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ABSTRACT

Many African American male adolescents mature without the influence of an adequate social model, or a positive, same sex (or gender-homogenous) mentor. Thus, it may be difficult for African American male adolescents to reach adulthood having developed the perceived capability to be successful within specific domains that American society commonly associates with a healthy life course trajectory. A large body of research has suggested that vicarious experience or role modeling is a primary source of efficacy information in a variety of life domains. Research has also suggested that modeling effects are enhanced if the subject and model are similar, especially in terms of gender. The purpose of this study was to examine three models exploring the interrelationships among gender-homogenous mentoring, spiritual wellbeing, and domain specific self-efficacy beliefs (e.g., academic, career decision-making, and social) in African American male adolescents. Findings revealed that self-efficacy beliefs in the specific domains act, individually, as mediators of the relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and a mentee’s existential wellbeing. The results also indicated that aspects of spiritual wellbeing partially mediate, or explain, the relationship between gender-homogenous mentoring and self-efficacy.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

African American male adolescents face many difficulties in the development of self-efficacy beliefs in various life domains. Although several factors contribute to this set of issues, one of the most significant may be that many mature into adulthood without receiving the influence of a positive male social model or mentor (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005; Powell, 1990; White & Cones, 1999). Consistent with this fact, 63% of African American families are mother-headed households (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). While single mothers are very capable of raising competent young men, difficulties associated with fatherlessness or inconsistent fathering can cause many African American male youth to accept guidance about what it means to transition into manhood from unreliable sources (e.g. the media or negative social models within the community) that serve to foster the internalization of insidious stereotypical roles of black masculinity (White & Cones, 1999). Thus, rather than excelling academically, vocationally and socially, many Black youths reach adulthood having never attained self-efficacy within these specific domains, which, Americans commonly associate with successful passage into adulthood.

In the United States, only 41% of Black males graduate from high school, and for every three Black men in college, four are in prison (Department of Justice, 2002; Schott Foundation for Public Education, 2006). Unemployment among Black males is higher
than any other racial/ethnic group at 14.1% (U.S. Department of Labor, 2009). Black men in the U.S. also have the shortest life expectancy (69.5 years) of all other racial groups, averaging over six years less than white men who live 75.7 years (National Center for Health Statistics, 2005).

These statistics represent social problems facing African American males that have been inextricably woven into our society (Clark et al., 1999). The stifling effect of these issues is multiplied by the emphasis that society places on males becoming adept in seeking education, procuring sustainable and gainful employment, and engaging in social behavior that is consonant with societal norms as the basis of what it takes to function as a man in America (Clausen, 1991). For generations, African American males have been ridiculed for lacking the ability to ‘pull themselves up by their bootstraps’ and function within the aforementioned ‘manhood oriented domains’ with the same prowess as Whites in post-slavery America (Sue & Sue, 2008). But, it takes more than mere will power and good intentions to reverse the effects of atrocities that began with American slavery and have impacted African American men for centuries.

Joseph L. White and James H. Cones III (1999), in their exposition of the traditional view of slavery, stated that,

When Africans first arrived on American shores, they carried with them no history of family instability, juvenile delinquency, disrespect for the elderly, or rampant crime. In preslavery Africa, young men could realistically aspire to roles as fathers, providers, heads of families, protectors of women and children, and decision makers in community governance, following an orderly, clearly defined set of rules and customs. In America, African males were redefined as subhuman property… They were stripped of their roles as family head and community leader, and render defenseless to protect their women and children. …And after years of conditioning, the Black male (slave) came to believe in his own inferiority.
Once strong independent social models for subsequent generations, through no fault of their own, Black males were perceived as inferior and incompetent by a powerful oppressor (White & Cones, 1999). The result is a deep-seated history of cyclical self-misunderstanding, based on internalized racism that has existed from the moment the first Black man was captured, shackled and placed on a slave ship. African American males have been in a constant state of ‘identity-reconstruction’ ever since, engaging in an uphill battle against American social barriers that persists to this day (Taylor, 1990). Social modeling through mentoring may be a crucial process in confronting these social barriers because it carries the potential to generate self-efficacy beliefs in these individuals who might not otherwise attain them (White & Cones, 1999).

**Social Modeling and Self-Efficacy**

Social modeling is a primary source of self-efficacy information (Bandura, 1977). Albert Bandura (1969), in his chapter on *Social-Learning Theory of Identificatory Processes*, stated that the provision of social models is an indispensable means of transmitting and modifying behavior. It is the transmission and modification of behavior through social modeling that can potentially influence an individual’s self-efficacy (Anderson & Betz, 2001; Bandura, 1977).

Self-efficacy, or one’s perceived capability to achieve in various life domains, is guided by four mechanisms (Bandura, 2006). These mechanisms include performance accomplishments, verbal persuasion, emotional arousal, and vicarious experience (Bandura, 1977). Research has shown that vicarious experiences (i.e., social modeling) account for substantial variance in self-efficacy beliefs across a variety of different life
domains. For example, Schnuck (2003) found that academic self-efficacy and achievement can be enhanced through instructional methods that incorporate modeled strategies. Betz (1992) found that career-related self-efficacy is developed, in part, through vicarious experiences, and interventions intended to increase self-efficacy in this domain should include observational learning as a major component. Also, Anderson and Betz (2001) asserted that the transmission and modification of behavior through social modeling influences an individual’s social self-efficacy. Therefore, without adequate social models or mentors to exhibit success in these areas, it can be hypothesized that African American male adolescents risk failing to develop the types of robust self-efficacy beliefs that seem important to prospering academically, vocationally, and socially. Further, research has shown that model similarity in terms of race and gender is a significant moderator of these relationships—the relationship is stronger when the model is of the same gender and race as the participant than when the model and participants are of different races and genders (Bandura, 1969; Lent, 2012). Thus, it is hypothesized in this study that the extent to which African American male adolescents are exposed to male adult models will relate positively to the adolescents’ self-efficacy beliefs in three “manhood-oriented” self-efficacy domains.

**Manhood-Oriented Self-Efficacy Domains**

Academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy and self-assertive efficacy are all self-efficacy domains that this researcher is identifying as *manhood-oriented self-efficacy domains*. This study will focus on the first three domains—a academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-
efficacy, and social self-efficacy. American social mores dictate that there are various
distinguishing attributes, or competencies, a male should exhibit in order to be considered
an adequately functioning member of society (Clausen, 1991). It is important, however,
to consider that the term *manhood-oriented* is being used, in this study, in relation to the
specific gender of the population being studied. Therefore, it should not be assumed that
the associated domains relate exclusively to men or any particular racial group.

As mentioned above, in America, a man must be *at least* efficacious
academically, vocationally and socially to “succeed” in life. If a man does not perceive
that he is capable of succeeding or achieving within these domains, it is possible that he
will be less likely to do so (Bandura, 1977). The inherent consequences of failure in
these areas are the perpetuation of negative stereotypes and the inability to adequately
function as a member of society (White & Cones, 1999). For example, to be
unsuccessful academically is to be deemed unintelligent and intellectually inferior. To be
unsuccessful vocationally is to be placed at greater risk of poverty and economic
stagnation. To be unsuccessful socially is to be deemed incapable of attaining and
sustaining lasting relationships or engaging in socially unacceptable criminal behavior.
Intellectual inferiority, poverty, social ineptitude and criminality are all negative
stereotypes associated with Black masculinity that are greatly accepted within American
society (Clark et al., 1999; Powell, 1990; Rockquemore, Brunsma, & Delgado, 2009; Sue
& Sue, 2008; Whaley, 2001; White & Cones, 1999).

Self-efficacy has been found to influence choice of behavioral activities, effort
expenditure, persistence in the face of obstacles, and task performance related to
academic, vocational, and social domains (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996; Bandura, Pastorelli, Barbaranelli, & Caprara, 1999; Hackett & Betz, 1981; Lent, Brown, & Larkin, 1986; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991). Thus, factors (e.g., social modeling) that facilitate self-efficacy belief development in academic, vocational, and social life-domains should increase the probability of success in these domains. Competency in these domains will, in turn, advance one’s life course trajectories (Clausen, 1991).

**Gender-Homogeneous Mentoring**

Research on mentoring also supports the importance of gender and racial homogeneity between the mentor and mentee as an important element of mentoring effectiveness. This literature has also suggested several characteristics that an effective mentor must possess. First, a mentor must be a homogeneous and a supportive figure who is present and consistent (Bandura, 1969, 1977; Connor & White, 2006; Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & DuBois, 2008; Garringer, 2004; Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997). Particularly, gender homogeneity has been found to support psychological adjustment in mentees (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005a). Second, a mentor must be a credible role model and educator, from the mentee’s perspective, who is earnestly and altruistically dedicated to the mentee’s success (Rhodes, Spencer, Keller, Liang, & Noam, 2006). Third, a mentor must help a mentee understand the difference between the biological and social factors of manhood (White & Cones, 1999). Finally, a mentor must be a person who instills hope, is attuned to the mentee’s life circumstance, and works diligently to help
him gradually to achieve mastery in the aforementioned manhood-oriented domains (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b).

As mentioned before, research supports the relation between social modeling and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). If a mentor exhibits the above characteristics, the mentee should, theoretically, be able to develop self-efficacy in various domains (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b; Spencer, Cole, DuPree, Glymph, & Pierre, 1993; White & Cones, 1999). However, the mentoring literature does not specify whether or not qualitative differences exist in mentees’ ability to receive and integrate explicit and implicit messages from a mentor figure (White & Cones, 1999). In other words, if two same-aged adolescent males with equal intellectual ability receive guidance from the same mentor about the dangers of substance use, there is no stated indication as to whether or not one or both adolescents will abstain from using drugs and alcohol based upon the mentor’s guidance. There could potentially be dozens of explanations for differences of this nature. One such explanation could have to do with a mentee’s wellbeing and overall experience of life.

**The Influence of Spiritual Wellbeing**

Spiritual Wellbeing can be thought of as perceived spiritual quality of life as understood in two senses – a religious sense and an existential sense (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982). These two meanings of the term “spiritual wellbeing” reflect general vernacular. In other words, when people talk about their spirituality, they generally mean either their relationship with God (or a higher power) or their sense of satisfaction with life or purpose in life (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982). People’s level of understanding of
their own relationship with God (or a higher power) and their sense of meaning and purpose in life could strongly influence their overall outlook and sense of wellbeing. Bandura (1969) posited that internal representational processes that mediate subsequent behavioral reproduction obviously play a prominent role in observational learning. As it relates to this proposed study, spiritual wellbeing, as an internal representational process, could influence the effect of gender-homogeneous mentoring on the development of academic, career decision-making, and social self-efficacy beliefs.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Hypotheses**

There has been an absence of studies investigating the relationship among gender-homogenous mentoring, spiritual wellbeing, and self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents.

The current study therefore, examined the relations of gender-homogenous mentoring spiritual wellbeing, and self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents and tested the following three possible models for the relationships among these variables. The first model (Model A) was a moderator model that hypothesized that the relationship between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs would be stronger if spiritual wellbeing is high versus low (see Figure 1). This model posits that greater spiritual wellbeing (indicating that the mentee has an established relationship with God or a higher power and a significant personal sense of meaning and purpose) will promote the capacity to understand and integrate positive messages from a mentor, bolstering the relationships between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs. Thus, the relationship between
mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs will be stronger for adolescents with high versus low feelings of spirituality.

Figure 1. Moderation Model (Model A)

The subsequent two models were mediator models. The first mediator model (Model B) hypothesized that spiritual wellbeing mediates, or explains, the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Mediation Model (Model B)

That is, mentoring has a positive relation with self-efficacy because mentoring promotes greater spiritual wellbeing among mentees and spiritual wellbeing serves to promote greater self-efficacy belief development. The third model (Model C) tested the
hypothesis that self-efficacy beliefs in the manhood-oriented domains serve, individually, as mechanisms that explain the relation between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Mediation Model (Model C)

This model reverses the roles of spiritual wellbeing and self-efficacy beliefs by hypothesizing that mentoring gives rise to greater spiritual wellbeing through the influence of mentoring on the development of self-efficacy beliefs. For example, developing strong vocational, educational, and social self-efficacy beliefs via a mentor’s influence may lead to greater spiritual wellbeing, especially existential wellbeing, the dimension reflecting greater life purpose.

**Study Significance and Contribution to the Field**

This study will be a meaningful contribution to the field of Counseling Psychology because it could provide direction for counselors and educators working with African American adolescent males to promote greater feelings of confidence about their educational, vocational, and social futures (Mandara et al., 2005; Powell, 1990). It could elucidate the effect of religiosity and sense of meaning and purpose on a mentee’s ability to receive and integrate messages from a mentor. This study could also provide an
understanding of the mechanism that underlies the relation between gender-homogenous mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs in African American adolescent males as well as the mechanism that underlies the relation between gender-homogenous mentoring and spiritual wellbeing.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter provides a comprehensive review of the literature as well as a framework for understanding the research conducted in this study. This chapter’s main objective is to summarize and critique existing literature pertaining to mentoring, spiritual wellbeing, and self-efficacy beliefs relative to African American males. In addition, I explore the relevance of African American culture and history in discussions of self-efficacy to inform the rationale for this work.

Black Masculinity in America

The history of Black males in America is characterized by cyclical denigration brought about by slavery and its remnants. There are various ways to understand slavery’s destructive power when envisioning the past, present, and future of Black males. Two prevalent and opposing psychological theories addressing this issue are the traditional and revisionist views of American slavery (White & Cones, 1999).

The traditional view of American slavery portrays an image of Black males as passive pawns whom slave owners controlled psychologically and socially. The revisionist view describes the Black male slave as a human being attempting to live life with sense of agency over his own destiny without having the power to do so. Within this psychological perspective, black males of this time period are described as people who implicitly and explicitly resisted the deleterious effects of slavery while expressing a
clear pattern of self-determination and creating an enduring cultural style (White & Cones, 1999).

Although there are stark differences between the two perspectives, a strong point of agreement between traditionalists and revisionists is the understanding that slavery had a dramatic impact on the self-perceived prowess of Black males to subsist in society with autonomy. To name the full measure of catastrophic consequences that resulted from American slavery would be to move far beyond the scope of this work. Central to this research, however, is the concept of internalized racism and the lasting effect it has had on African American males.

**Internalized Racism**

There is some disagreement within the literature regarding the semantic nature of the concept of the internalization of racial messages. The terms, *internalized racism, internalized racialism, internalized inferiority, and internalized oppression* tend to fallaciously be used interchangeably. For the purposes of this study, I use the term *internalized racism*, which Cokley (2002) defined as “the internalization of negative stereotypes about one’s own racial group”. Internalized racism can be understood as the conscious and unconscious support of negative racial stereotypes that lead to the perception of one’s own racial group as inherently inferior (Baker, 1983; Cokley, 2002; Steele, 1997; Stevenson, 1995; White & Cones, 1999). What happens as a result is members of one racial group consciously or unknowingly endorse the oppressor’s ideologies by communicating counterproductive and racist messages to other group members. Thus, within-group perpetuation of damaging codes of conduct perceived to be
racially normative ensues (Lipsky, 1987). Over the years much attention has been brought to the status of young African American males, suggesting that there has been continued deterioration regarding unemployment, involvement in the criminal justice system, absent fathers, and victims of homicide and suicide (Gibbs & Ann, 1988; Lazur & Majors, 1995). Internalized racism contributes to these issues insofar as it has been linked to depression and learned helplessness, which inhibit achievement and task performance (Cokley, 2002; Klein, Fencil-Morse, & Seligman, 1976; Steele, 1997).

**Learned Helplessness**

Learned helplessness is a construct originally formulated in a laboratory setting with dogs and other animals as test subjects. This research demonstrated that when events are perceived as uncontrollable, the subject learns that its behavior is independent of any outcome (Maier & Seligman, 1976; Overmier & Seligman, 1967). Since the advent of this research, learned helplessness has been extrapolated to behavior in human subjects. “Learned helplessness occurs in a variety of situations, with a variety of uncontrollable events, and across the number of species, including rats, cats, mice, and men” (Broman, Mavaddat, & Hsu, 2000; Seligman, 1975). Seligman, et al. (1978) postulate that humans and animals who find outcomes to be uncontrollable experience the following three deficits: motivational, cognitive, and emotional. Motivational deficits can be observed when an individual becomes less likely to initiate action because of an expectation that initiated action is futile. Cognitive deficits can be observed when individuals become less likely to learn that a particular response can produce a related outcome. Finally, the authors suggest depression transpires after an individual learns that particular outcomes
are uncontrollable. Broman, et al. (2000) relate the learned helplessness model to African American males in the following statement:

…the person who is Black and behaving according to the dictates of society usually expects that he...will be treated accordingly, with dignity and proper respect. Racially biased treatment then reinforces the sense of uncontrollable outcomes. Each instance of victimization by discriminatory behavior reinforces the Black individuals view that being victimized by racially biased treatment is an uncontrollable event when one is a minority in American society.

Consistent with the learned helplessness model, two outcomes are expected for African American males, lowered sense of mastery and depression (Broman et al., 2000).

**Understanding African American Masculinity**

As demonstrated above, American slavery was, at the very least, profoundly psychologically damaging, and its effects continue to place great strain on Black males. However, amidst overwhelming social barriers, Black males have sought to attain social autonomy and define masculinity in various ways. Some constructions of African American masculinity have been described as dysfunctional and/or compensatory responses to racial oppression (Wade & Rochlen, 2013). One common depiction of the masculinity enactments of young Black men is known as *cool pose* (Majors & Billson, 1992; Oliver, 1984; Wade & Rochlen, 2013).

Cool pose can be defined as a “ritualized form of masculinity that entails behaviors, scripts, physical posturing, impression management, and carefully crafted performances that deliver a single, critical message: pride, strength, and control” (Majors & Billson, 1992, p. 4). For African American males, cool pose is adaptive in that it is used as a means to counteract stress created by racial bias observed in the majority culture. It can also communicate anger, bitterness, and distrust for the majority culture.
European American males often differ greatly in terms of social behavior. While African American males’ mode is often dynamic and assertive, European Americans males’ behavior is generally unchallenging and dispassionate. The differing styles create anxieties and misgivings that lead to premature judgment between races. Overall, however, cool pose is seen as a means by which to communicate dignity, pride, self-respect and social competence (Majors & Billson, 1992; Lazur & Majors, 1995).

Qualities of cool pose that are thought to be maladaptive can also be observed. Although cool pose guards against oppression and second-class treatment from European Americans, the act of being perpetually emotionally closed off can interfere with the creation and maintenance of authentic relationships, especially when it concerns the opposite sex (Majors & Billson, 1992). Cool pose is also a contributing factor in the mistreatment of self and other African Americans (Majors & Billson, 1992). Lazur and Majors (1995) assert that the inability to express feelings, fears, or worries coupled with constant pressure to prove one’s manhood can lead to emotions bursting forth in expressions of assault, accident, substance abuse, suicide, or homicide. Richard Wright (1940) vividly depicted this concept in his novel Native Son. Wright tells the story of Bigger Thomas, a young African American male who, in the earlier part of the 20th century, is reared in poverty by his single mother and subjected to pervasive systemic and individual racial prejudice. One night, he finds himself smothering to death, with a pillow, the daughter of the White couple he works for. Terrified and bewildered, Bigger has no idea why he committed the crime. But, Wright leads us to believe that immense
social pressure and powerlessness suddenly erupted and overcame Bigger in a very tragic and unexpected way. Wright provides perhaps an extreme example of how cool pose’s paradoxical necessity and potential perniciousness play out in the lives of African American male adolescents. Lazur and Majors (1995) provides another example this phenomenon with the following:

The toll [of cool pose] is most evident on African American adolescent males. Adopting cool pose tenets, the African American adolescent male distances himself from uncool activities like achieving success in school. In the midst of developing an identity yet full of self-doubt, confused about how to express himself, and confronted by the contrast between self and the dominant culture, the adolescent male often seeks identity refuge...

Such refuge is often taken in gangs or in media images and icons that perceivably exemplify what it means to be a Black man in America. However, what is actually communicated are false messages about what African American masculinity truly entails (Majors & Billson, 1992; White & Cones, 1999). Internalization of such messages can lead to low self-efficacy and further emotional deficits related to psychological maladjustment (Quintana & McKown, 2008).

An all-together different way of understanding black masculinity is provided by Hunter and Davis (1992). These authors identified four domains of manhood among African American men. The first defining domain is self-determinism and accountability, which entails directness, maturity, economic viability, perseverance, and free will. The authors define self-determinism and accountability as the coherency and viability of the self on which one’s performance or fulfillment of role expectancy rests. The second domain is family, which is thought to include family responsibilities and connectedness, equity in male and female relationships, and the fulfillment of family role expectations.
The third domain is *pride* in one’s manhood and sense of self entails one’s desire and capacity to for a man to better himself and his family. The final domain that Hunter and Davis (1992) discussed is *spirituality and humanism* and includes men’s views of their relationship to other human beings, the human community, and the importance of spiritual groundedness. The authors assert, “This domain embodies a worldview that links manhood to the collective “we” and spirituality” (Hunter & Davis, 1992, p. 472). It necessitates spiritual and moral principles, connectedness to human community, respect for womanhood, sensitivity, and belief in human equity (Hunter & Davis, 1992).

Having viewed both maladaptive and adaptive constructions of Black masculinity, it can be said that young African American male adolescents may benefit greatly from the observation and influence of a social model whose circumstance communicates healthy masculine values and the idea that success is possible despite the existence of aversive social barriers. Furthermore, a positive gender-homogenous mentor could, not only serve as a healthy social model, but also serve to help youngsters identify their idiosyncratic potential and recognize the utility of effort in areas otherwise thought to be “uncool” or unrelated to personal success (e.g. good academic performance, fair treatment of women, applying for a low-paying first job). The present research demonstrates that the way to combat cyclical and caustic means of envisioning one’s stake in the world is to attack the malady at its source.

**Mentoring**

The word mentor derives from a character in Homer’s *Odyssey*. Before his voyage, Odysseus gave his wise and faithful friend, Mentor, the task of looking after and
educating, Telemachus, Odysseus’ only son (Keller, 2007). The term mentoring is defined in various ways across settings and investigations. For the purpose of this review, mentoring will be described as a relationship between an older, more experienced mentor and an unrelated, younger protégé in which the mentor typically provides ongoing guidance, instruction, and encouragement aimed at developing the competence and character of the protégé (Rhodes, 1994, p.188). A mentor is thought to be a person who personalizes modeling influences for a mentee through direct involvement. This is different from the function of a role model (i.e. one who exhibits behaviors, values, professionalism, and competence) due to the development of a personal mentoring relationship. It can be said that a person can be a role model without being a mentor, but a person cannot be a mentor without also being a role model (Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992).

Because of the ubiquity of this concept, mentoring spans an array of disciplines that all provide a unique perspective on its focus and function. The mentoring focus that relates best to this study is known in the literature as youth mentoring. Formal youth mentoring in the United States has its origin within the major social movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Freedman, 1993; Keller, 2007). For instance, Freedman (1993) discusses the Friendly Visiting movement in which middle-class volunteers personally reached out to poor families to provide social support, moral uplift, and role modeling. Social reformer Jane Addams has also been linked to the beginnings of youth mentoring due to her work in establishing the nation’s first juvenile court in response to rising juvenile delinquency, which she perceived to be a consequence of deleterious urban environments (Baker & Maguire, 2005). Ernest Coulter, credited with establishing
the Big Brothers movement in 1904, also played a vital role in the origin of youth mentoring in the United States when he passionately appealed to business and civic leaders to act as big brothers for youth otherwise destined for the reformatory (Beiswinger, 1985; Keller, 2007). At present there are more than 4500 programs exist, nationwide, that support mentoring activities (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005a). Thus, youth mentoring as a construct is based on the actions volunteer mentors take on behalf of disadvantaged youths whose behavior has brought them to the attention of the authorities. Keller (2007) maintains, “This reliance on volunteer mentors and emphasis on children in need remains at the core of most structured (youth mentoring) programs”. In fact, formal mentoring programs have been found to have stronger effects with youths considered to be “at-risk”. DuBois and Silverthorn (2005) suggest the efficacy of such programs in the following statement:

In an investigation using the nationally-representative sample of the Add Health study, respondents who reported having a mentor during adolescence were more likely to report positive outcomes in each of several domains (i.e. education/work, problem behavior, psychological well-being, and physical health)…

To date, the literature on youth mentoring has concentrated on five major areas. The first area the research focuses on is the development of mentoring programs (DuBois & Neville, 1997). Sapone (1989), for example, discussed the importance of affective education and self-esteem building in working with at-risk youth. He argued that cognitive development should be focused on as a secondary goal, at least initially, and that affective strategies should be focused on primarily (Sapone, 1989). The next major area of youth mentoring research is one that focuses on describing aspects of existing mentoring programs for the betterment of fledgling programs (DuBois & Neville, 1997).
The third area entails *psychosocial and adjustment outcomes* associated with youth mentoring programs (Galvin, 1989; McPartland & Nettles, 1991). The final two areas are related in their foci – the *examination of mentor characteristics* and *mentoring relationship characteristics* (Furano, Roaf, Styles, & Branch, 1993; Hendry, Roberts, Glendinning, & Coleman, 1992).

Also indicated in the youth mentoring literature is the distinction between formal mentoring programs and what is known as *natural mentoring*. Natural mentoring relationships take place outside of formal mentoring programs and involve persons such as neighbors, teachers, coaches, and extended family members. (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b). These naturally arising connections account for approximately two-thirds (69%) of all reported youth mentoring relationships (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b). The authors go on to state that, “Natural mentoring relationships, because of their inherent greater flexibility (than formal mentoring relationship), may be better suited to providing benefits that extend equally to youths who are and are not identified as at risk” (p. 523). Therefore, it can be said that natural mentoring and formal mentoring relationships are not equally efficacious in all areas for all youth. Both types are, however, useful and life altering in many cases (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b; Rhodes, 1994).

Equally notable is the cross-cultural perspective on youth mentoring that examines the quality and effectiveness of mentoring dyads as functions of cultural similarity and dissimilarity. Embedded within this portion of the literature, are various explanations of the significance of gender, race, sexual orientation, ethnicity and other
intra-dyadic cultural factors. For the purpose of this study, I will focus on race/ethnicity and gender primarily.

Research indicates that racial and ethnic identity play a significant role in non-majority youths’ holistic development (Cross, 1978; Phinney, 1989; Stevenson, 1995; Thomas & Schwarzbaum, 2010). There is a draw in the youth mentoring literature to emphasize, in practice through mentor training, the influence of intersecting identities of mentors and mentees on the mentoring dyad (Bogat & Liang, 2005; Liang & Grossman, 2007; Sánchez & Colón, 2005). This movement is taking place as a result of an enduring concept that can be observed in youth mentoring called the similarity-attraction paradigm (Sánchez & Colón, 2005). This paradigm proposes that individuals are attracted to those similar to themselves (Byne, 1971), and it can be observed in both mentors and mentees (Sánchez & Colón, 2005). There are arguments for and against the similarity-attraction paradigm as it relates to race and ethnicity within formal and natural mentoring relationships. On the basis of studies from various disciplines, Sánchez & Colón (2005) conclude that:

… Similarity or dissimilarity of the mentor and youth along the dimensions of race or ethnicity should not be expected to be a robust predictor of relationship quality or youth outcomes. Looking beyond race/ethnicity and at the cultural nuances and processes taking place in the relationship might be more important for understanding effective youth mentoring.

What seems to matter most in youth mentoring relationships, regarding race and ethnicity, is cultural competence (Rhodes, 2005) at the provider level, which includes demonstrated cultural awareness, specific cultural knowledge, and the skills to work sensitively with youths from racial or ethnic backgrounds different from one’s own
(Rhodes, 2005; Sánchez & Colón, 2005; Sue & Sue, 2012). This is true across all racial and ethnic permutations of mentoring dyads due to the fact that everyone is culturally different from everyone else in some way. However, it is clear that non-majority mentees do benefit from forming relationships with mentors from similar racial and ethnic backgrounds (Stevenson, 1995; White & Cones, 1999).

Gender is an issue that is at the forefront of this study. Within the research literature on gender related to youth mentoring, there tends to be ever-present conjecture regarding the necessity of homogeneous dyads, especially within formal mentoring programs. Bogat & Liang (2005) explain:

Existing research in and out of the mentoring field has been mixed. Some research on natural and program-based mentoring relationships suggests potential benefit of same-sex matching. ...However, [other studies]... have failed to provide evidence of any differential benefits for programs using same-sex matches. Gender-homogeneous natural mentoring relationships seem to be more beneficial to youths in terms of adaptive outcomes than gender-homogeneous program-based mentoring relationships (Bogat & Liang, 2005; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b; Rhodes et al., 2006). Because natural mentoring relationships form within a youth’s existing social network, these relationships may be inherently connected to other important relationships and sources of support. This ease, if you will, allows natural mentoring relationships to be maintained over a significant portion of the youth’s development and may increase the mentor’s value as a primary source of support and encouragement (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005b). This type of mentoring relationship is well suited to young males especially given what the literature says about male youth’s and mentoring relationship values. Spencer (2007) conducted qualitative interviews with male mentees and their
mentors. It was revealed that boys value close mentoring relationships with men who can model how to be vulnerable and express one’s emotions without sacrificing manhood. These conventions challenge stereotypes of masculinity (Bogat & Liang, 2005) and can be extrapolated to the needs and values of young African American males.

The research literature on youth mentoring is robust with important information that supports the inherent value attached to this field. I also experience the literature as being generally conscious and even-handed with regard to diversity issues. One critique I have is that the literature tends to focus more on risk factors related to African American youth than protective factors. Also, currently, there are no existing studies that overtly focus on the relationship between mentoring and the development of Hunter and Davis’ (1992) four domains of manhood for African Americans. The articulated values (i.e. self-determination and accountability, family, pride, and spirituality and humanism) are antithetical to traditional masculine ideologies, yet convergent to what Spencer (2007) asserts young males are really looking for in a mentoring relationship.

**Self-Efficacy and Life Course Among African American Males**

Self-efficacy, introduced by Albert Bandura (1977) as one major part of Social Cognitive Theory, refers to the judgment of one’s capability to execute given types of performance. Self-efficacy theory is related to Bandura’s multidimensional model of the relationship between human cognition, environmental influences and human behavior called *reciprocal determinism* (Bandura, 1978). He claimed that self-efficacy is an important mediator of various aspects of human behavior, and what people think, believe, and feel affects how they will behave (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1978). The research
investigating and stemming from self-efficacy theory is varied and widespread. Much of the research literature centers on ascertaining what variables influence its development, what factors maintain it, and what the outcomes are.

Life course theory is another area of research that, like self-efficacy, focuses on developmental competencies. Life course is said to be shaped by the interaction between cultural and social structural features and physical attributes, psychological attributes, commitments, and purposive efforts of individuals (Clausen, 1991). Clausen (1991) discusses that there are certain aspects of modern society that have greatly influenced the adulthood transition process for adolescents. He argues that our society has undergone a shift from emphasizing tradition to rationality and functionality being the prevailing determinants of individual choices in transition into adulthood. It is because of this phenomenon that adolescent competence should lead to the engagement and mastery of academic, career, and social domains (Clausen, 1991). The attainment of competence in these areas is said to lead to effective coping throughout the course of one’s life because it will mean that adolescents were equipped to make realistic choices in education, occupation, relationships (Clausen, 1991). Failure to achieve such competencies leads to maladaptive, self-defeating patterns that perpetuate a vicious cycle of development that pervades the course of one’s life (Caspi, Avshalom, Elder & Bem, 1988; Clausen, 1991).

It is for these reasons that this study identifies academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy, the manhood-oriented domains, as extremely significant domains related to manhood transition for African American males.
According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy expectations may be important mediators of behavior and behavior change. However, the research gives no indication of self-efficacy’s bearing on the relation between mentoring and the development of religious or existential wellbeing. Hunter and Davis’ (1992) four domains of manhood for African Americans (i.e. self-determination and accountability, family, pride, and spirituality and humanism), may provide some insight as to the importance of wellbeing in these areas for the development of self-efficacy beliefs in the manhood-oriented domains.

**Spiritual Wellbeing**

Spiritual wellbeing finds its foundation in the subjective wellbeing literature. As a function of the quality of life movement, subjective wellbeing is often measured in terms of physical or psychological health outcomes (Blaine & Crocker, 1995; Koenig, Kvale, & Ferrel, 1988). This study will focus on spiritual wellbeing, which is a construct that comprises individuals’ experiences of security in their relationships with God (or a higher power), and their feelings of satisfaction and contentment with their life trajectories (Ellison, 1983; Mattis, 1997).

While the literature on subjective wellbeing tends to focus on three specific human needs, the *need for having material resources*, the *need for social relationships*, and the *need for satisfaction with one’s self* (Campbell, 1981), Ellison and Paloutzian (1982) identified a fourth set of needs previously left out of the subjective wellbeing literature— the *need for transcendence*. 
Ellison (1983) described the human need for transcendence as, “the sense of well-being we experience when we find purposes to commit ourselves to which involve ultimate meaning for life...It refers to a non-physical dimension of awareness and experience which can best be termed spiritual” (p. 330). Human beings experience the need for transcendence because of limits to human powers, as “a response to the problem of human insufficiency” (Pargament, 1997, p. 310). Pargament, Magyar-Russell, and Murray-Swank (2005) assert that,

When life appears out of control, and there seems to be no rational explanation for events – beliefs and practices oriented to the sacred seem to have a special ability to provide ultimate meaning, order, and safety in place of the human questions, chaos, and fear (p. 676).

Many of the most prominent world religions call human beings to transcendence as the path to the highest levels of wellbeing (Ellison, 1983). Spiritual wellbeing is thought to embody this concept of transcendence through specificity in two areas.

Spiritual wellbeing is thought of as two-faceted – comprised of both vertical and horizontal components (Moberg, 1974). Ellison and Paloutzian (1982) denote that the vertical dimension refers to one’s sense of wellbeing in relation to God, and the horizontal dimension refers to one’s sense of life purpose and life satisfaction with no specific reference to anything religious. While these dimensions are inherently different from one another, both indicate transcendence, or the ability to step back from and move beyond one’s experience as a means of gaining motivation, a sense of value and significance, or a source of coping (Ellison, 1983; Pargament, 2005).

Given the atrocities faced by African Americans as a result of slavery and its present-day remnants, transcendence is a concept that plays a vital role within the African
American community (Cone, 2010; White & Cones, 1999). Utsey, Bolden, Williams, Lee, Lanier, and Newsome (2007) found that spiritual wellbeing partially mediates the relationship between culture-specific coping and quality of life variables among African Americans. Newlin, Knafl, and Melkus (2002) found that, for African Americans, fulfilling one’s purpose in life is viewed as an essential condition for protection against adversity. These notions support the idea that spiritual groundedness is an important part of African American adolescents’ transition into manhood. (Hunter & Davis, 1992). The aim of this study is to ascertain the role of spiritual wellbeing, as it relates to the development of self-efficacy in the stated manhood-oriented domains.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a comprehensive review of existing literature pertaining to mentoring, spiritual wellbeing, and self-efficacy beliefs relative to African American males. This chapter also explored the relevance of African American culture and history to inform the rationale for this work. As this chapter has pointed out, there is no current study that seeks to examine the effect of gender-homogenous mentoring and spiritual wellbeing on self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents.

Although there is an emphasis on values, messages, and mentor relationship characteristics in the literature, no studies have focused on mentee characteristics that either enhance or inhibit a mentee’s ability to learn from and utilize positive messages from a mentor. A greater understanding of this process could aid in the development of our collective knowledge of what makes mentoring relationships successful. This study hypothesizes that the relationship between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs will be
stronger if spiritual wellbeing is high versus low (Model A). Next, it is hypothesized that
spiritual wellbeing will mediate, or explain, the relation between mentoring and self-
efficacy (Model B). Finally, this study hypothesizes that self-efficacy beliefs in the
manhood-oriented domains serve, individually as mechanisms that explain the relation
between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants and Procedures

Participants were recruited from one high school and one community organization in urban and suburban areas within a large Midwestern city. Using the Institutional Review Board (IRB) script (see Appendix A) African American male adolescents, between ages 13 and 19 were recruited from 2 sites with approval from staff and administrators at both sites. Sites included an urban community center ($N = 83$) and a suburban high school ($N = 74$). IRB waived parental consent for this study because the study itself posed minimal risk of harm to participants. Parental consent was also waived due to potential participant bias that could have resulted from adolescents seeking their parents’ consent to take part in this study. In lieu of parental consent forms, parents were provided with a debriefing statement with all relevant study information following data collection. Each participant gave assent to participate in the study. All potential participants were provided with paper copies of relevant materials, including a youth assent form with prize drawing information, debriefing statement for parents, demographic survey, and study questionnaire (see Appendices B, C, D, and E).

One copy of each signed form was for the student/parent’s record. The other was returned to the researcher and his mentor. In the debriefing statement parents were encouraged to contact the researcher or his dissertation chair with any questions or
concerns. When assent forms were returned, participants were each given the questionnaire packet containing the scales described below. The full packet took about 20-30 minutes to complete. Participants were not asked to give any identifying information. The packets were collected after they were competed. Participants were entered in to a drawing for a $50.00 iTunes gift card as incentive to participate in the study. The drawing took place immediately following survey administration.

Although 157 students participated in the study, materials submitted by 27 (17.2%) participants were dropped from the study due to missing data. The remaining sample consisted of 130 7th through 12th grade students with a mean age of 15.33 years ($SD = 1.34$, range = 13 – 19). A total of 93.1% ($n = 121$) of the sample identified as Black or African American, and 6.9% ($n = 9$) identified as Multiracial (Black). The sample consisted of 30 (23.1%) 7th or 8th grade students, 37 (28.3%) freshmen, 30 (23.1%) sophomores, 17 (13.1%) juniors, and 16 (12.3%) seniors. There was a total of 11 (8.5%) 13 year-olds, 25 (19.2%) 14 year-olds, 39 (30.0%) 15 year-olds, 29 (22.3%) 16 year-olds, 18 (13.8%) 17 year-olds, 7 (5.4%) 18 year-olds, and 1 (.8%) 19 year-old.

When participants were given the opportunity to identify whether or not they know and have a relationship with their biological father, 20% ($n = 26$) indicated they did not. When asked about their parents’ marital status, 20.8% ($n = 27$) said that their parents were married, 20.0% ($n = 26$) reported that their parents were separated, 17.7% ($n = 23$) said their parents were divorced, and 41.5% ($n = 54$) stated that their parents were never married.
When participants were asked which parent they currently live with, 20.0% \((n = 26)\) reported living with their biological mother and biological father, 7.7% \((n = 10)\) reported living with their biological mother and stepfather, and 1.5% \((n = 2)\) reported living with biological their father and stepmother. Only 5.4% \((n = 7)\) participants reported living with their biological father alone while 58.5% \((n = 76)\) reported living with their biological mother alone. 6.9% \((n = 9)\) of participants labeled their current living situation as “other”.

**Instruments**

**Demographic Survey**

The demographic survey gathered background information about participants, including age, year in school, information about the make-up of the family system, religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, racial predominance in community of residence, and characteristic of present mentor. The Demographic Survey is reproduced in Appendix C.

**Mentoring Relationship Feedback Form**

The Mentoring Relationship Feedback Form (MRFF) (Jackson, 2002) is a 9-item, 5-point strength of agreement scale \((1 = \text{very little/ not happy}, 5 = \text{a lot/ very happy})\) used to measure the quality of the mentoring experience from the perspective of the mentee \((\text{e.g. “How much does your mentor treat you with respect and admiration?”})\). The MRFF has limited reliability and validity data. Analyses were conducted on the MRFF using randomly selected students from several junior high schools in the Midwest. A series of paired comparison \(t\) tests indicated significant increases reported by mentees,
across two administrations, on their feelings of being treated with respect and admiration ($t(12) = 3.16, p < 0.03$). Also, the mentees reported a significant increase in how much their mentors taught them across administrations ($t(12) = 3.00, p < 0.05$). No other significant results were found (Jackson, 2002). However, Cronbach’s alpha for the total score has been estimated, in the current study, to be .83. The MRFF is reproduced in Appendix D.

**Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy-Short Form Scale**

The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy-Short Form Scale (CDMSE-SF) (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996) is a 25 item, 5-point, (1 = no confidence at all, 5 = complete confidence), measure of individuals’ degree of belief that they can successfully complete tasks necessary to make career decisions (e.g. “Decide what you value most in an occupation”). Item content covers the following: (a) accurate self-appraisal, (b) gathering occupational information, (c) goal selection, (d) making plans for the future, and (e) problem solving. Chung (2002) assessed predictive validity for the CDMSE-SF using the Career Commitment Scale (CCS; Farmer, 1985). The correlation between the CDMSE-SF and CCS was .45 ($p < .01$) for male participants, female participants, and the sample as a whole. This correlation was .51 for Black participants and .34 for White participants respectively. Gushue, Scanlan, Pantzer, and Clarke (2006) also establish internal consistency for a sample of African American high school students ages 15-19. Cronbach’s alpha, in that study, was estimated to be .87. The total score on the CDMSE-SF was used to measure career decision-making self-efficacy beliefs in the current study. Cronbach’s alpha for the total score has been estimated, in the current study to be .93.
This figure is consistent with Betz et al. (1996). The CDMSE-SF is reproduced in Appendix C.

**Children's Self-Efficacy Scale**

The Children's Self-Efficacy Scale (CSES) (Bandura, 2006) is a questionnaire designed to measure students' level of perceived capability within specific areas. This measure ranges in 11-unit intervals from 0 (*cannot do*); through intermediate degrees of assurance, 5 (*moderately certain can do*); to complete assurance, 10 (*highly certain can do*), and is comprised of various subscales. Only two subscales were used in this study. Subscales and corresponding sample items include: (1) *self-efficacy for academic achievement* (ASE) (“Learn reading, writing and language skills”), and (2) *social self-efficacy* (SSE) (“Make and keep friends of the opposite sex”). Coefficient alpha, an index of internal consistency, was calculated for each scale in the current study. They were as follows: .86 (ASE) and .75 (SSE). This is similar to internal consistency estimates from Bandura, Barbarinelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli (1996) sample of 11-14 year-old students: .87 (ASE) and .75 (SSE). Selected subscales for the CSES are reproduced in Appendix D.

**Spiritual Well-Being Scale**

The Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS) (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982) is a 20-item self-report tool with two subscales that are summed for a total SWB score. Subscales and corresponding sample items include: (a) *religious wellbeing* (RWB) (“I believe that God is concerned about my problems”) and (b) *existential wellbeing* (EWB) (“I feel good about my future.”). Items are rated on a 6-point rating scale (*SA* = *Strongly Agree*; *SD* = *Strongly Disagree*). The RWB and EWB subscale scores can range from 10 to 60; total
SWB scores can range from 20 to 120. As scores increase, so does spiritual wellbeing. Test-retest reliability coefficients obtained from 100 student volunteers at the University of Idaho (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982) were .93 (SWB), .96 (RWB) and .86 (EWB). A validation study was also done with African American adults. Utsey, Lee, Bolden, and Lanier (2005) tested a five-factor structure originally identified by Miller, Fleming, and Brown-Anderson (1998), placing emphasis on the fulfillment of one’s life purpose as a necessary means of protection against life’s adversities. Identified factors and associated Cronbach’s alphas were as follows: (a) connection with God, .82; (b) satisfaction with God and day-to-day living, .73; (c) future/life contentment, .72; (d) personal relationship with God, .54; and (e) meaningfulness, .49. Coefficient alphas rendered from the current study were, .83 (SWB), .74 (RWB), and .72 (EWB). With regard to validity, examination of the item content suggests good face validity. SWB scores have also correlated in predicted ways with other theoretically related scales including the Abbreviated Loneliness Scale (Ellison & Cole, 1982) (SWB: r = -.29; EWB: r = -.53) and the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978) (SWB: r = -.55; RWB: r = -.48; EWB: r = -.57). The SWBS is reproduced in Appendix E.

**Data Analysis**

The first model tested was the moderator model (Model A). Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to test the hypothesis that the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs will be stronger if spiritual wellbeing is high versus low (Aiken, West, & Reno, 1991; Cohen, 2003). The two predictors (mentoring and spiritual well-being) were entered into the regression equations first followed by a mentoring X
spiritual well-being product variable. A moderator effect is demonstrated if the change in variance accounted for by the product term is significant. Moderator effects will then be plotted to identify the potential form of moderation. As recommended, scale scores were centered to reduce multicollinearity between the main effect and interaction terms (Cohen, 2003).

Next, the two mediational models were tested. Model B hypothesizes that spiritual wellbeing mediates, or explains, the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy. This model was also analyzed using a series of hierarchical multiple regressions. First, self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is a relationship to mediate \( \text{path c} \). Second, spiritual wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to establish \( \text{Path a} \) in the mediational chain (see Figure 2). Finally, self-efficacy was regressed on both mentoring and spiritual wellbeing. This provided a test of whether spiritual wellbeing is related to self-efficacy \( \text{Path b} \) as well as an estimate of the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy controlling for spiritual wellbeing \( \text{Path c'} \). If the relation between the mentoring and the self-efficacy after controlling for spiritual wellbeing is zero, the data are consistent with a complete mediation model. If the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy is significantly smaller when spiritual wellbeing is in the equation \( \text{Path c'} \) than when spiritual wellbeing is not in the equation \( \text{Path c} \), but still greater than zero, the data will suggest partial mediation.

Hierarchical multiple regression was also used to test the second mediational possibility (Model C) that self-efficacy beliefs in the manhood-oriented domains serve as mechanisms that explain the relation between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing. First,
spiritual wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is an effect to mediate (path c). Second, self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to establish Path a in the mediational chain (see Figure 3). Finally, spiritual wellbeing was regressed on both mentoring and self-efficacy. This provided a test of whether self-efficacy is related to spiritual wellbeing (Path b) as well as an estimate of the relation between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing controlling for self-efficacy (Path c’). If the relation between the mentoring and the self-efficacy controlling for spiritual wellbeing is zero, the data are consistent with a complete mediation model. If the relation between the mentoring and the spiritual wellbeing is significantly smaller when self-efficacy is in the equation (Path c’) than when self-efficacy is not in the equation (Path c), but still greater than zero, the data will suggest partial mediation. Each of the three models were tested separately for the three self-efficacy (i.e. academic self-efficacy, social self-efficacy and career decision-making self-efficacy), and three spiritual wellbeing (i.e. religious wellbeing, existential wellbeing, overall spiritual wellbeing) domains. Thus, each of the 3 possible models was tested nine times with mentoring being the primary predictor variable in each of the analyses.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The results of the current study are presented in this chapter. First, a summary of the descriptive statistics is presented. Second, the results of the moderation analysis for spiritual wellbeing are discussed. Third, the results of the mediation analysis for spiritual wellbeing are discussed. Lastly, the results for the mediation analysis for self-efficacy are discussed.

As stated previously, the purpose of this study was to examine the relations of gender-homogenous mentoring and spiritual wellbeing on self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents and tested the following three possible models for the relationships among these variables. The first model (Model A) hypothesized that the relationship between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs would be stronger if spiritual wellbeing is high versus low (see Figure 1). This model posits that greater spiritual wellbeing (indicating that the mentee has an established relationship with God or a higher power and a significant personal sense of meaning and purpose) will promote the capacity to understand and integrate positive messages from a mentor, bolstering the relationships between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs.

The second model (Model B) hypothesized that spiritual wellbeing mediates, or explains, the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy (see Figure 2). That is, mentoring has a positive relation with self-efficacy because mentoring promotes greater
spiritual wellbeing among mentees and spiritual wellbeing serves to promote greater self-efficacy belief development. The third model (Model C) hypothesized that self-efficacy beliefs in the manhood-oriented domains serve, individually, as mechanisms that explain the relation between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing (see Figure 3). Within this model, the roles of spiritual wellbeing and self-efficacy beliefs were reversed beliefs, hypothesizing that mentoring gives rise to greater spiritual wellbeing through the influence of mentoring on the development of self-efficacy beliefs.

Descriptive Statistics

The intercorrelations, means, standard deviations, Skewness, kurtosis, and internal consistency estimates for the seven study variables are presented in Table 1. All variables were significantly intercorrelated with the exception that religious wellbeing did not significantly relate to mentoring. Thus, religious well-being was not included in subsequent mediator tests because mediator models require that the predictor (mentoring) relates to the mediator and criterion variables.
Table 1. The Intercorrelations, Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness, Kurtosis, and Internal Consistency Estimates of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CDMSE</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ASE</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SSE</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SWB</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RWB</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EWB</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M        | 34.23 | 97.87| 35.77| 16.44| 74.64| 30.37| 44.27|
SD       | 5.50  | 14.22| 6.43 | 3.00 | 12.13| 6.04 | 7.49 |
Minimum  | 14    | 54   | 15   | 6    | 53   | 14   | 29   |
Maximum  | 45    | 125  | 45   | 20   | 97   | 42   | 57   |
Skewness | -1.10 | -.47 | -.73 | -.85 | .07  | .31  | -.087|
Kurtosis | 1.72  | -.04 | .67  | -.84 | -1.10| -.54 | -1.14|
IC       | .83   | .93  | .86  | .75  | .83  | .74  | .72  |

Note. N = 130. * p < .05, two-tailed. ** p < .01, two-tailed. CDMSE = Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy; ASE = Academic Self-Efficacy; SSE = Social Self-Efficacy; SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing; RWB = Religious Wellbeing; EWB = Existential Wellbeing.

**Moderation Analysis – Model A**

The first model to be tested was the moderator model (Model A). Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to test the hypothesis that the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy beliefs will be stronger if spiritual wellbeing is high versus low (Aiken et al., 1991; Cohen, 2003). Model A was tested nine times with mentoring as the primary predictor variable in each analysis.

For the first test (test-1a), with career decision-making self-efficacy as the criterion, centered variables mentoring and spiritual well-being were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X spiritual well-being product variable (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .15$, $F (3, 125) = 8.70$, $p > .001$. As can be seen in Table 2,
the mentoring X spiritual wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict career decision-making self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in career decision-making self-efficacy scores.

Table 2. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (1a) - Variables Predicting Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>98.709</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>*.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>*.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>98.679</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>*.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>*.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X SWB</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .15$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .000$ for Step 2 (p > .001). * p < .001. SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing.

For the second in this first set of Model A analyses (test-1b), centered variables mentoring and religious well-being were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X religious well-being product variable (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .14$, $F (3, 125) = 7.28$, p > .001. As can be seen in Table 3, the mentoring X religious wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict career decision-making self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in career decision-making self-efficacy scores.
Table 3. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (1b) - Variables Predicting Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>98.408</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>*.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>*.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>98.422</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>*.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>*.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X RWB</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .14$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .000$ for Step 2 (p > .001). * p < .001. RWB = Religious Wellbeing.

Next, centered variables mentoring and existential wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X existential well-being product variable for Model A (test-1c) (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .16$, $F (3, 125) = 8.43$, p > .001. As can be seen in Table 4, the mentoring X existential wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict career decision-making self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in career decision-making self-efficacy scores.
Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (1c) - Variables Predicting Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>98.731</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring_Centered</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>*.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>*.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>98.647</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>*.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>*.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X EWB</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .16 \text{ for Step 1, } \Delta R^2 = .002 \text{ for Step 2 (} p > .001\). * p < .001. EWB = Existential Wellbeing.

For the second set of Model A analyses, academic self-efficacy serves as the criterion variable. Centered variables mentoring and spiritual wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X spiritual well-being product variable for Model A \((test-2a)\) (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced \(R^2 = .11, F (3, 125) = 5.46, p > .001\). As can be seen in Table 5, the mentoring X spiritual wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict academic self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in academic self-efficacy scores.
Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (2a) - Variables Predicting Academic Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>36.026</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>*.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>*.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>35.936</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>*.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>*.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X SWB</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .10$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .010$ for Step 2 ($p > .001$). * $p < .001$. SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing.

For Model A (test-2b), centered variables mentoring and religious wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X religious well-being product variable (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .11$, $F (3, 125) = 5.36$, $p > .001$. As can be seen in Table 6, the mentoring X religious wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict academic self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in academic self-efficacy scores.
Table 6. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (2b) - Variables Predicting Academic Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>35.968</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>* .24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>* .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>35.935</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>* .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>* .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X RWB</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .11 \) for Step 1, \( \Delta R^2 = .003 \) for Step 2 (p > .001). * p < .001. RWB = Religious WB.

For Model A (test-2c), centered variables mentoring and existential wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X existential wellbeing product variable (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced \( R^2 = .10 \), F (3, 125) = 4.94, p > .001. As can be seen in Table 7, the mentoring X existential wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict academic self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in academic self-efficacy scores.
Table 7. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (2c) - Variables Predicting Academic Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>35.988</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring_Centered</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>*.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>*.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>35.874</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>*.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>*.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X EWB</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .09$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .015$ for Step 2 (p > .001). * p < .001. EWB = Existential Wellbeing.

For the third and final set of Model A analyses, social self-efficacy serves as the criterion variable. Centered variables mentoring and spiritual wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X spiritual well-being product variable for Model A (test-3a) (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .19$, F (3, 125) = 9.86, p > .001. As can be seen in Table 8, the mentoring X spiritual wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict social self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in social self-efficacy scores.
Table 8. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (3a) - Variables Predicting Social Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE\ B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.787</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>*.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>*.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.792</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>*.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>*.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X SWB</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .19$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .000$ for Step 2 ($p > .001$). * $p < .001$. SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing.

For Model A (test-3b), centered variables mentoring and religious wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X religious well-being product variable (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .18$, F (3, 125) = 9.37, $p > .001$. As can be seen in Table 9, the mentoring X religious wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict social self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in social self-efficacy scores.
Table 9. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (3b) - Variables Predicting Social Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.748</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>*.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>*.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.748</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>*.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>*.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X RWB</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .18$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .000$ for Step 2 (p > .001). * p < .001. RWB = Religious WB.

For Model A (test-3c), centered variables mentoring and existential wellbeing were entered into the regression equations followed by a mentoring X existential wellbeing product variable (Aiken & West, 1991). The multiple regression model with both predictors and the product term produced $R^2 = .18$, $F (3, 125) = 9.14$, p > .001. As can be seen in Table 10, the mentoring X existential wellbeing product variable did not significantly predict social self-efficacy scores nor did it explain a significant portion of the variance in social self-efficacy scores.
Table 10. Multiple Regression Analysis for Model A (3c) - Variables Predicting Social Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.781</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring_Centered</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>16.786</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring X EWB</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .18$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .000$ for Step 2 ($p < .001$). * $p < .001$. EWB = Existential Wellbeing.

Mediation Analysis – Model B

Model B hypothesizes that spiritual wellbeing mediates, or explains, the relation between mentoring and self-efficacy. Using hierarchical multiple regression, self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to establish the correlation (path c). Second, the various levels of the spiritual wellbeing variable were regressed on mentoring to establish Path a in the mediational chain (see Figure 2). Self-efficacy was then regressed on both mentoring and the different levels of spiritual wellbeing. Model B was tested nine times with mentoring as the primary predictor variable in each analysis.

For the first test of Model B (test-1a), career decision-making self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is a relationship between these variables ($r = .31$) (Aiken & West, 1991). Then, the total spiritual wellbeing score was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship ($r = .15$). The relationship between mentoring and career decision-making self-efficacy was then estimated controlling for spiritual wellbeing. As Figure 4 illustrates, the relationship between mentoring and spiritual
wellbeing was statistically significant, as was the standardized regression coefficient between spiritual wellbeing and career decision-making self-efficacy.

Figure 4. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model B (Test – 1a)

\[
\begin{align*}
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Note: CDMSE = Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy; SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and CDMSE through SWB. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and CDMSE, controlling for SWB, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

The Sobel method was then used to determine whether or not the partial mediating path from mentoring to spiritual wellbeing to career decision-making self-efficacy was significant (Sobel, 1982), using the following formula:

\[
s_{\hat{\beta}_{ab}} = \sqrt{\hat{\beta}_a^2 s_b^2 + \hat{\beta}_b^2 s_a^2 - s_{\hat{\beta}_ab}^2}
\]

The t ratio rendered from the Sobel equation (t = 0.60) did not exceed 1.96, which led to a failure to reject the null hypothesis at \(\alpha = .05\). Therefore, partial mediation is not indicated for this portion of Model B.

With the path between career decision-making self-efficacy and mentoring already established (r = .31), existential wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (r = .18) for Model B (test-1c). The relationship between mentoring and
career decision-making self-efficacy was then estimated controlling for spiritual wellbeing. As can be observed in Figure 5, the direct path from mentoring to career decision-making self-efficacy did not drop to nonsignificance when existential wellbeing was added.

Figure 5. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model B (Test – 1c)

Note: CDMSE = Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy; EWB = Existential Wellbeing. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and CDMSE as partially mediated by EWB. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and CDMSE, controlling for EWB, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

The Sobel method, was then used to test whether or not the partial mediating path from mentoring to existential wellbeing to career decision-making self-efficacy was significant (Sobel, 1982). The \( t \) ratio rendered from the Sobel equation \( (t = 1.85) \) did not exceed 1.96. This led to a failure to reject the null hypothesis at \( \alpha = .05 \), meaning that there is no partially mediated pathway from mentoring through existential wellbeing to career decision-making self-efficacy. Therefore, partial mediation is not indicated for this portion of Model B.
For the next test of Model B (test-2a), academic self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is a relationship between these variables \( (r = .26) \). Then, spiritual wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to verify this relationship \( (r = .15) \). The relationship between mentoring and academic self-efficacy was then estimated while controlling for spiritual wellbeing. As can be seen in Figure 6, the direct path from mentoring to academic self-efficacy did not drop to nonsignificance when spiritual wellbeing was added.

Figure 6. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model B (Test – 2a)
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Note: ASE = Academic Self-Efficacy; SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and ASE through SWB. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and ASE, controlling for SWB, is in parentheses. *\( p < .05 \).

The Sobel method was then used to test whether or not the partial mediating path from mentoring to spiritual wellbeing to academic self-efficacy was significant (Sobel, 1982). The \( t \) ratio rendered \( (t = 1.63) \) did not exceed 1.96. This led to a failure to reject the null hypothesis at \( \alpha = .05 \), meaning that there is no partially mediated pathway from
mentoring through spiritual wellbeing to academic self-efficacy. Therefore, partial mediation is indicated for this portion of Model B.

With the path between academic self-efficacy and mentoring already established ($r = .29$), existential wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship ($r = .24$) for Model B (test-2c). The relationship between mentoring and academic self-efficacy was then estimated controlling for spiritual wellbeing. As can be observed in Figure 7, the direct path from mentoring to academic self-efficacy did not drop to nonsignificance when existential wellbeing was added.

Figure 7. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model B (Test – 2c)

![Diagram showing mediation path coefficients]

Note: ASE = Academic Self-Efficacy; EWB = Existential Wellbeing. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and ASE through EWB. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and ASE, controlling for EWB, is in parentheses. *$p < .05$.

The Sobel method, was then used to test whether or not the partial mediating path from mentoring to existential wellbeing to academic self-efficacy was significant (Sobel, 1982). The $t$ ratio rendered from the Sobel equation ($t = 1.46$) did not exceed 1.96. This led to a failure to reject the null hypothesis at $\alpha = .05$, meaning that there is no partially
mediated pathway from mentoring through existential wellbeing to academic self-efficacy. Therefore, partial mediation is not indicated for this portion of Model B.

For the next test of Model B (test-3a), social self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is a relationship between these variables ($r = .37$). Then, spiritual wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to verify this relationship ($r = .15$). The relationship between mentoring and social self-efficacy was then estimated while controlling for spiritual wellbeing. As can be seen in Figure 8, the direct path from mentoring to social self-efficacy did not drop to nonsignificance when spiritual wellbeing was added.

Figure 8. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model B (Test – 3a)

Note: SSE = Social Self-Efficacy; SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and SSE through SWB. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and SSE, controlling for SWB, is in parentheses. *$p < .05$.

The Sobel method was then used to test whether or not the partial mediating path from mentoring to spiritual wellbeing to social self-efficacy was significant (Sobel, 1982). The $t$ ratio rendered ($t = 1.82$) did not exceed 1.96. This led to a failure to reject the null
hypothesis at \( \alpha = .05 \), meaning that there is no partially mediated pathway from mentoring through spiritual wellbeing to social self-efficacy. Therefore, partial mediation is not indicated for this portion of Model B.

With the path between social self-efficacy and mentoring already established (\( r = .37 \)), existential wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (\( r = .18 \)) for Model B (test-3c). The relationship between mentoring and social self-efficacy was then estimated controlling for spiritual wellbeing. As can be observed in Figure 9, the direct path from mentoring to social self-efficacy did not drop to nonsignificance when existential wellbeing was added.

Figure 9. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model B (Test – 3c)

```
Note: SSE = Social Self-Efficacy; EWB = Existential Wellbeing. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and SSE through EWB. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and SSE, controlling for EWB, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

The Sobel method, was then used to test whether or not the partial mediating path from mentoring to existential wellbeing to career decision-making self-efficacy was significant (Sobel, 1982). The t ratio rendered from the Sobel equation (\( t = 1.76 \)) did not exceed
1.96. This led to a failure to reject the null hypothesis at \( \alpha = .05 \), meaning that there is no partially mediated pathway from mentoring through existential wellbeing to social self-efficacy. Therefore, partial mediation is not indicated for this portion of the Model.

**Mediation Analysis - Model C**

For the first test of Model C (*test-1a*), spiritual wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is a relationship between these variables (\( r = .18 \)) (Aiken & West, 1991). Then, career decision-making self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (\( r = .27 \)). The relationship between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing was then estimated controlling for career decision-making self-efficacy. As can be seen in Figure 10, the direct path from mentoring to spiritual wellbeing did drop to nonsignificance when career decision-making self-efficacy was added. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is convincing evidence of a full mediating pathway from mentoring through career decision-making self-efficacy to spiritual wellbeing.
Figure 10. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model C (Test – 1a)

Note: SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing; CDMSE = Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and SWB as fully mediated by CDMSE. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and SWB, controlling for CDMSE, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

For Model C (test-1b), we began with an already established relationship between spiritual wellbeing and mentoring (r = .18) (Aiken & West, 1991). Then, academic self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (r = .22). The relationship between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing was then estimated controlling for academic self-efficacy. As can be seen in Figure 11, the direct path from mentoring to spiritual wellbeing did drop to nonsignificance when academic self-efficacy was added. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is convincing evidence of a full mediating pathway from mentoring through academic self-efficacy to spiritual wellbeing.
Figure 11. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model C (Test – 1b)

Note: SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing; ASE = Academic Self-Efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and SWB as fully mediated by CDMSE. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and SWB, controlling for CDMSE, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

With the relationship between spiritual wellbeing and mentoring already established for Model C (test-1c) (r = .18), social self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (r = .31) (Aiken & West, 1991). The relationship between mentoring and spiritual wellbeing was then estimated controlling for social self-efficacy. As can be seen in Figure 12, the direct path from mentoring to spiritual wellbeing did drop to nonsignificance when social self-efficacy was added. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is convincing evidence of a full mediating pathway from mentoring through social self-efficacy to spiritual wellbeing.
Figure 12. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model C (Test – 1c)

Note: SWB = Overall Spiritual Wellbeing; SSE = Social Self-Efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and SWB as fully mediated by SSE. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and SWB, controlling for SSE, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

For the next test of Model C (test-3a), existential wellbeing was regressed on mentoring to establish that there is a relationship between these variables (r = .17) (Aiken & West, 1991). Then, career decision-making self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (r = .27). The relationship between mentoring and existential wellbeing was then estimated controlling for career decision-making self-efficacy. As can be seen in Figure 13, the direct path from mentoring to existential wellbeing did drop to nonsignificance when career decision-making self-efficacy was added. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is convincing evidence of a full mediating pathway from mentoring through career decision-making self-efficacy to existential wellbeing.
Figure 13. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model C (Test – 3a)

Note: EWB = Existential Wellbeing; CDMSE = Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and EWB as fully mediated by CDMSE. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and EWB, controlling for CDMSE, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

With the path between existential wellbeing and mentoring already established (r = .17), academic self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (r = .22) for Model C (test-3b). The relationship between mentoring and existential wellbeing was then estimated controlling for academic self-efficacy. As can be observed in Figure 14, the path between academic self-efficacy and existential wellbeing (path b) was not significant. Therefore, no conclusions regarding mediation can be drawn for this portion of Model C.
Figure 14. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model C (Test – 3b)

Note: EWB = Existential Wellbeing; ASE = Academic Self-Efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and EWB through ASE. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and EWB, controlling for ASE, is in parentheses. *p < .05.

With the relationship between existential wellbeing and mentoring already established for Model C (test-3c) (r = .17), social self-efficacy was regressed on mentoring to verify their relationship (r = .31) (Aiken & West, 1991). The relationship between mentoring and existential wellbeing was then estimated controlling for social self-efficacy. As can be seen in Figure 15, the direct path from mentoring to existential wellbeing did drop to nonsignificance when social self-efficacy was added. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is convincing evidence of a full mediating pathway from mentoring through social self-efficacy to existential wellbeing.
Figure 15. Mediation Path Coefficients for Model C (Test –3c)

Note: EWB = Existential Wellbeing; SSE = Social Self-Efficacy. Standardized regression coefficients for the relationship between mentoring and EWB as fully mediated by SSE. The standardized regression coefficient between mentoring and EWB, controlling for SSE, is in parentheses. *p < .05.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Chapter five provides an overview and discussion of the results of the current study which explores the role of overall spiritual wellbeing, religious wellbeing, and existential wellbeing in the relationship between gender-homogenous mentoring and academic, career decision-making, and social self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents. Also included in this chapter is a description of study limitations as well as implications for future research, clinical practice, formal and natural mentoring relationships, mentoring programs, and education.

In general, mentoring has proven to be an important part of overall human development (Baker & Maguire, 2005; Bogat & Liang, 2005; DuBois & Neville, 1997; Rhodes, 1994; Sapone, 1989; Spencer, 2007). Both natural mentoring and formal mentoring programs have dramatic implications for Black male adolescent life trajectories. As a Black male who was once considered to be an “at-risk” youth, this researcher experienced the benefits of mentoring on a first-hand basis. I was fortunate enough to be given the opportunity to internalize many positive messages from various natural mentors. Over time, this served to counteract the effects of internalized racism, altering my understanding of my ability to achieve success academically, socially and vocationally. Ultimately, this provided me with a strong sense of meaning and purpose. Interestingly, this process was explained by Model C of the current research.
The role of the current study in the research literature was to distinguish between three models based on the idea that overall spiritual wellbeing plays a critical role in the transmission of positive messages from a mentor that lead to increased self-efficacy beliefs (Models A and B), and the idea that self-efficacy beliefs play a critical role in the transmission of positive messages from a mentor that lead to increased overall spiritual wellbeing. Overall spiritual wellbeing (i.e. existential wellbeing and religious wellbeing) and the human need for transcendence have been identified as being vital components of daily life among African Americans (Cone, 2010; White & Cones, 1999). This study examined whether participants’ religious, existential, or overall spiritual wellbeing made a difference in the relationship between gender-homogenous mentoring and academic, career decision-making, and social self-efficacy beliefs – adulthood competencies taken from the life course theory literature and regarded as the manhood-oriented self-efficacy domains for the purpose of this study (Clausen, 1991; Harrison & Davis, 1992).

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of what factors serve to influence the strength of mentor messages and bolster a mentee’s ability to develop a sense of self-efficacy in the areas of life where one must be at least efficacious in order to be deemed a functioning member of society. To date, there are no studies that have underscored overall spiritual wellbeing as an important part of successful mentoring in the development of self-efficacy beliefs, nor have studies been done which underscore self-efficacy as a crucial component of successful mentoring in the development of overall spiritual wellbeing. Therefore, this study sought to answer three questions. First, (Model A) to what degree do religious wellbeing and existential wellbeing individually
and collectively (spiritual wellbeing) moderate the relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy? Second, (Model B) to what degree do religious wellbeing and existential wellbeing individually and collectively mediate the relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy? Finally, (Model C) to what degree do academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy mediate the relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and religious wellbeing/existential wellbeing individually and collectively? The strongest support was for Model C.

Results from the first part of Model C (1a, 1b, and 1c), suggested that academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy and social self-efficacy fully mediated the relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and overall spiritual wellbeing. This could indicate a preference for spirituality over the traditional understanding of an organized religion given that Model C (2a, 2b, and 2c) results were nonsignificant. Also, the research literature indicates that spirituality is strongly related to one’s sense of purpose in life (Ellison, 1983; Pargament, 2005).

Results from the second part of Model C (2a, 2b, and 2c), suggested that academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy and social self-efficacy did not mediate a relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and religious wellbeing because of nonsignificant results rendered for path c of the analysis. Therefore, it is clear that self-efficacy beliefs in the manhood-oriented domains cannot serve as
underlying mechanisms because there is perceivably no relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and religious wellbeing. Most likely, this can be attributed to the aforementioned common distress experienced as a result of religious beliefs (Pargament, Magyar-Russel, & Murray-Swank, 2005) whereas African American male youths might associate systemic racism as with perceived punishment or abandonment from God. Based on this research, it is also possible for a young Black male to view himself as unacceptable or unforgiveable in relation to God. Pargament, et al. (2005) finally suggest that distress experienced as a result of religious beliefs can also be associated with one’s perception of God as angry, vengeful or powerless against evil. This notion, when juxtaposed with current sociopolitical dynamics, is feasible at the very least. Model C (2a, 2b, and 2c) results may also be attributed to the implications of cool pose (Majors & Billson, 1992; Oliver, 1984; Wade & Rochlen, 2013) insofar as many young Black males may not want to be associated with religion due to implications of vulnerability. These results could also be associated with the Miller, et al. (1998) and Utsey, et al. (2005) identification of a five-factor structure for the Spiritual Wellbeing scale with African Americans. This structure was found to be different from that of Caucasians is based on differences in the way the two groups tend to view spirituality.

Results from the third part of Model C (3a, and 3c) were the strongest and most interesting. They indicated that career decision-making self-efficacy and social self-efficacy did, in fact, fully mediate the relationship between gender-homogeneous mentoring and existential wellbeing. Academic self-efficacy was not found to be a mediator of this relationship. It can be said that these findings help to determine what
self-efficacy does for young Black male mentees. The research literature supports the idea that self-efficacy beliefs play a major role in influencing feelings, thoughts, and actions (Anderson & Betz, 2001; Bandura, 1977; Lent et al., 1986; Pajares, 1996). Frankyl (1984) posited that each situation in life has its own meaning, and it is the burden of the individual to search for his or her sense of purpose. These results indicate that mentoring plays an important role in this process through the development of self-efficacy belief in at least two of the manhood-oriented domains.

The results of Model C are very important because they suggest the link between mentoring and the development of existential well-being is not simply a direct relationship, but one involving vital mediating psychological processes. In essence, these results suggest that a mentee must gain self-efficacy from a mentoring relationship in order to gain a general sense of meaning and purpose from said relationship. This means that an African American male adolescent mentee must perceive that he is capable of achieving success in at least two of the manhood-oriented domains in order for the mentoring relationship to elicit a positive change in his perception of whether or not his life has meaning. These findings are supported by an empirical study that found general self-efficacy to be a significant predictor of purpose in life for college students (DeWitz, Woolsey, & Walsh, 2009), and they have tremendous implications for clinicians, educators, natural mentors, and formal mentoring programs.
Implications

The present findings indicate that there are several important implications for clinicians, educators, and mentors related to the development of self-efficacy beliefs and overall spiritual wellbeing with an emphasis on existential wellbeing.

Clinicians

First, the results provide direction regarding what may be important to emphasize when counseling African American male adolescents. It is clear, from the literature that racial discrimination begets negative psychological symptoms (i.e. depression and anxiety) that perpetuate low self-efficacy (Cooper, McLoyd, Wood, & Hardaway, 2008), which has an effect on one’s sense of meaning and purpose. In addition to evidence-based interventions, gender-homogeneous mentoring could be recommended as a crucial source of social support that can serve to bolster African American male youths’ psychological adjustment – increasing self-efficacy (Cooper et al., 2008) and existential wellbeing. Additionally, clinicians can serve as champions of positive coping in relation to their young African American male clients by communicating with parents, mentors, and educators the need for support surrounding social and career decision-making self-efficacy. Practical and individualized interventions related to the development of self-efficacy beliefs in these domains could add to the effectiveness of the therapeutic alliance.

Educators

The first implication for educators is that they may either seek mentors for African American youths or serve effectively in this capacity by intervening in a way that
encourage one’s existential wellbeing. The present research indicates that this leads to increased self-efficacy beliefs in areas that are relevant to competencies pertinent to positive life course trajectories (Clausen, 1991). Next, educators should seek to provide or assist in procuring mentoring that provides interventions that target African American males’ social and career decision-making self-efficacy. The results suggest this will increase one’s sense of meaning and purpose and provide the opportunity for youngsters to come to positive and realistic conclusions about possibilities for their own life course.

**Natural Mentors and Formal Mentoring Programs**

Spencer (2007) outlined, in her study, various nontraditional masculine values held by adolescent male mentees. The current research adds to this portion of the literature by identifying mentoring areas of focus that emphasize values relevant to the development of African American male youths’ masculine identity. This study also emphasizes the need for mentors and mentoring programs that view young African American males through a positive lens – to illuminate the beauty of Black masculinity and to recognize social barriers as malleable and not immutable. It is not enough to merely possess this knowledge. Mentors and mentoring programs need to be forthright and methodical – being willing to share positive messages and being thoughtful about what messages are shared and when. Most importantly, the results suggest that mentors can help young Black males who perceive life to be meaningless and who have no secure sense of purpose by helping them to develop a positive understanding of their ability to achieve success socially and vocationally.
Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, as a cross-sectional, correlational study, the relationship between the predictors and outcome variables cannot be viewed as causal. As with most mentoring and self-efficacy research, this study relied on self-report data as opposed to manipulating variables between groups. Additionally, this study utilized a stratified sample. Hence, threats to external validity are present based on sampling. Also related to sampling, it is possible that the age range for this study may have been too broad. At times, some of the younger participants experienced difficulty comprehending certain questionnaire items. As mentioned earlier, the a priori power analysis conducted for this study indicated that 159 participants would be needed to detect a medium effect size with .80 power at an alpha level of .05. A total sample of 130 participants was procured. Failure to attain the recommended sample may have played a role in the rendering of nonsignificant results for the moderation portion of this study as well as the academic self-efficacy portion of the final Model C results.

Fifteen participants without mentors were asked not to complete a portion of the questionnaire packet that included the MRFF. These fifteen participants, with otherwise valid questionnaires had to be dropped from the study. Another issue involving measurement was that two items were inadvertently omitted from the SWBS. The omitted items were associated with the Religious Wellbeing factor of this scale. Despite this error, results do not appear to have been skewed in relation to this construct.

Range restriction is also a potential issue, considering that the ratio of participants who reported having mentors to participants who reported not having mentors was
disproportionate in favor of participants who reported having mentors. Additionally, it is possible that participants could have been distracted by unavoidable and substantial background noise at one of the data collection sites.

**Future Directions for Research**

Study results point to several directions for future research involving mentoring, spiritual wellbeing, and self-efficacy among African American adolescents. The self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations of adolescents are often, in part, determined by their peers’ attitudes about success in specific areas (Schunk, 1991). Research that focuses on peer influence as a potential mediator or moderator of the relationship between mentoring, self-efficacy, and spiritual wellbeing may provide an alternate understanding of how these variables relate to one another. Also, the current study focused exclusively on African American male adolescents and their male mentors. It would be useful to conduct a similar study on African American female adolescents and their female mentors as a means of exploring what values and beliefs about the self are important for young women to have as they transition into adulthood. Furthermore, research examining the effect of mentoring on the development of the additional manhood oriented domains (i.e. self-regulatory efficacy and self-assertive efficacy), which were loosely based on Hunter & Davis’ (1992) four domains of manhood among African Americans and Levant’s (1992) *new man* attributes, but were beyond the scope of this study. Such a study could serve to support the natural mentors and formal mentoring programs.
Additionally, most mentoring programs tend to provide guidance for youths in key areas including the domains emphasized in the current study (DuBois & Silverthorne, 2005a). However, it can be observed in the research literature that mentoring foci and activities tend to center on a singular area such as academics, relationship building, or career development (Hererra & Karcher, 2014). Also indicated in the literature is the tendency for formal mentoring programs to allow mentoring activities to be driven primarily by the unique interests of the mentee (Hererra & Karcher, 2014). The current study adds to the literature by bringing attention to the potential benefits of espousing a tripartite mentoring focus that centers on self-efficacy development in academic, career decision-making, and social domains together. As mentioned earlier, these domains have been identified as key adult competency areas for positive life trajectory (Clausen, 1991).

The results of the current study allow this researcher to assert that self-efficacy must be indicated as a priority in mentoring practices with Black male youth. Helping young Black males to develop a sense of mastery and competence in these crucial domains will perpetuate further growth and increased self-efficacy, leading to the internalization of positive messages and impressions about the self that will be reflected in their actions (Bandura, 1977). An added benefit is that this would actually provide the potential for mentees to become positive role-models for other youth. In the end, the mentee, as a result of the tripartite mentoring focus, would begin to perceive himself as success and develop an even greater foundational future orientation and overall sense of meaning and purpose.
APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT
Dear Representative:

My name is Toussaint D. Whetstone. As an African American male, it has been my experience that African American male adolescents face many difficulties in the development of self-efficacy beliefs. Although several factors contribute to this set of issues, one of the most significant is the reality that many face of having to mature without the influence of a positive male mentor who is earnestly dedicated to aiding in their transition into manhood. Self-efficacy, or one’s perceived ability to achieve, has been linked to positive youth outcomes, including the formation of healthy relationships, academic performance, positive career decision-making, and achievement in other areas. As psychologists and educators, we are interested in better understanding the relationship between mentoring and the above stated issues.

I am writing to you to ask for your assistance in a research project designed to examine the effect of gender-homogeneous mentoring on self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents. The areas that will be studied are mentoring, spiritual wellbeing, social self-efficacy, academic self-efficacy, and career decision-making self-efficacy. The study includes the one-time administration of surveys that will take 20-30 minutes to complete. Surveys will be distributed to African American male adolescents between the ages of 13 and 19 onsite, as a group, at a time that is convenient for you. One examiner will administer the surveys and debrief with the students, providing the opportunity to ask questions about the project. All participants will be given a chance to win a $50.00 iTunes gift card in a raffle that will take place immediately following the survey process described above. Each student will be given a number for the raffle. No other identifying information will be taken for the raffle or at any other time during the survey process.

Results from the surveys will help us learn more about the impact that mentoring relationships have on self-efficacy beliefs in African American male adolescents with regard to academics, career decision-making, and social behavior. This information will be important because it will help parents, educators, psychologists, and counselors to understand, more fully, how to assist African American male adolescents in their transition into manhood. It will also help youths to better understand their ability to thrive as men in this society.

As researcher, I would be more than happy to share with you the results of this important study in a manner that is relevant to your organization. I am enclosing an informed consent form that will be distributed to parents, which describes the procedures, risks and benefits of the study. Please feel free to contact me at (630) 917-9049 or twhetstone13@gmail.com with questions or concerns. Thank you for considering lending me your time. My hope is that, eventually, your sacrifice will change lives.

Sincerely,
Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate, Counseling Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Steven Brown, Ph.D.
Professor, Dissertation Chair
Loyola University Chicago
APPENDIX B

YOUTH ASSENT
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
(Youth Assent)

Project Title: The Effect of Gender-Homogeneous Mentoring on Self-Efficacy in African American Male Adolescents: A Test of Three Models

Researcher(s): Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A.; Steven Brown, Ph.D.

Introduction:
You are being invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Mr. Toussaint D. Whetstone, and Dr. Steven Brown in the Counseling Psychology department at Loyola University of Chicago. You are being asked to participate because we are interested in having opinions from African American males between 13 and 19 years of age.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in this study.

Purpose:
We are interested in understanding how mentoring affects young African American males’ self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as a person’s belief in his or her own ability to achieve. I will be looking at self-efficacy as it relates to academics, relationships, and career decision-making.

Procedures:
If you agree to be a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete 4 surveys and a demographic form. The surveys assess for academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and spiritual wellbeing. The demographic forms include information regarding school, age, family, neighborhood and mentoring experience. Surveys will take 25-30 minutes to complete and will be given on one single occasion. Toussaint D. Whetstone, the primary investigator, or a team member will be present when surveys are administered.

Risks/Benefits:
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. We do ask that the students fully participate, but if you do not feel comfortable in doing so you are not required to answer anything that you do not want to. There will be no penalty if you decide to withdraw from the survey administration. If you are having some discomfort, I will be available to answer any questions or address concerns.

There is no direct benefit to participants. The research project is being conducted to help us learn more about the impact that mentoring has on self-efficacy development in African American male adolescents with regard to academics, career decision-making, and social behavior. In addition, parents, educators, psychologists, and counselors may
come to understand, more fully, how to build self-efficacy in African American male adolescents.
Confidentiality:
- We will protect your right to privacy. No personal information about you will be shared with parents, teachers, counselors or anyone who is not working on this project. Your name will not be included on any form. Any and all data submitted by students will be destroyed once the study, in its entirety, has concluded.
- If you tell us that you are in danger because someone else is hurting you, or that you are a danger because you are hurting yourself or other people, the law requires us to tell the right person or agency. First, we will talk to you alone. Next, if we feel that we need to call an agency, we will call your parents first, and then call the agency. We may ask you to talk to a counselor at your school, and we will provide a list of agencies and counselors in your area.

Voluntary Participation:
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

Compensation:
Participants will be given a chance to win a $50.00 iTunes gift card in a raffle that will take place immediately following the survey process described above. No identifying information will be taken.

Contacts and Questions:
If you have questions about this research project or interview, feel free to contact Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A. at (630) 917-9049 or Steven Brown, Ph.D. at (312) 915-7403. The researchers are available to answer any questions or address concerns.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Statement of Assent:
Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Participant’s Signature  Date

Researcher’s Signature  Date
APPENDIX C

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT FOR PARENTS
Information for Parents

Project Title: The Effect of Gender-Homogeneous Mentoring on Self-Efficacy in African American Male Adolescents: A Test of Three Models

Researcher(s): Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A.; Steven Brown, Ph.D.

Introduction:

Your child recently participated in a research study being conducted by Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A. and Steven Brown, Ph.D. in the Counseling Psychology department at Loyola University of Chicago.

Your child was asked to participate because the researchers are interested in how mentoring influences one’s perceived capability to achieve academically, vocationally and socially. Your child was a participant in survey administration that addresses these topics.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study will be to examine the effect of positive mentoring on the self-efficacy development, or one’s perceived capability to achieve, of African American male adolescents in four specific areas – social, academic, and career decision-making. Your child was asked to complete a packet of surveys on one single occasion.

Procedures:

Your child was asked to complete 4 surveys and a demographic form. The surveys assess for academic self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and spiritual wellbeing. The demographic forms include information regarding school, age, family, neighborhood and mentoring experience. Surveys will take 25-30 minutes to complete and will be given on one single occasion. Toussaint D. Whetstone, the primary investigator, or a team member was present when surveys were administered.

Risks/Benefits:

There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Your child was asked to fully participate, but was not required to if he felt uncomfortable in doing so. There would have been no penalty had your child decided to withdraw from the survey administration. A researcher was be available to answer any questions or address concerns, in case your child was having some discomfort.

There is no direct benefit to participants. The research project is being conducted to help us learn more about the impact that mentoring has on self-efficacy development in African American male adolescents with regard to academics, career decision-making,
and social behavior. In addition, parents, educators, psychologists, and counselors may come to understand, more fully, how to build self-efficacy in African American male adolescents.

**Confidentiality:**

We protect the confidentiality of those who participate in the research study. No identifying information will be shared with anyone who is not connected with the research project. Information presented at conferences or for publication will not identify any individuals who participated. There will be no way to connect individual responses to individuals. No identifying information was collected on the demographic form. The demographic form as well as the assent form was collected and will be stored by the principle investigator separately from the surveys. Any and all data submitted by students will be destroyed once the study, in its entirety, has concluded.

**Voluntary Participation:**

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your child was free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

**Compensation:**

Participants were given a chance to win a $50.00 iTunes gift card in a raffle that took place immediately following the survey. No identifying information was taken.

**Contacts and Questions:**

If you have questions about this research project or interview, feel free to contact Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A. at (630) 917-9049 or Steven Brown, Ph.D. at (312) 915-7403. The researchers are available to answer any questions or address concerns.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Sincerely,

Toussaint D. Whetstone, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate, Counseling Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Steven Brown, Ph.D.
Professor, Dissertation Chair

Loyola University Chicago
APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
**Demographics**

**Part I.** First, we would like to know about your background, education, and mentee status. Please answer each of the following questions.

1. **Age:** _____

2. **Town/Neighborhood you live in:** __________________________

3. **Race:**
   - _____ Black or African American
   - _____ Multiracial (Please list race of each parent)
     - Father: ____________________________
     - Mother: ____________________________

---

4. **Please Indicate Your Year in School**
   - _____ 7th or 8th grade
   - _____ Freshman
   - _____ Sophomore
   - _____ Junior
   - _____ Senior

5. **Highest Level of Education You Want:**
   - _____ I’ll probably leave school before graduating
   - _____ Graduate from high school
   - _____ Graduate from a two-year college or trade school
   - _____ Graduate from a four-year college
   - _____ Get a graduate or professional degree (for example, a masters or doctoral degree, law degree, or medical degree.)

6. **Father’s Highest Level of Education**
   - _____ Did Not Complete High School
   - _____ GED
   - _____ High School Diploma
   - _____ Associate’s Degree
   - _____ Bachelor’s Degree
   - _____ Master’s Degree
   - _____ Doctoral Degree

7. **Mother’s Highest Level of Education**
   - _____ Did Not Complete High School
   - _____ GED
   - _____ High School Diploma
   - _____ Associate’s Degree
   - _____ Bachelor’s Degree
   - _____ Master’s Degree
   - _____ Doctoral Degree
8. Do you like school?
   ______ Yes  ______ No

9. How well do you do in school?
   ______ A-Student  ______ B-Student
   ______ C-Student  ______ D-Student or lower

10. What is your religious affiliation?
    ______ Protestant Christian (i.e. Baptist, AME, Pentecostal, Evangelical, Nondenominational, etc.)
    ______ Roman Catholic
    ______ Jewish
    ______ Muslim
    ______ Hindu
    ______ Buddhist
    ______ Other (Please list) _____________________

11. What is your parents’ marital status?
    ______ Married
    ______ Separated
    ______ Divorced
    ______ Never been married

12. Do you know, and have a relationship with, your biological father?
    ______ Yes  ______ No

13. Who do you live with?
    ______ Mother
    ______ Father
    ______ Mother and Father
    ______ Mother and Stepmother
    ______ Father and Stepmother
    ______ Other (Please list) _____________________

14. Is there an adult male, over the age of 25, in your life who believes in you, cares about your well-being, encourages you, and assists you when you need help without asking for anything in return (i.e. payment or favors)?
   ______ Yes  ______ No

If you answered “Yes” to question 14, please answer questions 15 – 27 and the rest of the questionnaire. If you answered “No” to question 14, please skip questions 15 – 27 as well as Part II. Then go to Part III on page 5 (the directions are also in red) and complete the rest of the questionnaire.
15. How long have you known this person?
   _____ 0-12 months
   _____ 1-3 years
   _____ 3-5 years
   _____ 5-7 years
   _____ 7-9 years
   _____ 10 years or longer

16. Who is this person to you?
   _____ Relative
   _____ Coach
   _____ Teacher
   _____ Pastor
   _____ Friend
   _____ Acquaintance
   _____ Other (Please list)

17. What is this person’s race?
   _____ White
   _____ Black, African American
   _____ Hispanic/Latino
   _____ Asian-Pacific Islander
   _____ Native American
   _____ Multiracial (Please list races) __________________________________________

18. What is this person’s religious affiliation?
   _____ Protestant Christian (i.e. Baptist, AME, Pentecostal, Evangelical, Nondenominational, etc.)
   _____ Roman Catholic
   _____ Jewish
   _____ Muslim
   _____ Hindu
   _____ Buddhist
   _____ Other (Please list) _____________________

19. What is this person’s highest level of education?
   _____ Did Not Complete High School    _____ Bachelor’s Degree
   _____ GED                             _____ Master’s Degree
   _____ High School Diploma             _____ Doctoral Degree
   _____ Associate’s Degree

20. Is this person married or in a committed relationship?
    _____ Yes    _____ No

21. Does this person have a job?
    _____ Yes    _____ No
21. Do you want to be like this person when you reach adulthood?
   ______ Yes    ______ No

22. Does this person avoid harmful influences like trouble-making peers, alcohol, drugs and violence?
   ______ Yes    ______ No

23. Does this person encourage you to avoid harmful influences like trouble-making peers, alcohol, drugs and violence?
   ______ Yes    ______ No

24. Does this person encourage you to do well in school and to continue in your education after high school?
   ______ Yes    ______ No

25. Is this person currently in trouble with the law?
   ______ Yes    ______ No

26. Does this person listen to and value your opinion?
   ______ Yes    ______ No

27. Do you have any further comments about this person?
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
Part II. We are interested in learning more about the quality of your mentoring relation. Please use the scale below to answer the following questions. (Note: 1 = Very little/Not happy; 5=A lot/Very happy)  
*Note: this is the Mentoring Relation Feedback Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How much free time does your mentor spend with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How much does your mentor get upset with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How much does your mentor teach you things you did not know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How much does your mentor care about you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How much does your mentor treat you with respect and admiration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How happy are you with how things are between you and your mentor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How much do you share your secrets and feelings with your mentor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How often does your mentor do enjoyable things with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How are you feeling overall about your mentor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III. We are interested in learning how confident you are that you could successfully complete some of the many tasks involved in getting a good job once you finish school. Using the following scale, please rate how confident you are that you could complete the following tasks. (Note: 1 = Not at all confident; 5=very confident)  
*Note: this is the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all confident</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use the internet to find information about occupations that interest you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Select one field of study from a list of potential fields of study you are considering.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Make a plan of your goals for the next five years.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Determine the steps to take if you are having academic trouble with an aspect of your chosen field of study.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Accurately assess your abilities.  
6. Select one occupation from a list of potential occupations you are considering.  
7. Determine the steps you need to take to successfully complete your chosen field of study.  
8. Persistently work at your field of study or career goal even when you get frustrated.  
9. Determine what your ideal job would be.  
10. Find out the employment trends for an occupation over the next ten years.  
11. Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle.  
12. Prepare a good resume.  
13. Change to a different field of study if you did not like your first choice.  
15. Find out about the average yearly earnings of people in an occupation.  
16. Make a career decision and then not worry whether it was right or wrong.  
17. Change occupations if you are not satisfied with the one you enter.  
18. Figure out what you are and are not ready to sacrifice to achieve your career goals.  
19. Talk with a person already employed in a field you are interested in.  
20. Choose a field of study or career that will fit your interests.  
21. Identify employers, firms, and institutions relevant to your career possibilities.  
22. Define the type of lifestyle you would like to live.  
23. Find information about graduate or professional schools.
24. Successfully manage the job interview process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
---|---|---|---|---|---
25. Identify some reasonable fields of study or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Part IV.** We are interested in learning how confident you are that you could successfully complete academic tasks. Using the following scale, please rate how confident you are that you could complete the following tasks. *(Note: 1 = Not at all confident; 5=very confident) *Note: this is the Academic Self-Efficacy scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Not at all confident</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learn general mathematics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learn algebra</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Learn science</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learn biology</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learn reading, writing, and language skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Learn to use computers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Learn a foreign language</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Learn social studies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Learn English grammar</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V.** We are interested in learning how confident you are that you could successfully relate to others. Using the following scale, please rate how confident you are that you could complete the following tasks. *(Note: 1 = Not at all confident; 5=very confident) *Note: this is the Social Self-Efficacy scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Not at all confident</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Make and keep friends of the opposite sex</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Make and keep friends of the same sex</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carry on conversations with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work well in a group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part VI. We are interested in learning more about how you think about spirituality. Using the following scale, please how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements (Note: SA = Strongly Agree; MA = Moderately Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; MD = Moderately Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree) *Note: this is the Spiritual Well-being scale

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I don’t find much satisfaction in private prayer with God</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I don’t know who I am, where I came from, or where I’m going</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I believe that God loves me and cares about me</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I feel that life is a positive experience</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I believe that God is impersonal and not interested in my daily situations</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel unsettled about my future</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have a personally meaningful relationship with God</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I feel very fulfilled and satisfied with life</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I don’t get much personal strength and support from my God</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel a sense of well-being about the direction my life is headed in</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I believe that God is concerned about my problems</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I don’t enjoy much about life</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I don’t have a personally satisfying relationship with God</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel good about my future</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel most fulfilled when I’m in close communion with God</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Life doesn’t have much meaning</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My relation with God contributes to my sense of well-being</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I believe there is some real purpose for my life</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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