

ABSTRACT

Title of Document: THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG COLLEGE
SELF-EFFICACY, ACADEMIC SELF-
EFFICACY, AND ATHLETIC SELF
EFFICACY FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN
MALE FOOTBALL PLAYERS

Tiffany Quiana Ayiku, Master of Arts in
Counseling and Personnel Services, 2005

Directed By: Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens, Affiliate Assistant
Professor
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

This thesis seeks to determine if there are relationships among college, academic and athletic self-efficacy in African American male student-athlete as measured by the College Self-Efficacy Scale (Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, & Davis, 1993), the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (Owen & Froman, 1988) and the Trait-Sport Self Confidence Scale (Vealey, 1986). Data for this study were collected from African American male student-athletes ($N = 37$) participating in football at a mid-size, Mid-Atlantic, comprehensive, public institution. The study found statistically significant relationships among college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy for African American male student-athletes participating in football.

THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG COLLEGE SELF-EFFICACY, ACADEMIC
SELF-EFFICACY, AND ATHLETIC SELF EFFICACY FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN
MALE FOOTBALL PLAYERS

by

Tiffany Quiana Ayiku

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2005

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens, Affiliate Assistant Professor,
Chair
Dr. Marylu K. McEwen, Associate Professor
Dr. Susan Komives, Associate Professor
Dr. William Sedlacek, Professor
Dr. Javaune Adams-Gaston, Assistant Professor

© Copyright by
Tiffany Q. Ayiku
2005

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank a few special people whose support and guidance helped me through this life-changing process. With their assistance, I am sure that this thesis could not have been completed.

First, and foremost, I would like to thank God, from whom all blessings flow. Without Him, nothing is possible. I would like to thank my incredible network of family and friends. Mom, thank you for your love and guidance and for being supportive when you didn't quite get what I was talking about. To the Click, Robin, Angel, and especially my sister in the name of love, Tica, thank you for dragging me out of my room on Saturday nights so that I could be reminded that the world exists beyond graduate school. To Mary, thank you for feeding me for the past 14 years and for allowing me to become part of your family. To Joan, thank you for being the best supervisor and friend a girl could hope for. Thank you for all your support and your unique way of showing sympathy. I love you. To Matt, one of the best people I know. Thank you for sharing your thoughts, stories, and for your support. You have been a wonderful supervisor and friend.

My deepest gratitude goes out to my thesis committee, Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens, Dr. Marylu McEwen, Dr. Javaune Adams-Gaston, Dr. William Sedlacek and Dr. Susan Komives. To Marsha, my thesis chair and advisor, thank you for taking me on and keeping me motivated, grounded and focused. You are truly an angel and I am blessed to know you and to call you my friend and ally. To Marylu, thank you for all of the teachable moments where you have given me a nugget of wisdom. I cherish the relationship we have built over the past two years and look forward to continued

collaboration and quick conversations that mean so much. To Jauvaune, thank you for being an inspiration and a role model for young African American women professionals in student affairs. Thank you for your continued support, wisdom, and insight. To Dr. Sed, thank you for teaching me how to avoid Type I error and for being statistically significant to $p < .01$. To Susan, thank you for bailing us all out in the 11th hour. I am constantly amazed at all that you do with a cheerful smile and an open heart. You are truly a gem. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas. Karen, thank you for giving me a love for statistics and for teaching me how to create a survey that even Bubba would fill out. You are amazing!

To my Road Dogs: Gina, Paul, Dan, José, Marcus, Greg, Yen Ling, Josh, thank you all for your love, support, and for the creation of the Thesis Support Group. I am blessed to know you all and words cannot express my gratitude for all that you have done for me. You all know that if you need me, you have nothing to do but pick up the phone. I'll be there. I love you all. To my O.F.S.L. family. Thank you for your support during the past two years. I am truly thankful to work with a group of people who understand the needs of students and who truly believe in the importance of Greek Life. And finally, to the football coach at the institution of study, thank you for granting me access to your student-athletes and for being so willing to help me realize my dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER I.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Self-Efficacy	3
Student-Athletes.....	4
African American Males and Athletic Participation.....	7
The Purpose Statement	9
Definitions of Terms	9
Summary of Methods.....	12
Significance of Study	13
Summary	15
CHAPTER II.....	16
Self-Efficacy	16
Theoretical Framework.....	16
Academic Self-Efficacy.....	21
Athletic Self-Efficacy	24
African American Male College Students	27
African American Male Student-Athletes	33
African American Male Athletes and Academic Achievement.....	35
Summary	40
CHAPTER III	42
Research Design.....	42
Hypotheses.....	43
Description of Sample.....	43
Instrumentation	44
College Self-Efficacy Inventory	44
College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale.....	46
Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory.....	47
Data Collection	49
Data Analysis	50
Summary	51

CHAPTER IV	52
Sample Characteristics.....	52
Results of the Primary Research Question.....	54
Primary Results.....	57
Summary	60
CHAPTER FIVE	61
Summary and Discussion of Findings	61
Implications for Practice.....	64
Limitations	68
Suggestions for Future Research	70
Summary	74
APPENDIX A: College Self-Efficacy Inventory	76
APPENDIX B: College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale	77
APPENDIX C: Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory	78
APPENDIX D: Demographic Questionnaire.....	79
APPENDIX E: Consent Form for Survey Participants.....	80
APPENDIX F: Instrument Permissions.....	81
REFERENCES	84

LIST OF TABLES

4.1	Frequency and Percentages of Positions Played.....	53
4.2	Hours Per Week Participating in Football	54
4.3	Means, Standard Deviations and Cronbach's α of Instruments	54
4.4	Qualitative Comments by Respondents.....	57
4.5	Correlation Matrix for College, Academic and Athletic Self Efficacy.....	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA, 2003) published a report outlining statistics on the 1997 entering freshmen class at Division I institutions and found that of the student-athletes who participated in NCAA Division I football, 18% fewer African American male student-athletes graduated from their institution of study than their White counterparts. When the NCAA compared the graduation rates of all men participating in Division I intercollegiate athletics, 48% of African American male student-athletes graduated as compared to 66% of their White male counterparts, which is consistent with the graduation rate of African American male football players (NCAA).

Student-athletes have a very different college experience from their non-athlete counterparts (Watt & Moore III, 1993). In addition to attending classes, doing homework, socializing with peers and faculty members, student-athletes must also practice and learn game play books while training and performing in their respective athletic endeavors. Athletes may face many challenges to success as intercollegiate athletes and as students at institutions of higher learning (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001; Etzel, Ferrante, & Pinkney, 1996; Ferrante & Etzel, 1991; Howard-Hamilton & Sina, 2001). Student-athletes who participate in NCAA Division I revenue generating sports, namely football and basketball, have additional responsibilities such as practice, meetings, and travel, and difficulties navigating their way successfully through college (Watt & Moore III).

As colleges and universities seek to holistically develop students, attention needs to be paid to the overall educational experience of student-athletes at institutions of higher learning. As student-athletes devote time and attention to athletics, their development in other areas, such as artistic, political, and religious, suffers (Astin, 1984). The necessary time devoted to athletics can often leave student-athletes worn out and feeling isolated from their academic and their non-athletic peers (Adler & Adler, 1984).

Bandura (1994) stated that students who feel more confident in specific domains will seek to improve and master learned skills in specific areas. He framed this concept of domain specific self-confidence as self-efficacy. Those who have high levels of self-efficacy are more confident that they will be able to accomplish goals in certain areas than those with low self-efficacy. Research shows that student-athletes spend more time in athletic pursuits than on academic ones (Watts & Moore, III, 1993) and therefore may not have the time and/or opportunity to develop high levels of self-efficacy in different domains. This study seeks to investigate levels of self-efficacy across various domains for African American male student-athletes who participate in NCAA Division I football.

This chapter will serve to provide an overview of the study including a description of self-efficacy, student athletes and struggles and challenges that make them a special population at college and universities, and African American males and their participation in intercollegiate athletics. Following the background of the study will be a description of the purpose of the study, definitions of terms used in the study, a summary of methodology and the significance of the study, and finally, a summary of participants covered in chapter one.

Self-Efficacy

People are both products and producers of their environment. They are both influenced by and have the ability to influence their environment (Bandura, 1989). Depending on environmental climate, a person may alter his or her behavior to best suit that environment. Conversely, the environment or climate can be changed by a person's behavior (Bandura). Early Social Cognitive Theory placed a large responsibility for the development of a person on her or his environment (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Drawing on this theory of social cognition, Bandura and a colleague created a Social Learning Theory that attempted to explain more of how students learn and develop. Schunk and Pajares stated that in 1979 Bandura found that a student's belief in his or her ability to accomplish tasks and develop competencies was what was missing from developmental theories of the past. From this development came the concept of personal self-efficacy.

Bandura (1994) contends that a student's belief in his or her ability to accomplish various tasks is highly influential on whether she or he actually accomplishes the task or succeeds in an individual area. He termed the belief in one's abilities as personal self-efficacy. Personal self-efficacy is believed to be domain-specific and is developed throughout a person's life in four ways: cognitive, modeling, social persuasion and mood (Bandura, 1994, 1997, 2003). Cognitive self-efficacy pertains to aspirations and is developed "by visualizing successful outcomes instead of dwelling on personal deficiencies or ways in which things might go wrong" (Bandura, 2003, p. 4). Developing this type of self-efficacy entails successful handling of a crisis or difficult situations. It is less important whether the situation resolves itself favorably, but that the individual was able to handle the crisis. Adverse situations and threats provide the type of stressful

situations that students must overcome as they continue to develop the skills necessary to be successful in a given area. Personally inefficacious students have often made the commitment to avoid the stress and anxiety associated with performing a difficult task. By doing so, they have eliminated the possibility of failure but also of growth and development.

Modeling behavior or vicarious experiences allow a person to learn from the actions or behaviors of others without first-hand experience. Persuasion refers to a person being convinced of his or her ability by another person. Finally, a person's attitude or mood affects a person's belief about whether he or she will be able to accomplish a task. All these methods contribute separately and together to an individual's development and level of personal self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994, 1997).

Student-Athletes

Student-athletes are a population who may experience growth and development difficulties with both cognitive and psychosocial tasks (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001; Parham, 1993). More specifically, Ferrante and Etzel (1991) stated that student-athletes need assistance in overcoming challenges in the development of athletic, academic, and personal skills. Howard-Hamilton and Sina (2001) echoed previous researchers when they stated that student-athletes need assistance in developing academic and athletic skills; the authors added that student-athletes also need assistance in the development of appropriate social skills in order to be successful in the college arena and beyond. Sowa and Gressard (1983) contended that student-athletes may not mature as other students do, due to the nature and culture of large team sports. Developing life skills is essential to future success and failure to develop skills in the aforementioned

areas may lead to dissatisfaction, stress, psychological problems and finally, athletic ineligibility (Sowa & Gressard).

Student-athletes face many challenges both in the spheres of academia and athletics. Many student-athletes, particularly African American males, come into college less academically prepared than their non-athlete counterparts. They often cannot compete in the classroom with their peers (Edwards, 2000) and consequently have been found to have lower standardized test scores and grade point averages than average college students (Hood, Craig, & Ferguson, 1992). On the whole, students who participate in intercollegiate sports have difficulty forming well made educational plans and aspirations (Sowa & Gressard, 1983).

Student-athletes' in-class experiences also challenge their ability to perform in academic situations. Engstrom, Sedlacek and McEwen (1995) studied faculty attitudes towards male student-athletes. They found that faculty members have prejudices towards athletes when compared to other students. Faculty felt that athletes possessed less academic ability than non students-athletes and expressed anger and discontent in situations where athletes received special services and/or privileges (Engstrom et al.). Faculty members had particularly strong reactions to athletes who were admitted to colleges with lower SAT scores than non-student athletes and those who received full scholarships for their athletic abilities. Engstrom et al. postulated that faculty felt that some athletes do not deserve to be at the institution. Lastly, Engstrom et al. found that faculty members were more apt to be suspicious of an athlete who made an A in a class as compared to non-student athletes. In addition to the energy exerted in a challenging

classroom environment, athletes must also dedicate a great deal of time and energy to their respective sport.

By the time athletes reach Division I institutions, they have focused significant energy in perfecting their sport, often to the detriment of their academic endeavors (Edwards, 2000). This dedication to improving and honing athletic skill at the expense of academic endeavor has been termed *role confusion*. Chartrand and Lent (1987) contended that role confusion occurs when the demands and expectations of one role supersede, to the detriment of, the other role. In the end, student-athletes become more committed to the athletic portion of their lives than to the student portion and thus the student-athlete may neglect his or her studies for the good of the team (Blann, 1985; Watt, & Moore III, 2001). This is an area of great concern in the matriculation of student-athletes. In a study of academic motivations and student-athletes, Simons, Van Rheenen, and Covington (1999) found that athletic commitment was negatively correlated with GPA. Consequently, when accounting for previous schooling, academic ability, and other factors, student-athletes who place their athletic above their academic commitments were likely to have lower GPAs than those who were more able to adequately balance both realms of commitment (Simons et al.).

The rigorous schedule of student-athletes may also impede their academic success. On average, student-athletes, particularly those in revenue-generating sports, will spend upwards of 20-30 hours per week in practice, traveling, game time, training, receiving care for physical ailments, study hall, and working with tutors (Ferrante, Etzel, & Lantz, 1991; Watt & Moore, III, 1993). Parham (1993) stated that “in season” student-athletes often suffer from acute stress as their schedules and responsibilities are more

intense than when not in season. Balancing academic with athletic responsibilities is difficult for most, but especially for those athletes who are academically less prepared than their counterparts.

Athletes' schedules do not allow much time for studying or other academic pursuits. Terenzini, Pascarella, and Blimling (1996) found that athletes, particularly those who participate in football and basketball, spent more time socializing with friends or had fewer teachable moments with faculty and students than the average student.

African American Males and Athletic Participation

To further narrow the scope of the study, African American male student-athletes were selected for this study as they may require additional attention given their circumstances and situations (Ferrante & Etzel, 1996). On average, one in every nine African American students in higher education is a student-athlete. More than half of the average intercollegiate football team is comprised of African American players (Person, Benson-Quaziana, & Rogers, 2001). In 2000, 42% of African American males in Division I sports graduated from college as compared to 57% of their White male counterparts. In revenue generating sports, 42% of African American males participating in football graduated as compared with 34% in basketball. Conversely, 60% of White football players and 52% of White basketball players graduated, respectively (Hyatt, 2003).

Research has been done on what impact participating in intercollegiate athletics has on African American male students. In addition to the concerns that apply to non-African American male student-athletes in revenue-generating sports, African American male students must also contend with acculturation stress and social isolation

(Smallwood, Sowa, & Young, 1991). It has been stated that African American students experience alienation when attending a predominantly White institution (Steward, Jackson, & Jackson, 1990). Steward et al. also concluded that academically successful African American students tended to be loners on campuses.

This isolation could be the result of African Americans having to leave their home and their cultures to attend predominantly White institutions (Hawkins, 1999). Smallman, Sowa, and Young (1991) conducted a study on ethnic differences and psychological responses to stress for student-athletes. African American athletes at predominantly White institutions reported more negative feelings than their White counterparts after a stressful event. Some of this may be attributed to a cross section between athletic participation and ethnicity. Smallman et al. contended that experiencing stressful events can cause more turbulence for African American athletes than for White athletes as they may have more to adjust to coming into a predominantly White environment. In order to assist African American athletes in their adjustment to campus and the new environment, Smallman et al. suggested that cultural adjustments need to be made in the institutional culture to allow for the coping mechanisms of African Americans.

Though research has been done on African American male student-athletes in several areas, there is a significant gap in empirical data and literature with regards to how confident or efficacious African American male student-athletes are in their ability to be successful in various contexts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine if there is a relationship among the college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy of African American male athletes who participate in football at an NCAA Division I university. Feelings of self-efficacy were measured in several situational constructs. The respondents were asked to evaluate their feelings of self-efficacy as they participated in their designated team sport and as they participated in other aspects of the university environment including the academic, social, community service and residential arenas. The intent of the study was to also determine if there is a relationship among college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy. Examining feelings of efficacy is important because the data may provide coaches, academic advisors and counselors at colleges and universities with information on domain-specific confidence levels of African American male student-athletes. This knowledge can provide administrators with the foundation for the development of new interventions and programs to help African American male student-athletes gain more confidence or efficacy in the functional areas of college.

Definitions of Terms

Before progressing further into the research study, it is important to define the use of terms that are essential to the understanding of the information presented. For the purpose of this study, the following terms will be used: *Revenue-generating sports*, *student-athlete*, *self-efficacy*, *self-concept*, *self-esteem*, *athletic self-efficacy*, *academic self-efficacy*, and lastly, *African American*.

For the purpose of this study, *revenue-generating sports* is defined as intercollegiate sports programs that have the potential to produce money to fund the

athletic program at institutions that have National College Athletic Association Division I sports. Revenue-generating sports are also responsible for internally sponsoring scholarships for student-athletes. Sports included in the definition of revenue generating sports are typically basketball, football, and sometimes baseball. This study focused solely on football.

The term *student-athlete* is defined as a male or female student who participates in intercollegiate athletics at the varsity level at the institution of study. Intramural, club team, and recreational sports are not included in this definition (Howard-Hamilton & Watt, 2001).

Though self-esteem and self-efficacy have been used interchangeably, they are different constructs that measure different areas of a person's feelings about oneself. *Self-efficacy, personal self-efficacy, perceived self-efficacy, or perceived personal self-efficacy*, used interchangeably, refers to a personal judgment one makes about one's capabilities in a specific area. Self-efficacy does not refer to how much a person likes him or herself or how much he or she likes the task at hand; rather, self-efficacy is concerned with how well a person believes he or she will be able to reach a desired outcome in a designated area (Bandura, 1997). Self-esteem is used to measure self-evaluation and how an individual feels about him or herself both in given areas and overall (Bandura). Simply stated, self-efficacy measures how successful an individual will be at a given task or in a given situation; conversely, self-esteem measures how an individual will feel about him or herself upon succeeding or failing at a given task. For the purpose of this study, the term *self-efficacy* was used to describe how well an athlete believes that he can obtain the desired outcome successfully in a designated area.

Lastly, researchers and readers alike have often confused self-efficacy with self-concept. It is important to note that self-concept refers to a composite view of one's self that is created through evaluations and direct experience with others and it is measured by asking an individual to rate how much one would apply descriptive statements to oneself (Bandura, 1997). Bandura noted, however, that self-concept can be reflective of personal self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy is usually domain specific and may not be transferable to other areas. Therefore, it is necessary for clarification to define other areas of personal self-efficacy. For the purpose of this study, *college self-efficacy* refers to an individual's belief that he or she will be able to successfully navigate the college experience. In addition to academics, it is also concerned with an individual's belief in his or her capability to be successful in social settings and living situations.

Athletic or sports self-efficacy refers to the athlete's belief that he or she will be able to proficiently acquire skills of their position(s) necessary to successfully perform at the peak of their athletic performance. It is also concerned with an athlete's belief in his or her ability to achieve personal and team goals which may include everything from making good snap decisions, to successfully performing learned skills under pressure.

Academic self-efficacy, according to Chemers, Hu, and Garcia (2001), is the ability and confidence of a student to master academic subjects and to "...make greater use of effective cognitive strategies in learning, manage their time and learning environments more effectively and...monit [or] and regulat[e] their own effort" (p.55). As with most forms of self-efficacy, academic success improves academic self-efficacy,

and failures decrease positive feelings of academic self-efficacy (Chemers, Hu, & Garcia).

African American, as defined by the United States Census Bureau (2003), is a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicate their race as “Black, African Am, or Negro or provide written entries such as African American, Afro-American, Kenyan, Nigerian, or Haitian” (p. B-38). For the purpose of this study, *African American* was defined as any person who self-identifies as African American or of African descent, born or currently living in the United States.

Summary of Methods

This study examined beliefs of college, academic and athletic self-efficacy for African American male student-athlete participants participating in revenue generating sports. Solberg, O’Brien, Villareal, Kennel, and Davis’ (1993) *College Self-Efficacy Inventory*, Owens and Froman’s (1988) *College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale*, and Vealey’s (1986) *Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory* were used to measure African American male student-athletes’ levels of self-efficacy in each respective construct. The survey was administered to African American male football players during a study hall period in the athletic academic support center during a site visit to the institution of study. The data were analyzed using a z-statistic to transform individual instrument mean scores into standardized scores. Pearson’s *r* correlation coefficient was used to test for relationships among the variables.

Significance of Study

Despite the various self-efficacy studies, there still is a gap in empirical research and literature surrounding African American male student-athletes and personal self-efficacy. Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical exploration into the possibility of relationships among athletic self-efficacy and other domains of self-efficacy. Therefore, this exploratory study sought to add to the growing body of empirical research concerning NCAA Division I African American male athletes and domains of perceived self-efficacy. Up until this point, there have been numerous studies on self-efficacy; however, most have studied domains such as career, general, college, and social self-efficacy (Betz, 2004; Choi, 2004; Dinter, 2000; Fan & Mak, 1998; Judge & Bono, 2001; Nauta, 2004; Solberg, O'Brien, & Villareal, 1993). However, as stated previously, self-efficacy is reportedly domain specific. By testing to see if there is a relationship among several domains of self-efficacy, the study provided the opportunity for further research in the area of athletes and self-efficacy. Lastly, this study may provide empirical evidence as to areas of an athlete's college experience that need improvement.

According to DeWitz and Walsh's (2002) study on students' out-of-class experiences and their influences on cognitive development, students with higher domain self-efficacy (college, social and general) had higher satisfaction rates with their college experience, with college self-efficacy being the highest predictor of student satisfaction. Apart from academic achievement, there have been few studies conducted (Astin, 1977, 2003; Pascarella, Bohr, Nora, & Terenzini, 1995; Winter, McClelland, & Stewart, 1981) that looked at participation in intercollegiate sports and cognitive development and perhaps none that have looked specifically at African American male student-athletes and self-

efficacy. It is important to note that Terenzini, Pascarella, and Blimling (1996) stated that of all the studies mentioned above, only Winter et al. (1981) found a positive correlation between participation in intercollegiate sports and achievements in critical thinking and analytical skills.

Pascarella, Bohr, Nora, and Terenzini (1995) sought to study academic achievement between athletes and their non-athlete counterparts. They found that when controls were made for pre-college variables (high school GPA, and academic aptitude), scholastic achievement of intercollegiate athletes was almost the same as their non-athlete counterparts. However, Pascarella et al. found that when looking at reading comprehension and mathematic skills, football and basketball players, whose demographic data have shown to be predominantly African American, scored significantly lower than their non-revenue generating and non-athlete counterparts.

Terenzini, Pascarella and Blimling (1996) postulated that football and basketball players may suffer disadvantages as a result of cultural implications surrounding the arena of sports. They contended that participation in football and basketball may promote a set of “academic values and behaviors different from those of other intercollegiate sports” (p. 154). Ferrante, Etzel, and Lantz (1996) also contended that outside difficulties such as life experiences, personalities, knowledge abilities, and/or skills may have an impact on the rate at which student-athletes accomplish developmental tasks. Perhaps there is another explanation for the lack of development. Perhaps an athlete’s level of self-efficacy plays a part. Although research has shown that self-efficacy can impact the level at which athletes and/or student perform (Bandura, 1997), few studies have examined various forms of domain specific self-efficacy and

relationships among athletic and college self-efficacy. This study seeks to examine perceived self-efficacy as a measure of how efficacious African American male student-athletes feel in various domains of college life. Examining college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy may provide researchers with more information and deeper insight into the confidence levels of student-athletes.

Summary

This chapter served as an orientation to the study by briefly reviewing the challenges student-athletes encounter, African American male student athletes and the impact of participation in intercollegiate athletes, and finally, self-efficacy. Noting the gap in relevant literature, studying African American male student-athletes in a Division I football team may provide insight for student affairs professionals. This chapter raised salient issues important to African American male athletes and challenges to their self-efficacy. The next chapter will review theory and relevant studies in order to ground the study in applicable empirical research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature pertinent to general, academic, and athletic self-efficacy, the impact of participation in intercollegiate sports on student-athletes, African American students and achievement, and African American male student-athletes. While there is an extensive body of literature surrounding African American males and student-athletes, there is a noticeable gap in empirical research on African American male student-athletes and feelings of self-efficacy which is where this study seeks to shed light.

Self-Efficacy

Theoretical Framework

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief that he or she will be successful at a given task or within a given construct (Bandura, 1997). Bandura contends that a student's belief in his or her ability to accomplish various tasks is highly influential on whether she or he will actually accomplish this task or succeed in an individual area. Self-efficacy is built through four main areas: cognitive, modeling, social persuasion, and mood or attitude (Bandura). Mastery of cognitive self-efficacy pertains to an individual's aspirations and is developed "by visualizing successful outcomes instead of dwelling on personal deficiencies or ways in which things might go wrong" (Bandura, 2003, p. 4). This entails successful handling of a crisis or difficult situations. It is less important whether the situation resolves itself favorably, but that the individual was able to handle the crisis. Adverse situations and threats provide the type of stressful situations that students must overcome as they continue to develop the skills necessary to be successful

in a given area. Personally inefficacious students have often made the commitment to avoid the stress and anxiety associated performing a difficult task. By doing so, they have eliminated the possibility of failure but also of growth and development.

Modeling allows for an individual to learn and develop self-efficacy through living an experience vicariously through another (Bandura, 1994). This technique allows a person to imagine themselves in someone else's situation without the possible negative outcomes. The person watching the modeling notes how situations can be addressed successfully. Observing people whom an individual may liken to him or herself achieving success in a given area may bolster an individual's feeling that he or she can also successfully accomplish a similar task. Modeling can help others learn essential life lessons and may help those developing self-efficacy in acquiring coping skills to help them complete tasks in the future (Bandura).

Social persuasion is the process by which individuals are convinced of their ability and their capability to accomplish certain tasks through the bolstering and support of their peers. Individuals receiving social persuasion are more likely to continue to pursue a desired goal and succeed even when they do not believe they are able to do so (Bandura, 1994). Verbal persuasion, when coupled with action on the part of the person with low self-esteem or worth, can be a powerful tool in raising self-efficacy (Bandura 1977, 2003). It is important to note however, that it is more difficult for students to retain self-efficacy bolstered by social persuasion and somewhat easy to cause individuals to doubt themselves and their ability (Bandura, 1994).

Lastly, mood or attitude is essential to developing high personal self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). Negative emotional states give individuals clues to feelings of stress

and anxiety which can lead to self-doubt. Positive moods give individuals good feelings about their personal self-efficacy and can increase the student's perception of what she or he can accomplish. Emotional arousal can strengthen self-efficacy by eliciting a situation that could be considered threatening, or that otherwise requires a response from the individual. This may provoke them to respond more strongly than if they did not feel that the situation required a response and can promote self-efficacy and self-esteem if the situation is handled correctly (Bandura).

Infants are born into the world without any personal self-efficacy and for newborns and children, family serves as the first point of contact during their early formations of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). As babies and children are encouraged to try new and increasingly difficult tasks, familial positive reinforcement and a safe, encouraging environment assists youngsters in developing positive personal self-efficacy (Bandura).

As small children mature, their sphere expands to include peers, teachers and schools (Bandura, 1994). Young children compare themselves and their abilities with their same-age peers and look to their teachers and schools for the positive reinforcement and supportive environments to continue to try new things and expand their sense of capability. Academic feedback also plays an important role in the development of personal self-efficacy. Learning groups and levels, as well as grades contribute to the formation of the students' feelings of perceived self-efficacy in academic arenas. High academically achieving students feel more capable in the classroom as opposed to students who do not achieve at the same academic rate (Bandura). Children who are encouraged in the classroom feel more supported and continue to strive for achievement.

As life increases in complexity and as children mature into adolescence, they are faced with new challenges (Bandura, 1994). Puberty, peer pressure, and other factors associated with adolescence enable students to expand their sense of self-efficacy by mastering increasingly complex tasks, social situations, and responsibilities. As students enter adulthood, they must also learn to master new and increasingly difficult tasks. Financial responsibilities, intimate relationships, and vocational identity are some of the new challenges with which young adults are faced (Bandura). As these students mature, they have the opportunity to encounter more challenges and build a greater sense of their ability and their personal self-efficacy.

People with high overall personal self-efficacy look at obstacles as challenges to be overcome and mastered, and they look at failures as opportunities to learn valuable lessons (Bandura, 1997). People with high personal self-efficacy believe that failures are the result of not putting enough effort forward in order to accomplish goals. These people are able to recover personal self-efficacy quickly after failures. Conversely, people with low personal self-efficacy find obstacles intimidating and avoid difficult tasks. These individuals believe obstacles to be nearly insurmountable. They often do not set high goals and have lowered expectations of their capabilities. When these individuals do not succeed at a task or in an area, they attribute the failure to their own lack of ability. They are unable to regain and recover feelings of self-efficacy easily (Bandura).

Bandura (1977) studied human behavior in order to create his theory of perceived self-efficacy. His research suggests that African Americans, particularly men, have not had many opportunities to interact in a social atmosphere than has enhanced or

strengthened their self-esteem, self worth, and self-efficacy. Because of this, the coping skills of African Americans may not be as proficient as others. To combat this, African American males have developed a defense mechanism that has been termed “cool posing” (Majors, 1992). The cool pose is a phenomenon, currently being studied, where African American males develop a façade where they disinvest and disengage with the environment to protect themselves from hurt and disappointment (Majors). However, if African Americans struggle through situations that may be “intimidating,” then they can develop these coping skills. Bandura (1997) labels these coping skills as “efficacy expectations,” which can eventually lead them to believe in their own ability and that they can succeed against the odds.

Students will avoid difficult activities and situations believed to be too difficult or awkward to successfully accomplish. Basically, students may avoid areas where they feel less efficacious (Bandura, 1994). However, students will willingly accept and face challenges and difficult tasks in areas where students believe that they are competent, capable and have high levels of personal self-efficacy. This leads students to develop personal self-efficacy in domain-specific areas.

As students increase their accomplishments in a given area, they also increase their personal self-efficacy in that area, leading them to accept and conquer greater challenges in those designated areas (Bandura, 1994). Miscalculations in areas may have twofold effects. Should a person miscalculate in a favorable manner, they will add to their level of self-efficacy in a given area. However, should they miscalculate in a negative way, they may decrease their personal self-efficacy in an area in which they previously were efficacious (Bandura). Therefore, positive miscalculations cause

students to see that they are able to go beyond what they thought were their limitations. On the other hand, should they overestimate their ability, failure could cause them not to achieve at their previous level in the future.

Academic Self-Efficacy

Academic self-efficacy is a construct where a student's intellectual performance is based on the development of cognitive skill and his or her perceived self-efficacy. Although research shows (Lent, Brown, & Gore, Jr., 1997) that academic self-efficacy and academic self-concept are not interchangeable concepts, academic self-concept is related, and can be highly correlated to self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) stated that academic achievement is heavily affected by feelings of self-efficacy. Factors such as "level of cognitive ability, prior education preparation and attainment, gender, and attitudes towards academic activities" (p. 216), along with the level of perceived self-efficacy, influence academic achievement. Developing proximal, instead of distal goals, assists students in a more rapid development of academic self-efficacy. Students work more diligently at accomplishing tasks when the goals are short term, instead of establishing long term goals that allow students to postpone difficult tasks until a later time. Using benchmarking methods and incentives to encourage students to set short time goals will help them develop academic self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

As students increase in their cognitive complexity, they are expected to begin to think more creatively and abstractly. They are also expected to take an active part in their learning and pursue cognitive development via "self-regulated learning" (Bandura, 1997, p. 229). Self-regulated learning is the process by which students pursue education and topics that are of interest to them. In order to continue to build cognitive skills and

academic self-efficacy, students must take what they have learned in one area and repeatedly attempt to apply learned skills in another area. Through a widening of experiences, collaboration and corroboration with knowledgeable individuals, student can transfer cognitive skills to other areas and situations and this may help to continue to build personal self-efficacy (Bandura).

Generally, research has shown that higher levels of self-efficacy correlate positively with increased academic achievement (Chemers, Hu, & Garcia, 2001; Lent, Brown, & Larkin, 1984). Researchers found that students with higher levels of academic self-efficacy achieved higher grades and persisted in their academic major longer than those with lower perceived academic self-efficacy (Lent et al., 1984). Lent and colleagues' study also revealed that academic self-efficacy was related to standardized tests and high school rankings; the researchers also found a significant correlation among levels of academic self-concept, self-efficacy and achievement.

House (1992) assessed academic self-concept, academic expectations and persistence for African Americans. He assessed students as freshmen, after four semesters and, finally, after eight semesters at the university. House discovered that self-concept and academic expectations were effective predictors of student persistence in college. In the fourth semester, House found that men were more likely to believe they would fail one or more classes than women were. At the eighth semester, he also postulated that if academic-self concept is controlled for, achievement-related expectancies do not account for significant variation in college persistence. Finally, he was unable to find support for student academic expectations correlating with academic persistence.

In a study of self-efficacy and academic performance, Mone, Baker, and Jeffries (1995) found that academic self-efficacy was a statistically significant predictor of personal academic goal setting and academic performance. Chemers et al. (2001) also found that academic expectations were highly related to academic achievement. Mone et al. contended that academic goal setting and academic performance can be increased by effectively raising a student's perceived sense of academic self-efficacy. This contrasts with previous research (Heresy & Blanchard, 1993) which called for increasing students' self-esteem in order to increase academic performance and improve personal goal setting.

Zimmerman, Bandura, and Martinez-Pons (1992) found that students' current academic self-efficacy and future goal setting correlated with previous grade attainment, but only when parental expectation of academic achievement was high for their respective student. Parents' goals for their children's academic achievement tended to be higher than goals students set for themselves. Parental expectations were purported to influence the type of academic expectations the students set for themselves. These students relied on their academic self-efficacy and parental expectations in order to formulate and solidify goals for the future. For students in the Zimmerman et al. study, personal goals played an important role in academic achievement by allowing students to set self-made goals which in turn improved their sense of academic achievement. Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli (1996) also found that parents can contribute to a students' sense of self-efficacy. In their study, the researchers found that children of parents with high self-efficacy, who instilled their own beliefs into their children, tended to have higher academic self-efficacy as their parents' beliefs were transferred onto their children.

When comparing academic experiences of African American students at historically Black colleges and universities and with those at predominantly White colleges and university, Cokley (2000) found that there was no statistically significant difference in students' academic self-concept and the type of institution attended. However, students attending predominantly White institutions had lower grade point averages, less positive faculty-student relationships, and less positive perceptions about the academic achievement capabilities of African American students than students who were attending a historically Black institution (Cokley). Students at both institutions were found to have a positive correlation on grade point averages and academic self-efficacy. As grade point averages increased, so did their academic self-efficacy.

Athletic Self-Efficacy

Athletic self-efficacy is a complicated process by which athletes develop and master skills related to their sport or position of choice. Research states that athletic skill is primarily built through modeling (Bandura, 1997). Novice or less skilled athletes observe more seasoned athletes and remember what they did in order to learn skills that will benefit them in the future. Athletes also learn skills through “physical demonstration, pictorial portrayal, or verbal instruction” (Bandura, 1997, p. 371). Although athletes can recall information given both ways, athletes learn more through imagery and performing the specified task themselves than if they were to be told what to do (Bandura). Bandura also postulates that when given a choice, athletes will choose to watch models that more closely resemble themselves. These athletes learn more effectively by watching models that more closely resemble them and their athletic abilities than from athletes with superior athletic ability. Learned skills are translated into

constructs and coded into either imagery or words in order to be easily recalled later (Bandura).

When putting learned skills into practice, the better an athlete is at composing an accurate cognitive representation of the information that he or she has coded, the better his or her performance will be when the athlete attempts to repeat what he or she has learned (Bandura, 1997). Demonstrating cognitively learned skills in action may unearth gaps in learning and gaps in skill acquisition. Actual reenactments of learned skills helps athletes fill gaps and acquire the information they need to correct what they are doing poorly in order to master the necessary skill (Bandura).

Self-efficacy in sports is not built on skills alone. Athletes must learn to navigate competitive events that are comprised of many uncontrollable and unanticipated variables. Athletes may have to adjust their style and plan based on changing game demographics, weather, strategies, and opponents' behavior. In order to adapt to changing variables in order to be successful in athletic endeavors, athletes must have a high level of cognitive self-regulation, which is the ability for a person to control and to focus their minds on the task or tasks at hand (Bandura, 1997). In order to masterfully perform skills athletes have acquired under pressure, they must exercise control over elements that could possibly impede their ability to perform the task they need to accomplish.

Athletes in competition must contend with stressors, interruptions, crowds, losses of both players and of games, physical pain and emotional and cognitive distracters. The athlete's ability to conquer these stressors and distracters will help athletes improve their cognitive self-regulation and will aid in improving their sports self-efficacy (Bandura,

1997). Athletic self-efficacy, like other forms of efficacy is domain specific and may not be transferable to another domain within the same sport or another sport (Bandura, 1997). For example, a wide receiver may have high self-efficacy in his ability to master and be successful in his position. However, the same wide receiver may not feel a high level of self-efficacy if he were asked to play quarterback or defensive end. Similarly, his high level of self-efficacy in this current position may not transfer to basketball or lacrosse.

Athletic self-efficacy is the ability to adapt and change with evolving or deteriorating situations while performing an athletic task masterfully (Bandura, 1997). Prior successes improve an athlete's sense of self-efficacy, which in turn allows them to set higher, yet achievable goals for themselves and gives them assurance that they will be able to perform at a higher level. However, when situations deteriorate, an athlete calls upon this athletic self-efficacy to bring her or him through stressful situations (Bandura).

While physical talent and ability are always important, in situations where participants on both teams are highly skilled, Bandura (1997) contends that the players' ability to retain high levels of cognitive self-regulation and athletic self-efficacy becomes the determining factor. Athletes who are less skilled, but have a high sense of athletic self-efficacy tend to perform better than athletes who are more talented, but have a lower sense of self-efficacy. Athletes who have similar skill sets and abilities will often perform at different levels depending on their level of athletic self-efficacy. In order to improve athletic self-efficacy, goal setting is important (Bandura, 1997).

Setting goals, both distal and proximal, assists athletes in building a healthy sense of athletic self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) contends that distal goal setting is considered vague and by itself does not help athletes improve athletic self-efficacy. Rather, setting

small, attainable goals that increase in level and complexity, such as benchmarks, helps keep the athlete organized and focused on the task at hand. It helps athletes gain self-efficacy by reflecting on what they have already mastered. By setting smaller goals and reflecting on successes, athletes are able to develop the athletic self-efficacy that will help them remain positively focused in the face of the prolific and frequent failures associated with playing sports (Bandura).

Cognitive self-regulation assists athletes in refocusing on the task at hand and what they need to do to be successful instead of dwelling on what they have done incorrectly or on past mistakes (Bandura, 1997). Efficacious athletes have acquired the ability to control these distracting ruminations and to put mistakes and failures out of their mind in order to attempt to achieve as much as possible on the field. Were they not able to do this, they would focus on their mistakes and all of the possible problematic situations that could transpire. Bandura postulates that low athletic self-efficacy feeds on itself causing the athlete to sink lower and lower into less efficacious behavior. Overall, Bandura states that athletes who use modeling to build skill sets and who have goals that are incremental and attainable are able to increase their overall athletic self-efficacy, which could mean the difference between a victory and a defeat when athletes are basically similar in their athletic ability and talent.

African American Male College Students

African American male college students are a unique population in today's institutions of higher education. When compared to other racial groups matriculating into universities, African American males attend college at a disproportionately lower rate than their female counterparts (Cuyjet, 1997). In 2000, African Americans comprised

roughly 11 % of newly enrolled 18-24 year old students in 4-year institutions of higher learning whereas their white counterparts comprised 68% of newly enrolled 18-24 year old students (NCES, 2003). Of the 11% of African Americans enrolled, roughly two-thirds (63%) were women and one-third (37%) were men (NCES). African Americans earned 9% of all bachelor's degrees and 8% of all master's degrees conferred. Lastly, African American men comprised 18% of all 25-29 year old men that have graduated from college with at least a bachelor's degree, as compared to 34% of their White counterparts (NCES).

Statistical evidence has shown that African Americans who seek higher education are academically unprepared to meet the rigors of higher education. The NCES (2003) found that in 2000 that only 27% of African Americans had taken an advanced English course. The report also found that while reading, math and science scores improved for African Americans, there were still large and significant gaps between the African American and White student performance levels. In addition to the three Rs, in 1998, a mere 5 % of African American students enrolled in a fourth year of foreign language (NCES).

Cross and Slater (2000) attributed the lack of African American male presence and success at institutions of higher learning to several conditions that prevent African American males from succeeding. They attributed some of the lack of presence to the culture of primary and secondary education which, they stated, favors African American girls over boys. They also stated that African American male role models are not in the homes of small boys and this contributes to their lack of persistence. Lastly, the authors stated that media greatly effects African American boys.

Cross and Slater (2000) stated that the media only portrays successful African American men as athletes and entertainers "...occupations that require little formal education. This pervasive message sends large numbers of young black males down a career blind alley" (p. 87). The perceived need for little formal education has allowed African American men to disidentify with educational achievement, and those African American males who continue to strive for academic excellence are often ostracized and ridiculed by peers (Cross & Slater).

In addition to "...peer pressure to disdain educational accomplishments and education as an outcome," (p. 7), Cuyjet (1997) stated that African American males often times attend academically poorer elementary and secondary schools. African American men also contend with lower academic expectations from adults and peers, have a lack of appropriate role models, encounter racism, and may endure many financial hardships, all making persistence to and completion of college a more difficult challenge for these students (Cuyjet).

Although the previously mentioned research stated that African American male students and student-athletes may be academically underprepared for college, it is important to note that graduation rates for African American male student-athletes tend to be higher than African American male students not participating in intercollegiate athletics, but overall less than athletes in general (Person & LeNoir, 1997). The researchers also stated that African American male student-athletes must contend with role stereotypes of being an athlete and an African American male in addition to the responsibilities of being a student-athlete.

African American males are often academically underprepared, are unable to integrate themselves into the social college atmosphere, and are financially unable to contend with the rigorous demands of institutions of higher learning, all of which may be interwoven with institutionalized marginalization and racism (Lett & Wright, 2003).

Academic achievement is a constant challenge for African American men. Researchers have conducted studies regarding the academic achievement of African American men. In an attempt to lay to rest confusion surrounding whether traditional academic indicators, such as SAT scores and high school GPA are accurate predictors of college academic achievement, Sowa, Thomson, and Bennett (1989) conducted a study on predictors of academic performance and African American college students. Sowa et al. postulated that neither traditional academic predictors nor some nontraditional measures can accurately predict the academic success (measured in college GPA) of African American college students. Through the findings of this study, they inferred that although African American and White students may have identical SAT scores upon entering college, after three years at the institution, African American students have lower cumulative grade point averages (Sowa et al.).

In a study comparing the cognitive effects of college on African American and White students, Flowers and Pascarella (2003) found that after controlling for background and attributes possessed prior to college enrollment, African American students were found to experience significantly lower cognitive gains than their White counterparts in the first three years of college. African American and White students enter higher education with a positive correlation between academic self-concept and grade point average (Cokley, 2002). However, by the time students reach upperclassmen

status, Cokley found that the correlation between academic self-concept and grade point average decreased significantly for African American men while it remained positively correlated for White male students.

Mayo and Christenfeld (1999) found that regardless of academic ability, minorities believed that they would perform less well than their White peers in a study measuring academic expectations of college students. In this study, both minority men and women (African American, Hispanic, and Native American) believed that they would individually perform poorer academically than the average student. They also believed that as a group, they would under-perform when compared to White students.

In researching the cognitive effects of college on African American students, Flowers and Pascarella (2003) attempted to account for the disparity of cognitive growth between African Americans and White students by citing the works of Davis and Jordan and McElroy-Johnson when they stated that “research has shown that African American college students may have had poor elementary and secondary educational experiences, which may have negative impacts on their performance on standardized tests of academic achievement and cognitive outcomes in college” (p. 45).

It has been suggested that African American students on predominantly White campuses lack safe and secure environments where African American men can express themselves freely without fear of recrimination or judgment (Dawson-Threat, 1997). The lack of productive development in African American male students can be partially improved if colleges and universities ensure that there is: an increased awareness and dedication to the tolerance and acceptance of differences, an opportunity to explore issues surrounding the African American male experience, and a concerted effort to address the

lack of environments that promotes healthy growth and maturation of African American males (Dawson-Threat).

For African Americans who are academically and socially successful, Stewart, Jackson, Sr., and Jackson (1990) found that these students tended to interact differently in a majority White environment than when in a majority African American environment. They also found that these students wanted to be more included and wanted to receive more affection when in an all White environment (Stewart et al.). Stewart et al. found that the students believed that their interaction in the White environment was necessary as the African American students in this study believed that Whites tended to have more of the information that would aid them in achieving academic success at the institution.

Bandura (1994, 2003) stated that perceived personal self-efficacy will greatly influence the amount of effort a person will expend on a task and how long they will attempt to achieve success in the midst of challenges and failures. Personally inefficacious students will not expend much energy attempting to complete a difficult task because they do not believe that they can succeed. In order to combat this, Bandura (2003) suggested social modeling in hopes that when students see others like themselves succeeding, they may be inclined to believe that they are capable of overcoming odds to succeed as well.

Providing positive role models for African American men in the form of mentorship can prove useful in addressing several areas of self-efficacy. As modeling can greatly improve self-efficacy, mentorship, both informal and formal can have long lasting effects on the self-efficacy of a student. Mentorship is one of the initiatives that can be created by a college or university “to attract, encourage, and motivate the African

American man...to increase his interest and make him more comfortable with the idea of participating in a postsecondary education” (LaVant, Anderson, & Tiggs, 1997, pp.51-52). For those African American males who are not involved in all areas of university life, they may benefit from a formalized mentor relationship. Over time, modeling through mentorship can have long lasting positive effects for African American males.

Person and LeNoir (1997) contend that while academic and social interaction and integration is difficult for most African American male students, African American male athletes have additional roles and responsibilities that make their adjustment to and success at the university that much more challenging. Participating in intercollegiate athletics may add additional burdens to African American male students on predominately White campuses.

African American Male Student-Athletes

Sowa and Gressard (1983) measured the relationship between athletic participation and student development tasks. They found significant differences between athletes and non-athletes in the areas of educational plans, career plans, and mature relationships with peers. The results of the study implied that athletes had difficulties formulating educational plans, being satisfied with their educational experiences and lastly, athletes had a difficult time moving towards interdependence and individuality. The authors noted that this may have occurred because athletes are socialized not to separate themselves from the team, but to think collectively. Cornelius (1995) postulated that students with a strong sense of athletic identity participate in and support activities that are more sports related. Sowa and Gressard also noted that due to the athletic time commitment, athletes may not have time to focus on educational and career development

plans. Athletic involvement absorbs many hours of athletes' time (Adler & Adler, 1985). Adler and Adler call for academic and personal counseling to ensure that athletes continue to develop and mature at the same rate as their non-athletic peers.

Simons, Van Rheenen and Covington (1999) studied the academic motivation of athletes. The study found that NCAA Division I athletes have weighty demands from athletics and therefore, are more heavily committed to the athletic department and their roles as athletes than their academic role. Students' athletic abilities are cultivated and rewarded by parents, coaches, and fans. Over time, athletes develop a strong sense of athletic commitment, sometimes to the detriment of their academic commitment. However, the lack of academic commitment can be due to poor academic performance or ability, academic history, or outside influences. Simons et al. also found that athletic participation was negatively correlated with grade point averages. The authors believed this may be due to this lack of time athletes assign to academic pursuits. Long practices, physical pain and fatigue may contribute to the lack of time athletes spend on academics. Simons et al. (1999) contended that academic endeavors are further hampered by the lack of rigorous requirements of the NCAA to stay academically eligible and the fact that some athletes leave college prematurely to pursue careers in professional leagues.

On the whole, Hood, Craig, and Ferguson (1992) found that athletes tended to have lower grade point averages and standardized test scores in high school than the average student. In college, athletes in revenue generating sports, typically male football and basketball players, have lower college grade point averages than their athletic peers who participate in non revenue generating sports. However, when matched with their non-athlete counterparts, Hood et al. (1992) contended that athletes did not differ in their

college GPA. Hood et al. found that students admitted under special circumstances, with ACT scores of 15 or lower, are most likely to have academic difficulty at the university level regardless of whether or not they participate in intercollegiate athletics. Hood et al. suggested that tutoring initiatives and course load observations could help overcome possible academic achievement barriers for athletes in revenue generating sports.

Overall, the authors found that there was a positive correlation between the amount of time spent studying and grade point averages. This suggests that the more time an athlete spends studying the higher their academic achievement will be, when measured by the GPA. This study also found that there was a negative correlation between the amounts of time spent watching television and grade point averages, suggesting that distractions to academic work, such as television, can be detrimental to academic performance and academic success for athletes.

African American Male Athletes and Academic Achievement

As stated previously, over half of the average football team in a Division-I school is composed of African American male athletes. These athletes are a special population in that they are usually recruited, brought to campuses and placed in high profile, high stress positions. These athletes are also faced with many challenges and have many different arenas within the university to negotiate. Adjusting to the academic, social, and athletic responsibilities can be an overwhelming task for African American male athletes (Person & LeNoir, 1997).

Research has shown that students participating in revenue generating sports generally have lower grade point averages, test scores and academic skill level than athletes participating in non-revenue generating sports (Hood, Craig, & Ferguson, 1992).

Several researchers have studied the academic performance of African American male athletes. Young and Sowa (1992) found that high school grades are useful in predicting the academic performance of African American male athletes. They contend that the collection of non-cognitive data will predict the academic potential and achievement of African American male athletes more consistently.

Research on the impact of participating in intercollegiate sports has been contradictory. In researching the impact of athletics and other activities on academic achievement, Hood, Craig, and Ferguson, (1992) found that while athletes generally had lower academic grade point averages than the average student at the university, when athletes were paired with students with like abilities and scores, athletes fared no worse academically than their non-athlete counterparts. Pascarella and Smart (1991) studied the impact of intercollegiate athletics on African American and Caucasian men. They found that participating in intercollegiate athletics had a positive impact on academic achievement, college satisfaction, social interaction and social self-esteem for both African American and Caucasian male student-athletes. Participation in athletics was shown to positively influence degree attainment for African American athletes.

Simons, Van Rheenen, and Covington (1999) studied the academic motivation of college athlete. They found that the higher commitment athletes made to athletics, the lower their academic commitment and thus the lower their academic grade point average. They contended that at NCAA Division I schools, the culture is such that athletes are made to strengthen their athletic commitment at the expense of their academic obligation; therefore, athletes' academic performance suffers and contributes to their lack of academic achievement (Simons et al., 1999). Athletes can exhibit a positive and high

athletic self-efficacy; however, if they have poor academic self-efficacy, they will tend to perform poorly academically (Killeya, 2001).

There have been varying reports on the amount of time that athletes spend on their sports. Simons et al. (1999) reported that athletes generally spend between 20 and 30 hours per week participating in their sport. Person and LeNoir (1997) cited Edwards in stating that between active participation, practice, team meetings, and other requirements, athletes can spend upwards of 40 hours on their given sport. Both Simons et al. (1999) and Person and LeNoir (1997) stated that the grueling athletic schedule often leads to physical pain and fatigue which makes studying after athletic commitments are done difficult at best. This can lead athletes to give up academic pursuits in favor of socializing or resting (Adler & Adler, 1985; Person & LeNoir, 1997).

Student-athletes must also contend with differentiating faculty and staff attitudes towards athletes in the classroom. Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen (1995) studied faculty attitudes toward male student athletes in revenue and non-revenue generating sports. The study discovered that members of the faculty have prejudiced notions towards both athletes in revenue and non-revenue generating sports. They found that faculty members were biased against student-athletes in several ways. Faculty attitudes were resentful at special accommodations that had to be made for athletes with regard to scheduling, travel and missed assignments. Engstrom, et al. also found that faculty members were particularly angered by the practice of admitting student-athletes into the university with lower than average SAT scores and with the scholarships provided to athletes in order to attend an institution. Most alarming is the fact that faculty were more concerned and suspicious when a student-athlete earned an A in a class, than when an A

was earned by a non-athlete. These prejudices among other things could lead to feelings of isolation and cause athletes to disengage from the rest of the class so they are not made to engage in class discussions (Engstrom, et al.).

Adler and Adler (1985) found that some athletes believe that certain faculty members will decide their grades based on their status as an athlete. Athletes believe that either the professor will assist them in becoming academically successful in their class or simply disregard them as athletes and therefore, non-academically capable. Through this and other messages athletes receive, they begin to discard their academic identity. Adler and Adler found that through athletes' academic failures and resulting embarrassment, they divested themselves of "self-investment they had made in their academic performance" (p. 247).

Claude M. Steele (1997; 1998; 1999) believes that the disparity between academic performance and self-esteem occurs because African Americans experience a phenomenon coined as *Stereotype Threat*. *Stereotype Threat* is a prevalent and alarming occurrence for African American male students that can be translated to African American male athletes. The anxiety caused by *Stereotype Threat* impedes their performance in testing and in academic settings. Steele and Aronson (1995) defined *Stereotype Threat* as "whenever African American students perform an explicitly scholastic or intellectual task, they face the threat of confirming or being judged by a negative society stereotype--a suspicion-- about their group's intellectual ability and competence" (p.797). In many testing and other academic situations (such as presentations), African Americans believe that they will be intellectually compared to

White students and therefore become anxious about reinforcing negative stereotypes about their group (Steele, 1997).

As stated previously in this chapter, students who are encouraged in the classroom feel more supported and continue to strive for academic achievement (Bandura, 1994). Bandura (1994) also contended that students will avoid activities and situations that they believe are too difficult, or situations where they feel as if they will not be able to succeed. In the case of athletes, it can be inferred that they would suffer a similar type of threat or anxiety at the prospect of being compared to non-athletes in an academic setting. When they are feeling threatened and/or feel as if they cannot be successful in an academic setting, as stated previously, student athletes will disengage from the class in order not to have to participate.

Stereotype Threat of academic performance is not derived from within a person, such as internalized racism, but occurs when a person within a group experiences anxiety about being academically stereotyped. Steele and Aronson (1995) conducted a study to test the *Stereotype Threat* theory. They hypothesized that, when *Stereotype Threat* is introduced into a test taking-situation, it is capable of interfering with the academic performance on that test. Aronson and Steele used African American and White Stanford University sophomores who were basically academically equal. One group of test takers was placed under *Stereotype Threat* by being told that it was a diagnostic test that measured their intellectual ability. The second group was told that the test was a problem-solving task and was non-diagnostic of ability. They found that in the diagnostic group, the mean score of solved problems for African American students was significantly lower than those of White students. In the second, non-diagnostic group,

there was no difference in their scores which served as an indicator that when stereotype is introduced into a test taking situation, African Americans will under perform.

Over time, *Stereotype Threat* can have long lasting complications and cause academic disidentification (Steele, 1999, 1998, 1997). Steele defines academic disidentification as a disconnection of self-esteem from academic performance. African American men protect their psyche by separating their view of themselves from painful academic situations where they receive degrading and stereotypical messages about their group's (e.g. racial) expected performance ability. (Steele).

Steel and Aronson (1995) contended that *Stereotype Threat* may interfere with the intellectual functioning of African American students and through time *Stereotype Threat* can pressure African American students to protectively disidentify with academic achievement in school. Although most students connect self-esteem with academic performance, African American males who suffer from *Stereotype Threat* will disconnect their feelings of self-esteem and self-worth from academic pursuits leaving them with little or no motivation or worth in attempting achievement in academic domains. These students will begin to see the domain (academic settings) as threatening and will begin to under-perform even when *Stereotype Threat* is not present or has been removed.

Summary

Many researchers have contended that African American males and African American male student-athletes face difficult odds and have many obstacles that make the population unique (Ferrante, Etzel, & Lantz, 1996). Many African American male student-athletes come from predominantly African American areas and have to adjust to new environments (Hawkins, 1999). African Americans and student-athletes may feel

isolated (Flowers & Pascarella, 2001; Hyatt, 2003; Parham, 1993), and may be less academically prepared than their White counterparts (Edwards, 1984). They may feel as if they will not be successful in college. African American male student-athletes may require programs and services to help them developmentally and to assist them to succeed in higher education (Cuyjet, 1997; Dawson-Threat, 1997; Person & LeNoir, 1997). Howard-Hamilton and Sina (2001) contended athletes especially need developmental help in academics, social, and athletic areas of life. Thus far, however, little research has been conducted to ascertain how efficacious African American male student-athletes feel in these areas.

Noting the gap in literature with regards to African American male student-athletes and self-efficacy, the academic difficulties athletes encounter, and the major time and personal commitment that participating in intercollegiate athletic sports requires of its athletes, it is important to study African American male student-athletes and perceptions of personal self-efficacy in the college experience as a whole, in the academic arena, and in the athletics.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The literature in Chapter II highlights several special concerns of African American male athletes participating in NCAA Division I sports. The literature has shown that academic achievement and college adjustment are a concern for this population. However, current literature has not adequately encompassed the constructs of self-efficacy into this concern for student-athletes. This chapter explains the methodology used in conducting this study, including research design, a description of the sample and institution, instruments that were used in conducting the study, data collection methods and strategies, and finally, techniques for the quantitative analysis of collected data.

Research Design

This study's research design is both comparative and correlational in nature. The research is targeted to specifically answer one major question: Is there a relationship among African American male student-athletes' feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy? To test the hypothesis, Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to discover if there were any statistically significant relationships among African American male student-athlete's feelings of college, academic, and/or athletic self-efficacy. A significance level was set at $p < .05$.

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among feelings of college, academic and athletic self-efficacy among African American male student-athletes participating in football. In order to examine this relationship, the following question was addressed. Stated in the null:

Hypothesis: There is no relationship among African American male student-athletes' feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy.

Description of Sample

This study was conducted at a comprehensive, mid-Atlantic public university, participating in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I sports. The institution used for this study was comprised of 14,311 undergraduate students and 3,556 graduate students, based on Fall 2004 enrollment information. The university had an undergraduate Student of Color population representing Black/African American who comprised 10% of the population and Asian Pacific American, Hispanic/Hispanic American and Native Americans who collectively comprised 6% of the population. The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics had 19 Division I athletic teams with 455 student-athletes participating on teams. There were 261 male student-athletes and 194 female student-athletes competing in intercollegiate sports at the institution at the time of this study. There were 37 African American male student-athletes participating in football at the institution. For the purpose of this study all 37 African American male student-athletes were sampled.

The study focused only on African American male athletes participating in football, one of two revenue-generating sports at the institution of study. African

American male student-athletes are a specialized population that often comes from different circumstances than that the average college student. These students are often from lower socio-economic backgrounds, may be academically less prepared than their White or non-athlete counterparts, have busy and complicated schedules, often feel isolated and singled out by peers and may be rejected by faculty (Adler & Adler, 1985). Though African American male student-athletes have been researched in the past, there is little empirical literature and research that speaks specifically to African American male student athletes and self-efficacy.

Instrumentation

For the purpose of this study, college, athletic, and academic self-efficacy were assessed using three different measures: The College Self-Efficacy Inventory (CSEI), the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES), and the Trait Sports Confidence Inventory (TSCI). Each instrument's reliability, validity and reason for selection are discussed below.

College Self-Efficacy Inventory (CSEI).

The College Self-Efficacy Inventory (Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, & Davis, 1993) is a self-efficacy measure conceptualized from college self-help manuals that discussed and addressed college-related issues. Six independent judges were used to extract important and relevant themes. From themes selected by the individual judges, 20 items were found to have high consensus from the judges (Solberg et al., 1993) and were then made into one scale that measures overall college self-efficacy with three self-efficacy subscales: course efficacy, roommate efficacy, and social efficacy.

The inventory consists of 20 questions that begin with “How confident are you that you could successfully complete the following tasks...” These responses were measured on a Likert-type, 11 point scale ranging from 0, “not at all confident,” to 10 “extremely confident.” The instrument is scored by summing the total of the 20 items. From the total score, one can infer the level of college self-efficacy. The higher the total score, the more college self-efficacy a student has.

Solberg and colleagues (1993) established reliability through internal consistency by using Cronbach alpha. Coefficient α for the CSEI was established at .93. DeWitz and Walsh (2002) used the CSEI for their study concerning self-efficacy and college satisfaction. For this study, a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .92 was established for internal consistency. The course efficacy, roommate efficacy, and social efficacy subscales were found to have .88 alpha coefficients, respectively. In order to establish convergent and discriminant validity, for this study, Solberg et al. submitted a correlation matrix consisting of the instruments in the study. Finally, Solberg et al. “submitted to a principal components analysis with varimax rotation” (p.89).

Solberg et al. (1993) also tested the CSEI to discern if there were differences in efficacy for acculturation, gender, and/or class. They used a MANOVA and univariate ANOVAs and found that there were no significant differences in levels of self-efficacy. The study was found to have acceptable convergent and discriminant validity as well as internal consistency reliability. The College Self-Efficacy Inventory was chosen in particular for this study as it was found to be useful for racial minority populations.

The College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES).

To assess academic self-efficacy among African American male athletes, the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, created by Owen and Froman (1988), was used. The scale was developed using three university faculty members who devised a pool of what they considered to be routine academic behaviors for college students. After being reviewed by seven graduate teaching assistants, the pool was revised and finally pilot tested by 93 undergraduate students majoring in education and psychology. After the pilot test, the instrument was revised once more and now consists of 33 items without hierarchical composition, with each question beginning with “how much confidence do you have about performing each behavior listed below?” Participants were asked to respond using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1, or “very little” to 5, or “quite a lot.” CASES is scored by calculating the mean score. By using the mean, Owen and Froman (1988) were able to account for questions participants may have omitted.

Reliability for the CASES instrument was established by using test-retest methods. The scale was administered twice to 88 psychology students over an eight-week period. The internal consistency reliability was measured using Cronbach’s alpha. The two testing sessions yielded alphas of .90 and .92 respectively. At the 8-week stability point, alpha was estimated at .85 for the study.

Validity for the CASES instrument was assessed in several ways. Enjoyment of task and frequency of task, both suggested by self-efficacy theory (Owen & Froman, 1988), were used to establish concurrent validity. In two separate studies, students were asked to rate frequency and enjoyment for the 33 items in the CASES instrument. The studies were arranged as incremental validity research and grade point averages were

placed into the regression equation followed by frequency or enjoyment, depending on which study was being analyzed.

To establish factorial validity, a new sample of 122 students were asked to rate the difficulty of performing tasks highlighted in the 33-item CASES instrument. Researchers analyzed responses and determined that items students found relatively easy to accomplish were those in which students most likely had more experience; those items they found most difficult to accomplish were most likely the result of having less experience or success with the task. Owen and Froman (1988) contended that the analysis was in keeping with Bandura's (1996) self-efficacy theory.

Owen and Froman's (1988) College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale was selected for this study because it was different from most academic self-efficacy instruments. CASES was unique in that the instrument investigates feelings of academic self-efficacy as a whole as opposed to teasing out individual constructs or areas of academic self-efficacy such as English, mathematics, and reading. Owen and Froman (1988) also believed that CASES can give specific diagnostic findings that can influence holistic change to increase overall academic self-efficacy.

Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory (TSCI).

To assess sports self-efficacy among African American male athletes, the Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory, developed by Vealey (1986), was used. The TSCI was developed to discern the degree of self-confidence an individual has about his or her ability to successfully accomplish goals in sports. Vealey found that self-confidence is directly related to self-efficacy and for each individual, successful completion of a task is a personal accomplishment. The TSCI was originally composed of 20 items and used a

five point Likert-type scale. After extensive testing for validity and reliability, the TSCI now is composed of 16 items and uses a 9-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1, or “low confidence,” to 9, or “high confidence.”

Reliability for the TSCI instrument was established using test-retest methods. Research was conducted using 219 participants. One-hundred nine of the participants were high school students, and 110 were college students. The participants were then divided into three groups. Initially, all participants were given the instrument on the same day. Group one was then retested one day later, group two one week later, and finally, group three was retested a month later. Using the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, the groups were found to have the retest reliability of .86 for group one, .89 for group two, and .83 for group three.

The TSCI was tested for both concurrent and construct validity. In order to establish concurrent validity, the same 209 subjects from the reliability studies were asked to participate in the validity studies. Participants were divided into two groups with group one being composed of 59 high school and 44 college students, and group two being composed of 44 high school students and 52 college students. The researchers used Pearson’s correlation coefficient to discern if a relationship existed between identified variables.

The TSCI was found to have a relationship with the State Sport-Confidence Inventory (SSCI) with a correlation of .64 ($p < .001$). Construct validity was established by using the TSCI, the SSCI, and the Competitive Orientation Inventory (COI). Participants were provided with the TSCI and the COI one day prior to competition and the SSCI 1.5 hours prior to the start of competition and then again within two hours after

competition. Pearson's correlation coefficient of $r=.60$ ($p<.001$), showed that the TSCI and the COI might be related to the SSCI.

Vealey's (1986) Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory was selected for this study because, of all the sports related instruments, this particular instrument seeks to examine the self-confidence an athlete generally feels about himself or herself in a given situation within his or her respective sport. Some sports related instruments look at specific sports such as tennis, swimming, and although they are useful for a particular sport, they are limited in their generalizability to overall confidence within the domain of that sport.

Data Collection

Prior to administering the surveys and collecting data, the researcher submitted a formal proposal to the Institutional Research Board at the researcher's institution and at the institution where the study would be conducted to gain permission to proceed with the study. Once written approvals were received, the researcher contacted the Associate Director of Athletics for Compliance and Student Services in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the Head Coach of the institution's football team to gain access to the participants at the institution of study. The researcher was granted permission to administer the instruments to African American football players. The researcher administered the study to the sample of African American male athletes who participated in football at the institution under study.

The first page of the instrument was a consent form for participants to sign detailing their rights in the study. There was also space allocated for the participant to indicate if he wanted to be provided with a copy of the results once the data analysis was completed. The cover letter of the study encouraged the student athletes to participate

and provided instructions for the survey instrument. The survey instrument was ordered in the following manner: the College Self-Efficacy Inventory followed by the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory. Lastly, student-athletes were asked to complete a demographic information survey (hours per week dedicated to football, grade point average, position in football most often played, and year at the institution).

The survey was intentionally ordered in this manner to allow participants to both begin and end the survey with less complicated material, placing questions about academic self-efficacy, which may be more sensitive in nature, in the middle of the survey. Lastly, demographic information was placed at the end of the survey as it is the least crucial to the analysis of data and easiest to complete. The survey was administered to African American male football players in paper and pen form during a study hall period during one period in mid-April of 2005. Due to NCAA restrictions, the researcher was unable to offer any incentives for participation in the study.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS 11.5 for Windows. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data for the study. The demographic data were collected as a part of the survey to ascertain African American male student-athletes' year in school, position, and grade point average in order to ascertain the make-up of the sample. Descriptive statistics included means, standard deviations, and inferential statistics included the use of Pearson's r correlation coefficient.

For the three self-efficacy measures used in the study (college, academic, and athletic), the means were scaled on criterion unique to each scale. In further detail, each

scale had a maximum and minimum number that was unique to that particular scale. The researcher was able to compare and contrast the means and this allowed the researcher to test the hypothesis, stated in the null, below.

Hypothesis: There is no relationship among African American male student-athletes feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy.

Analysis I: To test the hypothesis, Pearson's r Correlation coefficient was used. Three correlations were run between college self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy; college self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy, and finally, academic self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy to determine if there were any statistically significant relationships among any of the constructs.

Summary

This chapter serves to detail the methods used in the implementation of the study. Three preexisting scales of self-efficacy were used (Owens & Froman, 1988; Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, & Davis, 1993; Vealey, 1986) to measure African American male student-athletes' feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy. In data analysis, Pearson's r correlation coefficient was used to test for statistically significant relationships among the three constructs.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship among any or all of the feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy for African American male football players. For the purpose of the study, self-efficacy was defined as the individual's level of confidence that they will be able to successfully complete certain tasks. The hypothesis for the study, stated in the null, was as follows: There is no relationship among African American male student-athletes' feelings of college, academic and athletic self-efficacy.

This chapter reports the results found from the statistical analyses that were described in Chapter III. It will first review the population, response rate, and characteristics of the students who participated in the study. Second, this chapter will address the hypothesis and whether or not the null hypothesis was able to be rejected by the data.

Sample Characteristics

African American male student-athletes participating in football at a mid-Atlantic, midsized public institution were the sample used for this study. The sample consisted of the 37 African American male student-athletes participating in the football program at the institution of study. The study was conducted in spring semester of 2005. The football team at the institution of study did not have a winning season during the season preceding the collection of data. Though specific demographic information was collected, the decision was made to collapse data where appropriate to protect the anonymity of individuals due to the small sample size. This was particularly important when reporting

positions played. In that instance, responses were collapsed into either offensive or defensive positions. Fifteen of the respondents were primarily part of the offensive line (40.5%), 17 were primarily players on the defensive line (45.9%), and 5 (13.5%) did not respond to the question requesting what football position student-athletes played (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Frequency and Percentage of Positions Played (n=37)

	Frequency	Percent
Offensive Line	15	40.5
Defensive Line	17	45.9
Missing	5	13.5
Total	37	100.0

Fourteen of the respondents were underclassmen, characterized by individuals in their first or second year of college (37.8%), 22 were upperclassmen, characterized by individuals in their third or above year of college (59.5%), and one person (2.7%) did not respond to the question.

The student-athletes surveyed reported that, on average, they spent 32.7 hours per week (SD= 9.29) participating in football during the competitive season compared to 24.1 hours per week participating in football when not in season. In season, hours of participation had a minimum of 7.0 hours per week to 40 hours per week with a mode of 40 hours per week. During the off-season, hours of participation had a minimum of 0

hours per week and a maximum of 50.0 hours per week (SD= 11.77) with a mode of 20.00 (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2

Hours per Week Participating in Football (n=37)

	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Mode
In Season	32.69	9.29	7.00	40.00	40.00
Off Season	24.08	11.77	0.00	50.00	20.00

The grade point average of the respondents ranged from 1.75 (on a 4.0 scale) to 3.71 with a mean of 2.55 (SD= .44).

Results of the Primary Research Question

Hypothesis: There is no relationship among African American male student-athletes' feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy.

The primary investigation of this study was to determine the relationship, if one existed, among college, academic, athletic self-efficacy for African American male student-athletes participating in football at a NCAA I-AA institution. As discussed in Chapter III, participants were given three survey instruments: The College Self-Efficacy Instrument (CSEI; *Appendix A*), the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES; *Appendix B*), and finally, the Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory (TSCI; *Appendix C*).

The College Self-Efficacy Inventory (CSEI) used in this study was composed of 19 questions. The instrument asked students how confident they were that they could complete given tasks associated with attending a college or university. The survey included questions about how confident a student was in her or his ability to make new

friends in college, get a date, do well on exams, manage time effectively and keep up to date with school work. The CSEI used a Likert-type scale with a range of 0 (totally unconfident), 1 (very unconfident), 2 (unconfident), 3 (somewhat unconfident), 4 (undecided), 5 (somewhat confident), 6 (confident), 7 (very confident) and finally, 8 (totally confident). The instrument is scored by summing the scores on each question and dividing by the number of questions in the instrument. Participants had the ability to score between a range of 0 (the lowest amount of confidence) and 150 (the highest amount of confidence). The mean total score of participants on the CSEI in this particular study was 109 with a standard deviation of 16.99. A reliability analysis was run for the instrument and the instrument reported a Cronbach's α of .8702, confirming the reliability of the scores on this instrument for this study.

The College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES) was designed to ask students how confident they were in their ability to complete the list of behaviors associated with college success. The instrument included questions about how confident a student is in his or her ability to ask questions in large or small groups, take tests, study appropriately, run for student government, and write a high quality paper among others. A reliability analysis was run for the instrument and the instrument reported a Cronbach's α of .9018, confirming the reliability of the scores on this instrument for this study. This instrument was composed of thirty-three questions and used a Likert-type scale with a range of A (or 5 = Quite a lot of confidence), B (or 4 = A lot of confidence), C (or 3 = neutral), D (or 2 = A little confidence) and E (or 1 = very little confidence). The instrument is scored by summing the scores on each question and dividing by the number of questions in the instrument. Participants had the ability to score between a range of 33 points (the lowest

amount of confidence) and 165 points (the highest amount of confidence). The mean total score of participants in this particular study was 111 points with a standard deviation of 15.98.

Finally, the Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory (TSCI) asked students to answer how confident they were in their ability to do given tasks in their sport when compared to the best athlete they knew. The instrument included questions that asked students how confident they were in their ability to execute necessary skills, make critical decisions during competition, perform under pressure, be successful even when the odds are against him or her, and adapt to different game situations. A reliability analysis was run for the instrument and the instrument reported a Cronbach's α of .9436, the reliability of the scores on this instrument for this study.

The TSCI was composed of 13 questions and used a Likert-type scale. Answers for the scale ranged from 1-3 (low confidence), 4-6 (medium confidence) and 7-9 (high confidence). The instrument is scored by summing the scores on each question and dividing by the number of questions in the instrument. Participants had the ability to score between a range of 13 points (the lowest amount of confidence) and 117 points (the highest amount of confidence). The mean total score of participants in this particular study was 98 points with a standard deviation of 14.33. Lastly, at the end of the study, participants were asked if there was anything else they would like to tell the researcher. Six of the 37 (16.2%) participants responded to the question by providing comments. These are listed in Table 4.3. Most of the participants who chose to answer this question spoke about the time it takes to participate in football.

Table 4.3

Means, Standard Deviations and Cronbach's α of Instruments (n=37)

	Mean	SD	α
CSEI	109	16.99	.8702
CASES	111	15.98	.9018
TSCI	98	14.33	.9436

Table 4.4

Qualitative Comments by Respondents

- Athletes spend more time trying to achieve and as a result this can alter their confidence and cause stress.
- It's like a job.
- Football takes up a lot of our time, leaving academics as a secondary responsibility.
- Not enough time to study and relax. Also sometimes too tired to concentrate to study.
- I can adapt to any situation.
- I wish I had the time of a regular student.

Primary Results

The study sought to determine if there was a relationship among college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy for African American male student-athletes participating in football. To determine if there were any relationships among the three domain-specific areas of self efficacy, three Pearson r correlations were calculated between college self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy, college self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy, and between academic self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of

normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. Once it was determined that no violation of assumptions had occurred, analysis showed statistically significant relationships among all three instruments. Pallant's (2001) table for Pearson's r correlation coefficient was used to determine if the statistically significant relationships that existed among the three constructs were small, medium or large, with ranges that determined the strength of the relationship listed below:

$r = .10$ to $.29$ or $r = -.10$ to $-.29$	Small relationship
$r = .30$ to $.49$ or $r = -.30$ to $-.49$	Medium relationship
$r = .50$ to 1.0 or $r = -.50$ to -1.00	Large relationship (Pallant, 2001).

In the first analysis, between college self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy, the Pearson's r correlation was $.77$ ($p < .001$). This would suggest a large positive correlation between college self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy, showing that the level of college self-efficacy is positively related to the level of academic self-efficacy. This may also show that as a student's level of academic self-efficacy increases, so does their college self-efficacy and as their college self-efficacy increases so will their academic self-efficacy. This positive correlation may also suggest that a student with a low level of college self-efficacy may also have a low level of academic self-efficacy.

In the second analysis, a correlation was computed between college self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy. A medium positive correlation ($r = .42$, $p = .011$) was found, between college self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy, suggesting that a high level of college self-efficacy is moderately correlated to a high level of athletic self-efficacy. This also may show that as a student-athlete's athletic self-efficacy increases, so will their college self-efficacy.

Lastly, the third analysis was conducted between academic self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy. The correlation showed an r of .44 ($p < .01$). This would suggest that there was a medium positive correlation between academic self-efficacy and athletic self efficacy, indicating that a high level of athletic self-efficacy is moderately related to a high level of academic self-efficacy (Table 4.4). This may suggest that as athletic self-efficacy improves so can a student-athlete's academic self-efficacy.

The positive statistically significant correlations among college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy allow for the null hypothesis to be rejected.

Table 4.5

Correlation Matrix for College, Academic, and Athletic Self-Efficacy

	College SE	Academic SE	Athletic SE
College SE	_____	_____	_____
Academic SE	.772**	_____	_____
Athletic SE	.415*	.437**	_____

** $p < .01$ * $p < .011$ (two-tailed)

According to the data listed above, there are areas of shared variance among the three scales. In this study of African American male student-athletes participating in football at a NCAA Division I-AA institution, the variance in academic self-efficacy explains nearly 59% of the variance in college self-efficacy. Variance in athletic self-efficacy explains 17.2% of the variance in college self-efficacy. Finally, variance in athletic self-efficacy explains 19.1% of the variance in academic self-efficacy.

Summary

There were significant findings for the relationships among African American male student-athletes' feelings of self-efficacy in college, academics and athletics. The data showed that college self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy were highly positively correlated. College self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy, and academic and athletic self-efficacy, were moderately positively correlated. Therefore, based on the Pearson r correlation analyses, the hypothesis, stated in the null, was rejected. The implications of these results, limitations and generalizability of the study, and suggestions for future research will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among college, academic and athletic self-efficacy. The hypothesis, stated in the null, speculated that there was no statistically significant correlation between college and academic self-efficacy; college and athletic self-efficacy; and academic and athletic self-efficacy for African American male football players at the institute of study. Three Pearson's r correlation analyses were used to determine if relationships existed among the three domains of self-efficacy. All three correlations were found to be statistically significant. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Based on the findings in the previous chapter and the literature discussed in Chapter II, this chapter will represent a summary of the results. It will also provide implications for current practice, recognize the limitations of this investigation, and make suggestions for future research.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis: There is no relationship among African American male student-athletes' feelings of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy.

Three Pearson's r correlations were conducted to detect if there was a statistically significant relationship between college and academic self-efficacy, college and athletic self-efficacy, and lastly, academic and athletic self-efficacy. The data showed a high statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .772$) between levels of college self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy. For African American male student-athletes in this

study, academic self-efficacy explains 59% of the variance in college self-efficacy. From this data, it can be inferred that the higher an African American male student-athlete's level of academic self-efficacy, the higher his college self-efficacy and conversely, a lower level of academic self-efficacy may be correlated with a lower level of college self-efficacy. As academics are one of the most important aspects of college, a high positive correlation between academic self-efficacy and college self-efficacy may not be surprising.

The data also showed a moderate statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .415$) between college self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy. African American male student-athletes spend a great deal of their collegiate career participating in their sport of choice, not leaving much time for them to enjoy other aspects of college life. Therefore, it could be inferred that a higher level of athletic self-efficacy could be positively impact a student-athlete's overall college self-efficacy. The relationship, however, could also be in the inverse where a higher level of college self-efficacy could help elevate the athletic self-efficacy of an African American male student-athlete.

Lastly, the data demonstrated a moderate statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .437$) between academic self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy. Though it can be deduced that there is a positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy, a causal relationship between the two areas of self-efficacy cannot currently be inferred. However, according to Pascarella and Smart (1991), participation in an intercollegiate sport has a positive impact on academics for African American men. Thus, it might be inferred that an increase in the level of athletic self-efficacy can result in an increase in academic self-efficacy.

Prior research (DeWitz & Walsh, 2002), states that students with higher college, social, and general self-efficacy had higher college satisfaction rates. For African American male student-athletes in this study, 59% of the variance in college self-efficacy was explained by the variance in academic self-efficacy. Additionally, 17.2% of the variance in college self-efficacy was explained by the variance in athletic self-efficacy. In total, for the student-athletes sampled, 76.2% of the variance in college self-efficacy was explained by the variance in academic and athletic self-efficacy.

Drawing tentative conclusions from these data, it could be inferred that African American male student-athletes who feel higher levels of academic and athletic self-efficacy may have higher levels of college self-efficacy and in turn feel more satisfied with their college experience. Conversely, should an individual have lower levels of academic and athletic self-efficacy, it could stand to reason that this individual could have lower college self-efficacy and consequently be less satisfied with their college experience.

As stated previously, students with higher levels of academic self-efficacy correlate positively with higher academic achievement (Chemers, Hu, & Garcia, 2001; Lent, Brown, & Larkin, 1984) and that academic self-efficacy is a statically significant predictor of academic goal setting and academic performance (Mone, Baker & Jeffries, 1995). In this study, only 19.1% of the variance in academic self-efficacy can be explained by the variance in athletic self-efficacy. Consequently, there is still 80.9% of the variance in academic self-efficacy that is not explained by a student-athlete's participation in athletic endeavors. Conducting further research on other factors that

impact an African American male student-athlete's academic self-efficacy could help explain more of the variance.

The descriptive statistics for this study discovered that, on average, African American male student athletes spent 40 hours per week participating in football obligations during the season. This is keeping with prior research stating that student-athletes spend about 40 hour per week participating in their sport (Person & LeNoir, 1997).

Implications for Practice

As stated in Chapter I, this study was exploratory in nature because self-efficacy is generally considered to be domain specific, meaning that an individual's level of self-efficacy in one area does not necessarily relate to that same person's level of self-efficacy in another area (Bandura, 1997). Although several studies have been conducted on various areas and types of self-efficacy (Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino, & Pastorelli, 2003; Choi, 2004; DeWitz & Walsh, 2002; Fan & Mak, 1998; Lent, Brown, & Gore, 1997), and several sports related self-efficacy studies (Myers, Feltz, & Short, 2004; Myers, Vargas-Tonsing, & Feltz, 2005; Vargas-Tonsing, Myers, & Feltz, 2004), this study was unique as it sought to discover if there was a relationship among college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy for African American male student-athletes participating in football at a Division I-AA institution. The correlations run between the three areas of self-efficacy determined that there were statistically significant relationships among college and academic and athletic self-efficacy.

The coaching style and manner may play a part in the building of a student-athlete's athletic self-efficacy. In order to build self-efficacy, Bandura (1994, 1997) stated that a person must feel supported and able to take risks in order to grow in a given area. Coaches and athletic trainers can help increase student-athletes' athletic self-efficacy by designing a training program that helps the individuals feel successful and they may also assist student-athletes' in incrementally learning and mastering new skills.

On average, student-athletes reported spending 40 hours per week participating in football including practices, workouts, training, and meetings. This may cause them to identify heavily with football due to the amount of time that student-athletes spend on their chosen sport. This may be furthered through the athletic support student-athletes receive from the Athletic Department. Student-athletes may receive rewards and accolades from parents, coaches and peers, thus increasing their commitment to their athletic pursuits (Simons, Van Rheenen, & Convington, 1999). Simons et al. stated that coaches are disapproving of missing an athletic requirement for an unexpected academic requirement. Further, students-athletes may feel penalized during the game and/or practices for placing their academic commitment over their athletic one. This may in turn cause them to work more diligently at their sport than at other areas of their college experience (Simons et al.).

Coaches, administrators, and student affairs practioners may want to examine the system of support, encouragement, and accountability as it pertains to academics for student-athletes. Because the data showed a positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and college self-efficacy, it may stand to reason that increased attention and support to the academic side of a student-athlete's life might not only improve their

overall confidence about being successful in academics, but also in college as well. The student-athletes surveyed reported having grade point averages ranging from below a 2.0 to well above a 3.5 grade point average with a mean grade point average of 2.547.

Currently, eligibility requirements for NCAA Division I-AA include a 2.0 g.p.a. (Simons et al., 1999). This less than rigorous requirement allows for student-athletes to continue participating in their sport while minimally engaging in their academic careers.

Low academic standards (Cuyjet, 1997), lack of time or initiative to pursue academic endeavors (Person & LeNoir, 1997), along with disidentification theory (Steele, 1997) may explain why the student-athletes surveyed had lower academic self-efficacy, than college or athletic self-efficacy. Hughes and Demo (1989) and Steele and Aronson (1995) stated that while African American men have lower achievement in scholastic endeavors than their White counterparts, they continue to demonstrate high levels of self-esteem. Steele (1997, 1998, 1999) contended that African American males separate their feelings of self-worth from academics and therefore are less invested in the pursuit of academic achievement.

Advisors, coaches, and student affairs practioners should be cognizant of how academic achievement is perceived by African American male student-athletes and, in response, send a clear and consistent message about the importance of academic success beyond the eligibility requirements of the NCAA. Perhaps by employing some of the same coaching styles and tactics used by coaches and trainers in order to make student-athletes feel confident about their ability to be successful on the field, new support systems could be implemented to help these student-athletes build more academic and college self-efficacy.

The data showed that both academic and athletic self-efficacy were moderately, positively correlated with college self-efficacy. It may be inferred that as academic and athletic self-efficacy increases, so may the student athlete's college self-efficacy. Consequently, as academic and athletic self-efficacy decrease, so may their college self-efficacy. For student affairs practitioners who seek to develop students holistically, it may be important to continue to survey student-athletes to ensure that they are having a positive college experience outside of athletics. It may also be beneficial to discern whether student-athletes feel they have the necessary time to engage in university activities outside of athletics.

Both Astin (2001) and Tinto (1993) have attributed a sense of belonging as necessary for students to have a positive and productive college experience. African American male students spend much of their time isolated from the rest of the campus community (Parham, 1993; Snyder, 1996). Finding helpful and non-threatening ways to integrate these student-athletes into the university community is crucial to their success.

Ferrante and Etzel (1991) stated that student affairs professionals need to be cognizant that student-athletes struggle in athletic, academic and personal development. They also suggested that unless students are able to balance these three elements, they may incur increased stress, personal and academically related problems, and personal dissatisfaction. In order to assist student-athletes in maintaining a healthy and productive lifestyle in college, Howard-Hamilton and Sina (2001) called for those working with athletes to infuse student development theories and models into the living and learning environments of these athletes. They also suggested that colleges and universities ensure that the work of the athletic department follow the mission, goals and values of the

institution. Lastly, open and honest communication and a partnership between athletic departments and student-affairs practitioners may be beneficial to ensuring that student-athletes have a holistic college experience. This may assist both parties in providing the services and programs to ensure that student-athletes are provided with optimal experience on the field, in the college community and in the classroom, as well.

Limitations

Though this study was exploratory in nature, there are some limitations to the study. First, the study was designed to explore and gain insight into the feelings of self-efficacy of African American male student-athletes participating in football at a NCAA Division I-AA institution. As stated previously, student-athletes in general and more specifically, African American male student-athletes, are a very specific population with diverse and unique needs and experiences. Due to the specificity of the population, there are certain consequences that must be enumerated.

At the time of the study, there were 37 African American male student-athletes participating in football at the institution of study. Though the sample included all of the African American football players at the institution of study, the number of participants in the study remains small. This small number makes it difficult to conduct more complex analyses such as multiple regression which could, in turn, provide more information on the amount of variance of college self-efficacy as related to athletic and academic self-efficacy. The sample size also greatly reduces the ability to generalize the findings of this study to other students and institutions beyond African American male student-athletes at mid-size Division I institutions. Repeating the current study with

similar institutions and students may provide more comparison groups and an ability to generalize findings to a larger population. It may also further the generalizability of the finding to all Division I institution regardless of A or AA status.

In addition to the small sample size, the instruments used in the study proved to be a limitation. Though the CSEI, CASES, and the TSCI were all self-efficacy instruments scored on a Likert-type scale, all three instruments had different score ranges which made some types of analysis difficult to conduct. Three Pearson's *r* correlations were conducted. However, conducting other types of analyses, such as multiple analysis of variance, was difficult because the instruments were not scored using the same Likert-type scale.

The College Self-Efficacy Inventory and the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale also have some similar questions. The CASES instrument is comprised of academic and scholastically-related questions. The course self-efficacy sub-scale located in the CSEI contains some questions that are very similar to questions located in the CASES instrument. The high positive correlation (.772) between college and academic self-efficacy could possibly be due in part to the similarities of some of the questions between the two instruments.

Lastly, responding to the survey could be potentially anxiety producing for student-athletes. The head football coach at the institution of study was instrumental in obtaining the participants for the study. He convened all of the African American male student-athletes in order for them to take the survey. The student-athletes completed the survey together in one room at a specific time. The participants may have had difficulty answering questions as honestly as possible with their peers sitting around them. In

addition, the researcher was the proctor for the administration of the study and the research participants may have feared the possibility of identification, even though consent forms and surveys were kept separately. Conversely, the athletes may have felt pressured to answer in a specific manner because they knew that the researcher was interested in their responses and experiences.

Finally, some of the subject matter of the survey could be potentially anxiety producing for the student-athletes. The subject of self-confidence could be very sensitive for athletes. Juxtaposed to self-confidence questions are questions regarding their grade point average, positions they play most often, and how well they interact with students outside of athletics. By accounting for the limitations in this study, conducting research on this topic in the future may bring forth data that are more generalizable to a larger group of student-athletes.

Suggestions for Future Research

As there were limitations to this study, further investigation would be beneficial. This study could be repeated with several modifications in order to be able to analyze data more rigorously and more thoroughly. The self-efficacy instruments used in the study had reliable scores, reporting Chronbach α s of .87 (CSEI), .90 (CASES), and .94 (TSCI) respectively. While the participants of study generally scored higher on the athletic self-efficacy scale with a total mean of 98 out of 117 (SD= 16.99) as opposed to a mean of 111 out of 165 (.SD = 15.98) on the academic self-efficacy instrument or a mean of 109 out of 150 (SD= 14.33) on the college self-efficacy instrument, the data were not able to be analyzed to show a statistically significant difference in levels of college,

academic and athletic self-efficacy. This was due to the fact that the instruments were unable to be scored on the same scale. By reconfiguring the Likert scales of all three instruments into a standardized one, analyses such as MANOVA could be conducted to account for main effects. This would give the researcher more information and might provide the opportunity for more ancillary analyses in the future.

Additionally, conducting a similar study with a large sample size may improve the generalizability of the findings. This study focused specifically on a small population of student-athletes and, while the findings were statistically significant, it is unclear how far these findings may be generalized to the larger population. By increasing the sample size, data can be further analyzed using demographic information such as position, year in school, and grade point average. With a larger sample size, data analyses might also be conducted using class standing, race, and socio-economic status, to name but a few categories. The current study did not provide a large enough sample size to analyze data using a variety of variables.

New data may be generated regarding this population at different institutions and eventually, comparisons could be made in college, academic, and athletic self efficacy of student-athletes of other races and/or sports. Additionally, a researcher may be able to investigate self-efficacy differences depending on whether the team of study has had a winning or losing season. Over time, longitudinal studies may be conducted to discern if the team's season record effects individuals' self-efficacy. Lastly, self-efficacy could also potentially be studied across all institutions that participate in NCAA Division I athletics. Should findings continue to corroborate with the findings of the current study, comparisons might be made to institutions participating in NCAA Divisions I, II, and III.

By improving the sample size and the way the instruments are scaled and scored, many analyses could be conducted. The data could be analyzed by using MANOVA, which would inform the researcher whether the mean differences among the dependent variables are happenstance (Pallant, 2001), while allowing the researcher to conduct several omnibus tests at once. If those analyses were significant, the researcher could then conduct post hoc tests to discern where significant differences among the three domains of self-efficacy are.

A multiple regression analysis might also prove helpful to further interpret the domains of college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy. Multiple regression would allow the researcher to answer questions about how well sport, and academic self-efficacy can predict overall college self-efficacy for student-athletes. It could also help answer the question of whether academic or athletic self-efficacy is a better predictor of overall college self-efficacy. Data such as those might provide even greater insight into the lives of student-athletes and where they feel most self-efficacy, and areas where self-efficacy can be improved.

As graduation rates are higher for African American male student-athletes than for their non-athlete counterparts (Person & LeNoir, 1997), conducting further research regarding the role of athletics in the persistence and graduation rate for these African American male student-athletes may illuminate and clarify more of the experiences of student-athletes. As reported previously, the mean grade point average for participants in the study was a 2.57. Further researching the academic self-efficacy of these student athletes may provide more information. It may also be beneficial to conduct research surrounding additional experiences of African American male student-athletes and

conditions that impede or promote their success in academic achievement and overall college adjustment and success.

Finally, more qualitative study of African American male student-athletes may provide further insight into the experiences of this population. The final question of the survey asked participants if there was anything further they wished to disclose (*Appendix D*). Some participants disclosed varying testimonies to some of the consequences of participation in athletics. Participants stated:

- Athletes spend more time trying to achieve and as a result this can alter their confidence and cause stress.
- It's like a job.
- Football takes up a lot of our time, leaving academics as a secondary responsibility.
- Not enough time to study and relax. Also sometimes too tired to concentrate to study.
- I can adapt to any situation.
- I wish I had the time of a regular student.

These statements corroborate prior research on African American male-athletes (Person & LeNoir, 1997; Simons, Van Rheenen, & Covington, 1999; Sowa & Gressard, 1983), where student-athletes reported how much of a time commitment football is, often leaving them with little time to study. Student-athletes also reported being so tired when they return from their athletic responsibilities, left them not feeling like exerting the effort it would take to study for classes. Continuing to build on these findings might allow for the researcher to better understand the experiences of African American male-student athletes specifically, but also of student-athletes as a whole which might in turn continue to inform the practice of student affairs practitioners, athletic administrators and college

and university administrators. These data might be collected employing both quantitative and qualitative methods to obtain a more complete representation of the experiences of student-athletes.

Summary

Though past research has stated that self-efficacy is domain specific, this study sought to explore self-efficacy in several domains for African American male student-athletes participating in football at an NCAA Division I-AA program. The study used the College Self-Efficacy Inventory (CSEI), the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES), and the Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory (TSCI), to explore the levels of self-efficacy for African American male student-athletes.

By using the Pearson r correlation, the data showed that there were statistically significant relationships among college, academic and athletic self-efficacy of African American male student-athletes. Although all three relationships were statistically significant, it is important to note that there was a large positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and college self-efficacy; a moderate positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy; and a moderate positive relationship between college self-efficacy and athletic self-efficacy. From these findings, it may be inferred that a higher or lower level of academic self-efficacy can be related to a higher or lower level of college self-efficacy. Additionally, a higher or lower level of athletic self efficacy may be related to a higher or lower level of academic or college self-efficacy.

The study had several limitations that impeded the generalizability of the findings of the study. The study focused on a particular group which in turn yielded a small sample size. The sample size made it impossible to run more complex statistical analyses that would generate more in depth findings on which to base further research. However, each piece of knowledge discerned about college students can inform the practice of student affairs and athletic practitioners who seek to provide all students with the optimal college experience.

In the future, more research concerning student-athletes should be conducted. This is a very specific population that often gets a lot of attention from the media and campus constituents. Understanding their experiences, particularly as it relates to self-efficacy, can assist institution administrators in educating and aiding in the development of these students for success as students, student-athletes and for life beyond college.

APPENDIX A: College Self-Efficacy Inventory.
 Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, & Davis (1993)

Directions: Think about yourself as a college student. For each statements below, circle the number that best represents your confidence.

How confident are you that you could successfully complete the following tasks: (Circle one number).

0-totally unconfident	5-somewhat confident
1-very unconfident	6-confident
2-unconfident	7-very confident
3-somewhat unconfident	8-totally confident
4-undecided	

1. Make new friends at college.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
2. Talk to your professors/instructors.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
3. Take good class notes.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
4. Divide chores with other you live with.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
5. Research a term paper.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
6. Understand your textbooks.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
7. Get a date when you want one.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
8. Ask a professor or instructor a questions outside of class.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
9. Get along with others you live with.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
10. Write a course paper.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
11. Socialize with others you live with.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
12. Do well on your exams.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
13. Talk wth a school academic and support staff.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
14. Manage your time effectively.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
15. Join a student organization.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
16. Ask a question in class.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
17. Divide space in your residence (if applicable).....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
18. Participate in class discussions.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
19. Keep up to date with your school work.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Please continue on the following page

APPENDIX B: College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale. Owen & Froman (1988).

Directions: How much confidence do you have about doing each of the behaviors listed below?
For each statement below, circle the letter that best represents your confidence.



- | Lot | Little | |
|----------------|--------|---|
| A B C D E..... | | 1. Taking well-organized notes during a lecture. |
| A B C D E..... | | 2. Participating in a class discussion. |
| A B C D E..... | | 3. Answering a question in a large class. |
| A B C D E..... | | 4. Answering a question in a small class. |
| A B C D E..... | | 5. Taking "objective" tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching). |
| A B C D E..... | | 6. Taking essay tests. |
| A B C D E..... | | 7. Writing a high quality term paper. |
| A B C D E..... | | 8. Listening carefully during a lecture on a difficult topic. |
| A B C D E..... | | 9. Tutoring another student. |
| A B C D E..... | | 10. Explaining a concept to another student. |
| A B C D E..... | | 11. Asking a professor in class to review a concept you don't understand. |
| A B C D E..... | | 12. Earning good marks in most courses. |
| A B C D E..... | | 13. Studying enough to understand content thoroughly. |
| A B C D E..... | | 14. Running for student government office. |
| A B C D E..... | | 15. Participating in extracurricular events (sports, clubs). |
| A B C D E..... | | 16. Making professors respect you. |
| A B C D E..... | | 17. Attending class regularly. |
| A B C D E..... | | 18. Attending class consistently in a dull course. |
| A B C D E..... | | 19. Making a professor think you're paying attention in class. |
| A B C D E..... | | 20. Understanding most ideas you read in your tests. |
| A B C D E..... | | 21. Understanding most ideas presented in class. |
| A B C D E..... | | 22. Performing simple math computations. |
| A B C D E..... | | 23. Using a computer. |
| A B C D E..... | | 24. Mastering most content in a math course. |
| A B C D E..... | | 25. Talking to a professor privately to get to know him or her. |
| A B C D E..... | | 26. Relating course content to material in other courses. |
| A B C D E..... | | 27. Challenging a professor's opinion in class. |
| A B C D E..... | | 28. Applying lecture content to a laboratory session. |
| A B C D E..... | | 29. Making good use of the library. |
| A B C D E..... | | 30. Getting good grades. |
| A B C D E..... | | 31. Spreading out studying instead of cramming. |
| A B C D E..... | | 32. Understanding difficult passages in textbooks. |
| A B C D E..... | | 33. Mastering content in a course you're not interested in. |

**Please continue
on the following page**

APPENDIX C: Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory. Vealey (1986).

Directions: Think about yourself as an athlete and the most confident student-athlete you know.

When compared with the most confident athlete you know, How confident are you in your ability to successfully do the following tasks? (Circle one number)

1. Execute the skills necessary to be successful.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
2. Make critical decisions during competition.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
3. Perform under pressure.	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
4. Execute successful strategy.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
5. Concentrate well enough to be successful.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
6. Adapt to different game situations and still be successful..	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
7. Achieve your competitive goals.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
8. Be successful.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
9. Consistently be successful.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
10. Think and respond successfully during competition.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
11. Meet the challenge of competition.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
12. Be successful even when the odds are against you.....	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9
13. Bounce back from performing poorly and be successful..	Low 1 2 3	Medium 4 5 6	High 7 8 9

**Please continue
on the following page**



APPENDIX D: Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please circle one answer or write in your response where appropriate.

A. How many hours per week do you spend participating in football related activities in season (practice, travel, meetings, exercise, games)?

_____ HOURS PER WEEK

B. How many hours per week do you spend participating in football related activities NOT in season (practice, travel, meetings, exercise, games)?

_____ HOURS PER WEEK

C. What is your best estimate of your Cumulative GPA (*example: 2.5/4.0 scale*)? (Circle one).

_____ ■ _____ on a 4.0 scale

D. What year ins school are you? (Circle one).

1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year 4th Year 5th Year

E. What football position do you play most often?

Is there anything else you'd like to tell us?

Thank you so much for completing this survey!! If you would like a copy of the study, please check the appropriate box on the consent form at the beginning of the survey. You can also contact the proctor at tayiku@yahoo.com.

APPENDIX E: Participant Consent Form for Survey

**Title: College, Academic and Athletic Self-Efficacy and African American Male
Student-Athletes**

I state that I am over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens (principal investigator) and Tiffany Q. Ayiku (student investigator) in the Department of Counseling and Personnel Services at the University of Maryland, College Park.

The purpose of this research is to determine if there is a relationship among college, academic, and athletic self-efficacy.

The data collection procedures involve my completion of 65 questions from the College Self-Efficacy Inventory, the College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory. It is estimated that the survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

All information collected in this study is confidential to the extent permitted by law. I understand that the data I provide will be grouped with data others provide for reporting and presentation, and that my name will not be used. This consent form will be stored separately to protect my identity. There are no known risks associated with this study.

This study is designed to help the investigators learn more about self-efficacy (self-confidence) and how it manifests itself in different domains in college life. I am free to ask questions or decline my participation at any time and without penalty.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact:

Institutional Review Board Office; University of Maryland; College Park, MD 20742
E-Mail: irb@deans.umd.edu Telephone: (301) 405-4212

Principal Investigator

Dr. Marsha Guenzler-Stevens
Counseling and Personnel Services
0110 Stamp Student Union
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8505
mguenzle@union.umd.edu

Student Investigator

Tiffany Q. Ayiku
8 Fraternity Row
College Park, MD 20740
(301) 226-4484
tayiku@umd.edu

Name of Participant: _____

Signature of Participant: _____

Date: _____

E-Mail Address: _____

I would like to receive an electronic copy of the study once completed.

APPENDIX F:

Permission to use the Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel & Davis (1993)

College Self-Efficacy Inventory

From: Scott Solberg [SMTP:ssolberg@uwm.edu]

To: tiffany ayiku

Cc:

Subject: Re: College Self-Efficacy Instrument

Sent: 12/7/04 4:34 AM

Importance: Normal

I will try and send it out this week - do you have a fax number in case I am unable to email it?

scott solberg

V. Scott Solberg, Ph. D.
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Department of Educational Psychology
P.O. Box 413, 745 Enderis Hall
Milwaukee, WI 53201
414.229.5845; 414.229.4939 fax
414.902.8417 (South Div. H.S.)
GO PANTHERS!

>>> tiffany ayiku <tayiku@union.umd.edu> 12/3/2004 9:15:20 AM >>>
Greetings from Maryland Dr. Solberg!

My name is Tiki Ayiku and I am a second year Masters student in the Counseling and Personnel Services Department at the University of Maryland. I contacted you via email a couple of weeks ago, but just recently found out that you have been out of the country at a conference. I hope your trip to Italy was great. I also tried to reach you directly in the office, but your voicemail did not pick up. I do not mean to be a pest, but I am extremely interested in using the CSEI in my research. Any guidance or information you could provide me with would be greatly appreciated.

I apologize again if I am worrisome and thank you in advance for your time and consideration,

Tiki Ayiku
PHC Advisor
Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life
1110 Stamp Student Union
College Park MD, 20740
301-314-8278
tayiku@umd.edu.

APPENDIX F continued:

Permission to use the Owen & Froman (1988) College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale

From: Owen, Steven V [SMTP:OwenSV@uthscsa.edu]
To: tiffany ayiku
Cc:
Subject: RE: College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale
Sent: 11/19/04 9:19 AM **Importance:** Normal

And greetings in return from sunny San Antonio! I am happy to share CASES with you, Tiki. I am out of the office until Monday, but will send off the scale and relevant info right off on Monday morning.

Best wishes,
steve

From: tiffany ayiku [mailto:tayiku@union.umd.edu]
Sent: Thu 11/18/2004 8:05 PM
To: Owen, Steven V
Subject: College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale

Greetings from Maryland!

My name is Tiki Ayiku and I am a second year graduate student in the College Student Personnel program here at College Park. I am currently in the process of writing a thesis that will look at African American males and self-efficacy. Through researching, I've encountered your instrument I am interesting in using it for my study. Marcus Peanort, a colleague of mine, relayed that he has been in contact with you and gave me your contact information. I am writing you today to inquire whether it would be possible for me to use the CASES. Any help that you could give me would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you kindly in advance for your time,

Tiki Ayiku

PHC Advisor

Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life

APPENDIX F continued:
Permission to use the Vealey (1986) Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory

From: Robin Vealey [SMTP:vealeys@muohio.edu]

To: tiffany ayiku

Hi Tiki:

Yes, you have permission to use the TSCI, and actually you don't even need permission. The inventory is published and free to use. I appreciate your professionalism and wish you the best of luck on your research!

Robin Vealey

Robin S. Vealey, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Physical Education, Health and Sport Studies
Phillips Hall
Miami University
Oxford, Oh 45056
513-529-6530 (phone)
513-529-5006 (fax)
vealeys@muohio.edu (email)

REFERENCES

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: the academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 58(4), 241-250.
- Astin, A.W. (2001). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development*, 67, 1206-1222.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M., & Pastorelli, C. (2003). Role of affective self-regulatory efficacy in diverse spheres of psychosocial functioning. *Child Development*, 74, 769-782.
- Blann, F.W. (1985). Intercollegiate athletic competition and students' educational and career plans. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 115-118.
- Carodine, K., Almond, K.F. & Gratto, K. K. (2001). College student athlete success both in and out of the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 19-34.

- Chartrand, J.M. & Lent, R.W. (1987). Sports counseling: Enhancing the development of the student-athlete. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 66, 164-167.
- Chemers, M. M., Hu, L. T., & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first-year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55-64.
- Cokley, K. O. (2002). Ethnicity, gender, and academic self-concept: A preliminary examination of academic disidentification and implications for psychologists. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8, 378-388.
- Cokley, K. O. (2000). An investigation of academic self-concept and its relationship to academic achievement in African American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 226, 148-164.
- Cornelius, A. (1995). The relationship between athletic identity, peer and faculty socialization, and college student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 560-573.
- Cross, T., & Slater, R. B., (2000). The alarming decline in the academic performance of African-American men. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 27, 82-87.
- Cuyjet, M. J. (1997). African American men on college campuses: Their needs and their perceptions. In M. J. Cuyjet (Ed.), *Helping African American men succeed in college* (pp. 5-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dawson-Threat, J. (1997). Enhancing in-class academic experiences for African American men. In M. J. Cuyjet (Ed.), *Helping African American men succeed in college* (pp.31-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- DeWitz, S.J. & Walsh, W.B. (2002). Self-efficacy and college student satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment, 10*, 315-326.
- Dinter, L. D. (2000). The relationship between self-efficacy and lifestyle patterns. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 56*, 462-473.
- Edwards, H. (2000). Crisis of Black athletes on the eve of the 21st century. *Society, 37*, n.p.
- Edwards, H. (1984). The Black "dumb jock": An American sports tragedy. *The College Board Review, 131*, 8-13.
- Engstrom, C. M., Sedlacek, W. E., & McEwen, M. K. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward male revenue and non-revenue student-athletes. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*, 217-227.
- Etzel, E. F., Ferrante, A. P., & Pinkney, J. W. (Eds.). (1996). *Counseling college student-athletes: Issues and interventions* (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Ferrante, A. P., Ezel, E. F., & Lantz, C. (1996). Counseling college student athletes: The problem, the need. In E. F. Ezel, A. P. Ferrante & J. W. Pinkney (Eds.), *Counseling college student athletes: Issues and interventions* (pp. 3-26). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Flowers, L. A., & Pascarella, E. T. (2003). Cognitive effects of college: Differences between African American and Caucasian students. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 21-49.

- Hawkins, B. (1999). Black student athletes at predominantly White National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I institutions and the pattern of oscillating migrant laborers. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 23, 1-9.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hood, A. B., Craig, A. F., & Ferguson, B. W. (1992). The impact of athletics, part-time employment, and other activities on academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 447-453.
- House, J. D. (1992). The relationship between academic self-concept, achievement-related expectancies, and college attrition. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 5-10.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F., & Sina, J. A. (2001). How college affects student athletes. In M.F. Howard-Hamilton and S. K. Watts (Eds.), *Student Services for Athletes* (pp. 35-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howard-Hamilton, M.F., & Watt, S. K.(2001) Editor's notes. In M.F. Howard-Hamilton and S. K. Watts (Eds.), *Student Services for Athletes* (pp. 1-6). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hyatt, R. (2003). Barriers to persistence among African American intercollegiate athletes: A literature review of non-cognitive variables. *College Student Journal*, 37(2). n.p.

- Killeya, L. A. (2001). Idiosyncratic role-elaboration, academic performance and adjustment among African-American and European-American male college student athletes. *College Student Journal, 35*, 87-95.
- LaVant, B., Anderson, J.L., & Tiggs, J.W. (1997). Retaining African American men through mentoring initiatives. In M.J. Cuyjet (Ed.), *Helping African American men succeed in college*. (pp. 43-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Gore Jr., P. A. (1997). Discriminant and predictive validity of academic self-concept, academic self-efficacy, and mathematics-specific self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 307-315.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Larkin, K. C. (1984). Relation of self-efficacy expectations to academic achievement and persistence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 356-362.
- Lett, D. F., & Wright, J. V. (2003). *Psychological barriers associated with matriculation of African American students in predominantly White institutions*. Retrieved April 26, 2004, from http://www.findarticles.com/cf_0/m0fcg/3_30/108836887/print./jhtml
- Majors, R. and Billson, J. M. (1992). *Cool pose: The dilemmas of African American manhood in America*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Mayo, M. W., & Christenfeld, N. (1999). Gender, race, and performance expectations of college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 27*, 93-105.

- Mone, M. A., Baker, D. D., & Jeffries, F. (1995). Predictive validity and time dependency of self-efficacy, self-esteem, personal goals, and academic performance. *Educational Psychological Measurement, 55*, 716-727.
- Myers, N.D., Vargas-Tonsing, T. M., & Feltz, D. L. (2005). Coaching efficacy in intercollegiate coaches: Sources, coaching behavior and team variables. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 6*, 129-144.
- Myers, N.D., Feltz, D. L., & Short, Sandra E. (2004). Collective efficacy and team performance: A longitudinal study of collegiate football teams. *Group Dynamics, 8*, 126-138.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2003). *Status and trends in the education of African Americans*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on April 12, 2004 from <http://nces.ed.gov/>.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2003). *Research related to graduation rates of Division I student athletes: 1984-1997*. Power Point Presentation. Retrieved on December 12, 2004 from http://www.ncaa.org/grad_rates/2004/d1/1
- Owen, S. V., & Froman, R. D. (1988). *Development of a college academic self-efficacy scale*. Paper presented at the 1998 annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Parham, W. D. (1993). The intercollegiate athlete: A 1990s profile. *The Counseling Psychologist, 21*, 411-429.

- Pascarella, E. T. & Smart, J. C. (1991). Impact of intercollegiate athletic participation for African American and Caucasian men: Some further evidence. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 123-130.
- Person, D.R., Benson-Quaziana, M., & Rogers, A.M. (2001). Female student athletes and student athletes of color. In M.F. Howard Hamilton and S.K. Watt (Eds.), *Student services for athletes: New directions for student services* (pp. 55-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schunk, D.H. & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 16-32). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Adams-Gaston, J. (1992). Predicting the academic success of student-athletes using SAT and noncognitive variables. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 724-727.
- Simons, H. D., Van Rheenen, D., & Covington, M. V. (1999). Academic motivation and the student athlete. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 151-162.
- Smallman, E., Sowa, C.J., & Young, B.D. (1991). Ethnic and gender differences in student-athletes' responses to stressful life events. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 230-235.
- Solberg, V.S., O'Brien, K., Villareal, P., Kennel, R., & Davis, B. (1993). Self-efficacy and Hispanic college students: Validation of the college self-efficacy instrument. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 80-95.

- Sowa, C. J., & Gressard, C. F. (1983). Athletic participation: Its relationship to student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 236-239.
- Sowa, C. J., Thomson, M. M., & Bennett, C. T. (1989). Prediction and improvement of academic performance for high-risk Black college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 17*, 14-22.
- Steele, C. M. (1999). Thin ice: Stereotype threat and African American college students. *Atlantic Monthly, 284*, 44-53.
- Steele, C.M. (1998). Stereotyping and its threat are real. *American Psychologist, 53*, 680-682.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52*, 613-629.
- Steele, C. M. & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797-812.
- Steward, R.J., Jackson, M.R., & Jackson, J.D. (1990). Alienation and interactional styles in a predominantly White environment: A study of successful Black students. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*, 509-515
- Suggs, W. (1999). Graduation rates hit lowest level in 7 years for athletes in football and basketball. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*, A58-A60
- Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*, 149-162.

- Tinto V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of learner attrition* \ (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- United States Census Bureau (2003). Selected Appendixes: 2000 census of population and housing, B1-B77. Retrieved on November 3, 2004 from <http://www.census.gov>.
- Vargas-Tonsing, T. M., Myers, N.D., & Feltz, D. L. (2004). Coaches' and athletes' perceptions of efficacy enhancing techniques. *Sport Psychologist, 18*, 397-415.
- Vealey, R.S. (1986). Conceptualization of sport-confidence and competitive orientation: Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 8*, 221-246.
- Watt, S.K. & Moore III, J. L. (1993). Who are student athletes? New directions for student services. In M.F. Howard-Hamilton and S. K. Watts (Eds.), *Student services for athletes*, 93, (pp. 7-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, B.D. & Sowa, C. J. (1992). Predictors of academic success for Black student athletes. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 318-324.
- Zimmerman, B.J., Bandura, A., Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *Educational Research Journal, 29*, 663-676.