

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF SELF-EFFICACY ON ACADEMIC SUCCESS OF FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE SOPHOMORE STUDENTS

Recent literature shows that retention efforts should not solely focus on first-year experience, but also on their second or sophomore year in college. As a result of these findings, there is a considerable need for researchers to concentrate on post-freshmen retention. Coupled with the sophomore slump experience, many first-generation students encounter great challenges.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the effects of self-efficacy on academic success of first-generation college sophomore students. The participants in the study consisted of college sophomores from 5 of the 23 California State University (CSU) campuses. An online College Self-Efficacy Inventory (CSEI) was employed to measure participants' self-efficacy levels. The study addressed four overarching research questions. Using a multiple linear regression analysis, the first question aimed to assess the relationship between self-efficacy scores and academic success as defined by GPA and persistence rates. The second question used a 2 X 9 MANOVA to determine the effects of demographic factors, such as gender and ethnicity, on self-efficacy. The third question examined the difference in means of self-efficacy between first-generation and second-and-beyond students by utilizing Hotelling T² statistical test. The final research question explored the relationship between institution size and self-efficacy by using a one-way MANOVA.

The major significant finding was that self-efficacy is an important factor in predicting academic success and persistence. No significant differences were found for self-efficacy by gender. However, significant differences for self-

efficacy (total) and self-efficacy subscales (course, social, and roommate) by ethnicity were found. There were no significant differences on the means of self-efficacy between first- and second-generation sophomore students. Lastly, no significant differences were found for self-efficacy by institution size.

Mui Vuong
May 2007