

Mentoring of at-risk students

by Vilna Bashi

Vilna Bashi is a graduate student in economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Mentoring caught the public's attention in the late 1970s when the *Harvard Business Review* published two articles on mentoring in the business setting. The first (published in 1978) was titled "Everyone Who Makes It Has a Mentor."¹ In it three foodchain executives were interviewed about their careers (the generalization implied by the title was left unsubstantiated). The second² presented data collected on successful executives and found that two-thirds reported having had a mentor. On average, those in the study who had mentors were likely to earn more at a younger age, be better educated, and be more satisfied with their jobs and careers. After these articles, subsequent writings focused mainly on the importance of mentors in teaching career skills (like networking) to young professionals or in furnishing certain keys to "success."

In the 1980s the mentoring focus shifted to an educational setting. The I Have a Dream (IHAD) program began in 1981 when multimillionaire Eugene Lang spoke before an East Harlem (New York City) sixth-grade class and offered the students college tuition guarantees if they completed high school. (IHAD includes a mentoring component in addition to the tuition guarantee.)³ The event set off a new wave of mentoring programs in public high and junior high schools, mainly to combat high dropout rates and encourage postsecondary school matriculation. Mentoring programs are also found at the college or university level, where they exist chiefly to encourage students to stay in school or to direct students toward certain career options. Mentors for both secondary school youth and college students are usually seen as serving as role models and are implicitly charged with helping students navigate the school or university system.

Mentoring now abounds in both business and academic settings. School programs can be found in elementary

schools, junior high schools, high schools, and universities. So-called mentoring programs are also in place to assist graduate students, junior faculty, and junior administrators. Some programs are designed to work with the gifted as well as the disadvantaged, to target certain fields, and to target underrepresented population subgroups. According to Sharan Merriam,

One of the more intriguing topics to have emerged in several fields within the last few years is that of mentoring. The subject of talk shows, business seminars, journal and magazine articles, the interest in mentoring has reached, in one writer's terms, "mania" proportions. The listener or reader is told that mentoring is the key to career and academic success, as well as a necessary ingredient in psycho-social development.⁴

But now, after nearly fifteen years of what one might call "the mentoring experience," and volumes of literature (both academic and popular) on the subject, it is still unclear *how* mentoring works, and how well it works, if in fact it works at all. In an attempt to determine from the extant literature what is known about the mentoring process, this article summarizes the findings of research on mentoring in the educational setting, focusing specifically on programs that put at-risk or disadvantaged young people together with mentors.

Dearth of empirical research

An extensive search for empirical literature on mentoring of at-risk students showed truly meager results. (The studies—and their drawbacks—are examined in the next section.) This is not to say that because one finds little empirical work on the issue, there is little "out there" to study. Cora Marrett notes that as the number of programs designed to help minority or at-risk students has grown, so has the mentoring component in such programs become widespread. She attributes this expansion to the education literature coming out in recent years in support of the idea:

[The literature suggests that] some degree of sponsorship would be important, particularly for those on the

margin. It is very well known that successful people had mentors, and that mentoring is especially important in scientific careers.⁵

Despite our readiness to incorporate mentoring into existing programs and create new programs where the primary focus is on mentoring, we cannot say we know what the results of mentoring are. Several reasons are offered for this lack of empirical evidence. When talking with program coordinators and other authorities on mentoring, one is confronted with the well-known explanation that evaluation is difficult and expensive, and therefore not often a priority for program operators. Those outside the program-operation process may be unable to initiate independent evaluations because of lack of data. However, researchers are not inculpable—problems exist not only in data collection and program design but with evaluation design as well. (On this I elaborate below.) The vast majority of work written on the subject is still, as Sharan Merriam wrote in 1983, “relatively unsophisticated.”⁶

There exist questions about who should be a mentor. On this question, Marc Freedman suggests that “the most effective elders were those who had not lived what would be considered ‘successful’ lives.”⁷ Indeed, no clear definition exists of what a mentor is, nor what qualifies as a mentor-protégé relationship in an academic setting. The various empirical studies defined the word differently. In one, “mentors” were community members (outside of the college system); in another faculty members served as “mentors.” A third carefully made distinctions between teachers and mentors, implying a teacher could not be a mentor. Concha Delgado-Gaitan⁸ uses the term “mentor” to describe both parents and teachers of alternative programs. Henry Trueba and Delgado-Gaitan, in their ethnographic study of ten Chicano and four Anglo families in Colorado, present a descriptive but rather convincing account of “the way parents function as agents of academic socialization, especially in their role as mentors.”⁹ They pose the idea that students who stayed in school had a great deal of family/parental support, and that this is “essentially a mentorship role played by the parents.”¹⁰

Other academic literature on mentoring (i.e., that either showed no empirical results or did not explicitly use at-risk students as protégés) showed similar lack of consensus on a definition, although there was agreement about the origin of the word. Most assumed it was a reference to Mentor in Homer’s *Odyssey*, to whom Ulysses entrusted his son Telemachus. Mentor was to guard, guide, and teach Telemachus while Ulysses was away. Beyond this attribution and perhaps other descriptive statements, there were usually no more definitive statements on what it is that a mentor is meant to do. Often the words “mentor,” “guide,” “sponsor,” and “role model” were used interchangeably. Daniel Levinson, in probably the most quoted book on mentoring in adult development, has a concept of the mentor that includes being a “teacher,” “sponsor,” “host,” “guide,” and “exemplar.” Further, he says that the mentor is

one who provides “counsel and moral support in times of stress,” and who enhances the development of “skills and intellect.”¹¹ Levinson also describes mentoring as an intense “form of love relationship.”¹² Laurent Daloz has a definition of “mentor” that is even more vague:

Mentors are guides. They lead us along the journey of our lives. We trust them because they have been there before. They embody our hopes, cast light on the way ahead, interpret arcane signs, warn us of lurking dangers, and point out unexpected delights along the way.¹³

Merriam’s work makes a significant contribution here: Studies that incorporate Levinson’s and Daloz’s definitions tend to find fewer incidences of mentoring than those that tend to broadly define it as a helping, sponsorship-type activity.¹⁴

Evidently the lack of consensus on the definition of a mentor has implications for evaluating the results of mentoring programs.

Empirical studies of mentors for at-risk youth

Three empirical evaluations of mentoring programs list retention in school among the goals of the program: (1) the year-end report of the “Faculty Mentoring System for Minority Student Retention,” at Glendale Community College, in Arizona, evaluated by José Mendoza and Carl Samuels; (2) the 1977 evaluation by Martin Obler and others of the Teacher-Mentor-Counselor (TMC) Program at Brooklyn College, New York; and (3) the study by Angelo Atondo and others on the Puente Project at Evergreen Valley College in California.

As can be gathered from the program title, the Mentoring System at Glendale Community College targets minority-student retention as its sole objective. Mendoza and Samuels’s findings suggest that the program’s utilization of faculty members (who volunteer) as “personal counselors/mentors” for minority students does have a positive impact on student retention and student “sustainment.” The evaluation included data on both control and treatment groups, and found that the mentored sample ended the program with a lower grade point average (2.09) than controls (2.60 for each of two control samples), but that more of those mentored (94.5 percent of the treatment group as opposed to 70 percent and 72.5 percent of controls) finished the semester. The researchers drew no conclusions about the effects of mentoring but acknowledged their results, suggesting that “the Faculty Mentors [may have] emphasized staying in school and completing courses at the expense of higher grades.”¹⁵ They also noted that the “risk of attrition is greatest for new first time minority students who fail to apply for financial aid—therefore these students would most benefit from future mentoring/retention/student-success efforts.”¹⁶ But if these students left school because they could not carry the financial burden, it is valid to

question whether better financial aid outreach would show results similar to the “mentoring” component. In other words, researchers here may be attributing to mentoring benefits that do not accrue (solely) from a mentor-protégé relationship, and could result from interactions (such as a talk with a financial aid officer) that one would be hard pressed to classify as mentoring.

A second study evaluated the Teacher-Mentor-Counselor (TMC) experiment of Brooklyn College, which operated to both retain disadvantaged, underprepared minority students admitted under the “Seek” and open admissions programs, and to combat the “revolving door” syndrome whereby students enter and leave the college system with little change in their academic abilities.¹⁷ The primary focus of TMC was to correct reading and writing deficiencies using a coordinated interdisciplinary approach to remediation, although mentoring, not tutoring, was said to be the focus of the program.

For example, in one unit containing English and political science, the political science instructor lectured on ethnic and racial relations in America, while the English instructor analyzed a novel covering racial conflict in a colonial empire and required written papers on the subject matter. Similarly, in a Spanish class students were required to read a translated work of a novel covered by the English instructor, while the remedial reading instructor reviewed comprehension problems from both of the required texts.¹⁸

TMC therefore included not only teacher mentors for students but it also coordinated the work of program staff and instructors. The evaluation was designed to compare treatment and control groups served during the first five years of TMC operation. The most characteristic feature of the program was the built-in structure that encouraged constant interaction among students and instructors, counselors, and remedial staff. The experimental group had daily contact with this support group, whereas the control group had many fewer contacts. They had half as many conferences with instructors; one-third the number of contacts with counselors, and one-sixth the number of meetings with the remedial staff. The variables used to assess the effects of mentoring were retention, number of credits completed during freshman and sophomore years, and (positive or negative) grade deviations from their previous semester’s grade-point average. Findings from 1970 and 1971 (years which were comparably evaluated) are summarized in Table 1.

These results show that the program increased the percentage of students retained, with more of those retained completing more credits with better grade-point averages than they had before. The years 1972–73 and 1973–74 showed similar results: treatment students attempted and accumulated more credits than controls. Significantly, those receiving the treatment had higher freshman GPAs and more credits completed, but in their third semester (when they left the program) both these indicators showed a drop,

Table 1
**Brooklyn College Teacher-Mentor-Counselor Experiment,
Selected Program Results, 1970–1971**

	1970		1971	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
N	150	150	250	198
% retained to junior year	56.8%	38%	62.4%	58%
Of those retained, % with positive GPA deviations	64%	—	70.4%	46.7%
Mean credits completed	51	46	—	—

Source: Martin Obler, Kim Francis, and Robyn Wishengrad, “Combining of Traditional Counseling, Instruction, and Mentoring Functions with Academically Deficient College Freshmen,” *Journal of Educational Research*, 70 (no. 3, 1977), 102–147.

Note: The numbers in the table were gleaned from the text, and dashes are placed where the appropriate figures were not presented in the paper. Differences between treatment and control groups in 1970 are reported to be significant at the .001 level, and in 1971 at the .05 level (see Obler et al., pp. 144–145).

which picked up immediately the next semester—above their control counterparts. This gap *increased* in subsequent semesters.¹⁹ The success of this program is not in dispute, but the inferences one can make for the effects of mentoring are questionable. Although treatment students fared significantly better than did the controls, researchers “could not isolate the specific variables contributing to student academic success. Lack of adequate controls, staff personality factors, and the contribution of counseling vs. instructional programs were not isolated. Thus, although we know that integration of services within a team approach has been successful at Brooklyn College, we do not know why.”²⁰

The Puente Projects are designed to provide the elusive benefits of mentoring to students with language barriers on top of the problems of other at-risk students. Operating at ten California community colleges, the program seeks to retain students in school, to encourage them to complete general education requirements (including English), and to increase transfer to four-year colleges. The project teams an English teacher, a Hispanic counselor, and Hispanic professionals acting as mentors for Hispanic students. The study, carried out by Angelo Atondo, Mauro Chavez, and Richard Regua, compared 115 Puente students (not randomly selected) with 273 controls (who took similar courses on their own) over a three-year period with significant results. Their findings were as follows:

- 89 percent of the Puente students completed English 330 (entry level) compared to 46 percent of other Hispanic students
- 70 percent of the Puente students completed English 1A (the next level) compared to 8 percent of other Hispanic students
- Puente students completed English 1B at a rate 14 times higher than their counterparts
- Puente students were three times as likely to remain enrolled at Evergreen Valley College (53 percent vs. 17 percent)
- All 21 of the Hispanic students who began English 330 in fall 1983 and 1984 and who had received or applied for an Associate's degree by fall 1985 were enrolled in the Puente Program
- All 14 of the students from the original group who transferred to a four-year college were Puente students.

The researchers concluded:

This process of linking classroom learning with community mentors has proven highly successful. Most certainly, students not only gained a greater understanding of "what it takes" to "make it," but students learned that professional success did not mean, as some students asserted, "forgetting who you are." Students developed a greater appreciation and respect for the ability of mentors to effectively bridge two worlds.²¹

Unfortunately, the paper contained no discussion of the activities in which mentors and protégés took part, nor how much time they spent together, or if these factors are significant in the mentor-protégé relationship.

My search for empirical evidence on mentoring at-risk youth uncovered two additional studies; their conclusions will be briefly summarized here. Somewhat contrary to the results above (but confirming Marrett's statements on mentoring in scientific fields), a study of the Francis Marion College, Florence, S.C., mentor program reports that

The one clearly significant finding . . . showed mentoring to have a negative effect on the academic performance of black freshmen possibly because as the college satisfaction of blacks increases, their academic performance decreases. Mentoring in general was not found to be academically beneficial except for male and white Liberal Arts majors and all Science majors. Mentoring was found to have generally positive effects on the college satisfaction of only Undecided students, but as with black students, satisfaction scores of the Undecided students were inversely related to academic performance scores.²²

Vivian Boyd and others studied the results when black male freshmen were paired with alumni within the same fraternity who were designated to act as mentors.²³ Her evalua-

tion tested for academic persistence as well as persistence "in good standing" using a treatment/control design. Researchers stated that there was a great deal of enthusiasm by the participants, but no statistically significant differences between the two groups with either outcome variable.

Variation in program design

The structure (and presence or absence) of given program components and the settings in which mentoring takes place are likely to be relevant to the effectiveness of the program itself. Some work has been done to classify mentoring programs by their design, and discuss the merits of various designs, although no empirical results are available.

Partnerships of organizations for mentoring

Mentoring programs are often the result of cooperative efforts of high schools and colleges, corporations and schools, or other collaborations. According to Carol Ascher and Wendy Schwartz,²⁴ however, high school-college collaboratives generally have limited effectiveness. Among eight types of efforts made under these joint endeavors, they list "tutoring, mentoring and skill-building" as the third and report that the general perception is that high school personnel benefit more from contact with the college than does the disadvantaged student.²⁵ Richard Lacey has distinguished between school-business partnerships which may resemble IHAD and the IHAD program itself. The results he presents on IHAD make it difficult for one to form conclusions about IHAD's effectiveness.²⁶ Nonetheless, his writing is definitely sympathetic to IHAD. He argues that although school-business partnerships have a mentoring-type structure, they cannot be as effective as IHAD.

Such projects have typically been most successful when they emphasize three characteristics: first, mutual involvement of individuals from the school and the company—a focus on individuals' time and effort rather than corporate financial contributions; second, firm commitments from both parties, often in the form of contracts; third, strong leadership from the top—both the chief executive officer of the company and the school principal. . . .

Three drawbacks of school-business partnerships, however, contrast with and illuminate the strengths of I Have a Dream. First, the commitments are essentially between organizations rather than individuals. Consequently, when organizational priorities change, the commitments change as well. Second, the commitment to partnership is usually tentative and conditional, depending greatly upon factors such as economic conditions and the tenure of top management. The third drawback is that partnerships cannot mobilize and deliver services to individual youth over the period of time required in I Have a Dream.²⁷

Lacey further argued that neither can coordinated social service delivery programs do the job:

[These] programs focus on a range of necessary academic and social supportive services at the school level. A fundamental difference [between these programs and IHAD] is the lack of a personal sponsor and extended supportive services. Social and recreational services, tutoring and other resources are delivered primarily by volunteers or government employees whose commitment is limited.²⁸

Although Lacey claims to distinguish “true” mentoring programs from school-business partnerships and social service delivery programs (not—in his opinion—mentoring programs), nowhere else was such a distinction made.

Tuition guarantees and mentoring

A number of programs combine postsecondary tuition guarantees with mentoring. In a study of private programs that guarantee student aid for college, the U.S. General Accounting Office identified four different tuition-guarantee programs, two of which are relevant to this discussion by virtue of their mentoring components: these are “sponsorship” and “university-based” programs. Although nothing was said about the effectiveness of either type, GAO researchers were able to characterize the major features of each. Sponsorship programs (the I Have a Dream program and those modeled after it) are ones, again, which offer college tuition to a selected class of students still at the junior high or elementary school level. Individual sponsors (or those designated by community or corporate sponsors) agree to serve as mentors and arrange to pay for staff and services throughout the schooling years.

These programs’ designers appear to view the young persons’ whole lives as being at risk, often on account of the disadvantaged community or neighborhood where the students’ school is located. Accordingly, sponsorship programs may aim to supply the emotional support and total involvement of a substitute or added parent, together with a supportive small group of other young people undergoing similar changes of outlook, and bolstered by a wide range of services. The implication is that the types of support students need to get to college—academic, emotional, financial—are needed early but are not available in their immediate communities, and that strong external intervention can raise the expectations of those around the young person both at home and school. In their strongest form, such programs aim to radically restructure, from a relatively early point, the forces affecting poor children’s lives.²⁹

University-based programs include tutoring or other academic support and assistance, “personal mentoring,” summer or school-year “enrichment experiences,” developed at a specific university. The programs the GAO discusses are ones that offer a tuition guarantee in addition to these characteristics, with the guarantee either restricted to the

university in which the program is based, or transferable to any university the student chooses.

These designs may range from something very like the sponsorship model . . . to a guarantee to selected students in selected cities in one state that is usable only at a particular university campus. The assumptions about what students need in order to succeed may vary from the broadest assessment and most comprehensive services to little more than the guarantee alone. Programs with guarantees limited to a specific university campus may also reflect past problems of student adaptation, and may therefore stress activities to familiarize students with specific campus facilities and locations, academic demands, and student culture to help assure that students who eventually attend are ready to do their best and do not have to endure unnecessary shocks or surprises.³⁰

Conclusion

There exists no clear definition for what a mentor is, nor what qualifies as a mentor-protégé relationship, nor how this relationship really works. For example, recall that the finding of the Mendoza and Samuels study raised the question of how a mentor might differ from a good financial aid counselor. And the studies by Delgado-Gaitan and by Trueba and Delgado-Gaitan classified both teachers and parents as mentors. Merriam writes: “As yet, studies from educational settings reveal no clear notion of how a mentor is different from an influential teacher, and, if they can be differentiated, how pervasive mentoring actually is in this setting.”³¹

Marrett notes that programs often have very specific guidelines as to how much time mentors and protégés must spend together, of what activities are important, but that these guidelines are often written out of past practice or by hook or by crook. (She mentions the importance of apprenticeships in job training as an example of past practice that supports mentoring-type initiatives.) Marrett suggests that mentoring programs are designed with particular goals in mind—they are developed to respond directly to particular problems, and it is the problem the designers have in mind that will determine how the program works, who comprise the pool of mentors, etc. Although information may be lacking as to what mentoring itself does, she says that the problems the programs are meant to solve are often well defined, and there is an implicit assumption that mentoring is a strategy that will help. According to Marrett, absent any empirical evidence, administrators claim that “folk wisdom” suggests that mentoring works.

If Marrett’s assessment of the field is correct, problem-identification led to practice, both of which preceded empirical research. Whether these stages evolved in the most efficient or propitious sequence is arguable, but surely empirical evidence is needed to determine if mentoring solves the problems for which it was developed. At present, such

evidence seems to be nonexistent. To illustrate, of all the administrators I contacted who were engaged in running mentoring programs, only one could cite evidence that mentoring works, and the evidence offered came not from a study on mentoring, but from research on “persistence” and “integration.”³² Often, literature on role models is cited to support the value of mentoring, and the two may be related, but it may be incorrect to infer that mentors assigned to, or volunteering for such roles, will serve the same purpose as a role model.

William and Marilynne Gray, in the *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring*, admit there is “not much research evidence available that says what works and why, and what doesn’t and why not,” yet P. F. Mosqueda and Robert Palaich still declare that “mentoring’s current popularity indicates that the human connection is missing for a large number of young people growing up today.”³³ That may be the case, but it does not justify applying a concept that we know little about to problems that may be better solved with alternative approaches. In fact, Evelyn De Jesus, project coordinator for IHAD, Chicago, warns that the “connection” that is to be made is crucial to the success of the program. She summarized familiar complaints she has heard from the students:

“We don’t need anyone to feel sorry for us.”

“We don’t need pity.”

“We don’t need to feel adopted—we have our own parents.”

According to De Jesus, the mentor’s predisposition to the student can be key to whether the program works or not.³⁴

We must be certain that mentoring assists young disadvantaged or at-risk students in achieving academic or career goals. If mentoring works at all, we must learn under what circumstances and in what settings it is most effective. Mentoring in educational settings has been widespread throughout the 1980s, and programs continue to proliferate. The research agenda for the 1990s should be directed toward *empirical* evidence that answers these questions:

- What is mentoring all about?
- Does it work?
- If so, for whom does it work best? In what settings?

Or, more generally, is mentoring the most viable strategy one might use to achieve the desired educational objectives? ■

¹Eliza G. C. Collins and Patricia Scott, eds., “Everyone Who Makes It Has a Mentor,” *Harvard Business Review*, 56 (no. 4, July–August 1978), 89–101.

²Gerard R. Roche, “Much Ado about Mentors,” *Harvard Business Review*, 57 (no. 1, Jan.–Feb. 1979), 14–28.

³See Richard Lacey, “From Inspiration to Institution: The ‘I Have a Dream’ Approach to Dropout Prevention,” *National Center on Effective Secondary Schools Newsletter*, 4 (no. 3, Winter 1989–90), 3–8.

⁴“Mentors and Protégés: A Critical Review of the Literature,” *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33 (no. 3, 1983), 161.

⁵Quoted from January 1991 interview with Cora Marrett, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Director of the Minority Opportunity Summer Training (MOST) program for minority students interested in sociology, and adviser to mentoring programs run by the United Negro College Fund.

⁶Merriam, “Mentors and Protégés,” p. 169.

⁷“Partners in Growth: Elder Mentors and At-Risk Youth,” Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, Pa., 1988. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 303 561, quoted from the ERIC abstract.)

⁸“Teacher Attitudes on Diversity Affect Student Socioacademic Responses: An Ethnographic View,” *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1 (no. 1, Spring 1986), 103–114.

⁹Henry T. Trueba and Concha Delgado-Gaitan, “Minority Achievement and Parental Support: Academic Resocialization through Mentoring,” University of California, Santa Barbara, Graduate School of Education, 1988. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 299 339, quoted from the abstract.)

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹¹Daniel J. Levinson, Charlotte N. Darrow, Edward B. Klein, Maria H. Levinson, and Braxton McKee, *The Seasons of a Man’s Life* (New York: Knopf, 1978), p. 97.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 100.

¹³*Effective Teaching and Mentoring: Realizing the Transformational Power of Adult Learning Experiences* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986), p. 17.

¹⁴Merriam, “Mentoring in Higher Education: What We Know Now,” *The Review of Higher Education*, 11 (no. 2, 1987), 206.

¹⁵José Mendoza and Carl Samuels, “Faculty Mentoring System for Minority Student Retention, Year End Report, 1986–87 Educational Year,” Glendale Community College, Arizona, June 3, 1987. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 288 588, p. 4.)

¹⁶*Ibid.*, quoted from first page of “Summary and Statement of Recommendations,” which preceded the main body of the piece.

¹⁷Martin Obler, Kim Francis, and Robyn Wishengrad, “Combining of Traditional Counseling, Instruction, and Mentoring Functions with Academically Deficient College Freshmen,” *Journal of Educational Research*, 70 (no. 3, 1977), 143.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 144.

¹⁹The differences in GPA and credits completed are said to be significant at the .0001 level (Obler et al., p. 144).

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 146.

²¹Atondo, Chavez, and Regua, “A Study of the Puente Project, 1983–1986,” San Jose/Evergreen Community College District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 278 448, p. 2.)

²²Clarence Pope Huggins, Jr., “A Study of the Effect of a Mentor Program on the Academic Success and College Satisfaction of Freshmen,” Doctoral Dissertation in Educational Administration, University of South Carolina, 1987. (Quote from *Dissertation Abstracts on Disc*, CD-ROM database, January 1985–December 1988, DAI vols. 45/07-49/06, University Microfilms, Inc., 1989.)

²³Vivian Boyd, Steven Carstens, Patricia Hunt, Stanley Hunt, Thomas Magoon, and Brian McLaren (The Counseling Center Retention Study Group), “A Fraternity-Based Retention Intervention for Black Male

Freshmen," Research Report no. 02-89, University of Maryland, College Park, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 304 985.)

²⁴"School-College Alliances: Benefits for Low-Income Minorities," *Digest-ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education* (no. 53, 1989), Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Report no. EDO-UD-89-3. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 308 277.)

²⁵For additional work on personnel benefiting more than students, see D. Mickelson, W. Kritek, R. Hedlund and A. Kaufmann, "Urban School-University Collaboration," final report to the Ford Foundation, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Graduate School of Education, February 1988.

²⁶Lacey writes (p. 7): "More than half of Mr. Lang's original 61 students—34—are enrolled at least part-time in public and private colleges. Ten completed their college and sophomore year on schedule. Another nine either graduated from high school or received general equivalency diplomas." But he gives no data to enable us to compare these outcomes with outcomes for other classes in the school.

²⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 6–7.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁹U.S. General Accounting Office, *Promising Practice: Private Programs Guaranteeing Student Aid for Higher Education*. Report to the Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, GAO/PEMD-90-16, July 1990, pp. 18–19.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 19.

³¹Merriam, p. 169.

³²Esrold Nurse, who runs the mentoring program for minority students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, cited the following two papers by the same authors (on "persistence" and "integration") as evidence on mentoring: (1) E. T. Pascarella and P. T. Terenzini, "Patterns of Student-Faculty Informal Interaction beyond the Classroom and Voluntary Freshman Attrition," *Journal of Higher Education*, 48 (1977), 540–552; and (2) "Predicting Freshman Persistence and Voluntary Dropout Decisions from a Theoretical Model," *Journal of Higher Education*, 51 (1980), 60–75.

³³Mosqueda and Palaich, "Mentoring Young People Makes a Difference: Youth at Risk," Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado, for the Carnegie Corporation of New York City, January 1990. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 317 945, p. 15.) Mosqueda and Palaich quote William A. Gray and Marilynne Miles Gray, "Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Education, the Family and the Community," in *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring*, Vol. 1 (Vancouver, Canada: International Association for Mentoring, 1986).

³⁴Quoted from a January 29, 1991, telephone interview with Evelyn De Jesus, program coordinator, I Have a Dream, Chicago.

Obtaining IRP Publications

The Institute for Research on Poverty offers three free publications: *FOCUS*, which contains articles on current, major issues related to poverty in language intended for the general reader; *INSIGHTS*, an occasional bulletin that highlights recent research findings; and our catalogue, *RECENT PUBLICATIONS*, which lists Discussion Papers, Reprints, Special Reports, *Focus* articles, and books.

Discussion Papers and *Reprints* may be purchased individually or as part of a subscription package. Recent discussion papers have explored the connection between poverty and mortality rates across races, the effects of child care subsidies, the Earned Income Tax Credit, and the influence of parents' education on the high school graduation rates of their children. IRP Reprints are articles written by affiliates that have been published in scholarly journals.

Special Reports are prepared for government agencies, committees, or commissions. They vary in price and must be purchased individually.

To order any of these publications, please check the appropriate box on the order form at the back of *Focus*.

New subscribers to either the Discussion Paper Series or the Reprint Series receive back issues dating from the beginning of the current subscription year. Subscribers to both Discussion Papers and Reprints receive alternate mailings of one and then the other about every six weeks, beginning in September of each year. Subscribers to either Discussion Papers or Reprints receive mailings about every twelve weeks. Approximately 50 Discussion Papers and Reprints are produced by IRP affiliates in the course of a year.
