

**PROGRAM: ACROSS AGES**

**Population:**

Population Served: varies – this is an ongoing program

Age: 6<sup>th</sup> graders

Other characteristics: Mainly low-income families living in distressed areas

**Program components:**

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Mentoring activities	Elder mentor	1 school year	1:1 ratio, formal/informal
Life-skill curriculum	School	1 school year	
Community service learning		10-12 visits over year	Visits at nursing home
Parent workshops (Study 1 only)			Improve parenting

**Program objectives/goals:**

Safety and security: to prevent, delay, or curtail substance use among high-risk kids

**STUDY 1:**

**AA1 LoSciuto, L., Rajala, A., Townsend, T.N. & Taylor, A. S. (1996). An outcome evaluation of Across Ages: An intergenerational mentoring approach to drug prevention. Journal of Adolescent Research, 11(1), 116-129.**

**Study objectives and measurements:**

Objective

To evaluate the effectiveness of a comprehensive intergenerational mentoring approach to drug prevention for high-risk middle school students

Measurement instrument

Self-control, self-confidence, cooperation, family bonding, school bonding, absences from school, grades, alcohol use, marijuana use, problem behavior, attitudes toward ATOD use, attitudes toward helping others, and attitudes toward the elderly

**Evaluation:**

Type: experimental (mentor/curriculum/community service/workshops condition, curriculum/community service/workshops condition, and control condition; randomized pre-test/post-test collected for first year only

Statistical techniques: ANCOVA

Population evaluated: 562 6<sup>th</sup> graders living in three of Philadelphia's most stressed neighborhoods

**Outcome:**

Mentoring group had increased positive attitudes on four dimensions (school, the future, elders, and older people), increased knowledge about older people, improved reactions to situations involving drug use, and higher levels of community service. Participation in the mentoring group also significantly improved school attendance in youth. The Positive Youth Development Curriculum/community service/parent workshop condition improved knowledge about older people compared to controls. Mentor involvement was positively associated with improved school attendance.

---

**Other information:**

Data combined over three cohorts; 729 students completed the pre-test; of these, 77% or 562 students completed the post-test and makeup final sample

---

**STUDY 2:**

**AA2 Aseltine, R., Dupre, M., & Lamlein, P. (2000). Mentoring as a drug prevention strategy: An evaluation of Across Ages. Adolescent and Family Health, 1, 11-20.**

---

**Study objectives and measurements:**

Objective

To assess whether the various elements of the program were effective in improving student outcomes in four areas: personal and social resources, school performance, problem behavior, including substance use, and attitudes toward the elderly.

Measurement instrument

Self-control, self-confidence, cooperation, family bonding, school bonding, absences from school, grades, alcohol use, marijuana use, problem behavior, attitudes toward ATOD use, attitudes toward helping others, and attitudes toward the elderly

---

**Evaluation:**

Type: experimental (mentor/curriculum/community service condition, curriculum/community service condition, and control condition); randomized pre-test, post-test seven – eight months after assignment, and six months after program ends.

Statistical techniques: t-tests (of estimates controlling for background characteristics)

Population evaluated: Approximately 400 sixth graders living in Massachusetts

---

**Outcome:**

Mentoring group had significantly lower levels of problem behavior and alcohol use and significantly higher levels of self-control, cooperation, attachment to school and family, school absences, and attitudes towards the elderly and helping as compared with the control group. Levels of self-control, school bonding and problem behavior for mentored youth were significantly different from both the control group and a group who received other program components not including mentoring. Six-month follow-up data revealed a lack of persistence in the program effects with the exception of cooperation, and evidence that mentoring reduces future initiation of marijuana use.

---

**Other information:**

District chosen was 40<sup>th</sup> in nation for poverty.

Approximately 72% of district were minorities, and 77% met the requirements for low income.

Attrition rates were low: More than 90% of those who completed the pre-test also completed the post-test. However, many students who did not complete the pre-test interview could be characterized as very needy students – those who were chronically absent from school, were kicked out for behavioral difficulties, or failed to meet academic requirements.

---

**PROGRAM: MULTIPLE PROGRAMS**

---

**STUDY 1:**

**MP1** Grossman, J., & Johnson, A. (1999). Assessing the effectiveness of mentoring programs. In Grossman, J. (Ed.), Contemporary Issues in Mentoring (pp. 24-47). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

---

**Sample Population:**

Population Served: See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1.

Age: See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1.

---

**Study objectives and measurements:**

Objective

This study establishes benchmarks from the BB/BS and SAS data.

Measurement instrument

See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1.

---

**Evaluation:**

Type: Quantitative; random experimental assignment for BB/BS data; quasi-experimental design for SAS data (see BBS1 and SAS1)

Statistical techniques: Regression analyses controlling for background characteristics

Population evaluated: See descriptions for BBS1 and SAS1

---

**Outcome:**

A large number of effects from the two programs were found for certain students or students in certain types of relationships and diminished for other groups. So, those who initially scored low in academic achievement, had high absentee rates, and had minimal family support experienced many improvements in academically related outcomes compared to those who were initially better off (those who initially scored low in academic achievement were also less likely to start using drugs). Students in long- lasting relationships, who have frequent contact with their mentor, or who are involved in youth-centered mentoring experienced many improvements in academic outcomes and less substance use compared with those in relationships of shorter duration, with less frequent contact or relationships characterized by low levels of youth-centeredness.

---

**Other information:**

---