

**MALES AS MENTORS: A QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF VOLUNTEER
RECRUITMENT**

by

Kelly Rice Williams

B.S. in Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, 2012

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Behavioral and Community Health Sciences
Graduate School of Public Health in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Public Health

University of Pittsburgh

2015

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

This thesis was presented

by

Kelly Rice Williams

It was defended on

April 16, 2015

and approved by

Elizabeth Felter, DrPH, Visiting Assistant Professor
Behavioral and Community Health Sciences
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh

Susan Zickmund, PhD, Associate Professor of Medicine
Division of General Internal Medicine
Department of Medicine
University of Pittsburgh

Thesis Director: John Marx, Professor Emeriti, MA, PhD
Behavioral and Community Health Sciences
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh

Copyright © by Williams

2015

MALES AS MENTORS: A QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF VOLUNTEER

RECRUITMENT

Kelly Rice Williams, MPH

University of Pittsburgh, 2015

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative study is to assess what prompted current male volunteers to join Big Brother Big Sisters Greater Pittsburgh (BBBS), explore barriers potential male volunteers may have in joining BBBS and assess possible messaging/active recruitment techniques to increase the number of male volunteers. Specific aims of the research are to: (1) determine how current male volunteers were recruited; (2) understand why current male volunteers joined the program; (3) define perceived barriers to volunteering for BBBSP; (4) explore information needed by males in the communities to garner interest in mentorship; and to (5) gain insight on how BBBSP can relay/target information to males in the community. This research is significant to public health as mentoring programs promote future community health by targeting factors that put youth at-risk for dropping out of school, depression, and negative behaviors. Mentors have the opportunity to influence youth decisions surrounding school attendance, drug/alcohol use, and negative behaviors that would fall into the classification of misdemeanors. 14 semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with current Big Brothers, lasting 30-55 minutes. Data analysis was driven by a modified grounded theory approach and was used to create a comprehensive, thematic code book. Findings were synthesized into specific recommendations for BBBSP to increase male mentor (Big Brother) recruitment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	RAPID REVIEW OF RECRUITMENT LITERATURE	5
1.2	MENTORSHIP INFLUENCE AND MENTORSHIP PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	5
1.1.1	Evidence of effectiveness	7
1.1.2	Mentor effectiveness	9
1.3	RECRUITMENT OF MENTORS	10
2.0	METHODS	16
2.1	PROJECT CONCEPTION.....	16
2.2	PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT	17
2.3	DATA COLLECTION.....	18
2.4	INTERVIEW CONTENT.....	18
2.5	CODEBOOK CONSTRUCTION	20
3.0	RESULTS	21
3.1	DEMOGRAPHICS.....	21
3.2	ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY	22
3.2.1	Big Decision Factors	22
3.2.2	Initial Concerns.....	26
3.2.3	Personal Benefit	29

3.2.4	Barriers to Mentorship.....	34
3.2.5	Recruitment Techniques	39
3.2.6	Recruitment Information	45
3.2.7	Summary of Code Categories	47
4.0	DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	48
4.1.1	Race/Ethnicity	48
4.1.2	Mentoring Decisions	48
4.1.3	Barriers/Concerns.....	50
4.1.4	Limitations.....	52
4.2	RECOMMENDATIONS	52
4.2.1	Suggestions for Future Research.....	55
	APPENDIX A : INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	57
	APPENDIX B : CODEBOOK	61
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants ($N=14$)	21
Table 2. Summary of Code Categories	47

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Youth mentoring is widely used as a strategy to promote positive developmental and health outcomes for disadvantaged, at-risk youth (1-4). In the United States, there are over 5,000 mentoring programs serving approximately three million at-risk youths (2). These programs serve youth experiencing poverty, community violence, poorly performing schools, parental incarceration, and other environmental/social risks which impede positive developmental progress. The nature of the mentor-mentee dynamic assumes having a trusting, supportive and tailored relationship with a non-parental adult will benefit youths under stress in four developmental domains: personal/identity, emotional, cognitive, and psychological (2, 3, 5). In the following sections, the effects of mentoring on youth outcomes, the volunteers, and the community will be further examined.

One of the largest mentorship agencies is Big Brothers Big Sisters America (BBBSA), which operates in all 50 states, and in 12 countries around the world (6). Nationally, they provide program services to 330 communities in America, including small, large, rural, and urban settings (6). Similar to other mentorship programs, the overarching mission of BBBSA is to support and facilitate positive outcomes for youths facing adversity. The national organization targets youth, ages 6-18, specifically those who live in poverty, live in a single-parent household, and/or experience parental incarceration (6). BBBSA was initially established in 1904 to service only high-risk male youths, but incorporated female youths into their programs in 1970 (6).

The local chapter of BBBSA for Allegheny County, PA was established in 1965 to provide structured mentor support for boys facing adversity in Allegheny community (6). Girls

were incorporated into their mission statement in 1973, and, by 2002, the organization had expanded its service area and officially became Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Pittsburgh (BBBSP) (6). BBBSP's mission is to provide a one-to-one mentoring relationships to empower at-risk youths to realize their potential. The community-based program allows Big (adult volunteer)-Little (at-risk youth) pairs to form mentor-mentee relationships by going on outings and spending time in the community, rather than in a structured environment, such as at school or at a BBBSP facility.

Several federal agencies and the White House have expressed concern about youths who face economic, education, and health disparities. The White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth created an inter-agency workgroup to help coordinate all federal dollars various federal agencies were providing in support of mentoring programs in 2003 (2). As examples of monetary support from federal agencies: the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education, by 2004, provided approximately 100 million dollars per year to mentoring programs; and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), in 2011, provided a total of \$100 million to several such programs, including Big Brothers Big Sisters America which received \$60 million of the OJJDP funds (2). Even with the considerable support of the Federal Government and individual donors, there is still a long waiting list for mentors (7).

BBBSA has over 240,000 Big-Little (i.e. mentor-mentee) matches nationwide. The disparity between need and available mentors is such that BBBSA has 21,000 boys and 10,500 girls on the waitlist for a Big (i.e. mentor) (6). BBBSP faces similar supply and demand challenges. They serve more than 1,300 children in the Greater Pittsburgh area, and have approximately 102 children (78 of whom are males) on the mentee wait list. This local agency is

experiencing an insufficient supply of male volunteers, a fact compounded by data showing that 67.6% (N=426) of adults interested in becoming a Big were women in 2014.

Mentoring programs are on the front lines of promoting community health. They target youth-specific factors which put them at increased risk of dropping out of school (e.g. SES, parental level of education, single parent home, incarcerated parent), depression, and “problem behavior and health” (8, 9). In terms of health, one-to-one mentor relationships with youths have the ability to prevent or delay drug and alcohol use, reduce behaviors that could be classified as misdemeanors, as well as influence “sense of self-worth” (9). Utilization of mentors through structured mentoring programs try to influence youth decisions surrounding the above health indicators, which is pivotal to facilitating a healthier population and healthier community.

Literature on the effectiveness of mentorship relations will be discussed in section 1.1, but is generally estimated to have positive, albeit modest, effects (1, 2). As evidence-based frameworks for mentorship programs are developed and evaluated, the variability in mentor program requirements are likely to be reduced. This may lead to more effective mentored relationships. Mentor effects found in the literature are discussed further in section 1.1.2 (7, 10). The ability to recruit and retain such volunteers is another key factor in the facilitation of an effective mentor-mentee relationship (7). Discussed in section 1.3 is research on general strategies for volunteer recruitment, as well as changing patterns/motivations for volunteerism in today’s social environment.

***THE PURPOSE** of this qualitative study is to enhance our understanding of the barriers potential male volunteers might have in joining Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Pittsburgh, and to assess possible messaging/recruitment content and techniques to increase the number of interested potential male mentors.*

Specific aims of this qualitative study are to: (1) *determine how current male volunteers were recruited; (2) understand why current male volunteers joined the program; (3) define perceived barriers to volunteering for BBBSP; (4) explore information needed by males in the communities to garner interest in mentorship; and to (5) gain insight on how BBBSP can relay/target information to males in the community.*

1.1 REVIEW RELEVANT OF RECRUITMENT LITERATURE

1.2 MENTORSHIP INFLUENCE AND MENTORSHIP PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

There is general agreement that mentored relationships can have positive effects on youths. Youth mentoring programs assume that a dynamic relationship with a non-parental adult has positive influences on mentees' personal, emotional, cognitive and psychological development (2, 3, 11). These assumptions have been presented in a conceptual model of interconnectedness created by Rhodes who also outlined prerequisite conditions for beneficial relationships (2). The model posits that social-emotional, cognitive, and identity processes influence youth outcomes. Assumptions from youth mentoring programs concerning the effects of mentored relationships on youths development follows research about how youth interact with parents, teachers, and other non-related adults effect youth outcomes (2). To support positive development of socio-emotional processes, mentors can challenge a youth's negative self-image and model effective communication skills; thereby promoting expression, understanding, and emotional regulation (2). Mentors may also provide youth the chance to gain new thinking skills and help shape thoughts about their current and future identity (2).

Socio-emotional functioning is a term used to describe an individual's ability and skill set to "completely meet the demands of one's social environment and psychological well-being"

which includes feelings of self-worth, mastery, and purpose” (5). It has been reported that youths who have higher socio-emotional functioning have better scholastic achievements, better quality peer relationships, and fewer risky behaviors (5). Guided by Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model of development, Hurd et al., evaluated the effects of involved-vigilant parenting and natural mentors (i.e. non-parental adults who are already in the youth’s social network) on academic and well-being among black youth (5). Results indicated that both involved-vigilant parents and natural mentors can positively influence psychosocial youth outcomes (5). Specifically, compared to youths without a natural mentoring relationship, youths who had natural mentors reported higher levels of involved-vigilant parenting (5). Natural mentors might also play a role reducing parent burden and facilitate positive parenting (5). The positive effect natural mentors can have on both the child and the parent-child relationship is motivating evidence to further look into the effect non-natural mentoring can have on youth outcomes.

Youth mentoring has conceptually been around for almost three millennia, but dedicated programs and initiatives have increased tremendously (12). Today, programs focused on youth mentoring, in part, were established as solutions to the problems of lower academic outcomes, increased risk for delinquency, substance use, and mental health conditions such as depression experienced by youth who experience stressful life experiences and/or live in high-risk environments (4). In particular, low-income urban communities often face a plethora of barriers that undermine youth learning and academic performance, such as poverty and community violence (4). The exposure of community poverty increases youths’ experience of stressful life events, such as parental divorce/separation, violence, moving, and family/peer incarceration (4).

There are a limited number of frameworks and theories to guide research on the influences non-parental adults have on youths (10). Despite the limited theoretical support for the

effects of mentoring, empirical evidence hints at the importance of role models and mentors. In one survey, 82% of participants (urban youths of differing racial/ethnic backgrounds) self-reported having a non-parental adult on whom they could rely and who had significant influence on their lives (10).

An alternative to mentoring, individually-based coping techniques have been shown ineffective “for youth facing the most severe and chronic stressors.” (4) However, youth experiencing such stress can benefit from individual protective strategies if they also have an adult supportive relationship and a connection to a protective setting (4). As youths develop, they transition through stages of puberty, enter new scholastic environments, and tend to increasingly focus on peer relationships (5). Around the age of 10, adolescent reliance on their parent decreases and non-parental adults might have increased influence on youths’ development (5). Mentors are able to act as parental supports in fostering and encouraging positive youth trajectories. Grant and colleagues suggest that mentors have the ability to help youths coping abilities and school achievement as a support to parents or natural mentors who also live in the community and face similar stressors (4).

1.1.1 Evidence of effectiveness

The effectiveness of mentor relationships in the literature is generally viewed as modest. This section will detail the positive effects such relationships can have on youth by exploring several evaluation studies and meta-analyses. In general, the literature concludes that positive developmental outcomes can be influenced by components of mentorship, such as role modeling, positive feedback, and emotional support (1).

A 2011 meta-analysis aggregated information from 73 evaluations of mentor programs from 1999-2010 (2). Programs analyzed in this review primarily targeted youths at-risk for poor academic achievement, risk behavior, and/or health outcomes (2). Overall findings supported the view that typical mentor programs improve youth outcomes in four developmental domains: behavioral, social, emotional, and academic (2). Statistically, the comparative gains for mentored versus non-mentored youth in outcomes measured were modest, being “equivalent to a difference of nine percentile points from scores of non-mentored youth on the same measures” (2). For end-of-program assessments, the average effect size was 0.21 with 95% CI of [0.17, 0.26] (2). Even with modest effects on outcomes, such improvements on self-esteem, identity views and coping, are likely valuable to youth health and the future health of our greater community.

Evaluations of mentoring programs are fraught with issues, particularly lack of rigorous methods and lack of follow-up. For instance, a re-analysis of the Grossman et al. (2002) evaluation of BBBS, found that the effects on youth outcomes grew at an increasing rate as mentor-mentee relationships continued over time (2). Re-analysis showed regular contact with their mentor, over time, improved mentees feeling of security, attachment with the mentor and other relationships, including parental (2, 10). The initial study randomly assigned 1,138 youths, who applied to the BBBS program, to the waitlist or matched with a Big and administered a survey at baseline and 18 months later (1). Additional analyses supported the idea that mentorship may positively influence coping of stressors, conflict resolution, and indirectly reduce parental stress (1).

1.1.2 Mentor effectiveness

There are a several studies that describe program characteristics that supported positive outcomes. A meta-analysis of 55 mentorship programs found youth outcome effects were influenced by: length and closeness of mentor-mentee relationship; focus on instrumental goals; clear expectations from all involved parties; and ongoing program support of mentors (7, 10). Also, mentors with previous experience in a helping role/profession had larger effects on youth outcomes than those without (7). Another study found more positive youth outcomes when they experienced both structure and support from their mentor (10).

A major limitation to building an effective mentorship program is the difficulty of mentor recruitment and retention. Recruitment and retention play critical roles in the success of the program, for both the mentees and the mentors. At the time of this writing, the author is not aware of any rigorous studies of the recruitment of mentors in the context of long-term relationships. There is limited evidence on factors affecting retention. Programs offering training and on-going support to mentors impacted mentor's perceptions of mentor-mentee relationships positively and increased match duration (7). Additionally, the potentially negative effects of failed relationships should not to be overlooked, something that has often happened in previous literature. An evaluation of 1,000 youths in BBBS found that failed relationships (i.e. terminated before 1 year) had negative effects, such as decreased feelings of self-worth and reduced scholastic competence (7). Research on failed mentee-mentor relationships can serve to highlight important factors in what contributes to a beneficial match.

An exploratory study of volunteer attrition included mentors and mentees who had been involved in both successful and failed relationships (10). Interviews revealed that certain problems arose early in the relationship, such as unfulfilled expectations, disappointment, and

pragmatic concerns (10). Defining factors which affect mentor attrition rates would be beneficial to programs, so they are able to make the necessary program changes to better facilitate enduring and effective mentor-mentee matches. Similarly, research needs to be expanded on motivations to mentor and perceived/tangible benefits of the experience as this research could yield influential information regarding methods for recruiting effective mentors.

1.3 RECRUITMENT OF MENTORS

Recruitment of mentors is pivotal to the life and effectiveness of mentorship programs. When looking at volunteer recruitment in general, research has been conducted on the social climate surrounding volunteerism, barriers to volunteering, and how organizations can increase volunteer rates.

It has been postulated that both individual motivations and general patterns surrounding volunteer decisions have been evolving within societal constructs, secularization, and individualization (13). In the past, Americans were beholden to a strong ethic of service to those in need and the community (13). In the recent past and in today's society, volunteerism has been driven by self-interest and by personal interest in problems that are viewed as 'trendy' such as animal rights and HIV (13, 14). It is outside the scope of this review to judge motivations and ethical quandaries of shifting patterns in the bases of volunteers, but rather this review explores changes in motivations and volunteer patterns for the benefit of BBBS and other non-profits who are in need of volunteers.

Hustinx and Lammertyn (2003), provide an analytic framework to explore current 'conditions' of volunteering through sociological modernization theory (13). Within this

framework, two styles of volunteerism are explored, collective and reflexive. In essence, collective volunteerism is fostered from the ideal sense of ‘we’ and group membership, where volunteer actions are set and initiated by the group in relation to the needs of the specific community – not centered on individual volunteer interests (13). The concept of reflexive volunteerism hails from the idea that an individual’s experiences in society creates their frame of reference for decisions to volunteer. That is, an individual makes volunteer action decisions based on self-selected interests rather than geographical location or standardized group culture (13).

It is Hustinx and Lammertyn’s opinion that volunteerism is shifting from a collective style to that of reflexive volunteerism. Such a shift is important for organizations dependent on volunteers to understand, as it is reshaping behaviors and patterns in volunteering. External pressures on individuals such as “unpredictable life courses” and internal pressures of “increasing pursuit of professionalism and efficiency” are important factors to consider when looking at the differences in organizational and volunteer priorities (13). Being aware of changes in volunteer patterns and motivations is extremely important to the marketing strategies of volunteer organizations and the benefits their specific volunteer mission can give to individuals contemplating volunteerism.

In addition to considering societal shifts, it is equally important for organizations to understand specific barriers volunteers might have or perceive. Individual barriers to volunteering include: lack of time; money; information; skills; personal interest; social isolation; low community network connections; and perceived lack of opportunity (15). Sundeen and colleagues, conducted a study to look at whether the barriers non-volunteers perceived to volunteerism differed by non-volunteer characteristics such social class, gender, race, and

education (15). Their study found that lack of time is characteristic of individuals with higher income, more education, and working professionals (15). The authors also reported that highlighting the importance of the volunteer work and relevance of the tasks involved created more interest when trying to recruit ethnic minorities, and individuals with lower income, or less education (15).

A perceived set of necessary skills (e.g. skills that are perceived to be needed in order to perform volunteer-specific duties) is a barrier to volunteering for both people with high and low levels of education— those with high levels of education seem to believe their skills are above the activities needed to be performed as a volunteer, and those with low levels of education are more inclined to worry they do not possess skills needed to preform volunteer activities (15). As BBBSP recruits individuals from education levels of high school graduate to PhDs, this presents an interesting question— does the barrier of skills mismatch apply to mentorship volunteerism to the same extent as other volunteer opportunities?

Another barrier is lack of personal interest. Volunteering is often viewed as unattractive socially amongst the younger generation (12). Often characteristics of individuals who face the ‘lack personal interest’ barrier include, a low sense of civic responsibility, lack of perceived benefit to self and or family, lack of trust in volunteer organization(s), and perception that organizations do not want them as volunteers (15). These characteristics of low personal interest are particularly useful for volunteer organizations to know about because further research could illuminate marketing strategies to combat such feelings and increase interests/motivation. Similarly, organizations should pay attention to the importance of social isolation and potential volunteers’ desire for more information when developing promotional materials and employing recruitment techniques. Targeting “informal community communication frequently used by local

residents” or contacting community leaders to share information on the behalf of the organization is one way to overcome some of these barriers (15).

There is general agreement that organizations dependent on volunteers need to be aware not only of barriers, but also of the motivations of potential volunteers (14-16). Young adults are likely to volunteer with egoistical reasoning, such as personal advancement (14). In terms of mentoring, it has been found that mentors feel satisfaction, experience personal fulfillment, and feel they are having an effect (14). Feelings of satisfaction/fulfillment and feelings of making an impact/difference are also key concepts for volunteer retention(14). Mentoring others can be marketed as an opportunity to make a difference by using existing knowledge and skills (14).

Another factor, altruism, is also important. Further research should be done to look at how altruistic benefits of the mentoring experience can be promoted as an opportunity (narrowing in on egotist motivations). In a study conducted with college students, investigators sought to determine targeting strategies, specific to young adults, for recruitment purposes (14). Results found that communication for recruitment was more effective if it focused on the experience as an opportunity to make a difference, enhance personal and professional development, and to network (14).

An Independent Sector survey in 2000 of volunteers found that 70% of respondents were asked to volunteer and 25% of respondents were not asked to volunteer (15). This provides some evidence that being directly asked to participate in a volunteer experience could increase the likelihood the individual will engage in the volunteering experience. Another recent article stated that one of the main reasons individuals volunteer is because they were asked to do so (17). Such findings suggest personal requests are important for volunteer recruitment (15). Investigations of social networks and information provision would help illuminate the effects of social support and

peer requests on decisions to volunteer. There are two types of support social networks can provide individuals: emotional and instrumental (17). One study found that females are more likely than males to seek social support during the volunteer decision process (17). Although this study finds that females have larger social networks, are more likely to contact friends to participate in volunteering activities, there is limited research on the effects social networks have on direct requests to volunteer as a mentor— an experience where co-participation in the volunteer experience is limited.

Furthermore, there are strong perceptions among the young that volunteers are “uncool or do-gooders” (16). These negative perceptions can prohibit individuals from volunteering or create feelings of doubt and shame for those who are already engaged in a volunteer role. NAMES developed a volunteer matrix designed to address negative images of volunteering and to help organizations recruit and keep desired volunteers. There are two axes: (1) the price axis quantifies the cost of volunteering (time, negative social reaction, anxiety, monetary cost), and (2) the quality axis quantifies the experience(i.e. benefits: approval, training, professional gain, experience, psychological wellbeing) (16).

Callow’s Framework is another tool that can be used to consider volunteer recruitment. It suggests that volunteer-based organizations should focus their positioning and targeting efforts on individual differences in motivations for a specific target segment (14). This framework assumes that because potential volunteers are numerous, it is in the organization’s best interest to segment based on demographic criteria to separate out volunteers from non-volunteers (16). Although such a framework appears logical for organizations who need specialized characteristics, it does not seem adequate for youth mentor program recruitment. Mentoring programs often want mentors from a wide variety of backgrounds with many different

characteristics and personal traits. This allows them to attempt to match an adult mentor with the uniqueness of the youth in need.

Because BBBSP has an acute shortage of male volunteers, this thesis will explore specific barriers and potential recruitment strategies for male mentors. This research will assist BBBSP with their organizational goal of recruiting and retaining volunteers and address the scarcity of male volunteers.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 PROJECT CONCEPTION

In speaking with BBBSP staff, it was clear there was a need for qualitative research to understand motivations males had to engage in youth mentoring, with the goal of increasing male mentor recruitment. With input from the BBBSP staff, a pilot study was developed to address four research issues: 1) understanding why current male mentors joined BBBSP; 2) defining and exploring male specific barriers to joining BBBSP; 3) assessing Big Brothers views on recruitment techniques; and, 4) to elicit ideas for how to recruit male mentors.

For the pilot study, three current Big Brothers (Caucasian n=2; Non-Caucasian n=1) each took part in a semi-structured telephone interview. Analysis of the pilot interview data was informative, but just scratched the surface of research possibilities. Interviewees offered insights in terms of the benefits of the program and which aspects of being a mentor were the most appealing to them, but had limited knowledge about effective recruitment techniques.

The pilot study indicated that a larger, qualitative study was needed to enhance understanding of factors that influence male decisions to become Big Brothers, perceived barriers to mentorship, and to explore what information and information dissemination techniques would be beneficial in increasing males' interest in starting a Big-Little relationship and promoting the public health mission of BBBS.

2.2 PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

As the purpose of this study is to explore male perceptions of barriers and benefits of mentoring as well as what information is needed to increase male interest in mentoring, all female Bigs volunteering with BBBSP were excluded from participation in this study. As the aims of this study are specific to current Big Brothers in BBBSP, purposive sampling was employed. The target population for this study were active Big Brothers involved in the community-based mentoring program with BBBSP. All Big Brother – Little Brother matches that were technically closed or were in closing stages were precluded from this study. With the above criteria in place, 206 Big Brothers were eligible for participation in the study. The BBBSP study liaison sorted the 206 eligible participants into two groups, Caucasian (N=180) and Non-Caucasian (N=26). Then using the Excel random number generator, assigned each person in each group a random number between 1 -1000. Both lists were resorted from lowest random number to the highest. The first 26 entries, for each group, were selected for recruitment.

The BBBSP liaison emailed each participant independently to introduce the study. This initial contact let participants know that the researcher had the permission of the organization. After these initial emails, the researcher sent follow-up emails explaining the study in greater detail and requesting participation in a semi-structured telephone interview. The first seven Caucasian and first seven Non-Caucasian Bigs who expressed interest in participating were accepted into the study. Other potential participants who expressed interest were thanked for their interest, but were declined participation as the scope of this project was limited to fourteen interviews.

The sample size of 14 was guided by the qualitative principle of thematic saturation. Saturation is a qualitative principle which is used when interview data is collected and analyzed

until no new themes emerge, with 12-15 being generally sufficient to attain thematic saturation (18).

2.3 DATA COLLECTION

All participants verbally consented to participate in this study and completed a semi-structured telephone interview with the researcher. Interview duration ranged from 30-55 minutes, with only one interview falling under the 35 minute mark. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. This study was approved by the University of Pittsburgh IRB (PRO14060430).

2.4 INTERVIEW CONTENT

The interview guide created for the pilot study was modified for the current study in order to answer new research queries and to increase interviewee clarity. The interview consisted of questions structured to explore participant's thoughts and opinions about the problems males might face in becoming mentors and their ideas about how to recruit more male volunteers. The interview guide was broken down into two major sections: (1) thoughts and opinions about problems males may face in becoming mentors, and (2) feelings on how to recruit more male volunteers.

The first question in the interview was created to start the conversation as well as gain insight into the thought process and key decision factors that were directly and indirectly involved in the participants' decision to apply to volunteer with BBBSP. Participants were

probed on how they first heard about BBBS, preconceptions about the organization, and communication to others about their decision process. As the first section of the interview progressed, participants were asked to discuss concerns they had when thinking about becoming a Big Brother and how they overcame said concerns. Next participants were questioned about the benefits and difficulties they have experienced as current mentors. These questions were formulated to elicit information that would be beneficial for promotion purposes (benefits) as well as information to compare with perceived barriers (difficulties). Participants were also queried on barriers they perceived to becoming a Big Brother as well as potential barriers for other males in the community to join BBBSP.

The second half of the interview focused on the marketing to and the recruitment of potential male Big Brothers. Interviewees were asked a series of questions concerning current level of knowledge of BBBS outreach and recruitment techniques. Participants were generally asked what information they thought males in the community needed in order to become interested in being a Big as well as requirement techniques that would be effective in getting community males interested in mentoring. Participants were also probed on how they viewed the role of current Bigs in the mentor recruitment process. Discussions revolving around willingness to become involved in recruitment, reactions to being asked for help, as well as barriers that would make it difficult to recruit others were prompted. The full interview script is located in Appendix A.

2.5 CODEBOOK CONSTRUCTION

A modified grounded theory approach was used to construct a preliminary codebook (19, 20). The researcher was sole coder and initiated the coding process by reading the transcribed pilot interviews for emerging themes. The initial codebook was shared with the BBBSP liaison for input on content codes and other code definitions. As the data for the current study was collected, the preliminary codebook was altered to incorporate new themes and content which emerged in the 14 interviews. A final codebook was created containing global, qualitative themes as well as a question-specific coding approach, which is the basis for the analysis of the current study. Appendix B has the finalized codebook. ATLAS.ti software was used for the coding of the interviews and provided tools for analysis.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic information requested of participants included age, education, time as a Big Brother, and monthly costs for Big-Little activities. See the table below for the demographic characteristics of the study's participants.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants ($N=14$)

Characteristics	n
Age (years)	
24-26	2
27-30	5
31-34	4
38-40	2
Over 50	1
Education	
Postgraduate	3
Undergraduate	11
Time as a Big (years)	
Less than 2	5
2-4	5
Over 5	4
Big Monthly Outing Expense (dollars)	
Under 50	5
50-100	7
Over 100	2

3.2 ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

A variety of thematic categories appeared in all of the interviews: main factors which played a role in the participants decision to become a Big (Code Category: Big Decision Factors); participants initial concerns about becoming a Big Brother (code category: Initial Concern); benefits participants gained as a result of their experience (code category: Personal Benefit); barriers the participants faced in joining BBBSP or barriers they felt males in the community might face in becoming Big Brothers (code category: Big Barriers); recruitment techniques the participant was aware of or novel recruitment techniques that were perceived either effective or ineffective (code category: Recruitment Techniques); and lastly, information participants felt males in the community might need in order to become Big Brothers (code category: Recruitment Information). All code categories were nested with category specific thematic and content codes.

3.2.1 Big Decision Factors

The most frequently-discussed factor that influenced the participant's decision to join BBBSP was the program's ability to directly influence youths. Participants tended to note that one of the fundamental reasons they became a mentor was their inner desire to help people in need, give back to the community, and the ability to know they are making a long-term direct impression on one individual. In a typical statement, one participant, said, *"It was something that would have continuous involvement rather than one-off kind of projects or trips, things like that. I liked the idea that it would be longer term; that it would directly benefit a kid in need or however you'd like to put that. I think those factors - being able to directly impact a child was probably my*

biggest driver. [ID 110: Big for 3.5 years]” Another participant shared, *“I was a pretty young professional and I would just spend my time playing video games and drinking beer with my friends. And so, I figured that there was, had to be something else that I could be doing that’d be more impactful in the community. Somehow, I could give back my time, rather than just being lazy. [ID 60: Big for 3 years]”* Participants often stated that they felt the program offered them the unique chance to become a better and or more dynamic individual. During these discussions, the data often seemed to link the ability to help the community and influence a child as way to help the participants ‘become a better person’.

Several participants also noted that they compared the experience they thought they would have with BBBSP to other volunteer organizations: a key positive element of being a Big was their ability to make a direct “impact” on one child for a long period of time. Half of the participants mentioned being directly interested in volunteering their time to help the youth in the community, *“And it was a volunteer experience that I had always been very interested in, especially the opportunity to be able to work closely with the youth. [ID 108:Big for 1 year]”* Participants were not specifically probed on why they were interested in working with youth, but several reasons that were offered by participants included, having been a camp counselor or coach, the drive to mentor young males, and being able to help those growing up in less fortunate situations as compared to their own past.

Interview data also showed that knowing about the support the BBBSP organization could offer a mentor-mentee match played a role in decisions to become Bigs. One participant commented, *“I knew that Big Brothers Big Sisters [City] had the resources to help support a mentorship relationship, you know, one-on-one relationship. So I think the resources available to me, made me feel comfortable that ‘yes, I could do this and yes, I can be successful as a Big’. [ID*

31: Big for 5 years]” Other discussions about the organizations’ structural support and reputation were echoed by other participants. Sharing specific aspects of the program, such as its ability to facilitate long term, individual relationships and its positive reputation in the City, might be wise when developing informational materials as it represents key drivers participants felt had a role in their decision to become a Big Brother.

Another major deciding factor was coded as “Relational Experience.” About half of the participants discussed how knowing another Big greatly influenced their final decision to join their local BBBS chapter. One participant discussed, *“I feel like it was just from her experience and from what she had described to me as just an opportunity where you really get to connect with somebody and become not only this person's 'brother' in the BBBS sense of the word, but really became this person's friend, mentor, guide; and she would share some of the things she had done with her Little Sister. It seemed like she was very genuinely enjoying the experience, not only dealing with the Little, but also working with BBBS as an organization; dealing with the family as well. And she only had a really positive take; she seemed really excited about her experience with it. And that's something which kind of motivated me to search for and look for the same. [ID 108: Big for 1 year]”*

Often times, the Big the participant knew was not involved in the BBBSP chapter, but one in a different state. It seems the specific chapter of BBBSA the participant’s Big connection was in did not matter – just hearing about the rewards and positive experiences of other Bigs (mostly friends or family members) was important to the decision to join the program. This finding might also be influenced by the reputation of BBBSA, lack of relations with Bigs involved in the BBBSP chapter, and lack of negative discussions about the local chapter.

Several participants did not know another Big prior to entering the experience, but did become interested in the experience after having a peer ask them if they would want to become a Big Brother. For example, *“It was about probably two years ago, a friend of mine approached me ... And at the time I was kind of going through like a self-development phase. Um, so he thought I might be interested. [ID 333: Big for 1.5 years]”* In all of these instances, the friend who approached the participant did not wind up becoming a Big. In most discussions about relational experiences, a majority of participants felt that hearing a current Bigs’ personal experience prior to joining the program, being able to research the program with a peer prior to joining the program, or having someone explicitly tell the participant they would benefit from being a mentor was/would be highly supportive to their decision making process in becoming a Big Brother.

Additionally, there were a small number of discussions about having been exposed to the need for mentors and being from similar childhood backgrounds as factors influencing participation decisions. One participant shared his background as an explanation for why he became a Big, *“For me, I grew up in a house where my mother was a single, working mom. My parents got divorced when I was pretty young; I was seven years old. I saw my Dad occasionally. They actually, for a divorce, maintained a pretty civil relationship, but didn't have that male role model in the home. So I understand where these kids are coming from. More than anything, I guess my point is, where I grew up, my community helped raised me. I had family friends that we had gone out together and did stuff. You know, vacations as families. I wanted to pay it forward for somebody else in my free time. [ID 66: Big for 2.4 years]”* Further investigation into these factors could help BBBSP target recruitment efforts to increase

mentoring interest to males in the community who live in or come from ‘disadvantage’ neighborhoods.

3.2.2 Initial Concerns

Overwhelmingly, participants expressed that they had specific concerns about becoming a mentor before starting the BBBSP application process. Half of the participants stated that they did not share their concerns with anyone before the application process (but did eventually share them with BBBSP staff). A smaller number of participants mentioned that they did not know who to express their concerns with, as they did not know anyone who was currently involved as Big. Many participants described personal worry related to being in charge of a child’s wellbeing, knowing age appropriate boundaries in terms of communication (i.e. what is appropriate to share with a child versus peers), and being responsible for letting down the Littles family.

One theme arose with participants who had Littles of different racial background which was coded in the category of concerns. These participants described personal concerns over how strangers, in public places, might perceive/react to the adult-child relationship on outings (e.g. not knowing it’s a Big Little interaction). These feelings were borne out of two distinct concerns, both of which are rooted in perceived societal norms/rules. For instance, one participant mentioned this concern in relation to racial differences, *“Well, one of the big concerns was I’m Asian and my Little is African American. So I guess like that, just the superficial dynamic of having like that situation going on, I was concerned about, you know, about people’s perception. [ID 333: Big for 1.5 years]”* Another mentioned being concerned with how people might perceive the relationship between an adult and child who are not family, *“...I would say you know, just*

being with somebody who's not your family or someone's who not, you know, directly related to you – you know? My concern, early on, was I just want to make sure that this was a legitimate type of situation. It's not, taboo like I said before. I just didn't want anybody to feel like it was an odd thing for a guy to be with a younger boy. And there's just so many dynamics that come with that, that shouldn't exist, but they do exist in our culture. [ID 31: Big for 5 years]” In both of these situations, the participant noted that these concerns dissipated over time with outing experiences.

Similarly, participants were concerned about how the potential Little would perceive them. This is distinctly different from data coded as ‘Concern Internal’, as the participant directly describes concerns about how the Little would perceive them or the match, but not necessarily comments concerning participant self-doubt or abilities. A top concern is how the Little and Little’s family would react to them, as exemplified by this participants remark, *“Yeah...the one concern is that the kid would like me, I guess. That was definitely one of the biggest, because I didn't want to get into this and then the kid was like, ‘I just don't want to hang out with this jerk’. You know? I was just afraid of the rejection, I guess, but it never really came. [ID 104: Big for 5 years]”* Data collected on important information to share with males in the community touched upon how to address this concern and will be discussed in the “Recruitment Information” codes category.

Over half of the participants described concerns about the process of becoming/being a Big. Commitment was the most frequently mentioned, in that participants were unsure about what would be expected from them in terms of type of commitment and time devoted to the match. For instance, one participant stated, *“I guess just how the process would be. Not knowing how much is expected of you. You know? Don't want to bite off more than you can chew...so that was at the beginning, something that I was concerned about. Um, (pause) that was the major*

one. I just, you know, figuring out how much commitment is actually needed. [ID 226: Big for 7 years]” This was not the only concern that was rooted in lack of knowledge or understanding of basic program requirements and processes.

Participants also mentioned having concerns about the match process. Specifically, participants were concerned about not knowing who their match would be, personality differences, and relational chemistry. A typical statement about concern over not knowing who the Little would be is exemplified by, “...concern is you never know who you’re going to get – if there’s going to be any personality clashes and how is the family going to like you. Not knowing who they going to match you with. [ID 339: Big for 2 years]” Another participant expressed, “I was scared that I might get matched up with somebody who would be violent, not in a way that would hurt me, but just in a fighting kind of way. Or somebody who might lie or try to manipulate me. I was scared of that because I don't like dealing with people who lie; I find it very difficult. [ID 989: Big for 1.5 years]”

One participant was not concerned with who their Little would be, but offered concerns with where their potential Little was located (i.e. type of neighborhood). Educating potential mentors on the match process and safety measures taken could assuage such concerns as both the Big and Little/family go through extensive background checks and personality questionnaires.

Concern about personal ability to handle certain situations was mentioned by four participants. Such concerns were centered on the participant’s capacity to handle negative situations that might arise during the match. Concerns ranged from not knowing how to handle environmental situations such as divorce, parental incarceration/legal issues, to the Littles behavioral tendencies (i.e. violence, manipulation) to more general statements such as, “I was afraid of drama, family drama, because I had heard; I didn't know what to expect - where the kid

was coming from, what kind of environment he was in and having to kind of be in that environment...So I guess not really knowing who I was going to be paired up with, as well as what are some of the consequences of dealing with a child who was physically abused by his father or mother. Dealing with those kind of things, at first, had me a little bit concerned. [ID 104: Big for 5 years]”

3.2.3 Personal Benefit

Discussions surrounding personal benefits derived from the participants’ experience as Big Brothers occurred in all interviews, multiple times. Many discussions intertwined various benefits such as various positive feelings, current and future impacts, activity experiences, increased knowledge from building a relationship, as well as career development rewards.

Intrinsic benefits, defined as intangible benefits or feelings of satisfaction, was mentioned by all 14 participants. Generally, most participants mentioned feelings of enjoyment in seeing their Little happy. As one participant described, *“I’d say one of them, is again, the opportunity to really be able to make somebody, who’s not just you; getting to see that person happy...It’s just watching somebody else be really, really happy is something which I thoroughly enjoy. I like seeing that. [ID 108: Big for 1 year]”* Others echoed this ‘feel good aspect’ of being able to make a child happy and have an enjoyable time.

Multiple participants also described intrinsic benefits of the experience as helping to build or expand upon their own characteristics/traits such as growing as a person, becoming more unselfish, and increasing skills associated with responsibility, decision-making and communication. For instance, one participant stated, *“And when I’m with him I am not; boy, I don’t really think I’m a selfish person, but I’m thrifty, because I’m single and I don’t have any*

kids. I'm not married. With him, the unselfish side of me always tends to come out subconsciously. [ID 997: Big for 2.6 years]” Another mentioned specific things he has learned throughout his experience: *“I now have two kids. I have a four-year old and a two-year old, but prior to that, I didn't really know how to, you know, spend time with somebody at that level. With that type of experience, it just taught me how to be a better communicator, to be completely honest with you. I work in the business world and you know, it just taught me a different way of thinking, a different way of communicating, a different way to problem solve. There's a lot of things that come with having a Little Brother that, you know, has been through a lot and has a lot of challenges. So for me, you know, it was character building for me. [ID 31: Big for 5 years]”*

The data highlights that being able to learn from the experience and reap benefits that enhanced the participant's interpersonal toolkit seemed to be highly regarded.

Many discussions that were coded as “Yes Intrinsic”, described above, also had rich examples of why the Big felt that the relational experience was rewarding. Often participants discussed the mutual benefits of building a mentor-mentee relationship which was coded as “Yes Relational”. Such mutual benefits were described generally, and often took the form of statements such as *“As much as I've been able to give to him, I've learned back in return. [ID 31: Big for 5 years]”*

Participants also described the ‘feel-good aspect’ of knowing they are helping out another person and or doing their civic duty to make a difference in the community. Often participants seemed to be hesitant to mention this as a benefit. For instance, one participant described this as, *“I don't think specifically for myself, I've benefited necessarily, but I mean, psychologically I have, I'm sure....I mean, it just makes you feel good about what you're doing when you see that you're like helping anybody - I mean always has a positive effect on you. Makes you feel good*

about yourself and kind of makes you feel you're making a difference in some way. [ID 05: Big for 1.5 years]” This comment and others similar to it has elements of another theme that arose during discussions of personal benefit, and which was coded as “Impact”. For instance, one participant stated, *“To help somebody, to build a relationship with them, and to teach somebody something. I was taught well, and so maybe I could take some of what I learned and help somebody else to become better, help to move them forward into being a teenager and then an adult. That's something they will remember. [ID 444: Big for 5 years]”*

The benefit of being able to positively influence the Little was mentioned frequently. Having influence on or helping the Little expand upon their skills (trust, confidence) was mentioned and often linked to the participant being able to notice such changes due to their efforts as a mentor. One example of this connection is found in this statement, *“Yeah, you feel good about the experience if they ask you something and you relay something back; some good beneficial information and they're actually listening to you. And actually, you actually see them act on it. You know? Sometimes, what's interesting is if you're having conversations about something, you think, ‘are they really paying attention?’, and then it's so funny that they'll say ‘Now [Name]’, and they'll correct you. [ID 28: Big for 2.5 years]”*

Not only having influence, but being able to directly identify it was a frequent benefit mentioned. For instance, one participant remarked generally on the link between influence and benefit in relation to their needs as volunteer, *“I really feel like I'm making a direct impact on one individual. To me, I'm a kind of person; I'm very process-oriented, very pragmatic so it's good for me to kind of see I'm putting time into something that I'd love to see the output; I'd love to see the direct results. So for me, being able to see a direct correlation to my efforts to how it's impacting one individual – it seems really small but it was really big to me. So that's one big*

factor; just the being able to see the instant change in somebody based on a relationship. [ID 31: Big for 5 years]” This type of personal benefit is also linked to data collected about key decision factors and information that should be shared with potential mentors.

Similarly, several participants also mentioned influences they hope to have made or think are possible to make in the future such as, *“More importantly I think if he, [Little Brother], could be a good role model in his life [Future Life], and be a good corporate citizen. You know, always constantly talking about the fork in the road [Participant talks about this with Little Brother]; that he has to make the right decision and that fork has to do with you know, drugs, potentially sex, peer pressure – you’ve got to make the right decision. Your Mom or I aren’t going to be there. But hopefully you prepare them, [Littles], to make the right decisions and that’s the most rewarding thing. [ID 28: Big for 2.5 years]*” Personal benefit of having direct influence, both immediately and in the long-term were frequently mentioned in other conversations about deciding factors and information that is important to share with males in the community who are not Bigs. Looking at the overlap between benefits reaped and information participants feel is important to share with other males could have important implications for BBBSP recruitment efforts. Knowledge of any personal benefit gained will help provide evidence when sharing information with the community.

The “Impact” code often overlapped with the code of “Activities”, as the participants discussed both benefits received and benefits they felt their Little received from certain activities. Activities were discussed as being personally beneficial to the participant in two major ways: 1) partaking in community activities they do not typically have the opportunity to do; and 2) participating in activities out of their comfort zone. One participant described this as *“We’ve gotten to experience a lot of new things because of donations to the organization... We to go*

sporting events and shows and things together. So I guess that's exposed me to, to more of the culture of the city. [ID 333: Big for 1.5 years]" Another stated, *"Another benefit would be that I've seen and done everything in Pittsburgh that there is possibly to do. But especially when I was single, it got me out of the house to do things I normally wouldn't do and kind of out of my own comfort zone. [ID 104: Big for 5 years]"* Participants also described activities as a benefit because they enabled the participants to offer new experiences to their Littles; experiences the Littles might not have otherwise been able to experience.

Feelings of the experiences being able to benefit participants in the future with their own children or families was mentioned by half of the participants. Some participants viewed their relationship with their Little as experiences which might prepare them for parenthood, *"So yeah I benefitted by just, you know, feeling more comfortable around kids. I'm married now and we're going to have kids one day and I feel at least I know a little bit more about what to expect in the teen years. [ID 104: Big for 5 years]"* Another participant mentioned, *"I mean, I guess it kind of gives you (pause); I mean it gives you kind of a sense of what it's like to um; I guess it's a very small sense, but it gives you a glimpse into parenthood I suppose. I mean I think it kind of sounds strange to say because it's not anything like being a parent, but I mean I guess it kind of allows you to look at parenting – or even being an uncle from a different side. [ID 05: Big for 1.5 years]"* Even though comments concerning this benefit were not robust in terms of what specific skills might aid in parenthood, further exploration into this topic might prove to be beneficial when promoting skills mentors could learn from the Big Little relationship.

Participants also mentioned the experience as being beneficial to them because it affords them a specified time in their lives where they can disconnect from other aspects of their lives. For instance, a participant described, *"From that perspective, for me, I have a nine to five job. It*

sometimes gets a little bit stressful, and this for me: I don't want to necessarily call it a relief, but it's something that at the very least makes me excited for the weekends which is when I usually get to see my Little. And it really just provides me with a good opportunity to disconnect and focus on the smaller, fun things in life, I'd say. [ID 108: Big for 1 year]” Four participants echoed the benefits of being able to forget about work and life stressors.

Unprompted discussions about tangible benefits participants derived from being a Big were infrequent, but included building a larger social network from interactions with other Bigs, networking in professional settings, and resume-building. Resume-building was probed frequently by the interviewer, but the majority of participants did not consider it as a personal benefit as they had not sought out new employment since becoming a Big Brother. However, after being prompted about the potential for the volunteer experience to benefit a resume, several spoke about how employers might feel positive about applicants' commitment to the community.

3.2.4 Barriers to Mentorship

The most commonly mentioned barrier to becoming a mentor was time. Participants discussed how males in the community might perceive not having enough time in their schedules to become mentors. For instance, a participant noted, *“I think probably, my guess is the concern about the time commitment. I think that's probably a, a big, a big, big concern because people have so many different things going on in their life. So I think time is number one. [ID 28: Big for 2.5 years]”* Reasons for males perceiving they do not have adequate amounts of time to mentor included family obligations and work responsibilities. For example, *“I mean timing is tough with work and everything with your career. So that would be the toughest thing for me. Again, one of my top two out of the three would have been timing, so timing is tough when there is stuff that*

you have going on. So that would be tough. [ID 444: Big for 5 years]” Perception of time as a barrier is commonplace in the literature and there is nothing the BBBS organization can do about changing their time commitment requirements. Increased education about time commitment responsibilities and testimony from current Big Brothers about their abilities to incorporate their Little into their lives might prove beneficial in helping other males overcome this perception.

Other barriers concerning obligation to the organization and the mentee (i.e. type of commitment; expectations of match length) were discussed, often incorporating the issue of the availability of time. Many participants felt like males might be hesitant to become a mentor due to feelings of being unstable in their life, anticipating having to move due to work, and or fears of letting a child down due to having to end the match. As put by one participant, *“You know it’s different than other volunteering things because you’re dealing with another human being, and a kid like that; especially one that doesn’t have a Dad. They’re so sensitive to people coming in and out of their life. So you feel this obligation like ‘if I get into this, I have to live up to my obligation.’ And that’s a good thing; it’s been a good thing for me, but it’s also really scary because you’re like what if I have to move, or what if he doesn’t like me and all these questions. [ID 104: Big for 5 years]*” Another mentioned, *“I guess maybe making sure you have enough time to commit. The BBBS’ official policy is you are supposed to do a date for at least five hours, every two weeks, I believe. Which has pretty much been the case with us. But I think that might sound kind of intimidating to some people. [ID 989: Big for 1.5 years]*” Feelings about being uncertain about self and location stability were discussed by others as specific reasons males might not be inclined to become Big Brother.

Several participants mentioned age as a factor which plays a role in males concerns over their potential obligation to the potential mentee. One participant described young people as

“flighty,” or in a perpetual state of aspiring to move. This was presented as a barrier because if people do not know where they want to be or continually think they will be moving – they will not be in the mindset to make year-long commitment, let alone multiple years. This barrier is another example of a difficult barrier for BBBSP to overcome. Further investigation into feelings of stability would be beneficial for targeting young professionals or recent college graduates.

Participants also noted that money might be a barrier to becoming a Big Brother. One participant commented, *“I mean, you got to look at the economy and how it’s coming up, it’s still down a little bit. So a lot of people really just don’t have any disposable income at all. So budgeting; so see something like that and they don’t know what type of financial commitment it’s going to take, so they may want to shy away from. So, definitely could be an issue for some. [ID 226: Big for 7 years]”* Another stated, *“Yeah, maybe time and resources and maybe money. I know like, millennials, a lot of us of have crushing financial school debt. It’s up in the air about who pays for what. You know, it’s usually decided between the Big and the parent, who is paying for things. So if you’re driving wherever your Little is located...could be a long way, so just the time and money commitment could be a thing. [ID 60: Big for 3 years]”*

Many participants mentioned that while money could be a barrier, this perception was incorrect. Reasons why money is a perceived barrier, but not accurate, was that even if an individual did not have a lot of disposable income that could be allotted towards match outings, BBBSP offers many free events and activities. For instance, *“Money factor...like it or not...I’m sure if you’re a Big, you know, you don’t have to do expensive things. But it does cost money to go out. I think most people have some kind of an income that do this. [ID 66: Big for 2.3 years]”*

Another barrier, mentioned by several participants, had to do with the entry process of becoming a Big. Mainly, participants discussed concern over the uncertainty of who the mentee

was going to be as a barrier for males. The length of the application process and how long it takes to get matched was mentioned by several participants as a barrier. Strictly speaking, those who mentioned this talked about amount of time to fill out paperwork and interviewing specifically. One participant who noted this barrier also commented on why the process was needed, *“I think even the application process almost makes you not want to do it because it’s such a; it’s tough. It takes a lot of paperwork, which I can understand to protect a child, you know, from abuse or any sort of thing. [ID 339: Big for 2 years]”* Process length was also discussed as a barrier to those who wanted to start a volunteer experience within a short amount of time. Highlighting the reasons behind the application process was mentioned by several participants as important recruitment information to share.

Conversations surrounding barriers to joining the BBBS program did not just involve commitment or structural barriers. Liability was discussed as a potential barrier for males. “Liability” was coded when discussions arose about concerns over being responsible for a child’s wellbeing and worry about perceptions concerning abuse or misconduct. These concerns were also closely linked to gender, as one participant put it, *“You never want to be out into a position where you feel liable for you know, a younger person’s wellbeing and I never want to be put in the position where I was on the wrong side of it, for no reason what so ever. You know? And that’s hard, as a male, to be put in that position. There’s a lot with that. And that was one of my main concerns. I would understand why that would be some concerns for other males. I just think from a gender standpoint, this might be basis, but if you’re a young women and or a women and you’re going into a situation where you have a Little Sister, it just the difference culturally. It just is. You kind of feel it early on. It took me awhile to kind of allow myself to feel comfortable to speaking about it and understanding it. It was dynamic. [ID 31: Big for 5 years]”*

Other participants echoed this feeling of gender stereotypes, *“I feel because one of the things, and this is just something which I am sort of stereotyping from my perspective; and I might be very wrong about this, but I feel like men aren't naturally predisposed to working directly with children. They just don't really; I don't know what the right word is. I feel like it's something that doesn't really make them feel comfortable, especially when working with younger boys. [ID 108: Big for 1 year]”* While these ingrained stereotypes were also infrequently mentioned, discussions surrounding feelings of insecurity in abilities to interact with children were frequently brought up.

Participants spoke often and in detail about how males might have issues around self-doubt and social anxiety and how those were barriers. Emphasis was placed on males not perceiving that they have something to offer as a mentor. One participant stated, *“I think the biggest one is they think they don't have something to offer. They feel like they are just average Joe, like, what could they possibly learn from me? [ID 339: Big for 2 years]”* Similarly, others mentioned that males might not see themselves as worthy role models. As another participant commented, *“Some might not feel like they're really adequate; that they cannot fit the bill. They might feel even; what is the word I'm looking for? That they are not cut out to be a Big Brother. [ID 997: Big for 2.6 years]”* Not knowing what it means to be a mentor or lacking information about who can/should be mentors are major barriers to becoming a Big Brother, and even more basically, a barrier to having self-motivated interest. Why look into something if you automatically think you are not the type of person the organization wants to recruit?

Echoing concerns of self-doubt were barriers about males being concerned about their ability to interact and communicate with young children. Several discussions also included

concerns about males feeling social anxiety and having strong reservations about how to interact with a child they did not already know.

Males' perceptions of their own capabilities was not the only 'real' perception barrier noted. Societal perceptions of male mentors was discussed by multiple participants. For instance, one participant described how being a Big Brother changes people's perceptions of who you are, *"I think just getting over the hurdle of social perceptions. You know, because it is like a really super positive thing, it may come with a stigma. People might be; you might not be able to understand how to handle that when you tell somebody that you're a Big Brother. I don't know, they're idea of who you are immediately changes. So, whether that's good – it's typically good, you know, as opposed to bad, but it becomes I guess apart of who you are. And sometimes people are averted to changing who they are. [ID 333: Big for 1.5 years]"* Others mentioned that volunteering in general is seen as 'uncool' and that males might be self-conscious of partaking in a volunteer experience that is perceived as long term and youth focused. Barriers of self-doubt and social anxiety are also compounded with other barriers mentioned such as negative comments from men's social networks and peer pressure.

Other barriers mentioned are immutable, as BBBSP would not be targeting males who view these as barriers to volunteering: dislike of children; immediate and short lasting time commitment; in jail; or males who participate in illegal activities.

3.2.5 Recruitment Techniques

A majority of the participants stated that they would be interested in helping BBBSP recruit male Bigs if asked by the organization specifically. Interestingly, only four participants recalled being asked to help in recruitment efforts via mass email and there were 18 discussions concerning

knowledge about existing recruitment efforts being made by BBBS. Participants noted that they had not particularly thought about what types of recruitment events they would participate in, let alone what types of recruitment activities BBBS could employ to more effectively engage males in the program.

Overwhelmingly, when participants were describing or commenting on a specific recruitment technique, they also mentioned why it would be effective or not effective. In discussions of why a technique would be effective, many mentioned specific types of information that should be shared. Much of this information will be discussed in the following section. Cost was also mentioned several times in terms of effectiveness; if direct mailings or social media blasts from the organization was a cheap method, it might be worth it to try.

Often print media was viewed as being ineffective when prompted by the interviewer. The majority of discussions regarding newspaper advertisements or direct mailings were brief because participants stated such techniques were ineffective due to low visibility (e.g. most people throw out mailed advertisements; no one reads the newspapers anymore) or seeming not to be authentic. For instance, one participant commented, *“My experiences and what I know of other people with direct mail, I toss anything I don't have much of a connection to or wasn't expecting. [ID 110: Big for 3.5 years]”* One way that direct mailings could be effective is if they were personalized to the person of interest or if a story was told in a mailed pamphlet.

One participant stated, *“I just think that it would be a visual thing. Somebody can look at it and its coming directly to them. I know a lot of people throw away mail, but, I don't know, I think sending out those pamphlets, somebody might read that and say 'you know, let me contact BBBS. Let me see if I can get involved'. It goes back to what I said - if you can get a couple people off of sending out those advertisements to help the kids in the community, I mean, it's a*

success. [ID 444: Big for 5 years]” Several mentors brought up billboard advertisements or magazine advertisements as being an effective way to recruit other males. Overall, it seems that print media such as flyers and direct mailings are viewed as ineffective methods to recruit males into the program.

A great majority of participants felt that the use of social media would be an effective recruitment technique, and some stated it would be much more effective than traditional media (e.g. TV, print, radio, outdoor). Reasons stated for why the use of social media and advertising via the internet could be effective as young males are often on such sites, could target Bigs’ social networks, and could be used to direct people to the BBBS website. Several of the participants noted they were not on Facebook, but felt that it would be effective because technology is often a good way to get information to people and other people they know spend a great deal of time on Facebook. For instance, one participant remarked, *“You know what? Facebook might be a good way to reach out. I don’t have a Facebook site, but my wife does. I go on there occasionally, (laughing), just to see what the heck she’s spending so much time on (laughing). But, that might be a good way for recruiting. I think that would probably be a good tactic...if you could share some kind of a story or something, you know? Some kind of a rewarding story...I think that would be a really good way, versus just advertising on the radio or billboards or newspapers, something like that. [ID 28: Big for 2.5 years]”*

Many of the recruitment techniques discussed involved having the participation of current Big Brothers and Littles. Discussions also focused around holding functions that were social in nature, allowing potential mentors to engage with the organization. In regards to having Bigs involved, many comments were directed towards involvement with word-of-mouth activities (i.e. sharing stories, experiences verbally), social media postings and participation in

social events. Bigs involvement was seen as beneficial to recruitment efforts because as they are not paid staff, they would appear more trustworthy to a potential mentor, and they have personal experiences to share concerning interactions with the organization and Littles.

Several participants mentioned that BBBSP could expand upon events they already have in place for Bigs and Littles by including individuals who are interested in becoming Bigs. For instance, one participant described how BBBSP could invite interested community members to join for the last part of the BBBSP picnic to help provide males with a better picture of what it would like to be a Big. Other participants had similar comments regarding why it is important for males to be able to see Big Brothers and Little Brothers interact. One participant stated, *“In the right setting, maybe bring a Little or two so that they can actually see what an example of one of the kids that's involved. I think wondering who you are going to get matched up with and what they're going to be like is probably one of the biggest question marks about doing the whole thing....And if they see a real example of that, and it's a kid that they would like to connect with, I think that would take away a lot of reservations. [ID 110: Big for 3.5 years]”*

Similarly, participants mentioned that being able to have specific events for potential mentors to interact with Littles would be effective, *“A way to maybe break that barrier down is for, and I don't know what the exact answer is, but a way for them to almost try or have an experience; to see if it's something that they, you know, that they feel that would be something that they want to do.....So, so maybe like giving examples. So maybe, you know, maybe males like to do, let's say they like to go to a basketball game, or maybe they like to; maybe we put on a charity golf event and the Little Brothers would participate. Someway for people that are considering it to interact without the initial commitment. [ID 28: Big for 2.5 years]”*

Some participants expressed the desire to be able to take a friend along with them to free sporting events provided by the organization, so they could show a male peer what the experience was like. Another noted, *“Other ways I think are...I think we talked about. Having groups of potential Bigs have outings. I think the basketball thing is a good idea; ice skating, or whatever, with potential Bigs, just to get them around little kids. Just to reaffirm that these kids aren't biting, they're not some evil, crazy demons; everything is okay. They might even have a good time. (Laugh). [ID 66: Big for 2.3 years]”* Throughout many of these discussions, having Littles present was considered an important way to allow males to see what Littles are like and what the relationship dynamic is between Big Brothers and Little Brothers.

Social engagements that were directed towards adults only were also discussed frequently. Overall, these discussions focused on hosting events that were adult friendly (i.e. no Littles; alcoholic beverages) and more informally associated with the organization as an effective methods to increase male involvement with BBBSP. For instance, one participant described such an event: *“Anyway, so I think if there was a big event, like that. Somehow like Big Brothers is putting on a fun event; um, ‘come hang out with your friends’ and you get other people to talk about and recruit. Or Bigs talk about it and invite their friends. Maybe not necessarily have it be; label it a recruiting event, but just like ‘Summer BBQ at the Park- Free food and booze’. That always attracts people. [ID 60: Big for 3 years]”* Other participants had the same sentiment of able to invite friends or other couples to adult centered functions, but preferred themed parties.

As only two mentors stated they did not think that Big Brothers had a role to play in mentor recruitment, this seems to be a viable option. One of these participants discussed how he would like to be involved, and was involved with word-of-mouth advertising. The other participant stated, *“I want to say yes, but that would be hypocritical because I honestly do not*

think so [ID 104: Big for 5 years]” and discussed aspects of his job that would make extra commitments highly difficult.

Lastly, another frequently discussed recruitment technique was coded as “Word-of-mouth”. Participants noted three things about word-of-mouth advertisement: 1) it is one of the only existing recruitment techniques they had knowledge of, *“So I think it’s just word-of-mouth. A lot of people who I’ve talked to at work and also to customers, when I tell them the story, they’re like, ‘yeah, actually I’ve been a Big Brother too.’ So its word-of-mouth, man. I don’t really see it advertised anywhere in the media. [ID 997: Big for 2.6 years]”*; 2) they are currently involved with this technique, *“Yeah, I do some. I am a salesmen by trade, so I try to put that hat on if the timing is appropriate. And what I try to do is I try to just kind of share some stories, some success stories...You know, with them that hopefully they’ll want to know a little bit more about the association. So that’s, that’s kind of how I kind of do it if somebody is kind of trying to figure out, you know, what they want to do in life from a volunteer standpoint, and try to share the benefits or the rewards of, of; and that there is a big need for this and the organization is really great. [ID 28: Big for 2.5 years]”*; 3) it is effective as a technique, *“but I think that really, the big thing that works, is like basically really word-of-mouth. Like sharing more experiences more, with as many people as you can. Almost have to be personal to recruit, because it’s almost has to be one on one basis. I think that’s most successful then mass media. [ID 339: Big for 2 years]”*

Other recruitment efforts mentioned briefly were hosting information sessions or question answer booths, use of celebrity advertisement, utilizing existing structures of other organizations (e.g. volunteer speed dating) and interviewing Big Brothers.

3.2.6 Recruitment Information

The data gathered about information males in the community might need in order to become Big Brothers was insightful for ways to overcome certain barriers and warrants further exploration. Most importantly, discussions coded as “Testimonials” shed light on ways in which BBBSP can bolster their male recruitment and reassure individuals who are on the fence about becoming a Big. Generally speaking, participants felt that hearing Bigs experiences about the program would get males excited about the experience and at the same time alleviate concerns or potential issues they felt were preventing them joining the program. One participant referred to his own experience stating, *“I feel like I was more interested in hearing from people who had done the Program as Bigs, than I was interested hearing from somebody who works in an administrative position at the Program, telling me how it was going to be. [ID 989: Big for 1.5 years]”*

Another expressed a similar feeling, *“I’d have to say being able to not only share information about the Program itself, but also really being able to hear testimonials from other males about their experiences with the Program, I believe is a huge benefit. I wish I could have heard from a close friend or from somebody who is as interested in this as I am, being able to gain their experience and hear ‘okay fine, it was a little bit awkward at first, but, things got better and now we’re best buds’. [ID 108: Big for 1 year]”* When asked what type of information would be beneficial to share, participants responded with comments about highlighting emotional and fun aspects of mentoring, experiences with the program, activities with the Littles, and the importance of individual relationships. It was noted by one participant that it often depends on who you are talking to about what experiences will resonate.

Providing males in the community with information about specific resources was also discussed frequently. Important resources the organization should share include BBBSP

sponsored events, availability of free sporting event tickets, and organizational support. Having the support of a Match specialist was mentioned several times as being very beneficial, as one participant described, *“I think it would seem less daunting and potentially more of an opportunity for young men and men in general to get involved because they wouldn’t feel completely kind of on an island in terms of developing a relationship. [ID 31: Big for 5 years]”* Such information might also serve to alleviate financial concerns and concerns about not knowing what to do/how to communicate with Littles.

Often incorporated in discussions coded as “Testimonials” and “Resources” was the code “Personal Reward”. Here mentors comments were coded as such when they mentioned sharing the fun aspects of being a Big, choosing the outings, and learning new things you did not know before. Other participants mentioned it would be important to share that that even though the time commitment sounds intense, it really is not. A couple of participants also felt it was important to share that the application process was not as difficult as it seems, and that having a current Big explain what steps to take would ease the minds of some males.

Several participants emphasized the significance of the organization, with one participant stating, *“So many famous people, a lot of celebrities, a lot of athletes, a lot, of known individuals are part of the BBBS organization across the country. And so that's something that's not just for local people, or a person of a certain status, but everyone is involved in BBBS regardless of gender or economic status, or race. It's all inclusive. [ID 997: Big for 2.6 years]”* Others who had similar comments also noted it was important to share that all types of people can be Bigs and that this information might help males believe they are capable of being a mentor or role model.

3.2.7 Summary of Code Categories

In Table 2 below, is a summary of the code categories from the codebook and the results of the interviews.

Table 2. Summary of Code Categories

Big Decision Factors	Factors which played major roles in these participants decision to become Big Brothers were: hearing the real experiences Bigs have; knowing that organization provides the opportunity and structure to support a one-on-one relationship with a youth; and understanding the direct impact of time spent volunteering.
Initial Concern	Concerns participants had before entering the program, included concerns about being in charge of a child's wellbeing, public perceptions of the adult-child relationship, program expectations, the match process, and uncertainty concerning ability to handle negative situations that might arise.
Personal Benefits	Data concerning personal benefits derived from the Big Little experience (i.e. positive feelings about self, increased skills, seeing positive effects on Littles etc.) hold great potential for connecting decision factors and what information is important for males in the community to know to increase interest in becoming a Big Brother.
Barriers to Mentorship	Key barriers to becoming a Big Brother include fears of breaking obligations due to moving, entry process length, financial status, liability for a child's wellbeing, perceptions on qualities needed to be a mentor, self-doubt, social anxiety, and negative peer/social opinions.
Recruitment Techniques	The overwhelming sentiment was that the involvement of Bigs in recruitment or sharing of testimonials would increase the effectiveness of many recruitment techniques. Similarly, facilitating a snap shot of what a Big Little interaction is like through social functions was regarded highly as an effective technique. The use of social media and word-of-mouth were discussed frequently as being effective techniques, especially in comparison to billboards, mass mailings, newspapers, and TV/radio ads.
Recruitment Information	Important information participants felt males in the community need to know: benefits of being a mentor; experiences with the program and Littles; importance of individual relationships; free activities and events; support of the Match Support Specialist; Big diversity; and sentiments surrounding that the obligation is not a daunting as it sounds.

4.0 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

4.1.1 Race/Ethnicity

Participants were sampled to ensure that seven Caucasian and seven Non-Caucasian Big Brothers were interviewed to ensure equal representation on potentially unique insights as to barriers males of one race or another might face. Although seven participants in one group is not sufficient for thematic saturation, all quotes were analyzed to see if any themes or specific content arose more frequently or appeared to be more salient in responses given by members of each racial category. One theme arose with participants who had Littles of a different racial background-- concern about how people would perceive interactions between an adult male and a child of a different races. Further research on how perceived public perception of the racial make-up of the mentor-mentee match may shed additional light on how this concern affects males' interest in becoming a Big Brother.

4.1.2 Mentoring Decisions

Being able to hear real-life experiences of Bigs and the opportunity to develop a one-on-one relationship with a youth were two major factors that influenced participants' decisions to become mentors. The importance of communication with current Bigs, whether as testimonials or conversations, was a theme throughout the interviews. This type of interaction was also

discussed by participants as a way for males in the community to overcome initial concerns. Having Bigs share their personal experiences with interested males would be a valuable way to bridge the gap on what participants felt were benefits mentors received (i.e. positive feelings about self, increased skills, seeing positive effects on Littles etc.), and what information participants felt males in the community would need to know to become interested in mentoring (i.e. benefits of being a mentor, experiences with the program and Littles, importance of individual relationships, free activities/events, match support specialist, Big diversity, and sentiments surrounding that the obligation is not as daunting as it sounds). As talking to current Bigs and hearing firsthand accounts of match experiences were often discussed as an important decision factor to join the BBBSP program, this analysis suggests this would be an effective recruitment mechanism.

Being able to have positive experiences and enhancing their interpersonal toolkit were benefits that participants highly emphasized. The ability to develop a one-to-one relationship with a youth and to see a direct impact of time spent volunteering was another commonly mentioned motivation for volunteering. Personal Benefit data supported both this expectation and result. These linkages provide evidence that expected rewards/experiences, primary decision factors, were indeed experienced during the match and discussed as benefits. Given these findings, it would be highly beneficial for BBBSP to market personal benefits, rewards, and the type of experience offered by BBBS as a way to increase interest in mentorship in males in the community.

4.1.3 Barriers/Concerns

Barriers surrounding self-doubt and personal abilities to interact/communicate with Littles was also discussed often. Feelings of inadequacy or skepticism about role model ability is a barrier that BBBSP could try to ameliorate. Having such a diverse pool of mentors provides BBBSP with the necessary stories to share with males in the community to help change perceptions of what qualities one needs to possess in order to be a mentor. Using this finding in conjunction with the communication finding discussed previously, it would be constructive for BBBSP to provide current Big Brothers with recommended “recruitment” talking points. Deriving these talking points from decision factors, concerns, barriers and recruitment information data, will help support Bigs engage in word-of-mouth recruitment and provide them with talking points that might resonate with a variety of potential male mentors. Officially encouraging word-of-mouth recruitment might be beneficial for BBBSP, as this is a cost/time effective recruitment technique and the data from this study supports the idea that potential mentors might prefer to receive information from someone who is currently a mentor. Another study would be needed to confirm this.

Discussions surrounding initial concerns the participants had before becoming Big Brothers often connected with self-questioning about their ability to handle Littles’ behaviors (violence, manipulation), or environmental situations such as divorce and parental incarceration. One way BBBSP could try to minimize these concerns is to make potential mentors aware of current structural supports designed to help mentors navigate potentially harmful and negative situations that arise in their Littles’ lives. It would also be advantageous for BBBSP to partner with social work agencies to provide training relevant to working with youth.

Self-doubt and concern about Bigs ability to handle life situations that might arise in the Littles life has additional program change implications for BBBSP. Programming about protective strategies concerning youth social-decision making around sexual interactions, drug/alcohol consumption, and negative behaviors (e.g. bullying, fighting, and theft) could strengthen mentors perceptions about their mentoring abilities. BBBSP could also use this programming in their informational advertisements to address concerns/barriers males in the community face such as ability to handle negative situations and self-doubt. Such programming has the additional potential to have positive effects on mentors' actual ability to promote positive youth health outcomes.

As majority of the monetary barriers discussions ended with it not being a 'real' barrier; BBBSP might try to advertise average costs of outings per month so that potential volunteers may accurately gauge monthly costs. BBBSP might also market free events and activities as a way to help reduce personal mentor costs over the year. Sharing information that Bigs can build a positive and influential relationship with a Little, at low cost to personal bank accounts, would be advantageous.

Mentoring provides youths with skills and frameworks to facilitate and empower healthy decision making, which can influence their life-course as well as the community's health. Ensuring that potential mentors understand the needs, the benefits, and mechanisms to overcome concerns/barriers will help mentoring programs recruit more mentors. As mentor recruitment and commitment increases, the more opportunities children in the community will have to engage in a mentor-mentee relationship.

4.1.4 Limitations

There are two major limitations to this current study. Current Big Brothers provided key insights as to what factors played a major role in their decision to become a Big, initial concerns they had before joining the organization, what personal benefits they have reaped from the experience, and what recruitment techniques/information they think would be helpful to bolster Big Brother recruitment in the Pittsburgh community. As these Bigs have all been in the program for over a year, all discussions relied on the participant's memory to identify the factors that played a role in their decision to become a mentor, concerns they had before joining the program, and barriers they faced in becoming Big Brother. As such, there is potential for recall bias.

Another limitation to this research is that the participants who were interviewed were the first 14 Bigs to express interest in the study. Although all Bigs, who received invitations to join the study, were randomized from all eligible male Bigs, the Bigs who accepted participation might view their role as mentors differently than other Bigs as they actively sought participation in the study and therefor might be more involved with the organization. However, it is unclear how this factor would bias responses, if at all.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this data, BBBSPP could successfully engage more males in the community by developing recruitment techniques that:

Provide/Involve direct interaction with current Bigs. One of the most central themes that arose out of the data was that of self-doubt. Participants felt that males in the community

might perceive themselves as unworthy or unfit to be Big Brothers. Concerns and perceived barriers about the match process, program obligation, not knowing what it means to be mentor and monetary commitments, were also discussed frequently. Even though the majority of participants did not share such concerns with anyone before the application process, some noted that they would have if they had known someone who was a current Big. Other participants who knew a Big, prior to entering the program, discussed how hearing the Bigs experiences played a major role in their decision. As many participants discussed the importance of having Big Brothers involved in recruitment techniques because they could share their experiences with interested males, it is reasonable to assume that such an opportunity would allow for personalized discussions surrounding concerns/perceived barriers or alleviate feelings of self-doubt..

Involves Littles. Even though only several participants directly mentioned that Littles should be involved, there were many discussions surrounding how being able to see how Big Brothers and Little Brothers interact would help make the mentor process less intimidating for males. Enabling males in the community to see the match experience in action, could help them overcome concerns about the type of child that is in the program and their own abilities to interact/communicate with youths.

Contains a social component. For events that are not involving Littles, it would be beneficial to ensure that there is a good mix between existing Bigs and those who are interested. Participants often noted that mixed gendered events would be best and less intimidating for males. Making the event less formal and playing up that Bigs will be there, and not necessarily staff, might encourage other community members to attend by allowing them not to feel obligated or pressured into joining. Events that allow for people to come and go as they please

and include alcoholic beverages was seen as a way to make events seem less formal. Some participants also commented that it would be beneficial if they were able to invite friends to more intimate outings with their Little as opposed to larger recruitment events. Providing an extra ticket to a sporting event or other cultural event might encourage Bigs to bring along a friend to witness the match experience.

Disseminates information utilizing the Internet and Bigs' social networks. Many discussions stressed the importance of Bigs sharing their personal stories and experiences. One way to do this would be to encourage Bigs to share stories about their outings on their Facebook or tweet about upcoming Big Little events/fun activities they are going to do with their Little. Clarifying what information is allowed to be shared on social media would be highly important, as some participants noted not being able to post pictures of their Littles online as a barrier. If BBBSP wanted to boost word-of-mouth recruitment, they might consider setting up a contest or prize system for Bigs who successfully encourage or support an individual to initiate the application process.

Incorporates information about specific benefits and entry information. The opportunity BBBSP provides to develop a one-to-one relationship, in which the mentor can directly see the effects they are making, was mentioned as both a key decision factor and as a personal benefit gained. Sharing or marketing the structural benefits (e.g. free events/tickets; the match support specialist) could alleviate concerns about having a successful match, not knowing how to handle certain negative situations that might arise in the Littles life, and being “out on an island” in terms of thinking of activities or having to spend lots of personal money. Highlighting these program aspects, in conjunction with detailed process information, might increase confidence.

Personally asks Bigs to participate. All but two Bigs said that they would be more than happy to participate in recruitment events (e.g. Q & A sessions, social/sporting events, word-of-mouth) if they were personally asked by a BBBSP staff member or a board member. Many noted that personalized emails would make them feel like the organization really wants them to participate and would increase feelings of importance.

Create a word-of-mouth guide. Creating a simple guide of things that might be important to share with others, about being a Big and the BBBSP program, would be highly beneficial to word-of-mouth recruitment. Data from this study would greatly assist in the creation of this guide. The purpose would be to provide Bigs with a resource/cheat sheet on what types of things they might want to talk about/are important to share with other community members. This guide might also provide current Bigs with suggestions of information to share, that they might not have thought about (e.g. the support the match support specialist provides).

4.2.1 Suggestions for Future Research

Interview data uncovered that knowledge of the need for mentors and having similar childhood background might be two key factors, not fully explored in this analysis, that influence males' decisions to become Big Brothers. Future research should address how influential these factors are in mentor decision making as well as how organizations can capitalize on this knowledge to increase male mentorship interest in neighborhoods that are 'disadvantaged.'

Additional qualitative work should evaluate how the racial make-up of Big-Little matches influences concerns or barriers to males joining the organization, a factor that was mentioned by several participants of this study. Further investigation could illuminate ways in which BBBSP can alleviate concerns of social perception surrounding race differences and non-

biological adult-child interactions. Research should also be conducted on how mentors' benefits and rewards gained from the mentor-mentee relationship affect their community's health in terms of drug/alcohol consumption, negative behaviors, and sense of worth/connectedness. Research focusing on how mentorship benefits communities could provide another tool for public health and community advocates to address pressing issues.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Hello, my name is [state name] calling from the Males as Mentors: A Qualitative Assessment of Volunteer Recruitment study. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview, and as a fellow Big, I appreciate it! This research study was designed to help Big Brother Big Sister Greater Pittsburgh (BBBS) become even more effective at reaching/recruiting male volunteers in the community.

The purpose of our phone call today is to get your thoughts and opinions about problems males may face in becoming mentors and your feelings about how to recruit more male volunteers. The interview should last about 35 minutes and will be audio-recorded. Once the interview is completed, I will transcribe, or type out, the audio file and the audio-recording will be destroyed. Please know that any personally identifiable information, such as your name or anyone else's name, will be removed from the transcript. Each interview participant will be given an ID number, so that your name will not be associated with any of the data collected. There are no direct risks or benefits to you for participating in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from this project at any time. Your decision to participate or withdraw from the project will not have any impact on your status with BBBS or the University of Pittsburgh. These interviews are kept confidential from BBBS and should not impact your status with the organization, however, in the unlikely event that a concern regarding

child safety arises, BBBS will be notified and they will take the necessary precautions to ensure the child's wellbeing.

This study is being conducted by myself; if you have any questions concerning the interview, please contact me at #, or my liaison at BBBS, Mark H., at #. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. To start, could you please tell me a little bit about how you decided to become a Big Brother?
 - a. How did you first hear about BBBS?
 - b. What did you think about BBBS before you became a volunteer? What were your preconceptions about the organization?
 - c. Were there any key factors that played a role in your decision to become a Big Brother? Please specify.
 - i. Probe: What made you want to join BBBS? Please specify.
 - ii. Were there any messaging or recruitment efforts that made you want to join?
 - d. Did you ask or tell anyone about becoming a mentor? Who? What was their advice or reaction?
 - e. Have you personally benefitted from volunteering with BBBS? (i.e. resume building, community engagement, networking, meeting new people)
2. Can you please share with me any concerns you might have had when you were first thinking about becoming a Big Brother? Please Specify.
 - a. How did these concerns affect your decision to become a Big Brother?
 - b. Who did you talk to about these concerns? What was their reaction?
3. Can you please share with me what you think are the top three benefits of being a Big Brother? Why?

Probe for altruistic and or egoistic benefits (resume, applying for jobs, character/skill building, or interpersonal toolkit)
4. What do you see as the top three difficulties of being a Big Brother? Why?
5. What do you see as the biggest barriers to becoming a Big Brother at BBBS? Why?
 - i. Do you think time, money, age, skills, social anxiety, or opinions of the organization impact people's decisions? If so, how?
 - ii. Why do you think some males might not want to volunteer as Big Brothers at BBBS? Can you think of any information that would incentive males to become mentors at this organization?
 - iii. Do you think these barriers are different for different people in your community? [by age, profession, racial/ethnic background, education]

6. How do you talk to your peers about your involvement in BBBS?
 - a. Probe: Do you talk to your family, friends, co-workers about your involvement BBBS?
 - b. What types of things do you talk about? Please specify.
 - c. What is the typical reaction a male friend gives you when you talk about your involvement with BBBS? Has this changed over time?

7. Did you ever volunteer when you were under the age of 18? If so where did you volunteer? Do you currently volunteer at another organization besides BBBS?

Next I would like to talk about marketing to and the recruitment of potential male volunteers.

8. Could you please share with me what you know about BBBS recruitment efforts that target potential male mentors?

9. What information do you think males in your community need in order to become interested in being a male mentor at BBBS? Please specify.
 - a. Can you please share with me what thoughts males might have about being a mentor that would prevent them from becoming a BBBS mentor?
 - i. Probe for: program requirements/expectations, expectation BBBS wants professionals or that the mentor needs to have spendable money

10. What do you think is a mentor's role in the mentor recruitment process?
 - a. Has anyone from BBBS ever approached you to help recruit new male mentors? If no, skip to Question 10B.
 - i. How did BBBS contact you concerning your potential help with mentor recruitment? (examples: email, phone call, in person)
 - ii. What type of recruitment assistance did BBBS ask of you?
 - iii. Could you please tell me what your initial reaction was to this request?
 1. If accepted: Please share what recruitment activities you participated in and how effective they were.
 - iv. What barriers did you think about or encounter while helping to recruit male volunteers?
 - b. If no to Question 10A: How would you react if BBBS asked you to help recruit other male mentors? Why?
 - i. What kinds of recruitment activities would you participate in? (e.g. basketball game with current Bigs and potential recruits, bar event with BBBS staff and Bigs to just talk; sporting events)
 1. What types of events would entice you to join BBBS?
 2. How do you feel about inviting friends to go to BBBS recruitment events?
 - ii. What would be some barriers that would make it difficult to help recruit male volunteers?
 - c. How effective do you think a casual meet-up with a current male BBBS volunteer would be for recruiting new male mentors?

- i. Would it make a difference if a female Big was recruiting or a male Big?
 - ii. Probe: What are the benefits of male only recruitment events? What are the benefits of a mixed Big Sister and Big Brother recruitment events?

- 11. Pretend you are a male in the community who has no mentoring experience. What recruitment methods would be most effective in getting you interested in becoming a mentor at BBBS? How could we best advertise?
 - a. How effective do you think advertising on Facebook or the newspapers would be for recruiting male mentors? Why?
 - b. How effective do you think direct mailings, like a postcard or flyer, would be for recruiting male mentors? Why?
 - c. Please share any other thoughts or ideas you might have about how to advertise BBBS to males in the community.

- 12. Are you currently involved in other organizations or groups? (i.e. churches, boards, sport leagues, young professional groups)
 - a. How would you feel about asking [group] to allow a BBBS representative to share what being a mentor means for 5 minutes before or after the [group]?
 - i. What do you think about the efficacy of this approach?
 - b. What potential difficulties could you see to this? Please specify.
 - c. How would you like BBBS to contact you about potentially helping with this type recruitment?

- 13. How many emails do you get a week? How many do you read? What information is useful in these emails?
 - a. If an email was sent out about a request for recruitment help, what line heading would be effective? Why?

- 14. We are at the end of the interview and I have one question left for you. Do you have anything else that you would like to add about your experience as a Big Brother or better ways for BBBS to recruit new mentors?

APPENDIX B: CODEBOOK

BDF (Big Decision Factors): Any mention of factors that prompted the participant to become a Big Brother with the BBBS organization. Factors can range from personal inclinations towards mentoring, word-of-mouth about involvement, tangible factors such as time, intrinsic feelings, and or marketing campaigns that prompted the idea/or action of becoming a Big Brother.

- **BDF – Relational Experience:** Participant mentions that they know of someone who is/was a Big, and or that hearing a Bigs experiences/their recommendation to join the program impacted their decision to join the BBBS organization.
- **BDF – Low Difficulty:** Participant states that they felt/heard being a mentor was not difficult, which was a factor in their decision to become a Big Brother. Can be co-coded with BDF-Relational Experience.
- **BDF – Time:** Participant states that the time commitment was less than they had originally anticipated, which played a role in their decision to become a Big Brother.
- **BDF – Entry Ease:** Participant mentions that the process to become a Big Brother was not as difficult, or as much of a process as originally thought, which was a factor in their decision to become a Big Brother.
- **BDF – Media:** Participant describes that media coverage, advertisements, promotional materials about BBBS was a factor in their decision to become a Big Brother (TV, websites).
- **BDF – Youth Interest:** Participant mentions a predisposed interest in working with youth populations as a factor that prompted them to become a Big Brother.
- **BDF – Similar Background:** Participant describes coming from a similar background as many of the Little's in the BBBS program as a factor that prompted them to become a Big Brother.
- **BDF – Mentee:** Participant describes having a mentor in their youth as a factor that lead to their decision to become a Big Brother.
- **BDF – Need Exposure:** Participant mentions that they have been exposed to the need to youths in unfortunate life situations.
- **BDF – Comparative:** Participant mentions positive aspects of volunteering with BBBS in DIRECT comparison to other organizations.

- **BDF – Opportunity:** Participant describes the opportunities volunteering for BBBS provides them in terms of impacting a life, self-discovery, having a one to one relationship with a youth, help community and other intrinsic benefits of volunteerism.
- **BDF – Support:** Participant describes positive meetings, interactions with the BBBS staff, and or structure of Big support as a factor(s) that played a role in their decision to become a Big.
- **BDF – Mentor:** Participant describes having served as a mentor in any type of capacity (one to one or group) as a factor in their decision to become a Big Brother.
- **BDF – Key Factor:** Use this code when the participant states that any of the BDF codes was the “key factor” in their decision to become a Big Brother. Note: This can be in response to interviewer question “Were there any key factors that played a role in your decision to become a Big Brother? Please specify.”

PC (Prior Consult): In response to interviewer question “Did you ask or tell anyone about becoming a mentor? Who? What was their advice or reaction?” the participant mentions talking with, consulting with, or seeking advice from other people about becoming a Big Brother.

QUESTION SPECIFIC CODE – DO NOT APPLY GLOBALLY.

- **PC – No:** Participant did not talk to anyone or seek advice from any before becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Yes:** Participant did described talking to someone or seeking advice from someone before becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Yes Peers:** Participant mentions talking to their peers (i.e. friends or social network) about the volunteer opportunity before becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Yes Co-workers:** Participant mentions talking to their co-workers about the volunteer opportunity before becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Yes Family:** Participant mentions talking to their family [i.e. blood-relations and significant others] about the volunteer opportunity before becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Other Want:** In direct response to the question, participant reflects on who they would have liked to talk to about becoming a mentor.
- **PC – Positive Response:** Participant describes positive responses from either peers, co-workers or family about becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Negative Response:** Participant describes negative or concerned responses from either peers, co-workers, or family about becoming a Big Brother.
- **PC – Response Affect:** Participant states that the feedback from either peers, co-workers, or family did affect their decision to become a Big Brother.
- **PC – Response No Affect:** Participant states that the feedback from either peers, co-workers, or family did not affect their decision to become a Big Brother.

BNP (Big Notions Preconceived): Participant describes what they thought about the BBBS organization before they became a volunteer.

- **BNP – Time Commitment:** Participant expresses the preconceived notion that being a Big would be a high time commitment.
- **BNP - Age:** Participant mentions age of mentors or children as a notion they had before becoming a volunteer.
- **BNP - Positive:** Participant reflects on positive thoughts/opinions about the BBBS organization and or the mission served by BBBS and by the mentors.
- **BNP – Monetary Commitment:** Participant expresses the preconceived notion that being a Big would be a high monetary commitment.
- **BNP – Entry Process:** Participant expresses the preconceived notion that the entry, application process would be hard, time consuming, difficult, and or intense.
- **BNP – Nothing:** Participant expresses the preconceived notion that they did not think one way or another about the organization or did not have any preconceived notions.
- **BNP – General Research:** Participant mentions having done research on the organization.

IC (Initial Concern): Participant describes personal concerns they had before they became a Big Brother.

- **IC – None:** Participant states that they did not have any personal concerns before being a Big Brother.
- **IC – Concern Ability:** Participant describes personal concerns that they would come across behavioral issues, home life issues, or any situation involving the Little that they would not know how to fix or help out the situation OR not be able to do anything about the situation.
- **IC – Concern Geography:** Participant mentions concern over the location the Little lives for any reason (safety, distance etc...)
- **IC – Concern Monetary:** Participant mentions personal concern over the cost of having a Little (ex: activity cost).
- **IC – Concern Conversation:** Participant describes personal concern over how to have or hold conversations with a Little.
- **IC – Concern Internal:** Participant describes being concerned with their experience of being a Big in terms of liability, meeting self-expectations, or commonality with Little. Includes fears of outsiders perception of Big Little interaction.
- **IC – Concern Little Perception:** Participant describes personal concern over how the Little or Little’s family would perceive them in the beginning and throughout the experience of outings. Includes fears of rejection or not meeting the families expectations.
- **IC – No Share Concern:** Participant did not share concerns [any IC code] with anyone.
- **IC – Share Concern:** Participant did share concern(s) [any IC code] with others.

PB (Personal Benefit): Participant mentions any personal benefit they have received from being a Big Brother in the BBBSP organization or any other benefits of being a Big Brother.

- **PB – Yes:** Participant states they have personally benefited from being a Big Brother but does not offer further insight into such benefit.
- **PB – No:** Participant states they have not personally benefited from being a Big Brother.
- **PB – Yes Potential:** Participant describes the potential for personal benefit, in general, from being a Big Brother.
- **PB – Yes Resume:** Participant describes that being a Big would/does look positive on resumes.
- **PB – Yes Networking:** Participant describes the personal benefit of being a Big and or having volunteer experience as a positive in networking/work environments/for networking purposes.
- **PB - Yes Other Bigs:** Participant describes being a Big has personally benefited them with building relationships with other Bigs.
- **PB – Yes Relations:** Participant describes the personal benefit of building/having a close relationship with the Little/Little’s family and or the mutual benefits of such a relationship.
- **PB –Yes Activities:** Participant describes types of activities or the chance (includes sponsored activities) to do different types of activities or the fun aspect of activities with a Little as a benefit of being a Big Brother.
- **PB – Yes Impact:** Participant mentions that having impact on a child or seeing the impact of being a mentor is a benefit of being a Big Brother. This includes comments about being a role model, helping the community.
- **PB – Yes Interaction:** Participant describes that the interaction with the Little benefits them in understanding or knowing better how to interact with children.
- **PB – Yes Disconnect:** Participant describes aspects of being a Big Brother as chance to focus on the Little, and not other factors/realities of their personal life.
- **PB – Yes Intrinsic:** Participant mentions that a benefit of being a Big is the intrinsic ‘feel good’ of helping someone else/seeing them happy or that the experience makes the Big a better person or aspects of character building. DOES NOT INCLUDE benefits of increased knowledge about interacting with children.
- **PB – Top Three:** Participant mentions any of the PB codes as being in the top three benefits of being a Big Brother.

CD (Current Difficulties): Participant describes current difficulties they face as a Big Brother.

- **CD – Activities:** Participant mentions the difficulty of coming up with activity ideas and making sure the activities are fun.
- **CD – Scheduling:** Participant mentions the difficulty of scheduling times to be with Little due to conflicting/busy schedules or communication issues.
- **CD – Asking Cost:** Participant mentions monetary difficulties in terms of Little’s asking for participant to purchase things.
- **CD – Personal Cost:** Participant mentions monetary difficulties such as cost of activities.

- **CD – Little Family:** Participant describes situations with their Little’s family that are difficult to deal with or hear.
- **CD – Little Behavior:** Participant describes Little's behaviors or attitudes as a current difficulty to manage or think about.
- **CD –Let Down:** Participant mentions that a current difficulty is feeling like they did, are or will let down the Little in some manner.

BB (Barriers): Participant describes barriers they or someone else have/could face in becoming a Big Brother.

- **BB – Monetary Barrier:** Participant mentions that financial status is or could be seen as barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Behavior Barrier:** Participant mentions that being matched with or thought of being matched with a difficult Little is or could be seen as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Entry Barrier:** Participant describes the process it takes to become involved in the organization is or could be seen as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother. (ex. Process it takes to become a Big could be long or burdensome on volunteer)
- **BB – Education Barrier:** Participant mentions that certain levels of educational attainment is or could be seen as barrier to becoming a Big Brother. (ex. High School Education = work longer hours or need for higher education requirements, ect...)
- **BB – Ability Barrier:** Participant mentions that inability to deal with hard situations or problems is or could be seen as barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Time Barrier:** Participant states time commitment or busy schedules (work) or other family commitments is or could be seen as barrier to becoming a Big Brother. (Can co-code with other BB codes)
- **BB –Obligation:** Participant describes aspects of obligation such as not having life stability to make the commitment needed, concerns over causing harm to child by inability to fulfill commitment made as barriers to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB –Self Doubt:** Participant mentions personal characters or thoughts males might have about their character which would be a barrier to becoming a Big Brother. Ex. Not likable, apprehension working with kids, inadequacy, not having “mentor” characteristics.
- **BB – Social Anxiety:** Participant mentions having social anxiety, nervousness, and or communication anxiety as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB –Age:** Participant mentions anything to due with age as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Geography:** Participant mentions transportation or location of Little as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Liability:** Participant mentions that concern over liability for Little as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Unknown Rewards:** Participant mentions not being informed of the rewards of being a Big Brother as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother.

- **BB –Alternative:** Participant describes reasons why someone might not a fit with this type of mentoring as a barrier to becoming a Big Brother. Ex. Volunteer due to resume needs or does not like kids.
- **BB – Need Understanding:** Participant states that not seeing a need for mentoring/volunteering is or could be seen as barrier to becoming a Big Brother.
- **BB – Other Think:** Participant states that a barrier to becoming a Big Brother is or could be worry how others will perceive, think or change their view of individual based on decision to become a Big Brother.
- **BB – Exposer:** Participant mentions that not being exposed to BBBS or other Bigs is or could been seen as a barrier to becoming a Big.
- **BB – Typed:** Participant describes that a barrier to being a Big Brother is or could be that males have a specific general “view” or image of the “types” of people who are Bigs.

SNT (Social Network Talk): Participant describes how they talk to their social network (peer, family, co-workers) about their involvement in BBBS.

- **SNT – Comfortable:** Participant states they are comfortable talking about BBBS with their social network.
- **SNT – Uncomfortable:** Participant states that they are not comfortable talking about BBBS with their social network.
- **SNT – Negative Feedback:** Participant states that they receive negative feedback from members of their social network concerning their involvement with BBBS.
- **SNT – Other Initiate:** Participant mentions that they will talk about their involvement in BBBS with other initiate the conversation.
- **SNT – Family:** Participant mentions that they talk to their family about their involvement. Includes conversations, questions posed by family members.
- **SNT – Events:** Participant describes talking about events with their Little to their social network.
- **SNT – Low Talk:** Participant describes not bringing up being a Big all the time. Includes concern that others will feel the participant is being “showy” or doing it for “accolades”.
- **SNT – Other Bigs:** Participant shares they talk to friends who are also Bigs about their involvement.
- **SNT – Males:** Participant explicitly describes conversations with male peers about BBBS
 - **SNT-M-Conversation Drop:** Participant describes that when topic is brought up, friends drop it quickly. Includes friends don’t want to belabor point, not interested, don’t ask about it.
 - **SNT-M-Ask:** Participant describes that their fiends ask about their Little.

OV (Other Volunteering): Participant mentions other volunteering they have done in the past or are currently partaking in.

- **OV – Yes 18:** Participant mentions volunteering under the age of 18.

- **OV – No 18:** Participant mentions not having volunteered under the age of 18 or ever.
- **OV – Yes Now:** Participant shares they volunteer at another organization besides BBBS currently.
- **OV – No Now:** Participant shares they only volunteer for BBBS and not another organization currently.

RT (Recruitment Techniques): Participant spontaneously mentions or describes any recruitment technique or marketing method to target males. DOES NOT include recruitment techniques the participant is willing to participate in. First four codes (1 minimum) must be coded with supporting codes indented below.

- **RT – Novel:** Participant talks about a recruitment technique that they spontaneously brought up or the interviewer inquired about.
- **RT – Existing:** Participant talks about recruitment techniques that BBBS is already employing.
- **RT – Nothing Existing:** Participant does not know any current recruitment techniques employed by BBBS.
- **RT – Unsure:** Participant remarks that they are unsure of any techniques that would instill desire to mentor.
 - **RT – Information Session:** Participant describes an information session where Bigs or staff members can answer any questions posed by attendees and promote organization. Includes booths at Universities, Adult Centers, Lunch n Learns, Open House, Panels ect..
 - **RT – Little Involved:** Participant describes recruitment events that involves current Little's to share their background and stories with potential Bigs.
 - **RT – Word-of-mouth:** Participant describes how using Current Bigs to spread the message via word-of-mouth to their existing social networks as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT – Website:** Participant describes BBBS website as a recruitment method.
 - **RT – Print Media:** Participant describes seeing information about BBBS in the newspaper, newsletter or other print media as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT –Social Media:** Participant describes social media use as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT –Bigs Involved:** Participant describes making sure people are interacting with Bigs as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT – 1 to1:** Participant describes having a one on one experience with a Big as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT – Social Engagements:** Participant describes an event that is a social engagement as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT – Existing Organizations:** Participant describes using other organizations to promote BBBS as a recruitment technique.
 - **RT – Celebrities:** Participant mentions using celebrity promotion as a recruitment technique.

- **RT – Male Recruitment Advisory Board:** Participant mentions MRAB as a recruitment technique.
- **RT – Interview:** Participant describes a radio interview of a Big and Little as a recruitment technique.
- **RT – Happy Hour:** Participant mentions hearing a Happy Hour as a recruitment technique.
- **RT – TV:** Participant mentions TV ads as a recruitment technique.
- **RT – Golfing:** Participant mentions golfing events as a recruitment technique.
- **RT –Referral:** Participant mentions incentives for Big referrals as a recruitment technique.

RI (Recruitment Information): Participant mentions any information that should be included in recruitment or marking techniques that would draw in the male audience.

- **RI – Monetary Information:** Participant mentions that telling males that being a Big is not a huge expense would be important information to target. Includes information that expense is up to Big.
- **RI – Commitment Information:** Participant describes how playing to the reality of a Big’s commitment responsibilities would be beneficial. Participant talks about how the commitment is not as “huge” or “big of deal” or as intimidating as it seems. Includes time.
- **RI – Impact Information:** Participant mentions that highlighting the impact the program has on the youths is important information to target.
- **RI – Entry Ease:** Participant describes the process of becoming a Big and states that sharing how “easy” the process is would be important information to target. Includes information about how to become a Big.
- **RI – Creativity:** Participant mentions that it would be beneficial for males to know the experience can be as creative or not creative as Big wants.
- **RI – Little Expectations:** Participant states that sharing information about how Little’s expectations for the program are set by the Big. (ex. Cost and events set by Big).
- **RI – General:** Participant mentions that more information about what being a Big entails would be important information to share, but does NOT mention any specific information that should be shared. Includes prompted responses to “program requirements/expectations”.
- **RI – Personal Reward:** Participant mentions sharing information about the personal rewards Bigs receive, the fun and the personal satisfaction aspect of being a mentor is important information to share. Includes being able to see tangible results from efforts.
- **RI – Need:** Participant states that sharing the need for more Bigs is important information to share.
- **RI – Matching:** Participant states it is important to share information about how matches are paired based on similar interests and or the support the match specialists provide the Bigs.
- **RI – Testimonials:** Participant describes sharing experiences of Bigs and Littles is important information to share.

- **RI – Resources:** Participant mentions that information about supports, planned events, and free tickets from the organization is important information to share.
- **RI – Inclusive:** Participant describes telling people that anyone can be a Big is important and that age, gender, race, being famous, not being famous does not impact ability to mentor.
- **RI – Credibility:** Participant describes making sure people know how respected, credible, or positive general aspects of the organization is important information to share.

PE (Perceived Effectiveness): Participant describes the effectiveness level of any recruitment or marketing techniques.

- **PE – Location:** Participant describes the effectiveness of the technique based on location. (ex. Information session effective in one setting but not in another setting)
- **PE – Interested Parties:** Participant describes the technique as only being effective for individuals who are already interested in becoming a Big.
- **PE – Current Big:** Participant describes the technique as only effective because they/others are already involved in BBBS. Includes statements about ineffective techniques because only will be noticed by those involved.
- **PE – Presenter:** Participant mentions that if a presenter is used as part of a technique, the technique would only be as effective as the presenter/presentation is. Includes comments about presentation such as down to earth, exciting, beneficial, and necessary.
- **PE – Community:** Participant describes the effectiveness of a technique in terms of if it makes people feel like they are a part of a community or not.
- **PE – Reach:** Participant views the technique as effective due to its large audience reach.
- **PE – Familiarize:** Participant does not mention effectiveness of technique but states that it never hurts to get the organizations name out in the community.
- **PE – Visibility:** Participant describes a technique as not being effective due to its low visibility. Includes “junk mail”, “if they see it”, “do not read newspapers”, “throw it away” ect...
- **PE – Not Effective:** Participant states they do not feel a technique would be effective.
- **PE – Effective:** Participant states that they feel a technique is effective.
- **PE – Difficult:** Participant states that they cannot or it is too hard to predict if the technique would be effective or not.
- **PE – Group:** Participant describes characteristics of groups that would make a technique effective or not effective.
- **PE – More Effective:** Participant describes one technique as being more effective than another technique.
- **PE – Personalize:** Participant mentions technique needs to be personalized to be effective.

MRR (Mentor Recruitment Role): Participant speaks to the role of a current mentor in the recruitment of potential mentors and/or role in specific recruitment techniques.

- **MRR – Yes Role:** Participant states that mentors have a role in the recruitment process. Co-code with other MRR.
 - **MRR-YR-Best Position:** Participant explains Bigs have a role because they are in the “best position” to share with other males what is involved, benefits, risks, stories ect...
- **MRR – No Role:** Participant states that mentors do not have a role in the recruitment process. Co-code with other MRR.
- **MRR – Yes Asked:** Participant states they would help if asked by BBBS. Co-code with other MRR.
- **MRR – Yes Word-of-mouth:** Participant describes willingness to help recruited via word-of-mouth.
- **MRR – No Word-of-mouth:** Participant describes willingness to help recruited via word-of-mouth.
- **MRR – Yes Interview:** Participant would partake in a marketing method in the form of an interview between Big and Little OR an interview to share what being a mentor means.
- **MRR – Yes One to One:** Participant would partake in one on one conversations with a potential recruit.
- **MRR – Yes Q&A session:** Participant would partake in a question and answer session.
- **MRR – Yes Basketball:** Participant would partake in a basketball recruitment event.
- **MRR – Yes Happy Hour:** Participant would partake in a happy hour recruitment event.
- **MRR – Yes 5 Minutes:** Participant would be willing to ask outside organization/group they are a member of to allow a BBBS representative to talk to their group for 5 minutes.
- **MRR – No 5 Minutes:** Participant would be not willing to ask outside organization/group they are a member of to allow a BBBS representative to talk to their group for 5 minutes.
- **MRR – No Word-of-mouth:** Participant states they would not partake in recruitment via word-of-mouth.
- **MRR – No Canvassing:** Participant mentions they would not partake or do not think it is a Bigs role to door to door or street canvass for BBBS.
- **MRR – Yes Friends:** Participant mentions they would be willing to ask friends to go to a recruitment event.
- **MRR – No Friends:** Participant mentions they would not be willing to ask friends to go to a recruitment event.

(BRH) Barriers to Recruitment Help: Participants go through barriers Bigs might face to helping with the recruitment of other mentors.

- **BRH – Interest Level:** Participant states a barrier to recruiting would be friend’s interest level in organization or recruitment event.
- **BRH – Friends Left Out:** Participant states a barrier to inviting friends to recruitment events is the friends might feel self-conscious or left out due to not knowing anyone.
- **BRH – BBBS:** Participant describes having a formal BBBS event or a BBBS staff presence at event as a barrier to getting people to come and or feel comfortable. Includes statements about friends feeling pressured or potential of getting roped into something they are unsure about.

- **BRH – Time:** Participant mentions time as a barrier to helping with recruitment events OR time in terms of when the event is held.
- **BRH – Want:** Participant mentions that a Big might simply not want to participate as a barrier.
- **BRH – Nothing:** Participant describes that there are no barriers for a Big to try to help with recruitment.
- **BRH – Resignation:** Participant mentions that it is difficult to talk to someone about the experience because they only know what resonates personally for them, but maybe not the individual they are trying to recruit.
- **BRH – Personality:** Participant describes aspects of Bigs personalities that would prohibit them from recruiting others such as awkwardness and anxiety or difficulty explaining things.
- **BRH – Friends:** Participant describes not having friends or knowing people in the area as a barrier.

ORA (Official Recruitment Ask): Participant states if they have been officially asked or not asked to help BBBS with recruitment OR the participant describes how they would react if BBBS officially asked them to help with recruitment efforts.

- **ORA – Yes Approach:** Participant states that BBBS officially asked them for recruitment help.
- **ORA – No Approach:** Participant states that BBBS has never officially asked them for recruitment help.
- **ORA – Yes Potential:** Participant would participate or would try to participate in a recruitment event if asked by BBBS.
- **ORA – No Potential:** Participant would not participate or would not try to participate in a recruitment event if asked by BBBS.

CIO (Current Involvement with Organizations): Participant mentions they are currently involved with another organization or group.

- **CIO – Church**
- **CIO – Sports League**
- **CIO – Professional Group**
- **CIO – College Group**
- **CIO – None**

E&H (Emails & Heading): Participant describes the amount of emails they receive from BBBS, the amount they read, and what line heading would be most effective in getting Bigs to open a request for recruitment help email.

- **E&H – Amount of Emails:** Participant mentions how many emails a week they get from BBBS.

- **E&H – Amount of Emails Read:** Participant mentions how many emails a week they read from BBBS.
- **E&H – Useful Information:** Participant mentions helpful information from emails.
- **E&H – Line Heading Idea:** Participant describes a line heading.

GS (General Statements): Participant mentions something not covered by other codes.

- **GS – Positive Little:** Participant makes positive statements about their Little and or events the pair participates in. This can be from Big point of view or Little.
- **GS – Negative Little:** Participant makes negative statements about their Little. This can be from Big point of view or Little.
- **GS – Positive BBBS:** Participant makes positive statements about the BBBS organization not covered by other codes. This can be from Big point of view or Little.
- **GS – Negative BBBS:** Participant makes negative statements about the BBBS organization. Includes negative comments about match support check-ins. This can be from Big point of view or Little.
- **GS – Gender:** Participant mentions gender effects of type of recruitment method such as male only events, female lead events, mixed gendered events.
- **GS –Move:** Participant mentions moving to the city at some point in their life.
- **GS – Interest:** Participant mentions anything about inherent drive to volunteer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Grossman JB, Rhodes JE. The test of time: predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring relationships. *American journal of community psychology*. 2002;30(2):199-219.
2. DuBois DL, Portillo N, Rhodes JE, Silverthorn N, Valentine JC. How Effective Are Mentoring Programs for Youth? A Systematic Assessment of the Evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 2011;12(2):57-91.
3. Eby LT, Allen TD, Evans SC, Ng T, DuBois DL. Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2008;72(2):254-67.
4. Grant KE, Farahmand F, Meyerson DA, Dubois DL, Tolan PH, Gaylord-Harden NK, et al. Development of cities mentor project: An intervention to improve academic outcomes for low-income urban youth through instruction in effective coping supported by mentoring relationships and protective settings. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*. 2014;42(3):221-42.
5. Hurd NM, Varner FA, Rowley SJ. Involved-vigilant parenting and socio-emotional well-being among Black youth: The moderating influence of natural mentoring relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 2013;42(10):1583-95.
6. Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Pittsburgh. Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA2014 [cited 2014 October]. This webpage provides information on BBBS support, volunteers, how to enroll a child, events, programs, and partners.]. Available from: http://www.bbbspgh.org/site/c.ahKLIYMIIImI2E/b.8123819/k.F03D/Home_Page.htm.
7. Lakind D, Eddy JM, Zell A. Mentoring youth at high risk: The perspectives of professional mentors. *Child & Youth Care Forum*. 2014;43(6):705-27.
8. MENTOR National Mentoring Partnership. The vaule of mentoring MENTOR. Available from: http://www.mentoring.org/about_mentor/value_of_mentoring.
9. Jekielek SM, Moore, K, A., Hair, E. C., Scarupa, H, J.,. Mentoring: A Promosing Startegy for Youth Development Child Trends: Child Trends; 2002. Available from: <http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2002/02/MentoringRB.pdf>.
10. Rhodes J, Lowe SR. Youth mentoring and resilience: Implications for practice. *Child Care in Practice*. 2008;14(1):9-17.
11. Allen TD, Eby LT. *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*: John Wiley & Sons; 2011.
12. DuBois DL, Silverthorn N. Natural Mentoring Relationships and Adolescent Health: Evidence From a National Study. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2005;95(3):518-24.
13. Hustinx L, Lammertyn F. Collective and Reflexive Styles of Volunteering: A Sociological Modernization Perspective. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 2003;14(2):167-87.

14. Shields P, O. Young adult volunteers: Recruitment appeals and other marketing considerations. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*. 2009;21(2):139-59.
15. Sundeen RA, Raskoff SA, Garcia MC. Differences in perceived barriers to volunteering to formal organizations: Lack of time versus lack of interest. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 2007;17(3):279-300.
16. Haski-Leventhal D., Meijs L. The volunteer matrix: positioning of volunteer organizations. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 2011;16:127-37.
17. Wymer W. Gender differences in social support in the decision to volunteer. *Int Rev Public Nonprofit Mark*. 2012;9(1):19-26.
18. Kuzel AJ. Sampling in qualitative inquiry,. In: Crabtree BF. MW, editor. *Doing Qualitative Research* 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA,: Sage Publications; 1999. p. 35-45.
19. Strauss A., Corbin J. *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications 1990.
20. Strauss A., Corbin J. *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1998.