccer for Success	*Goal:* Reduce childhood obesity risk, promote healthy eating and exercise, foster positive youth development *Setting:* School *Duration:* 24 weeks *Format:* Group *Mentors:* Adult coaches *Mentees:* Youth K–8 in urban communities at risk for obesity	Activities grounded in Social Learning Theory; trained coaches deliver program curriculum and serve as mentors/role models to participating youth.	*Design:* QED of 16 randomly assigned intervention and 14 control sites in five US cities *Sample:* 712 youth in Soccer for Success; 522 in control condition *Mentoring:* Soccer for Success compared with control condition *Outcome:* BMI percentile, waist circumference, PACER fitness test assessed at baseline (fall) and follow-up (spring)	+ BMI percentile + Waist circumference + PACER test		
Untitled: Sports Based	*Goal:* Promote physical and mental well-being among youth *Setting:* Community *Duration:* 18 weeks *Format:* One-to-many *Mentors:* Certified sports coaches from local sports associations *Mentees:* High school students in Hong Kong	Students participated in 18-week after-school Positive Youth Development–based sports mentorship program. Students participated in small groups of 12–19 youth engaging in youth-chosen sports and facilitated by the mentors who received training prior to implementing the program. Group meetings followed a semi-structured curriculum.	*Design:* RCT *Sample:* 664 students *Mentoring:* 18 weekly sports mentoring sessions (90 minutes) compared with control condition (web-based health education game) *Outcome:* Survey and physical fitness tests completed at baseline and one month after completion of intervention	+ Mental well-being + Self-efficacy + Resilience + Flexibility + Muscle strength + Balance + Physical activity levels X Physical well-being X BMI X Body fat proportion X Social connectedness		

HYBRID GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Program			Evaluation		
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Campus Connections/ Campus Corps	*Goal:* Prevent deeper engagement with the juvenile justice system, school dropouts, and serious behavioral health problems *Setting:* College campus *Duration:* 12 weeks *Format:* One-to-one and group *Mentors:* Undergraduate students in a three-semester service-learning course *Mentees:* High risk youth ages 11–18, mostly recruited from probation and office of the District Attorney. Youth deeply involved in the juvenile justice system are not included	Each mentor is assigned "mentor family" (groups of four or five other pairs) and supervised by more experienced mentors and graduate students trained in therapeutic interventions and systemic thinking. Each week includes a four-hour meeting where mentors and mentees walk on campus, work on individualized career planning, have family dinners, or engage in other prosocial activities.	*Design:* QED, pre- and post-test *Sample:* 382 youth (n = 286 in Campus Corps; n = 136 comparison referred after program was full) *Mentoring:* Mentoring versus "treatment as usual" *Outcome:* Single youth-report open-ended truancy item, 13-item youth report scale of delinquent behavior and substance use	+ Delinquent behavior + Substance use + Truancy		
Mentoring for Sexual Health	*Goal:* Promotion of sexual health *Setting:* School *Duration:* 12 weeks *Format:* Many-to-many *Mentors:* Nursing students *Mentees:* Middle school students in Korea	Program combined formal group sessions and informal individual contacts. Trained mentors developed and delivered four formal group education sessions under the supervision of a faculty member.	*Design:* QED pre- and post-test design with nonequivalent control *Sample:* 17 student members of Health Discussion class participated as mentees and compared with 16 student members of a different class (matched for grade and sex) *Mentoring:* Mentoring intervention compared with nonequivalent control group *Outcome:* Knowledge and attitudes assessed at 12-weeks post-intervention	+ Sexual knowledge + Positive sexual attitudes		

HYBRID GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS						
Program			**Evaluation**			
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Metodologia TUTAL	*Goal:* Promotion of youth well-being *Setting:* School *Duration:* Eight months (school year) *Format:* One-to-many *Mentors:* Teachers *Mentees:* Students (9–16) in public schools in Portugal	Program included weekly one-to-one mentoring meetings to help with academic tasks, discuss personal issues, and promote development of self-regulation strategies. Group mentoring operated as compulsory 90-minute weekly meetings focused on schoolwork, promoting social integration, and discussing themes relevant to each group (group size approximately 20 youth/mentor).	*Design:* RCT *Sample:* Youth assigned to Metodologia TUTAL program (157) or control (160) *Mentoring:* Mentoring compared with control *Outcome:* Personal, social, and academic well-being assessed two months after start of program and six months later (after completion of program)	X No overall effects on mental and physical well-being, peer social support, school well-being, perceived academic competence, hope, autonomy, and parent relations	+ MEN X perceived support for basic psychological needs (relatedness, competence) → higher ratings for physical well-being, school environment, and personal competence	
My Life (Take Charge, Better Futures)	*Goal:* Enhance self-determination skills to improve outcomes for youth (e.g., transitioning out of foster care) *Setting:* School or community *Duration:* Open-ended *Format:* One-to-one and group *Mentors:* Young adults (near peers) with shared experiences (e.g., foster care or mental health involvement) *Mentees:* Youth and young adults with disabilities (Take Charge) or in foster care (My Life, Better Futures)	My Life Mentoring: Youth meet weekly with mentors for 60–90 minutes, either during unscheduled class periods or outside of school time; mentors help youth build skills by rehearsing strategies and practicing activities for goal achievement.	**Sample 2018 Study** (My Life Mentoring) *Design:* RCT *Sample:* Combined and augmented two prior randomized trials; total 293 youth (144 intervention, 149 control) *Mentoring:* My Life Mentoring compared with control group *Outcome:* Self-determination and self-efficacy; criminal justice outcomes assessed with long-term follow-up into early adulthood	+ Enrollment in postsecondary education X Criminal justice involvement	+ MEN X Gender → (-) Criminal Justice Involvement (CJI) for males in intervention group, no effect for females + MEN X Developmental Disability (DD) → (-) CJI for youth without a DD no effect for youth with a DD	

HYBRID GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Program			Evaluation		
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
The Young Women Leaders Program	*Goal:* Preventing delinquency and related negative outcomes in adolescent girls identified as at-risk *Setting:* Community *Duration:* Up to three years, mentees receive a new mentor each year *Format:* One-to-one and group *Mentors:* College women who commit five hours a week for the academic year *Mentees:* Seventh to ninth grade girls at risk for delinquency	Mentoring pairs meet for at least four hours a month one-to-one to do mutually agreed upon activities Pairs meet two hours a week after school in groups of 8–10 mentees, their mentors, and a facilitator for connection, homework time, introduction of skills, working on service projects, and group discussion of problematic topics All pairs attend structured activities once a semester on the college campus and most groups have sleepovers or play days.	*Design:* Quasi-experimental and randomized (true randomization did not occur in year one; five-year follow-up) *Sample:* 165 youth *Mentoring:* Examined outcome based on dosage *Outcomes:* Self-esteem (global and school self-esteem, family and peer self-esteem), assertiveness assessed at pretest (fall) and posttest (spring)	**+** Global self-esteem **X** Academic self-esteem **X** Assertiveness	**X** MEN X SES **X** MEN X Ethnicity	MEN → (+) Mentoring groups characterized by caretaking and trust building → (+) satisfaction with one-to-one mentoring relationship

INCORPORATED GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Program		Evaluation			
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Boys & Girls Clubs/ After-School Program	*Goal:* Promote positive youth development *Setting:* Community *Duration:* Open-ended *Format:* Group activities *Mentors:* Program staff and/or volunteers *Mentees:* Children and adolescents	Clubs provide a safe environment for kids during out-of-school hours and offer a diverse range of programs and activities.	*Design:* Qualitative *Sample:* 17 youth 12–18 *Mentoring:* Participants in Club *Outcome:* Observation of staff-youth interactions and interviews with youth			Qualitative data indicated three relational strategies used by staff to build relationships with youth: minimizing relational distance, active inclusion, attention to proximal relational ties. Relationships between staff and youth form foundation for youth program engagement and promotion of positive outcomes.
NC Playa'z	*Goal:* Promote positive youth development *Setting:* Community theater *Duration:* Unspecified *Format:* Group *Mentors:* Adult volunteer *Mentees:* Youth (6–16 years) recruited from a youth center and surrounding neighborhood in large urban area	Weekly drama group meetings of 90 minutes. Group chose, rehearsed, and performed a play under direction of a group leader/ director who supported teamwork, trust, and accountability as group norms.	*Design:* Qualitative analysis of group experience *Sample:* Final group of 10 youth (six girls and four boys) aged 10–13 *Mentoring:* Participation in theatre troupe *Outcome:* Group decision-making skills and group work; analysis of journals, videotaped sessions, and group leader observations, combined with brief questionnaires	Overall sentiment of youth and adults (including parents) very positive.		Noted that use of theater program allowed students to have a voice and also provided structure, communication, and a sense of group belonging.

INCORPORATED GROUP MENTORING PROGRAMS

	Program			Evaluation		
Name	**Structure**	**Processes/ Activities**	**Methodology**	**Question 1:** Effect of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 2:** Factors conditioning or shaping effects of mentoring on youth outcomes?	**Question 3:** Intervening processes linking mentoring to youth outcomes?
Unnamed program (drill team for African-American youth exposed to community violence)	*Goal:* Prevent at-risk youth from participating in risky behaviors via involvement in drill team (performing arts) *Setting:* Community Duration: Open-ended *Format:* Mentoring incorporated into program *Mentors:* Older peers and adult staff leaders *Mentees:* Youth as young as 8 work in small groups with team leaders	To be eligible, youth must keep good academic standing. Youth spend three hours per day, two days a week learning drills in small groups. Program staff follow a year-long curriculum on topics such as character development, addressed in team setting and one-to-one meetings with youth. Performances with whole drill team as well as smaller groups.	*Design:* Correlational analysis *Sample:* 65 youth and young adult members of drill team *Mentoring:* Reported relationships with team and staff leaders *Outcome:* Program participation; participation in other program settings; youth report of supportive relationships with adult staff, sense of community, norms for behavior, psychological distress, self-esteem, problem behaviors			Greater involvement with team associated with more positive perceptions of trusting and supportive relationships with adult team leaders and more prosocial behavioral norms