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Glossary

**Affective Attitudes (AA):** How one thinks one will *feel* during or after engaging in a given behaviour. For example, the behaviour may be perceived as enjoyable or unenjoyable, pleasant or unpleasant.

**Dose:** The duration of the *Go Girls!* program the participants received (reported in average minutes per session and total session minutes).

**Fidelity:** The extent to which the mentors felt they had completed the session according to the *Go Girls!* manual.

**Friend Self-Efficacy (SE):** One’s confidence in one’s ability to make friends.

**Instrumental Attitudes (IA):** Perceived benefits of engaging in a behaviour. For example, the behaviour may be perceived as beneficial or harmful, wise or unwise.

**Leisure Time Physical Activity (PA):** Physical activity one engages in *outside* of school hours (as measured in this study).

**Self-Efficacy:** One’s confidence in one’s abilities to perform a given behaviour.

**Self-Regulatory Efficacy (SRE):** One’s confidence in one’s abilities to self-manage one’s behaviour to engage in activities (e.g., healthy eating, physical activity).

**Significant:** In research, significant refers to the probability that the results are not due to chance alone. For example, the *p* values reported in the appendices of this report specify the probability that the changes in the outcomes of interest (e.g., the girls’ behaviours and thoughts) are due to chance (e.g., *p* = .02 indicates that there is a 2% probability that the findings are due to chance, and not due to the program). Typically researchers use a cut off value of *p* < .05 to determine if a finding is significant or not (i.e., there is no more than a 5% probability that any differences/patterns found are due to chance alone and not a treatment effect). When the term significant is used in this report it is referring to *statistical significance* (and does not necessarily provide an indication of the size of the effect).

**Total Physical Activity (PA) Behaviour:** The total amount of physical activity (including physical activity at school) one engages in over a one week period.

More details regarding how (i.e., the specific questionnaires) and why we analyzed these variables in the way that we did can be found in Appendix A.
Executive Summary

The purpose of this program evaluation was threefold:

1. To examine if girls who participate in the Go Girls! program report changes in: health behaviours (i.e., physical activity and healthy eating), thoughts regarding these behaviours (i.e., attitudes, self-regulatory efficacy), thoughts about themselves (i.e., body image) and relationships (i.e., sense of belonging and friend self-efficacy).

2. To assess if girls’ thoughts at the end of the program predict their physical activity and healthy eating behaviour 7 weeks after program completion (i.e., what are the psychological mechanisms that explain changes in the girls’ health behaviours)?

3. To assess the experience of going through the Go Girls! program for the girls and the mentors.

Outcome Evaluation

Girls reported feeling a sense of belonging to their Go Girls! group. We found that after completing the program, the girls self-reported sustained and significant increases in:

✓ Leisure time physical activity

We also found that 7 weeks after completing the program, girls self-reported significant increases in:

✓ Total physical activity behaviour
✓ Healthy eating behaviour

The girls also reported significant improvements in the following psychological variables (not all of which were significant at both the end of the program and at 7 weeks post-program completion):

✓ Self-regulatory efficacy for physical activity and healthy eating
✓ Intentions to engage in physical activity
✓ Sense of belonging
✓ Friendship self-efficacy
✓ Body image (note that body image also improved during the baseline comparison time)

However, the girls also reported significant declines in:

X Affective attitudes for physical activity (at the end of the program)
X Instrumental attitudes for healthy eating (7 weeks post program completion)
**Mechanism Evaluation**

Findings from the mechanism evaluation indicated that the *Go Girls!* participants’ self-regulatory efficacy, affective and instrumental attitudes and intentions at the end of the program predicted their physical activity and dietary behaviour 7 weeks after completing the program.

**Process Evaluation**

Findings from the qualitative process evaluation conducted through interviews with participants and mentors highlighted the overall positive perception and experiences reported in the program. The participants specifically reported enjoying making connections with the other participants and the mentors, the activities in the program and snacks, and positive changes in their thoughts and behaviours as a result of lessons learned in the program. The mentors also reported overall enjoyment of the program and activities delivered in the program, found the training sufficient and the manual very helpful, and observed improvements in the girls’ thoughts and behaviours throughout the *Go Girls!* program. Both participants and mentors reported the main suggestion for program improvement would be to make it longer (in terms of session duration and number of weeks). Research in the mentoring domain suggests that longer mentoring relationships lead to greater improvements in mentees’ thoughts and behaviours (J. E. Rhodes & DuBois, 2008).

**Recommendations**

- Consider making the program longer
- Ensure schools are ready, willing and able to deliver *Go Girls!*
- Consider providing age appropriate adaptations for activities
- Ensure girls understand that they can share lessons learned in the *Go Girls!* program with important others (e.g., family, close friends)
- Update program manual to provide mentors with evidence-based nutrition and physical activity guidelines
- Ensure mentors provide healthy snacks
Conclusion

Given the importance of improving health behaviours among adolescent girls (e.g., Colley et al., 2011; Pearson, Salmon, Campbell, Crawford, & Timperio, 2011), findings from the current program evaluation suggest that programs, such as Go Girls!, that target health-enhancing behaviour change (i.e., physical activity and diet) through mentorship models and foster belongingness can provide a valuable framework for health promoters.
Project Summary

The overall goal of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Go Girls! Healthy Minds Healthy Bodies program, or Go Girls! for short, among a sample of approximately 350 inactive adolescent girls. Specifically, the main purpose of the program evaluation was to assess the extent to which the Go Girls! program led to changes in the three main program outcomes which are to provide “a mentoring program for girls promoting active living, balanced eating and feeling good” (p. 3, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada, 2006). Drawing from social cognitive theory (SCT; Bandura, 1986) and the group dynamics literature, psychosocial (self-regulatory efficacy, attitudes, intentions, belonging, body image and friend self-efficacy) and behavioural (diet and physical activity) variables were assessed. Examination of the psychosocial variables also enabled us to examine possible mechanisms that could explain any possible changes in the girls’ diet and physical activity behaviours resulting from the Go Girls! program. Furthermore, to gain rich insight into the experience as a program participant or mentor in the Go Girls! program, we conducted semi-structured interviews with girls and mentors.

This report is broken down into the four following sections:

- First we present findings from the outcome evaluation (i.e., does the Go Girls! program lead to changes in the intended outcomes?).
- Second we present findings from the mechanism evaluation (i.e., how does the Go Girls! program lead to changes in the targeted outcomes?).
- Third we present findings from the process evaluation in which we conducted interviews with the participants and mentors (i.e., exploring the experience of participating in the Go Girls! program).
- Fourth, based on the results from the program evaluation, we provide recommendations for potential areas of program improvement.
Procedure

The program evaluation of Go Girls! began in December 2012 and took place in the Toronto, Peel and Thames Valley School districts in Ontario. The project coordinator for the Go Girls! program evaluation was Mrs. Justine Dowd (formerly Wilson) who is a PhD candidate at the University of British Columbia, under the supervision of Dr. Mark Beauchamp. Three hundred and forty-two Go Girls! participants (ages 11-14) participated in the study. Nine research assistants were hired (2 in Toronto, 2 in Peel and 5 in Thames Valley) to assist in data collection across 39 schools in southern Ontario.

Self-report questionnaires were administered at four time points: approximately 7 weeks prior to the start of girls’ involvement in their respective Go Girls! program (Baseline; December 2012-January 2013), the week immediately before starting the Go Girls! program (Pre; January-February 2013), the week immediately after completing the program (Post; March-May 2013), and 7 weeks after completing the program (7w Post; May-June 2013). The initial assessment period (Baseline-Pre), during which the girls did not receive any intervention, was utilized as the baseline comparison period to compare changes during the program (Pre-Post) and after the program (Post-7w Post). In other words, by collecting baseline data approximately seven weeks before the program started, we were able to obtain data from a pre-program comparison group without delaying the start of the Go Girls! program. Furthermore, as a consequence of having this baseline comparison in the same individuals, any changes that occurred during the 7 week time period of Go Girls! could be safely concluded to be as a direct result of the program, not due to natural changes (e.g., maturation) over a 7 week time period. Assessments took approximately 30 minutes to complete. Groups were given the sum of $10 per participant (range from $40-$150 per group) to spend on a mutually agreed upon reward (e.g., a fun group activity or outing).

In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a representative sample of adolescent girls ($n = 12$) and program mentors ($n = 8$) in order to obtain in depth qualitative feedback regarding both the participants’ and the mentors’ experiences in the Go Girls! program. Mentors were paid $10 for completing an interview.
Program Evaluation Questions

We collected both quantitative and qualitative data to answer the following questions:

1. **Outcome Evaluation**
   Do girls who participate in the Go Girls! program report changes in health behaviours (physical activity and healthy eating), thoughts about these behaviours and/or themselves?

2. **Mechanism Evaluation**
   How does the program lead to changes in the girls’ physical activity and eating behaviour? In other words, do the girls’ thoughts and attitudes towards physical activity and healthy eating at the end of the Go Girls! program predict these health behaviours 7 weeks after the program has ended?

3. **Process Evaluation**
   What is the experience of going through the Go Girls! program like for the girls and the mentors?
Demographic Information

The Participants

In total, 342 Go Girls! participants agreed to participate in the study (age range 11-14 years, $M_{age} = 12.24$ years, $SD = 0.80$). Six participants dropped out part way through the study (one because she moved away and the other five did not provide a reason for dropping out). Eleven participants were excluded from the analyses because they were former Go Girls! participants, one participant was excluded because she was unable to understand and complete the questions, eleven participants were excluded because the research assistant accidentally went 1 week early (i.e., data were collected at the end of the 6th session, not the final 7th session) and three participants were excluded because they told the research assistant they “just filled in their answers at random”.

The participants came from 39 elementary or middle schools (41 groups in total as two schools ran two concurrent separate Go Girls! programs) in Southern Ontario. We followed procedures used by Statistics Canada in the 2006 Census and allowed participants to identify all ethnic/cultural groups with which they self-identified (i.e., girls could identify with more than one ethnic group). The largest represented ethnic groups were White (39.2%), Japanese (20.8%), Black (17.5%), and South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani; 9.6%). Eleven other ethnic groups were identified with a frequency of less than 5%.

Program Social Context Check

In order to assess the extent to which the Go Girls! program created the social context as intended (i.e., the girls felt connected to one another), a measure of belonging to the Go Girls! program was administered immediately after the girls completed the program (Post). Scores from the Go Girls! program belonging measure confirmed that on average, the girls felt a sense of belonging to their Go Girls! group ($M = 3.76$, $SE = 0.03$; response range 2.0-4.0; scale range 1.0-4.0).
**Attendance, Dose and Fidelity**

Girls attended on average 91% of the 7 sessions (range 2-7 sessions attended; see Figure 1). Sessions were on average 78 minutes long (range 40-135 minutes; see Figure 2) and total program minutes were on average 534 minutes (range 280-910 minutes; see Figure 3). Mentors reported session fidelity using a scale from 1 (*did not complete any of the planned activities*) to 10 (*completed all of the planned activities*). Across all 7 sessions, average program fidelity was 7.04 (range 3.5-9.29; see Figure 4). However, this is based on a subset of the data (31 schools, 252 girls) and it is possible that the groups that failed to provide these data had lower (or better) attendance rates, shorter sessions (hence no time to complete this form) and/or less conscientious mentors.

![Attendance Pie Chart]

**Figure 1.** This chart represents the number of *Go Girls!* program sessions attended separated by percentage of girls who attended the sessions. For example, 60% of the girls attended all 7 sessions and 25.6% of the girls attended 6 out of 7 sessions.
Figure 2. This chart represents the average session duration separated by the number of Go Girls! program groups. For example, 3 of the groups’ sessions were on average 40-49 minutes long.

Figure 3. This chart represents the total Go Girls! program duration separated by the number of Go Girls! program groups. For example, 1 of the group’s sessions was 200-299 minutes long.
Figure 4. This chart represents the average Go Girls! session fidelity ratings from the program mentors separated by the number of groups. For example, 2 of the groups’ leaders felt the session content covered 3-3.99 on the scale for fidelity (1 = did not complete any planned activities --- 10 = completed all planned activities).
1. Do girls who participate in the *Go Girls!* program report changes in health behaviours (physical activity and healthy eating), thoughts about these behaviours and/or themselves after completing the program?

To answer this question, we collected this information from the participants approximately 7 weeks before (Baseline) and then again immediately before they started the *Go Girls!* program (Pre), immediately after (Post) and 7 weeks after (7w Post) participants completed the *Go Girls!* program. The period between Baseline and Pre served as a comparison period to assess changes in the outcomes before girls engaged in the program. As a consequence of having this baseline comparison in the *same individuals*, any changes that occurred during the 7 week time period of *Go Girls!* could be concluded to be as a result of the program, not due to natural changes (e.g., maturation) over a 7 week time period. Three-hundred and ten girls were included in the outcome evaluation analyses. There were no changes in the girls’ behaviours or psychosocial variables (other than body image) during the baseline assessment period. During this baseline period, significant improvements in body image were found.

**Behavioural Changes**

- At the end of the program and 7 weeks after completing the *Go Girls!* program, participants reported significant increases in leisure time physical activity (see Figure 5 and Table 1).
- While changes were in the positive direction at the end of the program, increases in total physical activity and healthy eating behaviour were only significantly higher 7 weeks post program completion (see Figures 5 and 6, and Table 1).
Figure 5

Changes in Physical Activity Behaviour

Figure 6

Changes in Dietary Behaviour

Note. * indicates the mean score (at Post or 7w Post) was significantly different from the average of the Baseline and Pre mean scores.
Psychosocial Changes

Active Living

- Participants reported being significantly more confident to self-regulate (i.e., self-regulatory efficacy) their physical activity behaviour 7 weeks post program completion but not at the end of the program (i.e., Post).
- The participants also reported significantly greater intentions to engage in physical activity at the end of the program and 7 weeks post program completion.
- Participants reported a significant reduction in affective attitudes toward physical activity at the end of the program. No significant changes were found in instrumental attitudes toward physical activity.

Healthy Eating

- Participants reported being significantly more confident to self-regulate (i.e., self-regulatory efficacy) their healthy eating behaviour at the end of the program but this was not maintained 7 weeks post program completion.
- While changes were in the positive direction, we did not find any statistically significant improvements in the participants’ dietary intentions.
- Participants reported a significant reduction in instrumental attitudes towards healthy eating 7 weeks after completing the program (i.e., these attitudes got worse after completing the program). No significant changes were found in affective attitudes toward healthy eating.

Feeling Good

- Perceptions of body image significantly improved over the course of the Go Girls! program. However, girls also reported an improvement in body image during the baseline assessment period (before they started the program).
- Participants reported a significantly greater sense of belonging 7 weeks post program completion.
- Participants reported significantly greater self-efficacy to make friends 7 weeks post program completion.

These results are displayed in Table 1 and Figures 7-10 below. For more detailed information, please see Appendix B.
**Table 1.** Effect sizes for changes in psychosocial and behavioural outcomes.

*Note.* PA stands for physical activity; SRE stands for self-regulatory efficacy, IA stands for instrumental attitudes, AA stands for affective attitudes, SE stands for self-efficacy. The effect size refers to the size of the difference between the average of the Baseline and Pre scores and either Post or 7w Post scores. Effect sizes were calculated from the $t$-ratios of the coefficients in the HLM output\(^1\) (see Appendix B for more information).

\(^1\) Effect sizes may be over-estimated due to the correction for repeated measures (over time) and the nesting effect of girls in groups (Dunlap, Cortina, Vaslow, & Burke, 1996).
Figure 7  Changes in Self-Regulatory Efficacy

Figure 8  Changes in Intentions

Figure 9  Changes in Attitudes

Figure 10  Changes in Belonging, Friend Self-Efficacy and Body Image

Note. SRE stands for self-regulatory efficacy; PA stands for physical activity; IA stands for instrumental attitudes, AA stands for affective attitudes. Error bars represent standard error. * indicates the mean score (at Post or 7w Post) was significantly different from the average of the Baseline and Pre mean scores. There were also significant improvements in body image from Baseline to Pre.
**Mechanism Evaluation**

2. **Do the girls’ thoughts and attitudes towards physical activity and healthy eating at the end of the program predict their healthy behaviours 7 weeks after completing the program?**

To answer this question we looked at the girls’ thoughts at the end of the program (Post) to see if they predicted the girls’ behaviours 7 weeks after the program ended (7w Post). To be included in these analyses, participants had to complete the questionnaire at both of these time points. Two hundred and thirty-seven girls were included in these analyses.

Drawing from mentoring theory (J. E. Rhodes, 2005; J. E. Rhodes & DuBois, 2008) and the activities described in the Go Girls! program manual, it was anticipated that the Go Girls! program would foster a sense of belonging among the girls to their group. Indeed, girls reported feeling a sense of belonging to their group ($M = 3.76$, $SE = 0.03$; range 2.0-4.0). Furthermore, it was hypothesized that developing this sense of belonging (i.e., an exemplar question is: “I am accepted at the Go Girls! program”) would foster an environment conducive to development of skills to lead a healthy lifestyle. As expected, we found that girls’ sense of belonging to the Go Girls! program predicted their self-regulatory efficacy, affective and instrumental attitudes for both physical activity and healthy eating. These findings are displayed in Figure 11.

In addition, as displayed in Figure 12 and 13 on the following page, we found that the girls’ thoughts about the health behaviours immediately after completing the Go Girls! program (i.e., the ‘Post’ time point) predicted their behaviours 7 weeks after completing the program (i.e., the ‘7w Post’ time point). Specifically, the girls’ self-regulatory efficacy, attitudes and intentions to engage in physical activity or healthy eating predicted their behaviour. As previously reported in the outcome evaluation, the Go Girls! program led to significant improvements in the girls’ self-regulatory efficacy for physical activity and healthy eating and physical activity intentions; these thoughts were all found to be important predictors of their health behaviours after the program had ended.

---

2We also attempted to examine the extent to which program fidelity and dose (i.e., session length) affected the behavioural outcomes. Unfortunately, since we were only able to collect this information from a subset of the population, we did not have enough data to run these analyses. As such, we are unable to conclude whether or not dose and fidelity affected the behavioural outcomes.
Figure 11: *Go Girls!* Belonging Predicts Girls’ Thoughts about Health Behaviours

Note. *Go Girls!* Belonging predicted the girls’ self-regulatory efficacy and attitudes for both physical activity and healthy eating behaviour (separately).

Figure 12: Girls’ Thoughts about Physical Activity Predict Behaviour

Figure 13: Girls’ Thoughts about Diet Predict Behaviour
To answer this question we used a social constructivist\(^3\) approach to conduct one-on-one interviews with both the girls and the mentors to gain a rich understanding about their experience in the program. The use of an open-ended interview methodology allowed the participants to express their interpretation of their experiences in the program in their own words. This procedure enabled us to identify the quality, nature, and range of relationships developed, changes experienced as a result of participation (either as a mentor or mentee) in the program, and collect feedback for program improvement. Twelve girls and eight mentors participated in this component of the program evaluation.

**Girls**

Participants in the *Go Girls!* program reported enjoying the program, experiencing changes in important health-enhancing cognitions and behaviours, and developing meaningful relationships with program mentors and other program participants. From the girls’ perspectives, the main suggested program adaptation was to make the program longer. The results were grouped into themes and categories that are presented in Figure 14 on the following page.

As displayed in Figure 14, the girls’ responses were categorized into three broad themes that relate to the *general components of the program, perceived changes* associated with participating in the program, as well as *suggested program adaptations*. These broad themes were composed of seven lower-order themes and 27 categories. Sample quotes from each category can be found in Appendix D, Table 4.1.

---

\(^3\) A social constructivist perspective was used because Schwandt (2000) suggests that an individual’s learning is facilitated through interactions in a social context. In this part of the evaluation we were interested in the *learning experiences* of the girls and mentors who engaged in the *Go Girls!* program.
Figure 14: Relationships Among Emergent Categories and Themes Identified by the Girls

Categories
- Previous Cognitions & Behaviours
- Initial Discomfort
- General Expectations
- Overall Positive Perceptions
- Processes
- Healthy Living Awareness
- Weekly Snacks
- Enjoyment of Activities
- Description of Activities
- Lessons Learned
- Positive Personal Characteristics
- Created Positive
- Roles as Leader
- Friendships
- Belonging/Bonding
- Shared Lessons Learned with Others
- Felt Like Family
- Psychosocial
- General
- Behavioural
- Relationships
- Minimal/No Changes
- Longer Program
- Keep the Same
- Activity Suggestions
- Change Groups
- Increase Group Size

Lower-Order Themes
- Previous & Initial Perceptions
- Elements of the Program
- Activities
- Mentor
- Social Connections
- Reported Changes

Higher-Order Themes
- General Components of the Program
- Perceived Changes
- Suggested Program Adaptations
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Mentors

The mentors reported a variety of positive perceptions of the program and improvements in the girls’ health-enhancing thoughts and some specific behaviours. The mentors also described their roles and responsibilities in their position, important components of the program, challenges they experienced as a mentor and provided suggestions regarding improvements to the program. The results were grouped into themes and categories that are presented in Figure 15 on the following page.

As displayed in Figure 15, the mentors’ responses were categorized into three broad themes that relate to the program, the participants, as well as being a mentor. These broad themes were composed of seven lower-order themes and 27 categories. There were also two themes that emerged from a small subsample (described by 3 or fewer mentors) relating to both positive and challenging aspects of the program. Sample quotes from each category can be found in Appendix D, Tables 4.2 and 4.3.
Figure 15: Relationships Among Emergent Categories and Themes Identified by Mentors

Categories | Lower-Order Themes | Higher-Order Themes
---|---|---
General praise/enjoyment | Positive Perceptions of the Program |  
Bonding |  
Program Manual |  
Enjoy Activities |  
Environment |  
Good Training |  
General |  
Components of Social Cognitive Theory |  
Description of Activities |  
Recruitment |  
Reasons for Volunteering |  
General |  
Specific Examples |  
Increase Duration |  
Difficult Situations |  
Range of Girls’ Needs |  
Short Duration |  
Roles |  
Responsibilities |  
Personal Style |  
Problem Solving Strategies |  
Co-mentor |  
After |  
During |  
Before |  
General |  
No changes |  
Challenges in Program Delivery |  
Suggested Program Adaptations |  
Characteristics of Mentorship |  
Mentor Perception of Girls |  
The Program |  
Being a Mentor |  
Participants
Areas for Improvement Identified by Girls and Mentors

In the interviews with the girls and mentors, participants were asked if any parts of the Go Girls! program could be improved. Main components of the Go Girls! program that were identified for improvement are outlined below (see Appendix D, Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 for example quotes). Recommendations to address these issues are provided in the next section.

1. Not Enough Time
   - Six out of the eight mentors felt they did not have enough time to run the program (i.e., not enough time in the sessions) as they would like/felt they were supposed to have.
   - All of the girls who spoke about the program duration (six out of twelve) suggested making the program longer (i.e., have more sessions).

2. Need More Support as a Mentor
   - Three of the eight mentors reported that a challenging aspect of the program was a lack of support from the school champions, and one mentor specifically identified a need to be able to contact someone within Big Brothers Big Sisters in confidence about resolving issues with a co-mentor.

3. Equipment Necessary for Program Activities not Always Provided
   - Three of the four mentors who spoke about equipment reported that another challenging aspect of the program was a lack of necessary equipment for the program activities.

4. Need for Age-Appropriate Activities
   - Three of the eight mentors felt that some of the activities in Go Girls! were too juvenile for older groups (e.g., activities would be appropriate for Grade 6 girls but not for Grade 8 girls).
Areas for Improvement Identified by Program Evaluators

Notwithstanding the numerous positive outcomes observed in the program evaluation, through the process of designing and conducting the program evaluation, Justine Dowd and Drs. Beauchamp and Jung identified several areas for program improvement. Recommendations to address these issues are provided in the next section.

1. Mentor’s Provision of ‘Healthy Snacks’
   - Mentors are asked to provide healthy snacks during program sessions. Our data indicated that the snacks provided may not meet current evidence-based recommendations for healthy dietary choices:
     - One Go Girls! program participant described how much she enjoyed one of the healthy snacks her mentors brought in for her group. She described a cinnamon spread and reported she loved to just eat this ‘healthy snack’ by itself (which is a condiment composed of primarily sugar and saturated fat from margarine\(^4\)).
     - One mentor spoke about a large quantity of cupcakes she would bake and bring in for the girls, specifically noting that “…it was really to the point where you bake 50 cupcakes for 10 kids, why am I baking 50 right I don’t know…”.
   - If these comments can be generalized to most groups (we are unable to ascertain this), there appears to be confusion regarding what constitutes a healthy snack.

2. Program Manual – Healthy Eating and Physical Activity Recommendations
   - Upon reviewing the Go Girls! program manual, we identified several instances where the dietary and physical activity information could be updated based on current evidence. For example, please see:
     - Page 71 – recommended consumption of juice, tortilla chips, pretzels, popcorn, cookies and/or granola bars for balanced snacks
       - Recent correlational evidence suggests that adolescents who consume high levels of ultra-processed foods (e.g., cookies, granola bars, chips, etc.; cf. Monteiro, Levy, Claro, Castro, & Cannon, 2010) are more likely to be diagnosed with metabolic syndrome (Tavares, Fonseca, Garcia Rosa, & Yokoo, 2012).
       - In addition, Wojcicki and Heyman (2012) recommend the “elimination of fruit juice consumption in favour of whole fruit for children” (p. 1630).

\(^4\) http://caloriecount.about.com/calories-imperial-cinnamon-spread-i331905
Moubarac and colleagues (2013) conducted an analysis of the typical Canadian diet and found high consumption of ultra-processed foods and recommended that diets should be based on primarily minimally processed foods. Thus, it is recommended that Go Girls! program mentors encourage girls to consume minimally processed foods (e.g., creative variations of vegetables and fruits).

- Page 121 – physical activity doesn’t have to be hard to improve your health…put on your favourite music and move for 10 minutes whatever way you like
  - For a detailed explanation of why this suggestion should be updated, please see Recommendation 6 in the following section.

- Page 122 – make time for breakfast – grab a piece of pizza and a juice box if you are in a hurry
  - For a detailed explanation of why this suggestion should be updated, please see Recommendation 5 in the following section.

- Page 164 – eating several small meals throughout the day will boost energy and help you feel more energetic and less hungry.
  - While the current evidence remains controversial regarding the ideal frequency of meals for health benefits (for a review of the current evidence see McCrory, Howarth, Roberts, & Huang, 2011), it is suggested that healthy eating habits can be taught to youth by encouraging them to listen to their bodies through mindful eating. For example, findings from a recent study indicate that obese adolescent girls who were taught how to eat mindfully through a 6 week intervention, experienced significant sustained reduction in their body mass index (BMI) 4 weeks after completing the study (Daly, 2013).

3. Fast Food Given as Reward for Participation in this Program Evaluation

- Contrary to guidelines provided by the program evaluators and Toronto area Go Girls! program directors, girls at some of the schools in the Toronto school board district were allowed to spend their $10 compensation for participating in the study on fast food. Receipts were submitted for purchases from fast food venues such as A&W and Pizza Pizza.
4. Understanding of Confidentiality

- In the interviews with the Go Girls! program participants, the interviewers asked the girls if they had shared what they had learned in Go Girls! with other people. Nine of the girls reported that they had indeed shared what they had learned in the program with others (e.g., friends who hadn’t completed the Go Girls! program and family members). However, two of the girls said they did not share what they had learned in the Go Girls! program with others because they thought everything in Go Girls! had to be kept confidential.
**Recommendations**

In line with the *Go Girls!* program mandate, findings from the outcome evaluation suggest the *Go Girls!* program is effective as girls who completed the program reported sustained elevated levels of physical activity and healthy eating, 7 weeks after program completion. Furthermore, girls reported improvements in important cognitions as well (e.g., self-regulatory efficacy, behavioural intentions). Thus, the overall activities involved in the *Go Girls!* program are effective in targeting adolescent girls’ health-enhancing cognitions and behaviours. However, as outlined in the previous section, several areas of the program could be improved. Recommendations to address these areas are provided below.

**Recommendation 1: Consider Making the Program Longer**

- The main concern identified by the majority of the mentors was a lack of time to run the program. Indeed, the *Go Girls!* program is designed to consist of seven 90-minute sessions (i.e., 630 minutes total), but mentors are encouraged to secure 2 hours for each session to ensure adequate time to deliver program. Findings from this program evaluation indicated that on average, program sessions were 78 minutes long and overall time in the session was approximately 534 minutes. Mentors reported that on average they completed 7.03 (on a scale of 1 = did not complete any planned activities – 10 = completed all planned activities from manual) of the sessions as they were designed. It is noted that during the current program evaluation, the teachers were on work to rule in all of the school districts in Ontario, so finding time during school for the girls to participate in the program was a challenge.

- *From a program effectiveness perspective*, the shortened version of the program (i.e., less than 90 minute sessions) still led to changes in health-enhancing cognitions and behaviours (which were maintained 7 weeks post program completion). **Thus, it is not imperative to increase the duration of *Go Girls!* (i.e., number or duration of sessions) to ensure minimal program effectiveness.** Future research could explore whether or not a longer program leads to greater changes in the girls’ cognitions and behaviours (cf. DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Silverthron, & Valentine, 2011; J. E. Rhodes, 2008).

- While the results of the outcome evaluation indicated the program led to changes in participants’ health-enhancing thoughts and behaviours, results from the process evaluation revealed that both the girls and the mentors wished the program was longer. Thus, *from the girls’ and the mentors’ enjoyment perspective*, it is recommended to increase or at least find time for delivering the program the way it was designed (i.e., in seven 90-120
minute sessions) for participant and mentor enjoyment. If this is not possible, consider helping mentors focus on the most important sections of the program so they do not feel rushed to cover the entire program content.

Recommendation 2: Ensure Schools are Ready, Willing and Able to Deliver Go Girls!
- Although three of the mentors noted that a positive component of the program was the support they received from the school champions (see Appendix D, Table 4.3), not all mentors felt this way. Three mentors identified a need for more support from program champions and one mentor specifically discussed the need for more support from a confidential contact at Big Brothers Big Sisters. When mentors are trained, it is important that they are made aware of supportive resources available to them (i.e., contacts within the school and/or Big Brothers Big Sisters).
- Member agencies of Big Brothers Big Sisters should ensure a mentor facilitator is available to talk to, in confidence, if mentors are experiencing concerns during the program and are unable to get assistance from school champions.
- Before agreeing to offer the Go Girls! program at interested schools, member agencies of Big Brothers Big Sisters should ensure that schools are ready, willing and able to provide the necessary resources to deliver this program effectively (e.g., supportive school champions, set aside appropriate room(s), able to offer for at least the minimum time the program was design for, and provide equipment for activities as necessary). Development of a readiness checklist could aid in determination of school readiness.

Recommendation 3: Consider Providing Age Appropriate Adaptations for Activities
- Three of the eight mentors felt that some of the activities were too juvenile for the older program participants. Consider adding age appropriate adaptations for activities in the program manual or going over such adaptations in mentor training.

Recommendation 4: Ensure Girls Understand that they Can Share Lessons Learned in the Go Girls! Program
- Several of the girls reported in the interviews that they did share lessons learned with their family or friends, in a manner that appeared to respect the confidentiality of the other participants (e.g., “I’ve shared with them like the healthy facts, like how to eat properly”). However, two of the twelve girls interviewed mentioned that they had not shared the lessons
learned in *Go Girls!* because they felt everything was to be kept strictly confidential.

- While it is very important for the girls to respect the confidential nature of the discussions in the program, it would be beneficial for the mentors to also give examples and teach the girls how they can share the tenets of the *Go Girls!* program. For example, the mentors could explain how the specific examples discussed in *Go Girls!* sessions should be kept private, the girls can share the overall lessons learned in the *Go Girls!* program (such as sharing healthy facts, how to be physically active, or relationship skills). **Given the numerous examples of personal growth reported by the participants in the interviews (e.g., improved confidence, self-worth, body image, relationships skills, communication skills, etc.), it is important for the girls to feel they can share these valuable lessons learned with others.** As the girls teach others (i.e., friends and family members) what they have learned, it reinforces using these valuable skills in their own lives.

**Recommendation 5: Update Program Manual to Provide Mentors with Evidence-Based Nutrition Information**

- We identified several instances throughout the program manual where nutrition recommendations could be updated based on the current scientific evidence.

- For example, research suggests that consuming breakfast is associated with better cognitive function, school attendance, overall health and well-being (Rampersaud, Pereira, Girard, Adams, & Metzl, 2005). In line with this research, a lesson on the importance of consuming breakfast and thinking of healthy quick options is provided on page 122 of the program manual. However, the “Tip of the Day” is to make time for breakfast, to consider all four food groups, and then goes on to suggest that girls just grab a juice box and piece of pizza for breakfast. Consuming a healthy breakfast is a very important lesson, however giving the girls the option to choose a high sugar (juice) and processed foods (pizza) gives the girls an easy excuse to eat unhealthy foods and is inconsistent with the *Go Girls!* program mandate (i.e., to teach girls about balanced healthy eating).

- The evidence suggests that adolescent girls should be encouraged to increase their intake of fruits and vegetables and balance this with healthy sources of protein and fat. Specifically, fruits and vegetables are full of important nutrients for growing adolescents (Moore, Singer, Qureshi, Bradlee, & Daniels, 2012; Prentice et al., 2006), healthy sources of protein are important for muscle growth (Tipton & Wolfe, 2001) and healthy sources of fats are important for obtaining fatty acids essential for growth and development (Huffman, Harika, Eilander, &
Osendarp, 2011). Furthermore, increasing healthy consumption of these foods during adolescence increases the chances these healthy eating behaviours will continue on to adulthood (Larson, Fulkerson, Story, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2013; Lien, Lytle, & Klepp, 2001).

- If the girls indicate they are having trouble planning breakfast, this could also be an excellent learning opportunity to teach the girls to think ahead and pre-make a healthy breakfast the night before. Girls’ self-regulatory efficacy for healthy eating was not sustained 7 weeks after completing the program and instrumental attitudes towards healthy eating became worse. Incorporating more opportunities in Go Girls! that could help the girls learn to self-regulate their eating and understand the health benefits of healthy eating would be beneficial.

- Rather than encouraging girls to grab something convenient but unhealthy to eat, program mentors should set high standards for the girls to aspire towards (which would be consistent with the Go Girls! program mandate). Thus, it is recommended that the program manual is updated based on current scientific evidence regarding nutrition guidelines.

Recommendation 6: Ensure Mentors Provide Healthy Snacks

- During the interviews, one mentor identified bringing unhealthy snacks (large amounts of cupcakes) and one of the girls reported being given unhealthy snacks as well (cinnamon spread). While it is important to teach girls about moderation, it is essential to also teach mentors about healthy snack choices and being creative about teaching girls to incorporate healthy food into their lives. Thus, given that one purpose of the Go Girls! program is to promote healthy eating, it is important the mentors are (a) educated about healthy eating to provide evidence based information for the girls and (b) required to bring in creative healthy snacks so the girls learn to try and like new and healthy foods.

- The manual could be updated to encourage the mentors to be creative when thinking about healthy snacks. For example, numerous websites exist that give many creative ideas for healthy snacks and fun and creative ways to present them to youth. Research suggests that healthy foods presented in creative ways (i.e., vegetables with super powers for younger kids; Agrawal, 2012) and simply encouraging adolescents to taste and try new foods helps to broaden their food choices (Birch, 1999; Hendrie, Brindal, Baird, & Gardner, 2013). Given that the girls reported significant decreases in instrumental attitudes toward healthy eating, focusing on improving this component of Go Girls! is an important next step in program improvement.

- Fun food choices could be obtained from creative websites including Pinterest.
(www.pinterest.com) and girls could be encouraged to try snacks based on whole foods such as kale chips or cauliflower popcorn (i.e., creative ways to eat vegetables).

- Finally, food should not be used as a reward (i.e., contrary to instructions from the program evaluators and Toronto program directors, girls were given money to spend at fast food venues for their participation in this study). This promotes unhealthy psychological relationships with food and increases the girls’ preferences for the food used as a reward (Birch, 1999). Go Girls! can be used as a platform to encourage development of lifelong healthy eating.

**Recommendation 7: Update Program Manual to Provide Mentors with Evidence-Based Physical Activity Information**

- Current evidence-based physical activity guidelines suggest that to attain health benefits, Canadian youth should engage in *at least* 60 minutes of moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity per day (Tremblay, Warburton, et al., 2011). Note that 60 minutes of physical activity can be accumulated over the course of the day.

- Furthermore, reducing screen time is also important for health benefits and it is recommended that youth limit recreational screen time to no more than 2 hours per day (Tremblay, Leblanc, et al., 2011).

- While the instructions in the manual suggest mentors do their best to help girls like to be active and think about becoming more active, the manual suggests that simply doing 10 minutes of dancing is sufficient physical activity. Indeed, any activity is better than none, however, similar to the nutrition recommendations, it is suggested that the Go Girls! program set high standards to which the girls strive to achieve.

- Simple updating the wording/tip of the day and information taught to mentors can raise this standard to help all girls strive toward attaining health benefits from regular moderate-vigorous intensity physical activity.
Recommendation 8: Further Scientific Exploration of:

Beyond these recommendations, a number of unanswered questions exist that are worthy of future research and future consideration by *Go Girls!* program directors. These include:

- Effective strategies to target affective and instrumental attitudes among adolescent girls
- Age appropriate program activity adaptations
- Development of school readiness checklist
- What is the optimal dosage (i.e., amount of contact time) of the *Go Girls!* program
- Evaluation of mentor training program
Discussion

Adolescent girls are in particular need of effective programs that develop healthy lifestyle behaviours (Neumark-Sztainer, Story, Hannan, & Rex, 2003). The high prevalence of inactivity (Colley et al., 2011) and poor dietary behaviours (Arbour-Nicitopoulos, Faulkner, & Irving, 2012) is a primary health concern for this population. For example, 30-50% of adolescent girls report no leisure-time physical activity (Kimm et al., 2002) and one in three Canadian adolescent girls do not meet current guidelines for fruit and vegetable consumption (Riediger, Shooshtari, & Moghadasian, 2007). In response to this public health issue, the Go Girls! Healthy Minds, Healthy Bodies program was developed to teach girls about active living, balanced healthy eating and feeling good about oneself. Go Girls! is a group-based mentorship lifestyle program, which aims to foster a sense of belonging among participants. This program has been widely disseminated across Canada for over a decade. Findings from this program evaluation indicate that the Go Girls! program is effective in achieving the majority of its targeted outcomes. From a public health perspective, it is particularly noteworthy 7 weeks post program completion, participants reported significant improvements the health behaviours (i.e., physical activity and healthy eating) targeted in the Go Girls! program.

Program Context

One of the unique elements of the Go Girls! program is the emphasis on fostering a sense of connection (i.e., belonging) among the girls and with the mentors. Based on previous research that highlights the importance of fostering interpersonal relationships when working with girls (Gilligan, 1982; Goodenow, 1993; Ma & Huebner, 2008), it is logical to suggest that fostering a sense of belonging may have contributed to the effectiveness of the Go Girls! program. For example, numerous studies have found relationships between class or school belonging, teacher support and adolescent girls’ academic motivation and performance (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Goodenow, 1993; Phan, 2013).

Indeed, as confirmed by the manipulation check used in this study, by the end of the program the girls reported feeling a strong sense of belonging to the Go Girls! program. Furthermore, findings from the mechanism evaluation indicated that participants’ feelings of belonging to their Go Girls! group predicted health-enhancing thoughts (i.e., self-regulatory efficacy and attitudes; both of which predicted behaviours 7 weeks post program) at the end of the program. We also found that the girls reported an improved general sense of belonging 7 weeks post program completion. While we did not examine potential reasons for this change, considering the activities delivered in Go Girls! that
targeted relationship skills, it is possible that as the girls began to use these skills, they felt more connected to their peers in general. Indeed, 7 weeks post program completion participants also reported greater confidence in their ability to make friends. Furthermore, considering the girls’ and mentors’ positive qualitative reports of their relationships developed in the program, it appears that the Go Girls! program provides a context in which girls can connect to the mentors and other girls and teaches them valuable relationship skills. When taken together, these findings are important because they suggest that programs designed to foster social connections among adolescent girls can provide a suitable environment to develop health enhancing social cognitions and behaviours among adolescent girls.

Changes in Outcomes

We found significant increases in the girls’ self-regulatory efficacy for physical activity and healthy eating. In line with Bandura’s (1997) recommendations to foster self-regulatory efficacy, instructions in the Go Girls! manual specifically outline how mentors should develop self-efficacy among the girls by providing opportunities for (1) mastery experiences, (2) social learning and (3) verbal support. Given that feelings of self-regulatory efficacy improved after the program and did predict the girls’ behaviour, targeting self-regulatory efficacy in the Go Girls! program is noted as a specific strength.

While the means were in an upward direction, we did not find any statistically significant improvements in the girls’ healthy eating intentions. It is possible that this finding is due to the measurement of healthy eating intentions. Specifically, healthy eating intentions were assessed using a questionnaire that asked girls to what degree they intended, planned and were determined to eat a healthy diet every day over the next week. In consideration of the physical activity intentions measure which asked girls if they intended, planned and were determined to do physical activity at least 3 times over the next week (and did detect significant improvements in physical activity intentions), it is possible that the healthy eating intentions measure was not sensitive to (potential) changes in the girls’ healthy eating intentions. In light of the adolescent girls’ improved dietary behaviour reported in the current study, future research is warranted to examine changes in dietary intentions using a less stringent standard for healthy eating (e.g., at least 3 times over the next week).

Furthermore, we did not find any positive changes in instrumental attitudes for physical activity or affective attitudes for healthy eating, and indeed affective attitudes towards physical activity and instrumental attitudes towards healthy eating declined. While these results suggest that the Go Girls! program did not substantively enhance participants instrumental or affective attitudes towards both
healthy eating and physical activity, it should also be noted that baseline measures of these variables were also high (Ms ≥ 5.10) and so any decreases (in affective attitudes towards physical activity and instrumental attitudes towards healthy eating) may reflect a regression to the mean (i.e., participants’ scores may have been overly positive at first, thus over time these attitudes return to the average – not overly positive or negative; Bland & Altman, 1994). Regardless, it is noteworthy that the results for the attitudinal variables did not align with the behavioural measures for physical activity and diet (which both improved), or the other social cognitive measures (e.g., self-regulatory efficacy, and intentions) assessed in this study. Disentangling such a discrepancy would represent an interesting direction in future research.

Participants reported significant improvements in body image over the course of the program. However, we also found significant improvements in the girls’ body image during the initial baseline comparison period (i.e., from Baseline to Pre). Thus, we cannot conclude that improvements in body image resulted from the Go Girls! program, as these improvements could occur due to other factors including (but not limited to): maturation (i.e., as the girls get older, their body image improves) or environmental factors (i.e., if a girls’ school is also providing a body image course).

Program Evaluation Limitations and Strengths
Balanced against the findings reported in this study, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, although we collected baseline assessments over a 7 week period before the Go Girls! program began, we did not collect data from a separate control group. Other than body image, it is noteworthy that there were no changes over the baseline period (during which the girls did not receive any intervention), and we did find changes in most of the outcomes immediately after and/or seven weeks after program completion. Nevertheless, in future work, the use of randomized controlled trial designs would appear necessary that includes an appropriate parallel control group. Second, the outcome variables were all self-reported and subject to bias. Future studies using objective measures to assess outcomes (e.g., accelerometers to assess physical activity) or reports from others (e.g., parents or teachers) on the girls' changes in cognitions and behaviours would be beneficial. Third, while it is noteworthy that increases in both physical activity and healthy eating behaviour were maintained at follow-up, this post-program assessment period was restricted to a 7 week sampling frame. Future research could explore the extent to which any acute effects of the Go Girls! program are sustained over a longer time frame (e.g., 6 months, 1 year). A fourth limitation pertains to our inability to examine the effect of program dose and implementation fidelity on examined outcomes. As noted by Rhodes (2008), assessments of both program dose and implementation fidelity are important components of
program evaluation. Unfortunately we were unable to obtain sufficient quantity of these data to examine this worthwhile question.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the findings of this study are noteworthy for a number of reasons. First, this was the first study to conduct a comprehensive examination of the effectiveness of the Go Girls! program, which demonstrates considerable ‘reach’ (cf. Glasgow, Vogt, & Boles, 1999) whereby thousands of adolescent girls participate in the program across Canada every year. Indeed, one of the biggest strengths of the study is that the findings are generalizable to other similar programs implemented in similar contexts (i.e., urban communities in Canada). Given the effectiveness of the Go Girls! program, future research is warranted to examine the extent to which an adapted version of the Go Girls! program could be beneficial for older adolescent girls (e.g., high school girls). Second, the use of hierarchical linear modeling represents a noted strength of the outcome evaluation component because this analytic approach is well suited for dealing with missing data and examining changes over time among participants nested within groups (i.e., girls within Go Girls! groups). Third, the use of multilevel structural equation modeling represents a strength of the mechanism evaluation component as we were able to examine psychological predictors of behaviour while controlling for the nested nature of the data.
Conclusion

In conclusion, findings from the current study suggest the *Go Girls!* program leads to improvements in health-enhancing cognitions and behaviours among adolescent girls. These findings provide evidence for the continued widespread implementation of programs, such as *Go Girls!*, that foster belongingness and target health behaviour change through mentorship models. In particular, such programs appear to represent a viable means to improve health-enhancing behaviours among adolescent girls.
Appendices

A. Questionnaires
B. Outcome Evaluation Results
C. Mechanism Evaluation Results
D. Process Evaluation Results
E. References
Appendix A

Psychometrics

Go Girls! Program Evaluation Measures and Reliability

Scores derived from the measures used in this program evaluation demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability (Cronbach, 1951; Eisinga, Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2012).

Table 1.1. Reliability Statistics for Measures used in the Go Girls! Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Reliability Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total PA Behaviour</td>
<td>$\rho_s \geq .82$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time PA</td>
<td>$\rho_s \geq .72$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary Behaviour</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE – PA</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .86$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE – Diet</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .89$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions – PA</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .91$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions – Diet</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .89$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Attitudes – PA</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .81$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Attitudes – PA</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .83$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Attitudes – Diet</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .86$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Attitudes – Diet</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Girls! Belonging</td>
<td>$\alpha = .87$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .79$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Self-efficacy</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .81$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>$\alpha \geq .73$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. PA stands for physical activity; SRE stands for self-regulatory efficacy.*

$\alpha = \text{Cronbach’s coefficient alpha}$

$\rho = \text{Spearman-Brown coefficient rho}$
Questionnaires

Physical Activity Behaviour

What are the survey questions?

• Total Physical Activity Behaviour (Prochaska, Sallis, & Long, 2001)
  1. Over the past 7 days, on how many days were you physically active for a total of at least 60 minutes per day?
  2. Over a typical or usual week, on how many days are you physically active for a total of at least 60 minutes per day?

• Leisure Time Physical Activity Behaviour (World Health Organization, 1996)
  3. Outside school hours: How often do you usually do physical activity in your free time, so much that you get out of breath or sweat?
  4. Outside school hours: How many hours do you usually exercise in your free time, so much that you get out of breath or sweat?

Why is Physical Activity Important for Adolescent Girls?

• Findings from a recent systematic review on the health benefits of physical activity for youth (Janssen & Leblanc, 2010) suggest that regular engagement in physical activity is associated with:
  o Physical benefits (e.g., improved blood pressure and bone mineral density).
  o Psychological benefits (e.g., reduced depression symptoms).

• The Canadian Physical Activity guidelines for youth recommend that youth engage in at least 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous intensity physical activity on most days of the week (Tremblay, Warburton, et al., 2011).

• Unfortunately, low levels of physical activity behaviours among adolescents are widely reported (Colley et al., 2011). For example:
  o 30-50% of adolescent girls report no leisure-time physical activity (Kimm et al., 2002).
  o Only 11.3% of girls engage in moderate-vigorous physical activity for a least 60 minutes on at least 5 days of the week (Colley et al., 2011).
Healthy Eating Behaviour

What are the survey questions?

We used a modified version of the Adolescent Food Habits Checklist (Johnson, Wardle, & Griffith, 2002) to assess healthy eating behaviours.

1. I usually avoid eating fried foods.
2. I usually eat a dessert if there is one available. (R)
3. I eat at least one serving of fruit a day.
4. I try to keep my overall fat intake down.
5. I avoid eating lots of hot dogs and burgers.
6. I often buy donuts, cupcakes or cookies. (R)
7. I try to keep my overall sugar intake down.
8. I eat at least one serving of vegetables or salad a day.
10. I eat plenty of fruit and vegetables.
11. I often eat sweet snacks between meals. (R)
12. I usually eat at least one serving of vegetables (excluding potatoes) or salad with my evening meal.
13. When I put butter or margarine on bread, I usually spread it thinly.
14. When I have a snack between meals, I often choose fruit.
15. I often have ice cream with desserts. (R)
16. I eat at least three servings of fruit most days.
17. I generally try to have a healthy diet.

Note. (R) indicates the item is reverse coded.

Why is Healthy Eating Important for Adolescent Girls?

• While the current guidelines for healthy eating are debatable (i.e., considerable controversy over Canada’s food guide; Canadian Obesity Network, 2014), the evidence does suggest that minimizing intake of sugar and processed foods is beneficial for health (Ebbeling et al., 2006; Kessler, 2009; Ludwig, 2011; Ludwig et al., 1999; Lustig, Schmidt, & Brindis, 2012). Furthermore, consuming a diet rich in fruits and vegetables and healthy sources of protein and fat is important for health benefits (Huffman et al., 2011; Liu, 2003).

• Unfortunately, poor dietary behaviours are widely reported:
  o Adolescent girls, on average, consume approximately 1.56 energy dense sweet foods per day (Pearson et al., 2011).
  o One in three Canadian adolescent girls do not meet current guidelines for fruit and vegetable consumption (Riediger et al., 2007).
Self-Regulatory Efficacy for Physical Activity and Healthy Eating

What are the survey questions?

- **Self-Regulatory Efficacy for Physical Activity** (Shields et al., 2008)
  If you really wanted to, how confident are you that you can…
  1. Be physically active even if you feel tired over the next week.
  2. Be physically active even if you are in a bad mood over the next week.
  3. Be physically active even if you don’t have the time over the next week.
  4. Arrange your schedule to be physically active no matter what over the next week.
  5. **Overcome obstacles** that prevent you from being physically active regularly over the next week.
  6. **Make up times** when you have missed your regular physical activity over the next week.

- **Self-Regulatory Efficacy for Healthy Eating** – we used a version modified for youth by Morton and colleagues (Morton et al., 2011) of the questionnaire developed by Strachan and Brawley (2008).
  1. How confident are you in your ability to bring a healthy lunch with you to school over the next week?
  2. How confident are you in your ability to eat healthily even if you are being overwhelmed by the demands of school over the next week?
  3. How confident are you that if you are preparing a meal or snack, it would be a healthy option over the next week?
  4. How confident are you in your ability to not let your schedule get in the way of your plans to eat healthy over the next week?
  5. How confident are you that if you are going to eat out, you will choose healthy meals over the next week?

**Why is Self-regulatory Efficacy Important for Adolescent Girls?**

- Research drawing from social cognitive theories of behaviour change (Ajzen, 1991; Bandura, 1986; Rosenstock, Strecher, & Becker, 1988) indicates that one of the most important predictors of behaviour is one’s confidence in his or her ability to engage in self-regulation (in sum, self-regulatory efficacy) necessary for the behaviour (e.g., Araujo-Soares, McIntyre, & Sniehotta, 2009; e.g., Luszczynska, Gibbons, & Bettina, 2004).
• Consistent with recommendations by Bandura (1997), activities within the Go Girls! program target self-regulatory efficacy for physical activity and healthy eating behaviour through provision of opportunities for (a) mastering these behaviours, (b) social learning from others and (c) verbal support from the mentors and the other participants.
**Affective and Instrumental Attitudes**

**What were the survey questions?**

Consistent with recommendations by Ajzen (Ajzen, 2002; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), affective and instrumental attitudes were measured using the following measure.

For me, **regular physical activity/eating a healthy diet** over the **next week** would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Attitudes</th>
<th>Affective Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Useful</td>
<td>Extremely Enjoyable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Wise</td>
<td>Extremely Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Beneficial</td>
<td>Extremely Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>Unenjoyable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foolish</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why are Attitudes Important for Adolescent Girls?**

- Affective attitudes relate to how one thinks engaging in a behaviour will make them *feel*; whereas instrumental attitudes refer to anticipated *costs* and *benefits* from engaging in a behaviour (R. E. Rhodes & Conner, 2010; R. E. Rhodes, Fiala, & Conner, 2009).

- Research suggests that while attitudes in general are important determinants of behaviour, affective attitudes are a stronger predictor of behaviours such as physical activity (Nasuti & Rhodes, 2013).

- In line with this research, **Go Girls!** mentors attempt to convey the vision that engaging in regular physical activity and healthy eating is not only good for your health (i.e., instrumental attitudes), it can be fun too (i.e., affective attitudes).
Physical Activity and Healthy Eating Intentions

What are the survey questions?

• *Physical Activity Intentions* (Chatzisarantis, Biddle, & Meek, 1997)
  1. I intend to do physical activity at least 3 times over the next week.
  2. I plan to do physical activity at least 3 times over the next week.
  3. I am determined to do physical activity at least 3 times over the next week.

• *Healthy Eating Intentions* This questionnaire was modified based on Chatzisarantis and colleagues’ (1997) physical activity measure and procedures used by Luszczynska and colleagues (2007).
  1. I intend to eat a healthy diet every day during the next week.
  2. I plan to eat a healthy diet every day during the next week.
  3. I am determined to eat a healthy diet every day during the next week.

Why Are Behavioural Intentions Important for Adolescent Girls?

• Findings from a recent meta-analysis suggest that intentions to engage in behaviour predict approximately 8.57% of physical activity behaviour and approximately 9.81% of dietary behaviour (McEachan, Conner, Taylor, & Lawton, 2011).

• Numerous social cognitive theories suggest that intentions are positively related to self-efficacy and attitudes (Ajzen, 1991; Bandura, 1986; Rosenstock et al., 1988). Given that the Go Girls! program mentors aim to enhance girls’ self-efficacy and attitudes, the girls’ intentions to engage in healthy behaviours should also increase.
Go Girls! Program Belonging

What are the survey questions?
1. I feel comfortable in the Go Girls! program.
2. I am a part of the Go Girls! program.
3. I am committed to the Go Girls! program.
4. I am supported at the Go Girls! program.
5. I am accepted at the Go Girls! program.

Sense of Belonging (General)

What are the survey questions?
1. I feel comfortable in the presence of strangers.
2. I am in tune with the world.
3. Even among my friends, there is no sense of brother/sisterhood. (R)
4. I fit in well in new situations.
5. I feel close to people.
6. I feel disconnected from the world around me. (R)
7. Even around people I know, I don’t feel that I really belong. (R)
8. I see people as friendly and approachable.
9. I feel like an outsider. (R)
10. I feel understood by the people I know.
11. I feel distant from people. (R)
12. I am able to relate to my peers.
13. I have little sense of togetherness with my peers. (R)
15. I catch myself losing a sense of connectedness with society. (R)
16. I am able to connect with other people.
17. I see myself as a loner. (R)
18. I don’t feel related to most people. (R)
19. My friends feel like family.
20. I don’t feel I participate with anyone or any group. (R)

Note. (R) means the item was reverse coded.
Friend Self-efficacy

What are the survey questions?

1. I am confident that I am good at making friends.
2. I am confident that I can help other people.
3. I am confident that I can ask others if I can be of help.
4. I am confident that I can do nice things for people.

Why are Belonging and Friendships Important for Adolescent Girls?

• The social context has been identified as an important factor to consider when developing programs to target adolescent girls’ behaviours. For example, interpersonal connections have been highlighted as particularly important for overcoming the unique challenges faced by adolescent girls (Gilligan, 1982; Goodenow, 1993; Ma & Huebner, 2008).

• Numerous studies have found relationships between class or school belonging, teacher support and adolescent girls’ academic motivation and performance (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Goodenow, 1993; Phan, 2013). Thus, programs that target girls’ health behaviours within a context that promotes interpersonal connections may be particularly effective for adolescent girls.

• In addition to the potential role of program mentors, the group environment may be particularly beneficial for influencing adolescent behaviours because the girls can learn from one another through social learning and subsequent mastery experiences (Bandura, 1977, 1986; Brawley, Rejeski, & Lutes, 2000) and develop connections with one another. In particular, through development of these connections, the girls’ need to belong can be fulfilled (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Research suggests that class- or school-based belonging as well as teacher support are positively related to improvements in motivation and academic performance among adolescent girls (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Goodenow, 1993; Phan, 2013).
Body Image

What are the survey questions?
We used the Sociocultural Attitudes Towards Appearance questionnaire to assess the girls’ body image (Heinberg, Thompson, & Stormer, 1995).

1. Women who appear in TV shows and movies project the type of appearance that I see as my goal.
2. I believe that clothes look better on thin models.
3. Music videos that show thin women make me wish that I were thin.
4. **I do not** wish to look like the models in the magazines. (R)
5. I tend to compare my body to the people in magazines and on TV.
6. In our society, **fat people are not** regarded as unattractive. (R)
7. Photographs of thin women make me wish that I were thin.
8. Attractiveness is very important if you want to get ahead in our culture.
9. It’s important for people to work hard on their figures/physiques if they want to succeed in today’s culture.
10. Most people **do not** believe that the thinner you are, the better you look. (R)
11. People think that the thinner you are, the better you look in clothes.
12. In today’s society, **it’s not** important to always look attractive. (R)
13. I wish I looked like a swimsuit model.
14. I often read magazines like *YM, Teen Vogue,* and *Girls’ Life* and compare my appearance to the models.

*Note.* (R) means the item was reverse coded.

Why is Body Image Important for Adolescent Girls?

- Poor body image is associated with depressive symptoms (Stice & Bearman, 2001), appearance anxiety, body shame and disordered eating behaviours (Slater & Tiggemann, 2011) among adolescent girls.
- Body satisfaction can protect adolescent girls from engaging in binge eating and excessive weight gain (Sonneville et al., 2012).
- Findings from numerous studies among adolescent girls highlight the importance of starting early in the prevention body dissatisfaction (McLean, Paxton, & Wertheim, 2013; Sonneville et al., 2012).
Interview Guide

Semi-Structured Interviews

Girls

1. Tell me about your experience in the Go Girls! program.
2. Could you describe your relationship with your mentor in the Go Girls! program?
3. Could you describe your relationship with the other girls in the Go Girls! program?
4. Is there anything that you do differently now that you’ve been through the Go Girls! program?
5. To what extent do you feel differently about yourself now that you’ve been through the Go Girls! program?
6. Could you describe any changes in the way that you think since you finished the Go Girls! program?
7. Have you shared anything that you learned in the Go Girls! program with friends or family?
8. What did you like about the Go Girls! program?
9. Do you think there is anything that could be improved with the program?
10. Any other comments or suggestions you would like to add?

Mentors

1. How long have you been involved with the Go Girls! program?
2. Tell me about your experience in the Go Girls! program.
3. What are your responsibilities as a mentor with the Go Girls! program?
4. Could you describe how you work/your mentoring style with the participants of the Go Girls! program?
5. Could you describe how the Go Girls! participants worked together?
6. Did you notice any changes in behaviour or attitudes amongst the girls regarding physical activity?
7. Did you notice any changes in behaviour or attitudes amongst the girls regarding diet?
8. Did you notice any changes in how the girls saw and felt about themselves?
9. Did you notice any changes with regard to the girls’ body image?
10. What would you identify as the strongest aspect(s) of the program?
11. Could you suggest any improvements you feel need to be made to the program?
12. Any other comments or suggestions you would like to add?

Note. Each of these broad questions were accompanied by a series of clarification and elaboration probes that were used by the interviewers in order to maximize understanding and obtain sufficient depth in participants’ responses.
Appendix B

Outcome Evaluation Results

A moderate proportion of missing data were found across all the study variables (14.25% - 24.60%). A missing value analysis was conducted using SPSS (Version 20), which indicated that the assumption of Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) was met. Specifically, Little’s (1988) chi-square test of MCAR was non-significant, $\chi^2 (2023) = 2028.11, p > .05$. In the subsequent models, a Full Information Maximum Likelihood approach to model estimation was used. Data were analyzed using growth curve analysis in Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM, student version 7.0) controlling for the nested nature of the data (i.e., repeated measures within individuals, and girls within groups). The intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) for the group-level differences are presented in Table 2.1. These data suggest that the majority of variance in scores was observed at the individual level (group ICCs ≤ .103).

We used a special type of data analysis technique (hierarchical linear modeling) which allowed us to include all the girls who completed questionnaires at least at 2 time points (either Baseline or Pre and either Post or 7 weeks post, but many of the girls did complete 3 or all 4 questionnaires). Hierarchical linear models were run which controlled for the non-independence of observations based on repeated measures within girls and girls clustered within groups (Hox, 2002). Coefficients, standard errors and effect sizes are presented in Table 2.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity Total</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity Leisure</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Eating Behaviour</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions – Physical Activity</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions – Healthy Eating</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA – Physical Activity</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA – Physical Activity</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA – Healthy Eating</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA – Healthy Eating</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE – Physical Activity</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE – Healthy Eating</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Connectedness</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* IA stands for instrumental attitudes, AA stands for affective attitudes, SRE stands for self-regulatory efficacy.
### Table 2.2. Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analyses for Changes in Outcomes Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1 – Time 2</th>
<th>Avg T1-T2 vs. Time 3</th>
<th>Avg T1-T2 vs. Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Total</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Leisure</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet Behaviour</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE – PA</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE – HE</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions – PA</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions – HE</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA – PA</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA – PA</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA – Diet</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA – Diet</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend SE</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>$Y_{100}$</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** PA stands for physical activity, SRE stands for self-regulatory efficacy, IA stands for instrumental attitudes, AA stands for affective attitudes, SE stands for self-efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients are reported. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.**
Appendix C
Mechanism Evaluation Results

At the item level, 13.62% of the data were missing. A missing value analysis was conducted using SPSS (Version 20), which indicated that the assumption of Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) was met. Specifically, Little’s (1988) chi-square test of MCAR was non-significant, \( \chi^2(951) = 904.13, p > .05 \). In the subsequent models, a Weighted Least-Squares (WLSM) mean-adjusted approach to model estimation was used.

A mediational analysis based on a multilevel structural equation modelling (MSEM) framework was used to test the path diagrams presented in the mechanism evaluation section. Through use of a MSEM approach, two mediation models were analyzed separately using Mplus 6 to test the study hypotheses. For both physical activity and dietary behavior, the entire path model was tested simultaneously to reduce the chances of Type I error, while controlling for the nested nature of the data (i.e., girls within groups).
Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Coefficients, and Zero-order Correlations for Physical Activity Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-regulatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy (T3)</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>2.389</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.44``</td>
<td>0.34``</td>
<td>0.61``</td>
<td>0.14`</td>
<td>0.46``</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes (T3)</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.42``</td>
<td>0.48``</td>
<td>0.20``</td>
<td>0.38``</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes (T3)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42``</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23``</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intentions (T3)</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21``</td>
<td>0.50``</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Go Girls!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging (T3)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total PA (T4)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations significant at * = p < .05, ** = p < .01. Self-regulatory efficacy measured from 0 – 10, affective and instrumental attitudes measured from 1 - 7, intentions measured from 1 - 7, sense of belonging measured from 1 - 4, physical activity measured from 1-7 days/week, where higher scores represent more positive cognitions and behaviour. Cronbach alpha reported for self-regulatory efficacy and ordinal coefficient alpha reported for the other variables. T3 means the variable was assessed at the end of the program (i.e., Post) and T4 means the variable was assessed 7 weeks after the program had ended (i.e., 7w Post).
Table 3.2. Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Coefficients, and Zero-order Correlations for Dietary Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-regulatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy (T3)</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes (T3)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes (T3)</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intentions (T3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Go Girls!</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging (T3)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dietary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour (T4)</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations significant at * = p < .05, ** = p < .01. Self-regulatory efficacy measured from 0 - 10, affective and instrumental attitudes measured from 1 - 7, intentions measured from 1 - 7, sense of belonging measured from 1 - 4, dietary behaviour scores range from 1-17 where higher scores represent more positive cognitions or behaviour. Cronbach alpha reported for self-regulatory efficacy and dietary behaviour and ordinal coefficient alpha reported for the other variables. T3 means the variable was assessed at the end of the program (i.e., Post) and T4 means the variable was assessed 7 weeks after the program had ended (i.e., 7w Post).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Physical Activity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outcome: Intentions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Affective Attitudes (a1)</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[0.105, 0.383]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Instrumental Attitudes (a2)</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>[0.050, 0.372]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Self-regulatory Efficacy (a3)</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[0.357, 0.651]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outcome: Physical Activity Behaviour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator: Intentions (b1)</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[0.154, 0.444]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor 2: Affective attitudes (c1)</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>[0.014, 0.182]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor 3: Instrumental attitudes (c2)</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>[-0.011, 0.287]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor 4: Self-regulatory efficacy (c3)</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[0.070, 0.286]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1 * b1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>[0.016, 0.110]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2 * b1</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>[0.012, 0.134]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3 * b1</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[0.079, 0.221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 (Diet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outcome: Intentions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Affective Attitudes (a6)</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[0.126, 0.338]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Instrumental Attitudes (a7)</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>[0.046, 0.242]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor: Self-regulatory Efficacy (a8)</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[0.429, 0.585]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outcome: Physical Activity Behaviour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator: Intentions (b2)</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[0.273, 0.881]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor 2: Affective attitudes (c4)</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>[-0.293, 0.381]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor 3: Instrumental attitudes (c5)</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>[-0.416, 0.298]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor 4: Self-regulatory efficacy (c6)</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[0.156, 0.610]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a4 * b2</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>[0.014, 0.324]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a5 * b2</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>[0.002, 0.238]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a6 * b2</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>[0.092, 0.390]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unstandardized path coefficients are reported.
Appendix D

Process Evaluation Results
Table 4.1. Qualitative results for participant interviews from Go Girls! Program Evaluation during 2012-2013 school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>P (n)</th>
<th>MU (n)</th>
<th>Example MU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous &amp; Initial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“…and a lot of other friends in other grades did it [the Go Girls! program] too and they told me it was fun.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial discomfort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>“…when we first got to Go Girls!, we were sort of uncomfortable like, ‘What am I gonna do?’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous cognitions and behaviours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>“Honestly, before when I would look in the mirror I would see so many things wrong based on like, the image society has put out in the world on how girls should look.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall positive perception</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>“I think Go Girls! was like an amazing experience.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>“It was like hands on, instead of just sitting down and taking notes it was more hands on and that I kind of liked about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy living awareness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>“Like just to eat more healthy and how it helps with your body.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly snacks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>“I liked the snacks because we had fruit, we had vegetables.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>“It was really fun, you had to hurry and say their name so it was really fun.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>“We had to spin a little spinner and the colour it landed on, it was in the book so then someone would ask us a question and then we’d answer it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“If you just look at it and just say ‘Okay, that’s a game,’ you wouldn’t really get what it’s supposed to do; but if you think about it and how that relates to that, and that relates to that, you will get it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created positive environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“…so every now and then we would pick three people to read from our Go Girls! journal, the, the tip of the day and we also did some creative stuff and she made sure that everybody was participating.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles as leader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“[what helped you?]…because she talked us through it and I talked to her about how I don’t think I’m skinny and she told me that it doesn’t matter and it doesn’t matter your shape, and it only matters your personality and how nice you are.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>“Well I definitely gained friendships [from Go Girls].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging/bonding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>“…because you get closer to the other people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared lessons learned with others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>“I’ve shared with them like the healthy facts, like how to eat properly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt like family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>“What I liked about the Go Girls! is that we felt like a family.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>“Well now that I’ve been through the Go Girls! program I kind of feel more open.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>“Yeah, I’d say I would. I could use it [what I learned in Go Girls!] in my afternoon class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>[after Go Girls!] “…I have been trying my best to run a little during recess and during all my free time too.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“I might see that, like I said before, that I can’t really don’t want to be in the same room as him [her brother], so maybe I can see a bright side if I’m nice to him, even if he’s not [nice to me].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal/no changes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“But not much changed though, to tell you the truth.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“If it [the program] could be a little longer [more sessions].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the same</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I don’t think anything should be changed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity suggestions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>“Well because of the timing, we were sort of in winter. I would like to go outside.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Well maybe they could add another grade.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase group size</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Probably to have more people join because I would wanna meet more people and be more friends, have more friends with people I never really knew before.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P = number of participants who spoke about the category. MU = number of meaning units that pertained to that category.
### Table 4.2. Qualitative results for mentor interviews from Go Girls! Program Evaluation during 2012-2013 school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>P (n)</th>
<th>MU (n)</th>
<th>Example MU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Program Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General praise/enjoyment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>“I loved just the way the whole program is organized.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>“The seven-week period I thought that we were able to make some long-lasting relationships between the girls.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>“It’s very good the way it guides you through discussions like what can you expect from potentially the girls.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>“We enjoyed all the activities and everything we had to do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“I found more kids were better than just one.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>“It was a bit of an overview for me but it was great because they really highlighted what their expectation for the mentors were in the program what specifically you need to make sure you do with the girls and stuff like that so that was great [the training].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor Perception of Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Attitudes: “…you can tell attitudes change about themselves.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Behaviours: “…and I think that what I’ve seen is as it moves forward, they become, they find more creative ways to engage in exercise.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships/bonding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Friendships: “At the end, everyone was like friends, and they were like ‘we’re gonna go to the movies together!’””</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| General | | | “General: "There’s more to these kids that everyone says are bad."
| During | 9 | 91 | |
| Subcategories | | | |
| Attitudes | | | “Attitudes: “We did a body mapping activity. Like I said they were more positive about the language they were using.” |
| Behaviours | | | “Behaviours: “I would bring a juice and they would take like 5, like these kids don’t eat or something it.” |
| Friendships/bonding | | | “Friendships/bonding: “They are quite friendly with each other.” |
| General | | | “General: “But overall, the girls have been very enthusiastic…” |
| Before | 8 | 49 | “For instance, I had a couple girls who just, at first were just so shy and timid, and didn’t want to really discuss anything.” |
| General | 8 | 62 | “They follow, they follow and just jump on it because they need to feel umm wanted.” |
| No changes | 7 | 34 | “Like I never had any girl that at the beginning was super upset about how she looked and at the end was super happy about the way she looked.” |
| **Characteristics of Mentorship** | | | |
| Roles | 9 | 98 | |
| Subcategories | | | |
| Leader/mentor | | | “Leader/mentor: “…but I definitely took charge when it came to um doing a lot of the activities or starting the discussions.” |
| Listener | | | “Listener: “You are there to listen.”” |
| Provide knowledge | | | “Provide knowledge: “In one group, the second group I really tried to focus on a lot of discussions on diet and what can happen if you continue to eat this way, or if you don’t eat, what can happen.”” |
| Responsibilities | 9 | 49 | “You are responsible for contacting or your co-mentor is responsible for contacting the school umm and asking, umm introducing yourselves.” |
| Personal Style | 8 | 66 | “…and then I think that’s why being a fun, crazy goofy mentor helps.” |
| Problem solving strategies | 7 | 34 | “Like I’ve turned off lights when the people weren’t paying attention.” |
| Co-mentor | 5 | 43 | “I’m usually a little bit of the louder one between the 2 of us [co-mentors].” |
**Program mandate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>“The mandate is about promoting healthy living, healthy mind, active living.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components of Social Cognitive Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery experiences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>“We talk about peer pressure, and a lot of the girls bring up the models they see in the magazines.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experience with Program**

| Recruitment                  | 6 | 11 | “It was pretty straightforward and it was just umm I had to go in to do a little interview and then I had to provide some references, personal references.” |
| Reasons for volunteering     | 5 | 25 | “Well I signed up for the Go Girls! program to get a bit more experience working with youth.” |
| General                      | 4 | 8  | “It’s been very much, umm, kinda front line, hands on social work experience with youth.” |

**Challenges in Program Delivery**

| Difficult situations         | 7 | 37 | “But I just find that one [session 6] is always like a toss-up, depending on the school location and stuff, because we’re not given the proper equipment.” |
| Range of girls’ needs        | 6 | 40 | “Right so it’s like they’re not acknowledging that maybe this is a specific group of girls that have specific needs that need to be met but they are sort of ignoring them.” |
| Short duration               | 6 | 34 | “I especially think that since the sessions are so short I definitely think that [the girls] are not getting everything out there that they should be getting.” |

**Suggested Program Adaptations**

| Specific examples            | 7 | 32 | “I think after school may help right it’s good for parents cause it gives them like you know the kids can stay yeah and I think it would fit people’s hours better well then again a lot of people are students.” |
| Increase duration of sessions| 4 | 24 | “I think it [the sessions] should be longer.” |

Note. P = number of participants who spoke about the category. MU = number of meaning units that pertained to that category.
Table 4.3. Minor emergent themes from mentor interviews from *Go Girls!* Program Evaluation during 2012-2013 school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Interviewee (n)</th>
<th>Meaning Units (n)</th>
<th>Example Meaning Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Before I would sort of give in to what they would say, but now we, I’m far better at sticking to the rules.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School champion/support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>“My champions have always been really fantastic they email back right away they’re really involved with the program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suggested changes for program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Nothing really [to change about program].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for continuance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“One girl said, ‘I wish the program didn’t end’...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging Aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“…some of them are great for grade 6s but when you apply them the grade 8 girls they’re a little lame sort of...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School champions/lack of support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>“It was pretty good, umm the first school we were at was a bit difficult only because our school champion wasn’t umm at the school when we were there so there was once or twice where we had a scheduling conflict where we had an assembly taking place that ran into our session time but nothing major.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underserved populations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>“A lot of these schools these kids are lacking the attention or that sort of things so now you have these group of girls that come in I mean that you know that you have to gain that trust with that you have to.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor for mentors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I mean she was great with the girls but I know if that is even necessarily pre-screening issue or maybe if there’s a way to make umm reporting difficulties a bit more easy to do like confidentially like I didn’t really feel comfortable necessarily like, I don’t know what the word is, like speaking to like my Big Sisters representatives just because I didn’t want to create any sort of conflict of tension with my co-mentor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program lacks depth in some areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“We also talk a little bit, and this is just, the truth is the program itself doesn’t really go in-depth.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P = number of participants who spoke about the category. MU = number of meaning units that pertained to that category.
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