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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A major concern of colleges and universities over the past few decades has been the retention and academic performance of African-American students in higher education. Studies have shown that attrition rates among African-American students \(\{65\%\}\) is significantly higher than that of the overall population \(\{30\%\}\) (Allen, 1987; Bennett & Okinaka, 1984; O’Brien, 1989). The number of African-American students currently enrolled in higher education has more than doubled since 1960 and for the first time in U.S. history, African-American students are now more likely to matriculate at predominantly White colleges and universities (PWU) than at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU) (Allen, 1987; Astin, 1970, 1971, 1982; Bennett & Okinaka, 1984; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Sedlacek & Pelham, 1976; Williams & Leonard, 1988). African-American enrollment at PWUs has increased dramatically over the past two decades, with figures showing a little over 80% of all African-American undergraduates now attending these schools (Allen, 1987; O’Brien, 1989).

Yet, the statistics also depict an interesting and different view of the success achieved by HBCUs. Even though HBCUs enroll only 20% of the African-American
undergraduates in the U.S. they graduate 32% of all baccalaureate degrees earned by African-Americans. These degrees are awarded by the 87 four-year institutions designated as HBCU by the Department of Education (Allen, 1987; O'Brien, 1989). Such dramatic shifts in postsecondary educational patterns among African-Americans raises important questions about the qualitative differences in the education experiences and outcomes of African-Americans who attend PWUs as compared to African-Americans who attend HBCUs.

One way of increasing the retention rate of African-American students is to develop a better understanding of those factors influencing retention and academic performance. Some studies suggest that the traditional college admissions criteria such as, Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and high school grade point averages (GPA) are culturally and/or racially biased, and that greater focus should be given to identifying those factors that may contribute more to African-American students' academic success than ability alone (Borgen, 1972; Sedlacek, 1977; Tracey & Sedlacek, 1984, 1985).

The literature on African-American students in higher education has focused equally on variables such as socioeconomic status (SES), cognitive abilities, (i.e., SAT scores), and high school preparedness, (i.e., GPAs) as the primary predictors of student persistence and achievement
(Spady, 1971; Terenzini, Lorang, & Pascarella, 1981; Tinto, 1982). However, a growing number of studies have indicated that noncognitive factors, such as interpersonal relationships, social and academic integration, and the ability to deal with racism, are as important or even more important in predicting achievement for African-American students (Erazo, 1991; Sdlacek & Brooks, 1976; Tracey & Sdlacek, 1984, 1985; Williams & Leonard, 1988). Further, the literature indicates that institutions and researchers are focusing their attentions and energies on other factors, such as remedial academic support, assertiveness, self-concept, social support, racial identity, and realistic self-appraisal (Carroll, 1988; Mallinckrodt, 1988; Spaight, Kenner & Dixon, 1986, 1987; Tracey & Sdlacek, 1984, 1985; Williams & Leonard, 1988).

Self-efficacy and social support have emerged as factors that have an impact on the academic success, and, therefore retention of African-American students (Allen, 1987; Brown, Brady, Lent, Wolfert & Hall, 1987; Brown, Lent & Larkin, 1989; Fleming, 1981; Jay & D'Augelli, 1991; Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1984, 1986; Multon, Brown & Lent, 1991; Williams & Leonard, 1988). The concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1993) involves the belief or expectation that one can successfully perform certain tasks or behaviors. The theory proposes that people make causal contributions to their own functioning through mechanisms of
personal agency. Efficacy beliefs influence how people feel, think, behave, and motivate themselves (Bandura, 1993).

Although the focus of most studies has been upon academic variables, other research suggests the importance of the campus social environment in student retention. Social support has been defined in several different ways, although certain characteristics are identified repeatedly throughout the literature, including: (a) the measurement of the extent and quality of a student’s relationship with peers at the institution, (b) measurement of the quality and impact of a student’s informal, non-classroom interactions with faculty, and (c) social isolation (Astin, 1975; DeFour & Hirsch, 1990; Griffin, 1991; Mallinckrodt, 1988; Spady, 1971; Tinto, 1975). Tinto (1975) proposed that the decision to stay in school is a function of both academic and social success experiences. Success experiences are characterized by increased involvement or integration into the social or academic life of the university. Therefore, involvement with peers and support from the family may be important factors in retention.

HBCUs have a history of retaining larger percentages of African-American students, even though they select students with lesser high school records and lower parental education attainment (Allen, 1987; O’Brien, 1989). Therefore, the HBCUs provide an opportunity to examine variables that may
offer better predictors of academic success, specifically self-efficacy beliefs and social support.

Rationale and Purpose

The present study is designed to investigate the variables of self-efficacy and social support, and their relationship to the academic success of African-American students attending an HBCU. Specifically, it is hypothesized that self-efficacy and social support are better predictors of the academic performance of African-American undergraduate students at HBCUs than traditional admissions criteria, namely high school GPA and ACT scores. Further, it is hypothesized that self-efficacy and social support will independently and collectively account for a significant portion of the variance in determining the academic success of African-American students attending HBCUs. It is anticipated that this study will add to the growing body of research on factors influencing African-American students' academic performance and persistence, and will contribute to the potential development of screening items and counseling interventions for identifying students that are at risk for dropping out.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The development of a reliable means of predicting and preventing the academic failure and attrition of African-American students has been a major concern of researchers in psychology and education over the past few decades. In the past, research has focused on the relationship between measures of cognitive abilities (e.g. standardized test scores) and academic performance (e.g. high school grade average) as the primary means of understanding the problem of African-American student success. More recently, researchers have begun to explore the relationship of academic success to environmental and personality factors (Griffin, 1991; Mallinckrodt, 1988; Tracey & Sedlacek, 1984, 1985).

This review of the literature will focus on the current research examining academic performance and persistence and its relationship to African-American students in institutions of higher learning. The first section will focus on the general body of research on academic performance and persistence. Included in this overview are discussions of the traditional factors utilized in the prediction of the academic performance and persistence
(e.g., SAT scores and GPAs) of college students and specifically, African-American college students. In the second section, an overview of the research on the construct social support and its relationship to academic performance is discussed. The third section provides a theoretical overview of self-efficacy theory and a review of the literature relating its applications to academic performance. The fourth section looks at the relationship of social support to self-efficacy. In the final section, the research hypotheses are stated.

**Persistence Research**

The study of student retention (the terms persistence and retention will be used synonymously) and performance has long been a concern of psychologists and educators. Understanding and developing a means of predicting success in school has generated a large and diverse amount of research since Spady's (1971) proposal of an empirical model for predicting dropout from higher education. Spady proposed a theory for determining the reasons for student dropout based on Durkeim's (1951) concept of social integration. Tinto, (1975, 1982, 1987) expanded Spady's model and developed a path analytic model for student retention and attrition based on student-institutional fit. Specifically, Tinto's model focused attention upon the impact the institutions themselves have on the dropout behaviors of their own students. Although the model takes
into account student attributes, skills, abilities, and commitments, its primary focus is on how institutions are at least partially responsible for student dropout. That is, how good a job does the institution do in selecting and helping students feel connected to the university? Also, what efforts are there on the part of faculty and administration to help students integrate into the environment? Tinto’s model has been validated by several researchers in several academic settings (Pascarella, 1985; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1983). Their research confirms that the model is primarily concerned with accounting for the differences within academic institutions, between dropout as academic failure and as voluntary withdrawal. By inference the question of how institutions can change themselves to reduce student attrition is raised.

Several shortcomings in Tinto’s model have been indicated by researchers. Specifically, the model does not take into account transfer behaviors as opposed to withdrawal behaviors. It also fails to look at how large a role financial concerns, gender, race, and value orientation may contribute to the withdrawal process (Mallette & Cabrera, 1991; Tinto, 1982). Critics point out the researchers’ over-use of 4-year, White, liberal arts institutions (Mutter, 1992). Indeed, Tinto (1982) pointed out the need for additional research that is institution
specific and that takes into account the unique variables that each institution contributes to the retention and withdrawal behaviors of its students.

**African-American Retention Research**

The issue of the retention and performance of African-American students has become a major concern of the higher education community over the last few decades. Since Brown versus the Topeka Board of Education in 1954, enrollment of African-Americans at HBCUs has shifted from approximately 99 percent of those in higher education to a little less than 20 percent. Accompanying this shift is an attrition rate among African-American students of 65 percent nationwide (Allen, 1987; Bennett & Okinaka, 1984; O'Brien, 1989). Despite these numbers, researchers reported approximately one-third of all baccalaureate degrees earned by African-Americans are awarded by the 87 four-year institutions designated as HBCUs (Allen, 1987; O'Brien, 1989). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES; 1983) although HBCUs did not absorb most of the increase in African-American enrollment over the last decade, they played a significant role in graduating African-American students. The NCES' statistics indicate that over half of the African-American bachelor’s degree recipients and one-third of the master’s and professional degrees were awarded by HBCUs. In contrast African-Americans comprised less than 5 percent of degree recipients at all degree levels at PWUs.
Further, private institutions awarded a higher percent of their degrees to African-Americans than did public institutions (Allen, 1987).

Research on the persistence of African-American students has generally focused on understanding what factors contribute to the decision to leave an institution. With much of the research focused on the PWUs, researchers have attempted to understand what factors contribute to a student's decision to leave, once enrolled in PWUs. Little if any attention has been given to understanding what factors contribute to the success of HBCUs in retaining and graduating African-American students. Researchers have consistently looked at factors such as social support, mentoring, social, and institutional integration as well as various other variables to aid in the development of a conceptual model of African-American student attrition. Results of research conducted in PWUs show that African-American students experience higher attrition rates, less satisfactory relationships with faculty, lower grade point averages, more dissatisfaction, and greater alienation than do their White counterparts (Allen, 1987, Bennett & Okinaka, 1984; Carroll, 1988; Giles-Gee, 1989; Griffin, 1991; Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1992; June, Curry & Gear, 1990; Mallinckrodt, 1988; Mutter, 1992; Pascarella, 1985).

By contrast, the literature portrays African-American students on HBCUs as satisfied, engaged in the campus life,
and well-adjusted. However, these students come from lower economic backgrounds and score lower on measures of academic achievement (e.g., standardized test scores) in comparison to their peers of both races on white campuses. In addition, they are more disadvantaged, relatively speaking, due to the institutional differences between HBCUs and PWUs in measures of wealth or material environment (e.g., physical facilities and faculty credentials). Still, African-American students at HBCUs report greater positive psychological adjustment, stronger cultural awareness and commitment, greater academic gains and higher attainment aspirations (Allen, 1987; O'Brien, 1989).

Allen's (1987) survey of African-American students attending eight HBCUs and six PWUs, yielded a return of 1,583 or 32 percent. Allen found grades to be higher for students attending HBCUs and significantly correlated with student college satisfaction and level of involvement in college life. In addition, grades were significantly higher for students who reported favorable relationships with faculty, with students experiencing more favorable interactions at HBCUs. However, Allen also found that despite the higher retention and graduation rates of HBCUs, a greater percentage of African-American students on HBCUs than on PWUs considered dropping out of college (40 percent and 33 percent, respectively), indicating that HBCUs are not a panacea for understanding how best to retain African-
American students, but, they may offer additional information on what factors contribute to their success.

Summary

Despite a growing body of research on the performance and retention of African-American students in higher education, there is no cohesive theory to understanding the complexity of factors that contribute to the alarmingly high dropout rate for this population. The literature reveals that African-American students attending HBCUs experience greater satisfaction, academic performance, and overall adjustment than those attending PWUs. This has occurred despite having lower socio-economic backgrounds and standardized test scores. Variables that have emerged as significant are the social environment that HBCUs offer versus PWUs, and the possible effects of that environment on students' institutional commitment, attainment goals, academic performance, and graduation rates.

Academic and Non-Cognitive Factors

Poor academic preparation, as illustrated by SAT scores and GPAs, has been found to be a central predictor of African-American students' success (Astin, 1971; Williams & Leonard, 1988). However, research focused in the area of predicting how well African-American students perform using non-cognitive variables has been expanding over the last several years. Tracey and Sedlacek (1984) developed and validated the Non-Cognitive Questionnaire (NCQ) with the
specific intent to establish a means of predicting student performance and persistence. More specifically, the purpose was to assess the adequacy of the instrument in terms of reliability, construct validity and predictive validity for both African-American and White students. The eight factors that make up the NCQ are (1) leadership, (2) fair academic opportunity, (3) preferring long-range goals, (4) academic self-appraisal, (5) family support (6) lack of perseverance, (7) self-confidence and (8) academic familiarity. Using a sample of 1,973 students (1,694 White and 279 African-American) from a large, eastern PWU, findings were that the NCQ has a test-retest (two weeks) reliability range of .70 to .94 with a median of .85. Tracey and Sedlacek (1984) further established construct and predictive validity for both the white and African-American samples used regarding performance. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, the NCQ in both the (1984) and a (1985) longitudinal follow-up was found to be more predictive of first and third semester college grade point average than SAT scores and more highly predictive of African-American student’s persistence through the fourth year. The NCQ was shown to be predictive of college success above and beyond that obtained by using only SAT scores. The researchers also suggested the use of the instrument as a diagnostic tool to identify those minority students who might not persist until graduation.

One of the shortcomings of the Tracey and Sedlacek
research (1984, 1985), is the population of African-American students used in the study and its external validity. The authors readily admit that the range of scores for the students who were admitted may be more restricted on SAT scores than on NCQ scores. This may occur because the NCQ scores were not used in the admissions process as the SAT scores were. Also, the results might be more generalizable with the inclusion of other institutional environments and a more varied sample of African-American students.

Williams and Leonard (1988) explored the relationship between the academic progress of African-American undergraduates in technical programs and the non-cognitive variables racial identity, self-efficacy, college environment and vocational interests. Their sample differed from Tracey and Sedlacek's (1984, 1985), in that it was looking at a very specific population (i.e., African-American computer science and engineering majors), and the noncognitive variables differed (i.e., racial identity, self-efficacy, college environment and vocational interests). The results were contradictory to the results found by Tracey and Sedlacek (1984, 1985). Williams and Leonard (1988) results showed the cognitive measures in their model contributed more to the prediction of academic success than the noncognitive variables (R²=.41 versus R²=.13, respectively). However, the results did indicate that students scoring higher on self-efficacy achieved
higher levels of academic success than students scoring lower on self-efficacy.

Tinto (1982) has suggested that retention research be institution specific with the understanding that the variables contributing to a student’s decision to leave vary greatly from institution to institution. Although several variables consistently appear in the literature (e.g., social support, integration, academic preparedness), no cohesive theory of African-American student retention and performance has been developed. In addition, little attention has been given to identifying the factors that contribute to the success of HBCU in retaining and graduating African-American students. Those studies that have focused on African-American students enrolled at HBCUs confirm that they experience greater levels of support, psychological well-being, retention and academic performance.

Social Support

Allen (1987) reported that African-American students on white campuses experience a less supportive environment and not surprisingly greater alienation than their African-American counterparts attending HBCUs. Social support, and more specifically, perceived social support may prove to be another variable that answers some of the questions concerning the academic performance of African-American college students. Social support refers to the resources
that an individual receives through interpersonal interactions with significant others such as relatives, friends, colleagues, and professionals (Barrera, 1986; Heller, Swindle, & Dusenbury, 1986). Heller et al. (1986) found that social support can enhance an individual's self-esteem and its ability to provide stress-related interpersonal aid, represented the primary focus of much of the research. Perceived social support has been defined as the cognitive appraisal of being reliably connected to others. That is, an individual's assessment of how well they are cared for, that significant others are available to them in times of need, and that they are satisfied with relationships they have in various domains of their lives (Barrera, 1986; Heller et al., 1986).

The concept of social support and its ability to protect individuals from the harmful effects of stress, and that the availability of support as an effective means of fostering healthy psychological adjustment has received wide-spread support in the literature (Barrera, 1986; Coyne & DeLongis, 1986; Thoits, 1986). An underlying assumption of this research is that social support is positively related to both physical and psychological well-being (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Cutrona, Cohen & Igram, 1990; Dilorio, Faherty & Manteuffel, 1992; Thoits, 1986).

Barrera (1986) and Thoits (1986) have both proposed that greater attention be given to the diverse categories or
types of social support. Barrera (1986) theorized that the global concept of social support should be abandoned in favor of more precise concepts that fit a narrower model of stress-distress relationships. He proposed distinctions among measures of social embeddedness, perceived support, and enacted support and the determination of their positive or negative relationships to life stress and distress. Most pertinent to this study is his research on perceived social support. Barrera (1986) discussed perceived social support in terms of perceived availability and adequacy of supportive ties. What differs about these terms and attempts at measuring these types of social support is their attempt to capture the individuals' confidence that adequate support would be available if it was needed or to assess an environment as helpful.

Thoits' (1986) theory found it useful to reconceptualize social support by viewing it as a form of coping assistance. She proposed that if the same coping strategies used by individuals in response to stress are those that are applied to distressed persons as assistance, models of coping and supports can be integrated. Barrera (1986) and Thoits (1986) each attempted to develop more useful and efficient ways for theorists and applied researchers to approach and better use social support and the roles it may play in human functions.

The beneficial effects of social support on the health,
adjustment, and well-being of a broad variety of populations are supported by the literature (Caldwell & Reinhart, 1988; Coyne & DeLongis, 1986; Cutrona, 1986a, 1986b; Dilorio, Faherty & Manteuffel, 1992). A functional approach to assessing social support focuses on determining the perceptions of the functions that interpersonal connections serve. It also entails determining the perceived support, sufficiency, and the perceived satisfaction of the interpersonal relationships. A key element of the functional approach is its focus on the individual's perceptions of social support resources and how it allows one to understand, through inquiry, how they perceive their support network.

Cutrona (1986b) studied social support within the framework of the buffering model of social support. The stress-buffering model of social support proposes that when stressful life events occur, individuals who have adequate support resources are able to mobilize these resources to help them cope effectively with the challenges posed by the stress (Cobb, 1976). Cutrona (1986b) examined the specific interpersonal behaviors that convey support from one person to another. The results were that behaviors reflecting emotional support and informational support occurred as a specific response to stressful life events. Further, esteem support was expressed with equal frequency in the presence and absence of stress and it was especially effective in
preventing depressive reactions to stressful events. Research participants who perceived themselves as having high levels of perceived social support were more frequently the recipients of helping behaviors following stressful events than those low in perceived support.

Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline and Russell (1994) tested the extent to which parental social support predicted the college grade point average of undergraduate students. Specifically, they attempted to determine whether perceived social support from parents would predict academic performance in college during the first or second years after the student left the parent’s home. The findings were that parental social support, especially reassurances of worth, predicted about 19 percent of grade point average when controlling for academic aptitude (ACT scores). Further, Cutrona et al attempted to test a theoretically based hypothesis and found that, although the effect for parental social support was small, it was statistically significant.

A considerable amount of research suggests that the social environment for African-American students attending PWUs, is more alienating and isolating than that of their white counterparts (Allen, 1987; Fleming, 1981; Jay & D’Augelli, 1991). A supportive community offers students opportunities for a variety of relationships to prevent vulnerability to stress, opportunities for social
integration and participation in campus life as a whole and the chance to experience a greater sense of progress in the academic sphere (Fleming, 1981; Fleming, 1984; Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1992).

Jay and D'Augelli (1991) assessed patterns of social support of African-American and White freshmen attending a PWU, and the relationship of support to measures of adjustment to university life. They found African-American students reported significantly less support available than White students, but this difference disappeared when family income was used as a covariate. Further they found no difference in the adequacy of social support, even with family income and prior academic performance covaried. In addition, a conflicting and difficult to explain finding was that African-American freshmen had lower current academic performance than their White counterparts, even after controlling for prior academic performance. This suggests that factors other than prior academic performance have an influence on the current academic performance of African-American students. The authors suggest the need for further research using sub-populations or other populations of African-American students to understand the influence of non-academic factors on the academic performance of African-American college students.

In a more extensive analysis utilizing a path-analytic model, Hershberger and D'Augelli (1992) examined the
influence of perceived social support on differential graduation rates of African-American and White students at a PWU. In this study, significant differences between African-American students and White students in their perceptions of social support and well-being were found, but these differences were not found to have an influence on graduation. On the contrary, first year college grade point average and indirectly, pre-college academic performance were most useful in predicting graduation. An important factor and obvious shortcoming of this study is the authors' assertion that, "because more African-American students enter this university with lower precollege academic scores, fewer graduate" (p. 197). This factor might explain the differences between the findings of Jay and D'Augelli (1991) and Hershberger and D'Augelli (1992). That is, Hershberger and D'Augelli's (1992) findings are influenced by a range restriction that could have had a direct or indirect effect on the academic performance of the population studied. In addition, the measures of social support included in this study were not specifically constructed to assess support related to academic performance, or information pertaining to students' social networks' encouragement or discouragement of academic persistence.

Research on the relationship of perceived social support to the adjustment of college students was further enhanced by the development of a theoretically derived
measure of perceived social support by Brown, Brady, Lent, Wolfert, and Hall (1987). Brown et al. (1987) presented three studies addressing the psychometric characteristics and counseling uses of the Social Support Inventory (SSI; Brown, Brady, Lent, Wolfert, and Hall, 1987). The theoretical model underlying the development of the SSI is a person-environment fit model of satisfaction. This model assesses the fit between the individual's stated needs and the subsequent support provided or perceived to be provided by the environment.

The first study addressed the psychometric properties of the SSI and it was found to possess excellent internal consistency reliability, concurrent validity and performed in theoretically predicted ways in a series of construct validity analyses. The second study revealed that the SSI is mood independent and not influenced by transient mood states, while the third study addressed the diagnostic utility of the instrument. Those results provided evidence for the usefulness of the SSI in a counseling capacity and offered further evidence of the influence perceived social support has on college adjustment and psychological well-being.

Summary

The literature suggests that the social environment for African-American students attending PWUs is less than ideal, with students reporting social isolation, alienation,
loneliness, and lack of social integration both in the immediate campus environment and in the neighboring community. It has been documented that a supportive environment can facilitate adjustment and well-being, that, in turn influences academic performance.

Self-Efficacy Research

Measures of academic aptitude have long been employed in the diagnostic evaluation and counseling of college students. Academic ability, however, is only one determinant of success in college. Another significant factor is an individual's belief in his/her ability to succeed academically. Bandura (1977, 1982, 1993) hypothesized that people have specific expectations about their ability to perform highly specific behaviors. Perceived self-efficacy has been found to influence one's choice of activities, the amount of effort put forth, and the length of time one will persevere when confronted with obstacles or negative circumstances. The theory proposes that people make causal contributions to their own functioning through mechanisms of personal agency. Perceived efficacy beliefs influence includes cognitive, motivational and affective processes (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1993).

Since Bandura's (1977) initial development of, and research on, the concept of self-efficacy, a wide body of research has shown it to be an effective predictor of
behavioral change across a number behaviors. Included are recovery from heart attacks (Bandura, 1982), reducing phobic behavior (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & Adams, 1977), cessation of smoking (Brod & Hall, 1984; Yates & Thain, 1985), assertiveness (Lee, 1984), career indecision and vocational choice (Betz & Hackett, 1981, 1983; Hackett & Betz, 1981), and academic performance and persistence (Brown, Lent & Larkin, 1989; Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1984, 1986; Multon, Brown & Lent, 1991). In addition, Church, Teresa, Rosebrook and Szendre (1992) attempted to answer questions regarding gender differences, ethnicity, and acculturation, as well as the relationship of self-efficacy to measured aptitudes using a sample of Latino and Native-American students. Self-Efficacy beliefs were found to have a direct influence on perceived career options and choice among minority high school equivalency students.

Lent et al. (1984) examined the relationship between the academic self-efficacy of 41 undergraduate science and engineering majors, their academic achievement, as measured by GPA, and persistence, as measured by continuing in a technical and/or science major during subsequent academic quarters. A variety of self-efficacy measures were administered to assess the participants' perceived ability to fulfill the educational requirements and job duties of a variety of technical and/or scientific occupations. The results indicated that participants reporting high self-
efficacy beliefs for educational requirements generally achieved higher grades and persisted longer in technical and/or scientific majors over the following year than those with low self-efficacy beliefs. Self-efficacy was also moderately correlated with objective predictors of academic aptitude and achievement (math PSAT & high school ranks).

In subsequent studies, Brown et al. (1989) and Lent et al. (1986), expanded their research to include self-efficacy beliefs to educational and/or vocational choice and performance by assessing the extent to which efficacy beliefs, in concert with other relevant variables, predicted academic performance, persistence, and perceived career options in students considering science and engineering fields. In addition, they sought to determine if self-efficacy acts as a moderator between aptitude and performance. The results confirmed the reliability of self-efficacy in understanding and predicting diverse aspects of important career options, such as perceived career options, academic performance and persistence. Further, Lent et al. (1986), noted, it should not be inferred that self-efficacy beliefs show compensatory effects on the academic success of students with low levels of scholastic aptitude. Rather, self-efficacy beliefs appear to improve performance where skills are adequate.

In extending self-efficacy and its influence on academic performance to other populations, Adams (1990) used
a law school sample of 208 first-year students, found a positive correlation between level of self-efficacy and academic performance, as measured by first and second semester grade point averages. In addition, the study demonstrated a negative correlation between strength of self-efficacy and persistence, as measured by matriculation to the second year of law school, that is, the higher the strength score on the self-efficacy measure, the lower the attrition rate of the students. According to Betz and Hackett (1981), the level of self-efficacy expectations refers to the degree of difficulty of the tasks the individual feels capable of attempting, while the strength of self-efficacy expectations refers to the person's confidence in his or her capability and is related to persistence.

Finally, Multon et al. (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of thirty-nine studies and found the relationship of self-efficacy beliefs to academic performance and persistence to be significant. The effect size estimates in the meta-analyses were .38 for performance and .34 for persistence across various types of student samples, designs and criterion measures. Self-efficacy beliefs accounted for approximately 14 percent of the variance in students' academic performance and approximately 12 percent of the variance in the academic persistence. Multon et al. also found that self-efficacy and performance were more highly
related among low achieving students than among average achieving students. In addition, a stronger effect size was found in those studies that employed a basic skills performance measure as the criterion, with classroom based performance having the next strongest and achievement tests having the weakest. The studies used in the meta-analyses included samples from elementary schools, high schools, colleges, and one non-student group.

Summary

The positive relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance has been demonstrated throughout the literature. Bandura (1977, 1986) proposed that self-efficacy influences choice, performance, and persistence if there is sufficient ability to perform the relevant behavior. Multon et al., (1991) found self-efficacy to have a greater effect on low achieving students than average achieving students. A limitation of the existing research is how self-efficacy may be influenced in specific environments and with specific populations. The existing research has been limited to homogenous populations and settings.

Studies Relating Social Support and Self-Efficacy

A recurring theme in the research on social support is that social support has stress-buffering qualities, it is a protective resource against a variety of psychological and physical health threats, and it has esteem enhancing
benefits (Barrera, 1986; Coyne & DeLongis, 1986; Cutrona, 1986a, 1986b; Heller et al., 1986). The idea that enhanced esteem can lead to better coping skills is consistent with Bandura's (1977) concept of self-efficacy. The literature addressing the relationship between social support and self-efficacy is very limited and therefore offers the opportunity to further understand the role these two variables may have on each other. Bandura (1977, 1982) suggested several sources of self-efficacy beliefs and relationships and/or the support of other individuals seems consistent with his theory.

Cutrona and Troutman (1986) first hypothesized the existence of a relationship between social support and self-efficacy in their research addressing infant temperament and parenting self-efficacy. Specifically, the authors proposed that social support would provide a protective resource against the stress of daily responsibility for infants of varying degrees of temperamental difficulty and that maternal self-efficacy would have a mediating effect on prenatal social support through the reduction of postpartum depression. The results revealed that women who reported high levels of social support during the prenatal assessment subsequently reported higher levels of self-confidence in the parenting role and less depression 3 months after delivery, thus, providing support for the theoretical model. Results of a path-analysis indicated that social support
appeared to exert its protective function against depression primarily through the remediation of self-efficacy.

In another study, Dilorio, Faherty and Manteuffel (1992) addressed the relationship between perceived social support and self-efficacy in self-management of epilepsy. The authors hypothesized that these two variables would have a positive effect on the self-management behaviors of epileptic patients. Their results found both social support and self-efficacy to be positively correlated to the criterion self-management, but only found self-efficacy to be predictive in the stepwise regression analysis. The study demonstrated that the variable self-efficacy was a greater predictor of self-management for adults who have epilepsy than was the variable social support.

Summary

The literature addressing the relationship between social support and self-efficacy is limited, but raises important questions about the relationship between these two variables. Specifically, what, if any, influence does social support have on self-efficacy and how does it influence an outcome measure, such as academic performance. Further, the results suggest the need for additional investigation of the relationship between social support and self-efficacy.

Conclusion

The constructs of social support and self-efficacy have
been reviewed suggesting that these constructs may be useful in better understanding the academic performance of African-American students. The research exploring the relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance and persistence has found self-efficacy to be a good predictor of academic performance and persistence. The same is true for the relationship between social support and academic performance. These constructs, however, have been limited to either homogenous samples of academically successful Caucasian students or minority students attending predominantly white colleges and universities. Consequently, self-efficacy has not been studied in a population of African-American students, attending historically Black colleges and universities. Even though African-American students attending HBCUs tend to have lower high school records, lower parental education attainment and fewer resources, they experience a higher rate of graduation. Given these findings and the previously discussed research on non-cognitive variables and their greater predictive value for African-American students, it is proposed that this model may prove useful to examining to better understand the academic success of African-Americans attending HBCU.

**Hypotheses and Rationale**

The general purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among the variables self-efficacy, social
support, and the academic performance of African-American students attending historically Black colleges and universities. Specifically, the review of the literature led to the following hypotheses:

1. There will be a significant positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic performance among African-American students attending HBCUs.
   a) There will be a significant positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic success as measured by overall G.P.A..
   b) There will be a significant positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic progress as measured by completion of the specific number of required courses in a major program.

2. There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived social support and academic performance among African-American students attending HBCUs.
   a) There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived social support and academic success as measured by overall G.P.A..
   b) There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived social support and academic progress as measured by completion of a specific number of required courses in a major program.

3. A combination of academic self-efficacy and perceived social support will predict academic performance
better than either self-efficacy or social support alone after aptitude is controlled.

4. Social support is related to the criterion (academic performance), both directly and indirectly through its influence on self-efficacy.
CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were 167 (37 males, 129 females, one non-identified) African-American undergraduate students attending Xavier University of New Orleans during the spring, 1996 semester. Xavier University was chosen because of easy access and because the U.S. Department of Education has designated it as one of the 87 four year HBCUs. Xavier is similar to other private HBCUs in demographic make-up and its mission to provide African-Americans with a college education. All students, representing the continuing freshman (12%), sophomore (18%), junior (28.7%), and senior (41.3%) classes, were volunteers. They were recruited through announcements seeking participants and by the researchers attending several lectures. Descriptive statistics for the sample may be found in Table 1. Of this sample, 159 (95.2%) were single and eight (4.8%) were married. The breakdown of the living arrangements was as follows: 17.4% were living alone, 44.9% were living with a roommate, 31.1% were living with family, 2.4% were living with a partner/spouse, 3.0% were living with a partner/spouse and child, .6% were living with a child and no
partner/spouse, and .6% did not respond.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Sample (N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(77.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Freshman</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(28.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(41.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>(95.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Alone</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Roommate(s)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(44.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(31.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Partner/Spouse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Partner &amp; Child</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Child; No Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Situation/If Living with Roommates (A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/House</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(31.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(47.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(41.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Part Time</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(50.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Full Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure

After obtaining permission from both Loyola University of Chicago and Xavier University of New Orleans, participants were asked to complete two Consent Forms, one asking them to participate in the study and another asking permission to have specific academic records (i.e., GPAs, SATs, etc.) released to the examiner (see Appendices A & B for a copy of the Consent Forms). All steps needed to insure confidentiality were taken. In addition, a Demographic Information Form (DIF) (see Appendix C), two Self-Efficacy Measures (Appendices D & E), and the Social Provisions Scales (Appendix F) were administered.

In this study, the practical definition of academic performance was successful completion (grade of C or better) of the specific numbers of required courses in the given academic major each academic year. The College of Arts and Sciences requires completion of 29 credits within the major to reach sophomore status, 62 for junior and 95 for senior. Williams and Leonard (1988) determined academic progress dividing cumulative credit hours into four levels: good, moderate, minimum, and no progress. Students were assigned a composite score of three for achieving good academic progress, two for achieving moderate progress, one for achieving minimum progress, and zero for no progress. An overall numerical score and an academic level was assigned to each participant based on the number of required major
courses completed each academic year.

**Instruments**

The Demographic Information Form (DIF) contains standard demographically oriented questions; gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, living situation, employment status, and age (see Appendix C).

The first self-efficacy measure (Undergraduate Courses Questionnaire {UCQ}), has been constructed based on procedures described by Lent, Brown, and Larkin (1984, 1986) and Brown, Lent, and Larkin (1989) to assess student's self-efficacy relating to required course work. In the original Lent et al. (1984) study undergraduate students involved in a science and engineering career planning course were asked to complete a self-efficacy measure. The measure assessed the students' perceived ability to complete the educational requirements and job tasks of science and engineering related fields. Participants rated the level and strength of their self-efficacy in regard to their perceived ability to fulfill educational and job requirements. The authors reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .89, over an eight week time frame for the strength dimension. An alpha coefficient of internal consistency reliability for self-efficacy strength measure was also reported to be .89. Their findings also revealed that the self-efficacy strength measure correlated significantly with the self-efficacy level estimate, at r=.81. The authors found that those
students who espoused high educational self-efficacy with regard to science and engineering courses tended to perform better academically, and persisted longer in the science and engineering majors over the course of the next year following the career course, when compared to students who espoused low self-efficacy. Therefore, their instrument measuring self-efficacy appeared to be a reliable measure for assessing academic self-efficacy.

Further evidence of the UCQ's reliability was provided by Williams & Leonard, (1988) using an African-American sample. With a sample of 196, the authors examined the relationship between academic progress of African-American undergraduates in technical programs and social identity, self-efficacy, college environment, and vocational interests. Their results indicated students who scored high on self-efficacy achieved higher levels of academic progress than did students scoring lower on self-efficacy. Lastly, Erazo (1991), looked at self-efficacy, defensive pessimism and social support, and their relationship to college adjustment of minority students. Erazo found self-efficacy level correlated significantly with end of the year grade point average ($r=.31$, $p<.05$). Thus, students espousing positive beliefs in their ability to succeed academically tended to perform well academically, as evidenced by higher end of the year grade point average.

The UCQ consists of 18 items (each item related to
courses representing core curricula). The measure assesses the level of self-efficacy by determining students' estimates of confidence in their ability to fulfill the educational requirements of the core curriculum. Students were asked to indicate how confident they are of their ability to successfully complete the course requirements by rating it on a 10-point scale (1=not at all confident, 10=very confident). Total confidence scores for each participant will be calculated by dividing the summed confidence estimates by the total number of courses (18) included on the scale (see Appendix D).

Academic Self-Concept Scale (ASCS). The ASCS was developed by Reynolds, Ramirez, Magrina, and Allen (1980) to assess how positively one feels about his/her academic ability. The ASCS consists of 40 statements with a four-point Likert scale ranging from "1-strongly disagree" to "4=strongly agree", with no neutral point. Scores can range from 40 to 160; the higher the score, the stronger the level of academic self-concept. Reynolds, et al. reported an internal consistency of .91. The ASCS has been found to correlate with grade point average; r=.40 - .52; SAT scores, r=.12 - .22; and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale, r=.45 (Reynolds et al., 1980). Further evidence of the ASCS' reliability was confirmed by McCurtis (1994) using an African-American sample. With a sample of 86, McCurtis examined the extent to which racial identity, self-esteem,
and academic concept could predict school performance for an African-American high school student population. The author reported a Cronbach alpha of .90. A copy of the ASCS can be found in Appendix E.

The Social Provisions Scale (SPS; Russell & Cutrona, 1985) was used to assess social support. This scale was developed to assess the six functions of social relationships proposed by Weiss (1974). These functions (termed "provisions" by Weiss) include the following: (a) attachment, a sense of emotional closeness and security; (b) social integration, a sense of belonging to a group of people who share common interests and recreational activities; (c) reassurance of worth, acknowledgment of one's competence and skill; (d) reliable alliance, assurance that one can count on others for tangible assistance; (e) guidance, advice and information; and (f) opportunity for nurturance, a sense of responsibility for the well-being of another person. The measure asks respondents to rate the degree to which their relationships with others are currently supplying each of the provisions. Each provision is assessed by four items, two that describe the presence and two that describe the absence of the provision. Respondents indicate on a four-point scale ("1=not at all true" to "4=completely true") the extent to which each statement describes their current social relationships. For scoring purposes, the negative items (2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14,
15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24) are reversed and summed together with the positive items to form a score for each social provision. A total social provisions score is also formed by summing the six individual provision scores.

Internal consistency for the total scale score is relatively high, ranging from .85 to .92 across a variety of populations. Alpha coefficients for the individual subscales range from .64 to .76. Factor analysis has confirmed a six-factor structure that corresponds to the six social provisions (Russell & Cutrona, 1984, 1985). Several studies support the validity of the SPS. Among first-year college students, the six social provisions in combination accounted for 66% of the variance in scores on the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Cutrona, 1982). Significant negative correlations between the SPS and negative emotional states have been found both longitudinally and in cross-sectional studies of diverse populations, including postpartum mothers (Cutrona, 1984), public school teachers (Russell, Altmaier, & Van Velzen, 1987), and nurses (Russell & Cutrona, 1984). Finally, analyses of data from a college student sample have supported the discriminant validity of the SPS against relevant measures of mood (e.g., depression), personality (e.g., neuroticism, self-esteem), and social desirability (Russell & Cutrona, 1985).

Two Source-Specific-Social Provisions Scales (Cutrona, 1989) were also administered in which respondents were asked
to evaluate the extent to which each of the six provisions of social support was currently available from each of two sources: parents (SPS-Par) and friends (SPS-Fri). The source-specific scales included two items per provision, and were worded to refer to a specific source. For each provision, one item is worded negatively and one positively, to minimize the effects of acquiescence. Respondents indicated their answers on three-point scales (no, sometimes, yes). A total score is obtained by summing up the response across all 12 items after reversing items 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 12. The scores can range from 12-to-36. Cutrona (1989) reported alpha coefficients for the parent and friend source specific scales were .69 and .63, respectively. Correlations for the source-specific subscales with the original SPS were .44 (p<.001) for parent support and .56 (p<.001) for friend support (Cutrona, 1989). A copy of the SPS, SPS-Par, and SPS-Fri can be found in Appendix F.

In addition, information was collected on the students' aptitude (ACT scores), high school and college GPAs, and college course completion through the university registrar. The mean high school grade point average (HGPA) was 2.86, with a S.D. of .045, and a range of 1.710 to 4.00. ACTs had a mean of 20.70, a S.D. of 3.30, and a range of 13 to 28. The mean college grade point average (CGPA) was 2.83, with a S.D. of .62, and a range of .00 to 4.00.
Data Analysis

Preliminary analyses involved assessing the psychometric characteristics of the UCQ, ASCS, SPS, SPS-Par, and SPS-Fri, as well as describing the sample demographics. The first two hypotheses were tested by calculating Pearson correlations between self-efficacy and academic performance (i.e., CGPA and progress), as well as social support and academic performance. The third hypothesis was tested using two separate stepwise regression analyses to determine the extent to which self-efficacy and social support contributed to the prediction of academic performance. Specifically, the first regression tested CGPA as the criterion and the second analysis tested progress as the criterion. The fourth hypothesis was tested using path-analysis to determine how social support is related to academic performance, both directly and indirectly through its influence on self-efficacy. Specifically, EQS, A Structural Equation Program (Bentler, 1993) was employed to test the proposed path-model.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Sample Score Characteristics

A full list of the sample score characteristics can be found in Table 2. CPGAs ranged from .00 to 4.00 with a mean of 2.83 and a S.D. of .62. HGPAs ranged from 1.71 to 4.00 with a mean of 2.83 and a S.D. of .56. ACT scores ranged from 13 to 28 with a mean of 20.64 and a S.D. of 3.27. UCQ scores ranged from 5.25 to 10 with a mean of 9.02 and a S.D. of 1.07. ASCS scores ranged from 63 to 155 with a mean of 116.60 and a S.D. of 14.73. SPS scores ranged from 56 to 95 with a mean of 82.78 and a S.D. of 8.09. SPS-Fri scores ranged from 16 to 36 with a mean of 32.53 and a S.D. of 3.67. SPS-Par scores ranged from 16 to 36 with a mean of 30.82 and a S.D. of 4.42. Credit hours ranged from 3 to 169 with a mean of 77.74 and a S.D. of 35.99. Once credit hours were converted to the variable progress, the breakdown was as follows; 1 (.5%) achieved no progress, 15 (9%) achieved minimum progress, 35 (21%) achieved moderate progress, and 116 (69.5%) achieved good progress.
Psychometric Information

The reliability coefficients, means, standard deviations, and ranges of all of the instruments and measures that were used in this study are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Sample Score Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>α Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>13-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGPA</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.71-4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGPA</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.00-4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>3-169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress (Hours Converted)</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCQ</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.25-10.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCS</td>
<td>116.60</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>63.00-155</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>82.78</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>56-95</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS-Fri</td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>16-36</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS-Par</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>16-36</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACT = American College Test; HGPA = High School Grade Point Average; CGPA = Cumulative College Grade Point Average; UCQ = Undergraduate Course Questionnaire; ASCS = Academic Self-Concept Scale; SPS = Social Provisions Scale; SPS-Fri = Social Provisions Scale-Friends; SPS-Par = Social Provisions Scale-Parents. [Progress Frequencies; 116 (69.5%) = Good Progress; 35 (21%) = Moderate Progress; 15 (9%) = Minimum Progress; 1 (.5%) = No Progress.]

Coefficient alpha correlations were employed to estimate the reliability (internal consistency) of the instruments. The alpha coefficients ranged from .83 to .92. The lowest alpha coefficient was found on the SPS-Fri. The highest was found on the ASCS. In addition, this represents
the first set of reliability coefficients on the SPS (alpha = .85), SPS-Par (alpha = .84), and SPS-Fri (alpha = .83) using a sample of African-American college students. Thus, the SPS, SPS-Par, and SPS-Fri appear to be reliable instruments for use among African-American college students.

Tests of Hypotheses

Pearson correlations calculated among the self-efficacy variables (UCQ & ASCS), the social support variables (SPS, SPS-Par, & SPS-Fri), HGPA, ACT scores and the dependent variables (CGPA & Progress) are shown in Table 3. The results are presented according to the hypotheses. Academic self-efficacy was significantly and positively related to academic performance (Hypothesis 1). The results revealed that academic self-efficacy was significantly related to CGPA, although the correlations for the UCQ and ASCS were low (r = .25, p<.01, r = .22, p<.01, respectively) (Hypothesis 1a). However, the results are mixed regarding academic self-efficacy's relationship to academic progress (Hypothesis 1b). The UCQ was significantly and positively related to progress, although the correlation was low (r = .20, p<.05). On the other hand the ASCS was not significantly related to academic progress.

Social Support, however, was not found to be significantly related to academic performance (Hypotheses 2a & b). Specifically, no significant relationship was found among social support, CGPA and academic progress. Thus,
Table 3

Correlation Coefficients for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>UCQ</th>
<th>ASCS</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>CGPA</th>
<th>HGPA</th>
<th>ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.5541**</td>
<td>.2495**</td>
<td>.1655</td>
<td>.4305**</td>
<td>-.0590</td>
<td>.0864</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>.0432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS-Fri</td>
<td>.5541**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0903</td>
<td>.1006</td>
<td>.2716**</td>
<td>-.0220</td>
<td>-.0130</td>
<td>-.0429</td>
<td>.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS-Par</td>
<td>.2495**</td>
<td>.0903</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1151</td>
<td>.2423**</td>
<td>-.0678</td>
<td>.0940</td>
<td>.0377</td>
<td>-.0116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCQ</td>
<td>.1655</td>
<td>.1006</td>
<td>.1151</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2799**</td>
<td>.2015*</td>
<td>.2489**</td>
<td>.3388**</td>
<td>.3394**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCS</td>
<td>.4305**</td>
<td>.2716**</td>
<td>.2423**</td>
<td>.2799**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0740</td>
<td>.2245**</td>
<td>.0755</td>
<td>.1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>-.0590</td>
<td>-.0220</td>
<td>-.0678</td>
<td>.2015*</td>
<td>.0740</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.3190**</td>
<td>.3010**</td>
<td>.3149**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGPA</td>
<td>.0864</td>
<td>-.0130</td>
<td>.0940</td>
<td>.2489**</td>
<td>.2245**</td>
<td>.3190**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4677**</td>
<td>.5231**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGPA</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>-.0429</td>
<td>.0377</td>
<td>.3388**</td>
<td>.0755</td>
<td>.3010**</td>
<td>.4677**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.6257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>.0432</td>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>-.0116</td>
<td>.3394**</td>
<td>.1156</td>
<td>.3149**</td>
<td>.5231**</td>
<td>.6257**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant .05
**Significant .01
Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Self-efficacy alone was the only research variable significantly related to academic performance.

Stepwise multiple regression using all variables and entering CGPA as the criterion (academic success) showed that three of the nine variables that entered the equation reached statistical significance. These were ACT, HGPA, and ASCS. The analysis yielded an $R^2 = .33$ of explained variance in academic success. Separate analysis conducted to determine which of the nine variables best predicted progress yielded only two variables that reached statistical significance. These were CGPA and ACT. Neither of the hypothesized variables, i.e., self-efficacy and social support, were significant predictors of academic progress. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported. The data are shown in Table 4.
### Table 4

**Stepwise Multiple Regression, Predicting Academic Performance (i.e., CGPA and Progress)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables, Predictors</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CGPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>3.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGPA</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCS</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGPA</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=167; CGPA = College Grade Point Average (cumulative); ACT = American College Test Composite Score; HGPA = High School Grade Point Average; ASCS = Academic Self-Concept Scale Overall Score.

* $p<.05$
** $p<.0001$

Figure 1 presents the hypothesized path model. The exogenous variable social support was defined by the three observed variables (latent variables) SPS, SPS-Par, and SPS-Fri. The endogenous variable self-efficacy was defined by the two observed variables UCQ and ASCS and academic performance was defined by the observed variables CGPA and progress. Social support is hypothesized to directly influence academic performance and indirectly through its influence on academic performance. The analysis yielded a $\chi^2(11df, N=160) = 105.616$, $p<.001$ that was significant and
resulted in the rejection of the path model. Further support for rejection of the model is provided by the Bentler-Bonnett Normed Fit Index (NFI) (.282), which may range from 0 to 1 (a 1 indicating a perfect fit to the data). Kline (1991) suggest a NFI > .90 is indicative of a good model fit. Therefore, the analysis revealed that social support is not significantly related to the criterion (academic performance) either directly or indirectly through its influence on self-efficacy (Hypothesis 4).
Figure 1. Hypothesized Path Model
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among academic self-efficacy beliefs, social support, and the academic performance of African-American undergraduate students attending an HBCU. The literature on African-American undergraduates has suggested that these two variables are particularly important factors in the academic adjustment of this population, but very little research has focused on African-American students attending HBCUs.

Contributions of this Study

Overall, the results indicated that academic self-efficacy was significantly and positively related to academic performance. That is, it was significantly related to both CGPA (UCQ, $r=.25$, $p<.01$, & ASCS, $r=.22$, $p<.01$) and progress (UCQ, $r=.20$, $p<.05$). While the ASCS was found to be a significant predictor of CGPA ($R^2=.03$), the combined contributions of the covariates ACT scores and HGPA ($R^2=.30$) were greater than the research variables (self-efficacy and social support). Cognitive measures in this research were more predictive of college success than were the hypothesized variables of self-efficacy and social support.

The findings of the significant relationship of
academic self-efficacy and academic performance are consistent with the considerable research that has shown that students who scored high on self-efficacy achieved higher levels of academic performance and persistence (Brown et al., 1989; Erazo, 1991; Lent et al., 1986; Multon et al., 1991; Williams & Leonard, 1988). These findings represent the first data showing a significant relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic performance using African-American undergraduates attending an HBCU.

While the results suggest that academic self-efficacy is significantly related to the academic performance of African-American undergraduates attending an HBCU it was not found to be a significant predictor of academic success. This result can partially be explained by the differences between correlations and regressions. While correlational measures determine the existence and strength of a relationship the regression analysis measures the unique variance accounted for by the variable. Therefore, while self-efficacy was significantly correlated to academic performance it did not account for a significant amount of unique variance above and beyond the other variables in the prediction of academic performance.

An examination of the academic progress of the students in this study reveals that the vast majority of them were achieving good to moderate progress (69.5% and 21%, respectively). The students who participated in the present
study, were average achieving students with college GPAs of 2.83 (S.D. = .62). The correlations between self-efficacy and CGPA in this study (r = .25, r = .22) are lower than the effect size found for the total sample (.38) in the meta-analytic study by Multon et al. (1991). However the present correlations are comparable to the correlations found in the study conducted by Erazo (1991) looking at the relationship of self-efficacy to the academic adjustment of minority students (r = .21). The Multon et al. (1991) study did not address demographic factors, such as race, and how they might moderate academic self-efficacy. The findings of this study while not as strong as the effect size estimates of the correlational data (.32) reviewed by Multon et al. (1991), do seem to support and extend previous results showing that self-efficacy expectations are related to academic performance (Brown et al., 1989; Lent et al., 1984, 1986).

It is important to note at this point that while the ASCS was operationally used as a measure of self-efficacy, it actually measures a much broader domain of a student’s beliefs about his/her academic abilities than the UCQ. The ASCS was developed as a measure of generalized academic self-concept and found to relate significantly with measures of academic success such as GPA (Reynolds et al., 1980). The ASCS’ correlation of .22 (p < .01) with CGPA was lower than the correlations (i.e., .40) found by Reynolds et al.
(1980). Its discriminant validity appears to have been confirmed based on its moderate to low correlation with the UCQ (r = .28, p < .01). In addition, the ASCS was found to have significant correlations among the social support measures. This suggests a possible link between the students' social support and how they perceive their overall academic abilities. A path model that looks at the influence of social support directly on academic self-concept and the subsequent effect on academic performance might have resulted in a better outcome. That is, the mediational effect of social support on academic self-concept might have been supported with the elimination of the direct path. The results may also indicate a state versus trait relationship between academic self-concept and academic self-efficacy. That is, academic self-concept may be a more stable construct that is directly influenced by significant relationships, such as, parents (SPS-Par) and friends (SPS-Fri) and subsequently academic performance, while academic self-efficacy's influence is less stable and related to specific tasks.

Social support was generally not a factor in the results of the study. Specifically, no significant relationships were found among social support, CGPA, and academic progress. This lack of findings differ from the results of several studies which have found social support to be a significant predictor of African-American academic
achievement (Hershberger & D’Augelli, 1992; Tracey & Sedlack, 1985). The lack of significant findings should not be interpreted to mean that social support does not play a role in the academic performance of African-American undergraduate students. It does suggest that alternative hypotheses exist that may have better explained the relationships among social support, self-efficacy, and academic performance. As stated previously, an alternative model that looks at the relationship between social support and academic self-concept might have resulted in a better path model.

Limitations

Generally the limitations of this study are most evident in terms of issues related to external validity. For instance, the sample was drawn from a small southern HBCU. The utilization of differing sized and geographically located HBCUs would provide a more heterogenous sample of African-American college students and therefore more generalizable results. In addition, the inclusion of African-American undergraduate students at PWUs would provide the opportunity for comparison of the academic experiences of African-American students at both types of institutions. Also, the recruitment of African-American men to institutions of higher learning has to become a priority. Given the more than 3 to 1 ration of females to males in the present study, these results may be more representative of
African-American females.

In terms of issues related to internal validity, the results of this study also suggests the presence of other variables which may have better predicted academic performance and warrant inclusion in future studies. For instance, the inclusion of demographic variables such as living situation or employment status as predictors of academic performance.

The findings that neither self-efficacy or social support were predictive of academic performance might also have resulted from the use of a cross-sectional method in this study. The lost of subjects due to poor performance and/or the absence of supports may have reduced the magnitude of the correlations. In addition, the exclusion of students that had either voluntarily or involuntarily withdrawn from the institution is likely to have had an effect on the outcome. The use of a cross-sectional design did not allow for the inclusion of those subjects who had left the institution and, therefore, may have resulted in lower variability or range restriction. Further, the self-efficacy beliefs and perceived social support of the students who were utilized may be more restricted on the measures used than on the aptitude measures (HGPA, ACT scores) because the UCQ was not used in the admission or selection process.
Future Research

A particularly interesting finding was the variance accounted for by the aptitude covariates, HGPA and ACT scores, in the prediction of academic performance (30% for CGPA, 13% for progress) for this study. These findings suggest that traditional predictors of academic performance do have some value in predicting the performance of African-American students at an HBCU. In addition, it suggest that other crucial mediating variables, besides self-efficacy, need to be combined with traditional academic indices to help in the development of better predictors of academic performance. The development of a more comprehensive path-model to determine how these factors contribute to the academic performance of African-American students should include these possibilities.

An examination of how the provision of remediation, as well, as the size of an institution should be included in future studies that seek to understand what factors contribute to the academic performance of African-American students. In a related vein, future research should include factors such as, how faculty and institutional support affect the academic performance of this population. That is, what specific roles do the institutions and the professors play in encouraging achievement and commitment in their student body.

In conclusion, this study has contributed to our
understanding of some of the factors effecting the academic performance of African-American undergraduates attending an HBCU. Traditional admission indices, i.e., high school GPA and ACT scores were found to better predict academic performance than the experimental variables, namely academic self-efficacy and social support. African-American students have to be encouraged to realistically assess their preparedness, and when indicated utilize remediation. They also need to be encouraged to look at how their effort interacts with ability in determining their academic success. It is recommended that retention programs address issues surrounding students' academic self-concept and academic self-efficacy, as well as, the adequacy of their preparation for higher learning. While self-efficacy and self-concept are not determinants of academic success, they clearly have an influence on the students effort and persistence. It is recommended that future research continue to explore these variables, along with others, in an effort to better understand and improve the academic success of African-American students.
APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH PROJECT

RESEARCHER: Torrey Wilson, M.A.

This study is concerned with exploring the college experience of African-American students attending historically Black colleges and universities. The main purpose of the study is to ascertain what types of factors contribute most strongly to the academic success of African-American students.

If you decide to participate in the study, you will first be asked to give your permission for me to obtain your high school grade point average and SAT/ACT scores from Xavier University's admissions office. In addition, you are asked to give your social security number and permission to contact the university's registrar, so that your cumulative GPA and course credits can be obtained. The permission form is attached.

Second, you will be asked to fill out two questionnaires today. Please be assured that your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings and that no one at Xavier University will have access to your questionnaire responses. All your responses will be kept completely confidential and will be available only to me.

Your participation is strictly voluntary. If you agree to participate now, you are free to withdraw at any time.

Although you will probably experience little personal benefit from participating, it is hoped that the results of the study will be beneficial to future African-American undergraduates at Xavier and elsewhere.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me at (708) 964-8789 or my research supervisor, Dr. Suzette L. Speight at Loyola University of Chicago (708) 853-3348.

I have read the above description of the study and I hereby consent to participate in the study.

------------------------  ------------------------
Date Please print name

------------------------
Signature
APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM
Authorization for Release of Student's high school GPA, SAT/ACT scores, cumulative college GPA & course credits

Subject to the conditions set out below, I authorize the administration of Xavier University to release my high school GPA SAT/ACT scores cumulative undergraduate GPA and course credits to Torrey Wilson for research purposes.

Conditions:

1. Neither my name nor any other information about me which could be used to positively identify me personally as a research subject will ever be disclosed to any other person, agency or organization.

2. Once assembled and verified, any information from which it would be possible to identify me personally will be destroyed. Only questionnaire results and anonymous demographic data will be retained.

3. All information collected about my academic performance will be used solely for purposes of scientific research.

-----------------------------  -----------------------------
Date                          Signature

-----------------------------
Please print name

-----------------------------
Social Security Number
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM
Demographic Information Form

Please answer all the questions as completely as possible.

1. Age____

2. Sex _____ Male _____ Female

3. Marital Status (Please check one):
   _____ Single (never married)
   _____ Married
   _____ Separated
   _____ Divorced
   _____ Widowed

4. Current living situation (Please check one):
   _____ Living alone
   _____ Living with roommate(s)
   _____ Living with family
   _____ Living with partner (married or unmarried)
   _____ Living with partner and children
   _____ Living with children, no partner

4a. If living with roommate(s), check one:
   _____ Dormitory
   _____ Apartment or house
   _____ Other (please specify)

5. Current classification (Please check one):
   _____ Sophomore
   _____ Junior
   _____ Senior
   _____ Other (please specify)

6. Current employment status (Please check one):
   _____ Not working
   _____ Working part-time (less than 40 hours/week)
   _____ Working full-time (40 or more hours/week)
   _____ Other (please specify)
APPENDIX D

SELF-EFFICACY MEASURE
INSTRUCTIONS: Assuming you were motivated to do your best, please indicate how confident you are that you could do each of the following at Xavier University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Complete the Speech core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete the History core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Complete the English Composition core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complete the Mathematics core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complete the Natural Sciences core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete the Philosophy core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Complete the Social Sciences core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Confident</td>
<td>Very Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Complete the Theology core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Complete the Literature core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Complete the Fine Arts core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Complete the Language core requirements with a C or above</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Remain at Xavier over the next semester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Remain at Xavier over the next two semesters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Excel at Xavier over the next semester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Excel at Xavier over the next two semesters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Graduate from Xavier</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SELF-EFFICACY MEASURE
ASCS/Reynolds

School Attitude Survey

Listed below are a number of statements concerning school related attitudes. Rate each item as it pertains to you personally. Base your ratings on how you feel most of the time.

INDICATE THE RESPONSE BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER. Be sure to answer all items. Try to respond to each item independently, do not be influenced by your previous choice. Use the following scale to rate each statement:

A. Strongly agree
B. Disagree
C. Agree
D. Strongly agree

1. Being a student is a very rewarding experience.
   A B C D

2. If I try hard enough, I will be able to get good grades. 
   A B C D

3. Most of the time my efforts in school are rewarded.
   A B C D

4. No matter how hard I try I don’t do well in school.
   A B C D

5. I often expect to do poorly on exams.
   A B C D

6. All in all, I feel I am a capable student.
   A B C D

7. I do well in my courses given the amount of time I dedicate to studying. 
   A B C D

8. My parents are not satisfied with my grades in school.
   A B C D

9. Others view me as intelligent. 
   A B C D

10. Most courses are very easy for me. 
    A B C D

11. I sometimes feel like dropping out of school.
    A B C D

12. Most of my classmates do better in school than I do. 
    A B C D
13. Most of my instructors think that I am good student. 
   A  B  C  D

14. At times I feel school is too difficult for me. 
   A  B  C  D

15. All in all, I am proud of my grades in school. 
   A  B  C  D

16. Most of the time while taking a test I feel confident. 
   A  B  C  D

17. I feel capable of helping others with their class work. 
   A  B  C  D

18. I feel teachers’ standards are too high for me. 
   A  B  C  D

19. It’s hard for me to keep up with my class work. 
   A  B  C  D

20. I am satisfied with the class assignments that I turn in. 
    A  B  C  D

21. At times I feel like a failure. 
    A  B  C  D

22. I feel I don’t study enough for a test. 
    A  B  C  D

23. Most exams are easy for me. 
    A  B  C  D

24. I have doubts that I will do well in school. 
    A  B  C  D

25. For me, studying hard pays off. 
    A  B  C  D

26. I have a hard time getting through school. 
    A  B  C  D

27. I am good at scheduling my study time. 
    A  B  C  D

28. I have a fairly clear sense of my academic goals. 
    A  B  C  D

29. I’d like to be a much better student than I am now. 
    A  B  C  D

30. I often get discouraged about school. 
    A  B  C  D

31. I enjoy doing my schoolwork. 
    A  B  C  D

32. I consider myself a very good student. 
    A  B  C  D
33. I usually get the grades I deserve in courses.  
   A  B  C  D

34. I do not study as much as I should.  A  B  C  D

35. I usually feel on top of my work by finals.  
   A  B  C  D

36. Others consider me a good student.  A  B  C  D

37. I feel that I am better than the average student.  
   A  B  C  D

38. In most of the courses, I feel that my classmates are  
   better prepared than I am.  A  B  C  D

39. I feel that I don't have the necessary abilities for  
   certain courses in my major.  A  B  C  D

40. I have poor study habits.  A  B  C  D
APPENDIX F

SOCIAL PROVISIONS SCALE
The Social Provisions Scale

DIRECTIONS: In answering the following 24 questions, think about your current relationships with friends, family members, coworkers, community members, and so on. Then indicate to what extent you agree that each statement describes your current relationships with other people. Use the following scale to give your opinions. So, for example, if you feel that a statement is very true of your current relationships, you would place a "4" on the line next to the statement indicating that you "strongly agree." If you feel that a statement clearly does not describe your relationships, you would indicate "strongly disagree" with a rating of "1" next to the item. If you feel that the statement is mostly to somewhat true of your relationships, you should give it a rating of "3" (Agree). If it is mostly to somewhat untrue of your relationships, you should rate it as a "2" (Disagree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There are other people I can depend on to help me if I really need it. ____

2. I feel that I do not have close personal relationships with other people. ____

3. There is no one I can turn to for guidance in times of stress. ____

4. There are people who depend on me for help. ____

5. There are people who enjoy the same social activities I do. ____

6. Other people do not view me as competent. ____

7. I feel personally responsible for the well-being of another person. ____

8. I feel part of a group of people who share my attitudes and beliefs. ____

9. I do not think other people respect my skills and abilities. ____

10. If something went wrong, no one would come to my assistance. ____
11. I have close relationships that provide me with a sense of emotional security and well-being. 

12. There is someone I could talk to about important decisions in my life. 

13. I have relationships where my competence and skills are recognized. 

14. There is no one who shares my interests and concerns. 

15. There is no one who really relies on me for their well-being. 

16. There is a trustworthy person I could turn to for advice if I were having problems. 

17. I feel a strong emotional bond with at least one other person. 

18. There is no one I can depend on for aid if I really need it. 

19. There is no one I feel comfortable talking about my problems with. 

20. There are people who admire my talents and abilities. 

21. I lack a feeling of intimacy with another person. 

22. There is no one who likes to do the things I do. 

23. There are people I can count on in an emergency. 

24. No one needs me to care for them.
Relationship Questionnaire

In answering the next set of questions, please think about your current relationships with your friends. If you feel a question accurately describes your relationships with your friends you would say "yes". If the question does not describe your relationships, you would say "no". If you cannot decide whether the question describes your relationships with your friends you may say "not sure".

1) NO
2) SOMETIMES
3) YES

1. Are there friends you can depend on to help you if you really need it? __________
2. Do you feel you could not turn to your friends for guidance in times of stress? __________
3. Are there friends who enjoy the same social activities that you do? __________
4. Do you feel personally responsible for the well-being of your friends? __________
5. Do you feel your friends do not respect your skills and abilities? __________
6. If something went wrong, do you feel that none of your friends would come to your assistance? __________
7. Do your relationships with your friends provide you with a sense of emotional security and well-being? __________
8. Do you feel your competence and skill are recognized by your friends? __________
9. Do you feel none of your friends share your interests and concerns? __________
10. Do you feel none of your friends really rely on you for their well-being? __________
11. Is there a trustworthy friend you could turn to for advice if you were having problems? __________
12. Do you feel you lack emotional closeness with your friends? __________
In answering the next set of questions, please think about your current relationships with your parents.

1) NO
2) SOMETIMES
3) YES

1. Can you depend on your parents to help you if you really need it? ____

2. Do you feel you could not turn to your parents for guidance in times of stress? ____

3. Do your parents enjoy the same social activities that you do? ____

4. Do you feel personally responsible for the well-being of your parents? ____

5. Do you feel your parents do not respect your skills and abilities? ____

6. If something went wrong, do you feel that your parents would not come to your assistance? ____

7. Does your relationship with your parents provide you with a sense of emotional security and well-being? ____

8. Do you feel your competence and skill are recognized by your parents? ____

9. Do you feel your parents do not share your interests and concerns? ____

10. Do you feel your parents do not really rely on you for their well-being? ____

11. Could you turn to your parents for advice if you were having problems? ____

12. Do you feel you lack emotional closeness with your parents? ____
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