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In the summer of 2017, MENTOR: The National Mentoring Partnership and its partners at AT&T set out on an ambitious data collection and research project intended to capture the perceptions, beliefs, and activities of American adults about the topic of youth mentoring. This first-of-its-kind project had many core objectives we hoped would galvanize support for both MENTOR’s work and the youth mentoring movement as a whole in the years to come:

- Measure Americans’ engagement in mentoring relationships outside their families, both in and out of youth-serving programs
- Determine motivations and barriers to participating in mentoring relationships or in supporting mentoring programs locally
- Examine perceptions and opinions about mentoring and youth generally, including how these perceptions predict engagement in the mentoring movement
- Understand the impact of employer engagement in mentoring on employee job satisfaction and employee participation in mentoring relationships

It is this last objective—a deeper understanding of how American businesses facilitate the engagement of working-age adults in youth mentoring opportunities—that is the subject of this report. While the Power of Relationships survey, as it came to be known, ultimately surveyed 1,700 American adults over the age of 18, many of the results presented here are based on a subset of 1,002 working Americans, including an oversampling 221 American adults who were both currently employed
and also engaged in youth mentoring activities that were supported by their employer in some capacity. A breakdown of these respondents by job level and industry is available at the end of this section.

In examining this group, we are able to not only isolate the impact that employer engagement has on the mentoring attitudes and behaviors of their employees, but also build understanding about how employers support mentoring and the impact that serving as a mentor has on employee morale and a variety of other outcomes.

Readers are encouraged to also download and explore the full Power of Relationships report, which presents most of its findings on a statistically-representative cross-section of American adults with regards to age, race and ethnicity, household income, and other demographic factors. As such, that report represents the best look at the true engagement of American adults in the youth mentoring movement. Although this report here does not have the same generalizable statistical representation in terms of the respondents, the data referenced here offers tremendous insight into how working adults think about mentoring, the role that their employers play in getting them engaged in mentoring, and the benefits that can accrue for businesses, their workers, and local mentoring programs when employers get involved in mentoring. For American companies looking for a way to give back to their communities in a way that has a “multiplier” effect, this report offers a great example of one path to strengthening communities while also empowering employees.

We hope you join MENTOR in strengthening the engagement of employers in growing the youth mentoring movement.

WHO PARTICIPATED IN THIS SURVEY?

The following graphics detail the employment levels and industries of the 1,002 employed adults who constituted the sample of respondents for this report.

![Employment Level Chart]

- Executive/Sr. Management: 1%
- Manager: 16%
- Salaried: 39%
- Hourly: 20%
- Intern: 25%

![Industry of Employer Chart]

- Health Care/Social Assistance: 13%
- Education: 12%
- Retail: 8%
- Finance/Insurance/Real Estate: 8%
- Software/Telecommunications/IT/Other: 7%
- Legal/Scientific/Technical Services: 7%
- Manufacturing: 7%
- Hotel & Food Services: 6%
- Arts, Entertainment, & Recreation: 6%
- Construction: 6%
- Transportation/Warehousing/Wholesale: 5%
- Government & Public Administration: 5%
Taken as a whole, the findings of this report make clear that the corporate sector and employers nationwide are already playing a major role in boosting the engagement of citizens in mentoring young people. They are particularly helpful in driving their employees to local mentoring programs that badly need the infusion of highly skilled, professional volunteers that businesses can bring when they engage in mentoring opportunities and generally promote a culture of mentoring.

We also see that when employers engage in mentoring, there is a considerable ripple effect: those employees not only mentor more but even the non-mentors contribute to mentoring in other ways by donating their resources or skills or voice. These employees become supporters of this movement and are critical in bringing others in their orbit into the lives of young people. The friends and family of mentoring employees can find themselves caught up in the movement, drawn in by an employee who is matching their company’s enthusiasm for this unique, personal form of giving back to the community.

And perhaps most relevant to the bottom-line mindset of the business community, we find here that employees who work for a company that cares about mentoring are simply happier with their jobs and career and think highly of their employer’s decision to step up for youth in the community. This engagement builds a culture of mentoring in a company that can extend to the professional development employees receive and the values that are expressed every day in their workplace. Simply put: When America’s businesses invest their people and their resources in youth mentoring the mentoring movement gets a major boost in growing to scale and more children are positioned to not only benefit from a mentor’s care and support but also to pass it on themselves when they are a successful adult someday.

MENTOR thanks the employers of America for the engagement they already have in the mentoring movement. For those not yet engaged, we hope that this report has helped convince you that your involvement in mentoring matters. If we are to take this movement to scale, if we are to reach all the young lives that need what you and your employees offer, we need you to join us on this journey. This report clearly shows that your employees will be thankful for your engagement and that you have as much to gain from giving back as do the youth you will support through caring relationships. MENTOR is here to help you join this movement and we look forward to working with you to facilitate real impact in your community.

KEY TAKEAWAYS
As noted previously, one of the core objectives of this study was to determine how many American adults were engaged in either structured or unstructured mentoring relationships (see definitions in the previous section) and to examine the many factors that might potentially predict or contribute to their involvement in mentoring a child within the last year. But we also wanted to use the survey as an opportunity to simply learn more about the ways in which businesses support mentoring for youth locally. As shown in Figure 1, we found that 28% of employed Americans reported that their employer supported youth mentoring in some way (providing mentors to a program, donating money or resources, etc.). Even more impressive, was the finding that almost half of those employees who do mentor a child said that their employer supports their involvement in some way (these ways are detailed later in this section).

We also examined whether certain industries were more or less engaged in mentoring from the perspective of their employees. As Figure

**Figure 1:** General Employer Engagement in Mentoring

**Figure 2:** Rates of Mentoring Engagement by Industry
2 illustrates, the education, finance/real estate, agriculture/natural resources, and legal and technical services fields are the most likely to be engaged in mentoring. The retail, hospitality, wholesale, and arts and entertainment fields are least likely to be engaged in mentoring young people. While there are many factors that explain the variance in these rates, it is worth noting that industries with either strong employee mentoring cultures, such as education, or a lower proportion of hourly or “front line” employees tend to be most engaged in mentoring. These factors are discussed in more detail in the next chapter on “Mentoring and Employee Satisfaction.”

Types of Engagement in Mentoring

We also examined how exactly employees perceived their employers being involved in mentoring young people. As can be seen in Figure 3, the most common form of engagement was connecting employees to local mentoring opportunities, followed by a number of forms of financial and in-kind support. Surprisingly, only 27% of these companies offered paid time off for mentoring activities. It is worth noting that these are the perceptions of employees about their employer’s involvement in mentoring. There may be ways that these companies are involved in mentoring that employees are unaware of, particularly if that employee is not directly engaged with the mentoring opportunities made available through work.

The Impact of Employer Engagement on Employees

It is very clear from the responses of employed adults that when employers are engaged in youth mentoring, those who work for them will also gravitate toward supporting mentoring in a variety of ways. In fact, one of the primary ways companies get employees on board is by encouraging those employees to value mentoring, regardless of whether that employee actually mentors or not. Figure 4 shows that employees of companies who support mentoring were significantly more likely to think that mentoring relationships are important for youth, something that was just as true for non-mentors as it was for those currently in a relationship with a young person.

Types of Employer Engagement in Mentoring

We also examined how exactly employees perceived their employers being involved in mentoring young people. As can be seen in Figure 3, the most common form of engagement was connecting employees to local mentoring opportunities,
These same employees are also more likely to indicate that there is a need for more mentoring for youth, as well as a dearth of mentoring opportunities available, in their communities (Figure 5). Most notable is the large disparity around awareness of local mentoring opportunities—adults whose employers are not involved in mentoring are much less likely to be aware of local opportunities or know how to get involved.

**Figure 5:**
Awareness of the Need for Mentoring in the Community by Employer Engagement

Parents today are less involved with their children, which increases the need for mentors
- Strongly agree: 67%
- Agree: 65%

My community needs more quality mentors for youth
- Strongly agree: 61%
- Agree: 77%

Growing up in today’s society is harder than it used to be; therefore, more mentors are needed
- Strongly agree: 72%

My community needs more quality mentoring programs for youth
- Strongly agree: 60%
- Agree: 73%

Instead of relying on structured mentoring, society should hold parents accountable
- Strongly agree: 57%

I do not know enough about mentoring programs in my community to get involved
- Strongly agree: 32%
- Agree: 52%

**Rates of Mentoring for Employees**

One of the most important goals in the Power of Relationships survey was to determine exactly how many Americans are actively engaged in mentoring a child (or were within the last year as of the time of the survey). Overall, we found that about 10% of all adults mentored a youth in some form of structured program in 2016-17, with another 15% mentoring a child informally (2.5% of adults managed to do both). These findings were surprising in the context of historical analyses that had put formal mentoring involvement closer to 1-2% when looking at volunteering in what might be considered “typical” mentoring nonprofits, such as Big Brothers Big Sisters. Based on these tremendous findings, we set out to learn more about why and how this larger number of Americans were flocking to mentoring.

Perhaps the most surprising—and in retrospect, important—finding from the entire study was the dramatic impact that employers have on the mentoring habits of their workers. Of all the factors that might influence whether someone mentored or not, the engagement of their employer was one of the strongest correlating factors. As Figure 6 illustrates, the rate of mentoring for respondents who said their employer is engaged in mentoring is three times the national average. Employees at companies not involved in mentoring tend to mentor youth at about the same rate as the general population—about 25% are in a relationship with a young person. But we found that 75% of those who said their employer supports mentoring were actively involved in mentoring one or more youth!

It is worth noting that there is likely some selection bias in these results: Those who are aware of their employer’s mentoring involvement are probably also those who know more about opportunities to get involved (and take the offer). There may be many employees in these companies who aren’t aware of their employer’s involvement in mentoring, as well as employees that are heavily invested in mentoring who are overestimating their employer’s engagement. Some of these results are also explained by involvement in internal mentoring programs for young adult employees joining the
company (our definition of youth went up to age 24, so it’s possible some of this “youth” mentoring was actually for junior employees). But these bias issues don’t obscure what is a crystal clear trend: When employers get involved in mentoring and support local mentoring programs and opportunities, their workers care more about mentoring and get involved in mentoring at a rate that is higher than the national average by several orders of magnitude.

What’s most interesting about these data is that employer engagement in mentoring also correlates with more worker involvement in informal mentoring—that is, mentoring that happens outside of a formal structured program. It may be that employers who are socially conscious and involved in causes like mentoring tend to recruit and retain employees who are like-minded and who simply care about engaging youth in this way at a rate greater than the general population. Certainly this type of “clustering” of like-minded caring adults within caring companies explains some of this. But we think it’s equally true that when employers establish a strong culture of mentoring and community engagement, that ethos works its way into the beliefs, behaviors, and engagement of employees too. Figure 7 shows just how dramatically employer involvement in mentoring correlates to greater volunteerism in programs and more caring relationships with youth outside of programs.

We also find that employees whose employers support mentoring spend about an hour a week more directly mentoring a child than do their counterparts in companies that don’t support mentoring. They also tend to be in these relationships about a year and a half longer on average (Figure 8). Once again, some of this may be explained by involvement in those “onboarding mentoring” programs for young adult employees, but it is also likely that these employees are able
to commit more time to mentoring because their employer facilitates, either through paid time off or other supports, their mentoring activities.

One of the clear trends in our national findings was that there are several barriers to mentoring young people that adults simply struggle to overcome: time constraints from professional or family obligations, health or disability-related reasons that make it challenging to get out in the community to engage youth, concerns about the experience or feelings that young people wouldn’t benefit from what they have to offer. All of these might explain an adult’s reluctance to directly mentor. Which is why we were pleasantly surprised to also see that employees of companies who support mentoring are also more likely to support mentoring in other ways than directly mentoring a child.

As illustrated in Figure 9, those whose employers support mentoring are more likely to donate money or resources to mentoring causes, are more likely to advocate for mentoring, and are more likely to help recruit mentors to programs even if they don’t (or can’t) make that commitment themselves. Only 9% of those who said their employer was engaged in mentoring said they did none of these things to support the cause, compared to over 40% of those who didn’t know or confirmed their employer’s non-involvement.

**Figure 7:**
Types and Rates of Employee Mentoring by Employer Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Employer Involved in Mentoring</th>
<th>Employer Not Involved or Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Mentor</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Structured &amp; Informal</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Only</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Only</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8:**
Frequency and Duration of Mentoring activity by Employer Engagement

**Mentor with Corporate Support**
- Hours Mentoring Per Month:
  - 20% 26+
  - 26% 11-25
  - 31% 5-10
  - 22% 0-4

**Mentor without Corporate Support**
- Hours Mentoring Per Month:
  - 15% 26+
  - 25% 11-25
  - 27% 5-10
  - 34% 0-4

**Mentor with Corporate Support**
- Years Mentoring Per Month:
  - 29% 6+
  - 31% 4-5
  - 28% 2-3
  - 12% 1 or <

**Mentor without Corporate Support**
- Years Mentoring Per Month:
  - 11% 6+
  - 30% 4-5
  - 48% 2-3
  - 11% 1 or <
Based on the findings presented in this section, we have clear evidence from the nation’s workforce that when employers get involved in mentoring, in almost any capacity, they trigger a wave of employee engagement that extends far beyond just a partner program at a local school or an onboarding relationship for young employees. They actually spur deep engagement in mentoring youth throughout the community, as well as deeper investment of resources and advocacy in local mentoring programs. And these involvement opportunities for companies are truly not a heavy lift: a simple referral of employees to local programs, a statement from company leadership that mentoring matters, recognizing employees who mentor in the company newsletter, investing in local mentoring activities, and making in-kind contributions to mentoring programs and mentors and mentees. When workers see their company giving back in these ways, they are clearly motivated to contribute too, and even go beyond the company-sanctioned mentoring to get more involved in local mentoring causes and the lives of children in their neighborhoods. Simply put, when companies join the mentoring movement, the ripple effect creates a culture of caring that impacts whole communities. And as we illustrate in the next section, it also has some great impacts on the business side, as well.
WAYS EMPLOYERS CAN GET INVOLVED IN MENTORING AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

- Refer employees to local programs (either those close to the company for easy volunteering or programs that align with the work in some way)
- Craft policies allowing paid time off for employees to mentor during the week
- Recognize employees who mentor in the company newsletter or other venues
- Sponsor or participate in fundraising events for one or more local programs
- Offer in-kind donations of goods or services, especially those that might offset program costs or be directly usable by mentors and youth on outings
- Allow mentors and youth to visit your company as part of career exploration activities
- Advocate for increased state and local funding for mentoring programs for youth
- Offer professional development for all employees on effective communications, supportive relationships, and other skills that are translatable to supporting the healthy development of young people
- Stay abreast of local community issues involving youth and identify specific youth groups who may need extra support
- Encourage other businesses and civic leaders to get involved themselves—lend your voice to the movement
MENTORING AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

In addition to exploring the impact that employer engagement in mentoring had on the mentoring behaviors of their workers, MENTOR also wanted to learn about the impact that being a mentor (or even just being employed in a mentoring-friendly environment) had on employees themselves. When employees mentor, does it improve the relationship they have with their employer and how they view their own position in the company? Do they care that their employer is connected to mentoring?

Our survey results (Figure 10) indicate that employees of companies that are engaged in mentoring are significantly more likely to be satisfied in their jobs than employees in companies that aren’t involved in mentoring (or where the employee isn’t aware). And while those who serve as a mentor with some support from their employer are the happiest of all (77% feel extremely happy in their job), it is worth noting that the boost in job morale for those who work at mentoring-aligned companies seems to largely persist even when the employee decides not to mentor. In other words, being involved in mentoring leads to happier employees even if those employees don’t directly mentor. This speaks, once again, to the caring culture that can be created or strengthened when company leadership commits to supporting mentoring young people.

We see a similar pattern of employee satisfaction when asked about their career in general (as opposed to their current job). As Figure 11 illustrates, those who work at companies who support mentoring have much higher career satisfaction, which holds true independently from the employee’s decision to mentor or not.

We also see evidence that engagement in mentoring causes employees to view their employer in a more favorable light. When asked about whether it is important to them whether the company they work for supports mentoring or other youth causes, those whose employers do offer that support placed much greater importance on their employer doing so (Figure 12). It may be that their employer being involved in mentoring made them realize how important it is. It may also be that those who care about supporting youth will seek out careers at companies who also live that value. There are likely
many reasons for this distinction, but it’s telling that only 27% of employees at companies that don’t support mentoring placed a high level of importance on whether their company did or not (note that the chart shows the percentage rating it as an 8/9/10 on a 10 point scale). Conversely, well over half of employees in companies that do support mentoring indicated that it matters a lot to them—they strongly value their employer’s direct support of mentoring. The level of importance for corporate support was highest among employees who had children in the home, who were relatively younger, who were more conservative politically, and who were a member of a racial or ethnic minority.

**Company Support for Employee Mentoring**

As noted above, employees who mentor with the support or involvement of their employer rated the highest in terms of both job and overall career satisfaction. But some forms of company support clearly bubbled up to the top of the list. It’s worth noting here that 72% non-mentors in our full national survey results indicated that paid time off from their employer to mentor was rated as something that would be a factor in a decision to start mentoring—with half of them saying it would have a major impact on their decision.

Unsurprisingly, paid time off was also the top form of support desired by current employees. Figure 13 shows that those who work at companies who support mentoring really see the value in offering that paid time off—53% rated it as highly important. This paid time off likely explains, in part, the much higher rates of mentoring for those who work in these businesses.

The importance of paid time off was highest among those with children in the home (who likely don’t have time to mentor in the evenings and weekends), Hispanic and Black employees, and employees who were younger or more politically conservative. It also mattered most to those who were mentored in a program themselves when they were young. These adults perhaps understand better than anyone how...
much it matters when an adult takes a little time out their workday to be there for a child.

We also found that paid time off to mentor was most important to those in the managerial class compared to other job classifications (Figure 14). In fact, this is part of an overall pattern of managers and executives placing more importance on mentoring, and their company’s support of mentoring, than other job classes.

Figure 15 shows that executives and managers place significantly greater importance on their company’s engagement in mentoring than salaried or hourly employees. This might be a natural extension of the fact that these upper job levels are often part of the decision to get involved in mentoring in the first place, but it also suggests that there is room to grow in getting salaried and hourly workers more engaged with mentoring. It’s clear that mentoring is most often embraced by managers and company leaders—in fact people working at those levels simply find mentoring to be more important overall (Figure 16).

Connecting Youth Mentoring and Internal Employee Mentoring

Another interesting finding around employer support of mentoring is that when businesses and corporations are engaged in youth mentoring, their employees are also more likely to want internal mentoring that can advance their careers within the company. As shown in Figure 17, 54% of employees of mentoring-engaged companies say that it is critically important for the company to also offer internal mentoring opportunities so that employees can get the guidance and advice they need to thrive and grow their careers. Once again, this is compelling evidence that engagement in youth mentoring creates a more global mentoring culture within organizations and that these employees see the value and place great importance on both giving and receiving mentoring. This likely explains, in part, the job satisfaction of these employees noted previously—they have found jobs where they have the opportunity to give, but also receive mentoring.

As with many aspects of employer engagement, offering internal mentoring for employees was rated
more highly by those in the managerial class, with salaried employees also expressing strong interest in this type of career mentoring. Unfortunately, hourly employees don’t quite place the same value on mentoring, once again suggesting an area for potential growth and more employee outreach so that these hourly employees are more engaged in the mentoring culture and opportunities of the organization.

Taken as a whole, the findings presented here make a compelling case that being engaged in mentoring will lead to happier employees who notice their employer’s commitment to not only kids but to them as valued team members as well. They especially value contributions from their company that free up their time during the day to mentor, with managers and executives expressing the most enthusiasm for this type of engagement. Clearly there is also room to grow the engagement of salaried and hourly employees in deepening this mentoring culture, as well.
EMPLOYER SUPPORT

THE IMPACT OF EMPLOYER SUPPORT ON THE MENTORING EXPERIENCE

The last set of questions we asked around employer engagement in the mentoring movement were related to how the support of employers impacted the mentoring experience for those who decided to mentor a child. Once again, here we find that employers have a major positive impact on not only the decision to mentor, but the mentoring relationships that result.

Mentor Satisfaction and Closeness

One of the keys to a successful mentoring relationship is ensuring that mentors and mentees truly enjoy each other’s company and that they form a close, trusting bond. While we assume that this happens naturally in informal mentoring relationships—it’s unlikely that a pair outside of a formal program would be spending mentoring time together if they didn’t like being with each other. But it can be a real struggle in formal structured programs where adults and youth are connected as strangers in an awkward new type of relationship. But once again, here we see the positive influence that employer support of mentoring can have.

When asking mentors how satisfied they are with their relationship, and how close they feel to their mentee, we see that those who have the support of their employer are significantly more likely to say they are strongly satisfied with the relationship and also report feeling closer to their mentee (Figure 18).

These mentors are also more likely to say they will continue mentoring and recommend mentoring to others than those who don’t have the support of their company (Figure 19). This suggests that when employers simply make it easier for their employees to mentor a young person it creates not only longer term relationships, but also has a multiplier effect that brings their friends, colleagues, and extended family to the doors of programs, as well. These employees essentially become an army of recruiters to programs, something that is crucial in taking mentoring to scale. The most effective form of mentor recruitment is having someone the prospective mentor knows (rather than a program representative) make “the ask.”

Figure 18: Mentor Closeness and Satisfaction by Employer Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Closeness</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Mean: 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Mean: 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Mean: 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Mean: 8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentor With Corporate Support | Mentor Without Corporate Support
Mentor With Corporate Support | Mentor Without Corporate Support
Interestingly, we find that mentors who serve with the support of their employer are more likely to report mentoring a young person of a different race/ethnicity or socioeconomic class than their own (Figure 20). When it comes to structured mentoring, this cross-race/class trend is almost certainly a function of the common practice of referring employees to specific mentoring programs that the company has decided to formally partner with or support. Most mentoring programs are specifically serving youth with elevated risk profiles who are most likely to be in need of the support of a mentor. Given that most employee mentors are white collar professionals or those who have ascended to the management class, it’s easy to see how they would be especially more likely to be mentoring a young person from different backgrounds and circumstances than their own.

What’s interesting here is that these “supported” employee mentors are also more likely to be mentoring youth across race and class lines in informal relationships outside of a program context. As Figure 20 shows, these trends also apply to informal mentoring relationships that, while they may be connected to an institutional context, are self-created by the mentor and mentee. While the cause of this trend is unclear, one might assume that when employees get involved in a mentoring program, it also spurs their engagement with other young people, perhaps those who live in their neighborhood or who are peers of their own children. Here again, we see the ripple effect that happens from simple employer investment in mentoring.

Regardless of the reasons, this is good news for the youth being served in these contexts. The sharing of social capital—the connections, relationships, and access to spaces that allow young adults to thrive and more easily navigate challenges in their professional and personal lives—is one of the most critical aspects of mentoring in our deeply inequitable society. When middle and upper class
Mentors get more involved in the lives of young people, they share their social capital and provide avenues to success that might otherwise have never been available to a young person. This is not to say that mentoring can only be impactful if it involves the transfer of social capital down the socioeconomic ladder. But the reality is that far too many youth in America lack access to the types of interpersonal connections that can help them get the encouragement and enrichment they need and that facilitates their transition into postsecondary education, career pathways, and healthy young adulthood. The findings here suggest that employer engagement in mentoring helps give more youth the advantages of meaningful relationships and can help in reversing disparities we see in the accumulation of social capital in modern America.

In aggregate, these findings suggest that employer support of mentoring leads to longer and stronger mentoring relationships for youth in the community, both in and out of programs. It also seems to influence who receives mentoring and the much-needed transfer of social capital across generations and other demographics. And perhaps most compellingly, employer engagement might also boost the recruitment of other individuals outside the company to the doors of mentoring programs and spur more informal engagement across the community.
LONG-TERM INFLUENCE

LONG-TERM INFLUENCE OF MENTORING

One of the lingering questions for the youth mentoring movement is how to measure the long-term, cross-generational impact of mentoring. When we mentor a cohort of young people in a community, what does that result in years, even decades later? While this study was not designed to answer these types of longitudinal questions, we see several interesting things in the Power of Relationships data which suggest that the long term benefits of mentoring more than outweigh the modest costs that go into providing mentors to youth in need.

One interesting finding is that those who currently work at the salaried level or above are more likely to report having had a mentor of their own when they were a young person (Figure 21). While we only have a correlation here, and have certainly not proved causation that having had a mentor is the reason individuals have risen in their career to a higher professional level, we can certainly infer that the wisdom and guidance of mentors played some role in these employees getting to where they are today.

Perhaps more disconcertingly, we see that hourly employees were much less likely to report having had a structured mentor at any point and even lag behind in the presence of informal mentors during their childhood. Once again, this is not implying cause-and-effect, but it does suggest that mentoring is something that too rarely touches children growing up in lower-income communities and that across generations there is a cumulative gap in supportive adult relationships that eventually does translate into a long-term lack of engagement in mentoring and more limited career prospects.

Those same salaried, manager, and executive
groups also do much more mentoring in programs compared to their hourly colleagues (Figure 22). And when we asked mentors in structured programs nationally what they got out of the experience, they touted a number of personal benefits to being a mentor that can easily be applicable to or helpful in the professional space: improved communication skills, increased tolerance and understanding of other cultures, a better understanding of self, and the refinement of career-related skills. As shown in Figure 23, these benefits are also further enhanced with the support of the mentor’s employer.

It’s clear that employees who mentor get a lot out of the experience and that it strengthens their career happiness and skills in myriad ways. But far too frequently, these benefits do not extend down to hourly and part-time workers who have a harder time finding free hours to mentor, who are less likely to already be familiar with a culture of mentoring, and who may not realize how beneficial mentoring can be for their community or their own career. One of the key ways we can further growth of the mentoring movement with the help of businesses and corporations is to find flexible programming contexts and facilitating paid time off so that frontline workers can also be part of this movement and find meaningful ways to give back. These data suggest they are currently being left behind in our movement.