This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

DIFFERENCES IN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS AMONG ACADEMICALLY RESILIENT AND ACADEMICALLY NONRESILIENT AFRICAN AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

presented by

MORRIS KENARD LEWIS, III

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Gloria A. Arnold
Major professor

Date 8/1/2002

DIFFERENCES IN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS AMONG ACADEMICALLY RESILIENT AND ACADEMICALLY NONRESILIENT AFRICAN AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

By

Morris Kenard Lewis III

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education

2003

ABSTRACT

DIFFERENCES IN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS AMONG ACADEMICALLY RESILIENT AND ACADEMICALLY NONRESILIENT AFRICAN AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

By

Morris Kenard Lewis III

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether academically resilient and academically nonresilient (as measured by grade point average) groups of African American undergraduate students exhibit significant differences in emotional intelligence and related constructs, which include emotional control, impulsiveness, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience. This study is important for several reasons. First, it contributes new information to the scientific literature regarding the relationship between affective variables and academic resilience. A thorough review of the literature revealed that only one empirical study examining emotional intelligence has been conducted on African American populations, which yielded significant results. Second, few studies on resilience have used African American college students as subjects. Thus, this study may help in understanding factors contributing to academic success, which may be useful to those working with younger populations.

A sample of 129 African American undergraduate students were surveyed to examine relationships between participants' academic resilience, as measured by grade point average, and their emotional intelligence and related constructs. Academic resilience was operationally defined as the ability to thrive and achieve above-average academic performance (3.0 or greater GPA) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or

environmental challenges. Related emotional intelligence constructs were emotional control, impulsiveness, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience. It was hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of emotional intelligence, emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience.

Results indicated that there was a positive correlation between academic resilience and two subscales on the Resilient Attitudes Scale, Independence and Morality. However, no other significant correlations were found when examining the sample as a whole. To improve future studies on academic resilience, it is suggested that researchers use emotional intelligence scales that have been normed on large African American samples; identify and use an instrument that specifically measures academic resilience; use a more heterogeneous sample of African Americans from majority institutions; restrict self-report measures; use control samples for comparative purposes; use instruments that are not highly correlated with each other; expand cutoff scores (i.e., 0-1.999 = academically nonresilient and 2.0-4.0 = academically resilient); shorten surveys and provide better directions to improve participation and sample size; examine sociocultural, family functioning, and environmental variables; use qualitative studies to examine academic resilience; use multiple regression or path analysis to examine the data; examine grade inflation in higher education; and develop a single instrument extracting the most reliable and valid questions from the various instruments used in the study.

DEDICATION

First and foremost, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my mother, Lula Lewis. You are probably the only person who loves me more than I love myself. You encouraged me from day one and always made me believe that this was possible. As a single mother, you did the very best for all of us, and your efforts are reflected in this accomplishment. It has been stated that a woman cannot teach a man how to be a man. I disagree. You molded me into the man that I have become and continue to strive to be.

To my father, Morris Kenard Lewis, Jr., who died on Super Bowl Sunday 2001, you are the smartest man I have ever known. I still admire the things you were able to accomplish in the era and environment you accomplished them in, given your young age. As a child, I imitated your every move. Unfortunately, you are not here to see the moves I have made. However, I will make sure that I do the things for my children that you would have done for us if the circumstances had been different. Although you are lying down, you are still and always will be the only man I look up to. May God bless you!

To my sister, Michelle Antoinne Lewis, I have always admired your pure intelligence. I had to work hard to learn things, whereas it appeared that you had to work hard not to get bored. If I can achieve this, there is no reason why you should not, given the fact that intelligence comes naturally for you. I am looking forward to being at your graduation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To **Dr. Gloria Smith**, chairperson of my doctoral committee, mother figure, and friend, I am deeply grateful to you for supporting me in my personal, educational, and professional efforts. Your advice, guidance, and wisdom are untouchable. Thank you for standing by me through five years of good and hard times. I appreciate your unconditional and genuine regard for me as a person as well as a student, even when some people were trying to poke holes in my armor. Words can never describe what you mean to me personally. Because of you, I am the rose that grew from concrete! Your impact on my life and contribution to my growth are nothing short of beautiful. I will forever be indebted to you for your good will and commitment to students of color.

To Dr. Lee June, member of my doctoral committee, thanks for your time, concern, wisdom, and support throughout this experience. You contributed significantly to my personal growth and professional development. The manner in which you conduct yourself should be taught to African American males across the country.

To Dr. Marylee Davis, member of my doctoral committee, thanks for your time, energy, thoughtfulness, and support throughout this experience. Thanks for agreeing to serve as a member of my committee. You were my number-one draft choice. Your smile, experience, and expertise made this experience easier to deal with.

To Dr. John Schweitzer, member of my doctoral committee, thanks for your time, patience, understanding, and support throughout this experience. Your statistical expertise was invaluable in helping me analyze the data.

To Dr. Sonya Gunnings-Moton, member of my doctoral committee, thanks for your time, concern, and support throughout this experience. You kept me focused on the task and kept me relaxed along the way with your kind words and beautiful personality.

A heartfelt thanks is given to Leah Hardwick for understanding me and supporting my efforts, as well as providing me with priceless unconditional love and emotional support. I found my one. Whenever you are ready, let's do it!

A profound thanks is given to Elvin Poole, Jr., my best friend and best man when I decide to take that walk, for providing me with sound advice on how to navigate this journey. Thanks for the loyalty and "true friendship." In this day and age, it is hard to find a true friend.

A distinctive thanks is given to Dr. Richard Chiles, my undergraduate advisor, for pushing me as an undergraduate student to maximize my potential and for pushing me harder as a graduate student to maximize my intellectual capabilities.

A special thanks is given to Rudolph Valentino Wilson, "The Godfather," for bringing me into the Omega family.

A special thanks is given to Dr. Hilton Thomas for being a positive role model and friend. Also, thanks for the professional advice and support.

A special thanks is given to Dr. Thomas Gunnings for providing me with the opportunity to gain invaluable personal and professional experience.

A heartfelt thanks is given to Dr. Eleanor Bossi for supporting my efforts and having a genuine concern for my well-being, professional growth, and development.

A sincere thanks is given to Dr. Dave Novicki for providing me with sound clinical supervision and for being someone to talk to. You kept me at ease.

A special thanks is given to Glenda Hammond for understanding that priority one was reaching my destiny. Thanks for the understanding, support, and encouragement.

A special thanks is given to Dr. Charlene Patterson and Carmen Gear for providing me with the encouragement and inspiration to get this done.

A warm thanks is given to Darius and Paula Cunningham and family for providing me with warmth, kindness, encouragement, friendship, and genuine hospitality during my stay in East Lansing.

An expression of gratitude is given to Dr. Maxie Jackson and Kennetha McFadden for their support throughout this experience.

A sincere thanks is given to Mark Freeman for being a solid friend and brother. You taught me what it means to be an "Omega." Of all the members I have encountered, you are the most level headed. The friendship we have transcends the fraternity.

I would also like to thank Sue Cooley Miller for making me look good!

Finally, a profound expression of gratitude is given to all of those people who doubted me. You provided me with the discipline, motivation, determination, and dedication to continue this mission when I was low on energy, enthusiasm, and patience.

"Let everyone know, whether they wish me well or wish me ill, that I will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any true friend, oppose any foe, to ensure my survival and success."
Adopted and slightly altered from John F. Kennedy, 1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

Background and Problem Statement

Since the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954, which opened the door for African Americans to integrate American school systems, educational opportunities for African Americans have increased. As a result of these educational opportunities, social conditions for African Americans have improved (U.S. Department of Education, 2002b). It is believed that African Americans are currently doing better socially, educationally, and economically than during any other period in American history. However, since the 1960s, many problems still remain for African Americans. In particular, problems among African American adolescents have either improved slightly, remained the same, or have become significantly worse. For example, currently, there are more African American adolescents in county jails, state prisons, and federal prisons than during any other period in American history (U.S. Department of Justice, 2002a). This is just one of the problems affecting African American adolescents.

A historical overview highlighting research and statistics concerning the progress and stagnation of African American adolescents from the 1960s to the present is given in the first section of Chapter II. This is important because the increase in African Americans of middle and upper-middle class status has caused some to believe that social conditions are better for this group. However, if one were to examine the unemployment rates of African Americans, he or she would discover that this is simply not true (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002). Consequently, African American adolescents throughout America are suffering a great deal, and research must be conducted to

discover protective factors that will ameliorate the problems that exist within this population, in particular, academic problems such as high dropout rates, poor academic achievement, truancy, and aversive relationships with school administrators and teachers whom they perceive as oppressive.

The plight of African American adolescents in American society is a national tragedy requiring immediate and direct action (Murray & Fairchild, 1989). Many African American adolescents experience poverty, discrimination, high stress levels, high unemployment rates, drug and gang-related violence within their communities. As a result, many African American adolescents resort to crime, drug abuse, violence, and a host of other delinquent behaviors to cope with the stressors and escape the painful realities they encounter in everyday life, often resulting in family, mental and physical health, and academic problems.

In addition, many African American adolescents are overrepresented in the statistics on high school dropout rates, exhibit poor performance on nationally standardized achievement tests, and typically experience greater challenges in higher education (Ford, 1990; Gordon, 1995). Consequently, many African American adolescents drop out of school due to family problems, disciplinary problems, poor conflict-resolution skills, and drug abuse as a manner of coping and escaping reality, economic hardships, and violence. Because many African American adolescent dropouts lack the necessary skills to secure gainful employment, the drug trade seems appealing to them. Consequently, the lucrative drug trade has increased violence and murder rates among unemployed and uneducated African American adolescents who see no alternative ways to achieve the "American dream" (Short, 1997).

Homicide is the most common cause of death for young African American females as well as males. The probability of a young African American female dying by homicide is four times that of a non-African American female. A young African American male is 21 times more likely to die by homicide than is a non-African American male (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a). Not only are we losing African American adolescents in the streets, we are losing them in the schools as well.

Some educators have ignored African American adolescents in the academic arena, believing they are unteachable, social welfare institutions are ill-equipped to respond to their various problems and unique needs, the juvenile justice system has failed to provide programs that will rehabilitate them, and the mental health care system has excluded them by ignoring their unique needs. Although there are currently more middle-income African American families and more African American college students than during any previous period in United States history, there are also more African Americans on welfare and more severe problems among the majority of African American youths who are neither middle class nor college bound (Neubeck, 2001).

Current statistics indicate that, compared to 1960, more African American youths are unemployed, in the juvenile justice system, involved in substance abuse, committing suicide and homicide, and having children out of wedlock (Meckler, 1998; National Center for Health Statistics, 2000; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2000; U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a). However, although a significant number of African American adolescents find difficulty in negotiating their environment and the academic arena, there are those who defy the odds and excel academically. These individuals are able to transcend financial problems, stressors, and other less-than-desirable circumstances. These African American adolescents are considered to be academically

resilient. For the purposes of this study, the term *academically resilient* is used to refer to a student's ability to achieve above average academic performance (3.0 or greater) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or environmental challenges, presented by an inner-city, rural, or suburban community.

I selected inner-city, rural, and suburban African American students as participants in this study because research findings have suggested that there are higher rates of adolescent behavior problems (e.g., juvenile delinquency) among underprivileged populations (Felner et al., 1995). In inner-city communities, violence often is dramatically evident in nightly shootings, drug exchanges, gang violence, and prostitution. Many families struggle to keep their children from succumbing to the temptations of fast money and crime, as well as to prevent their children from becoming perpetrators or victims. These problems used to affect only inner-city areas; however, the problem of youth violence is no longer limited to urban environments.

Domestic violence, hate crimes, sexual violence, and violence among peers pose threats to children and teenagers in every American community. No community in America is immune to violence, although the probabilities of involvement are influenced by race, social, and economic class, age, geographical area, population density, and other factors.

In addition, despite heightened interest in and several decades of research on resiliency, several gaps remain in the scientific literature on this subject. First, most resiliency studies have focused primarily on risk factors. Second, these studies have overexamined variables. Third, these studies primarily have used adolescents as subjects. Finally, resiliency studies have failed to examine affective variables as facilitators of academic resilience. Hence, this study was undertaken to contribute to the scientific

literature by examining emotional intelligence and related constructs as facilitators of academic resilience in African American students attending a Historically Black College.

Purpose of the Study

My primary purpose in this study was to determine whether academically resilient and academically nonresilient (as measured by grade point average) African American students attending a Historically Black College exhibit significant differences in emotional intelligence and related constructs, which include emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience. Drawing from the theory of emotional intelligence, I hypothesized that African American students attending a Historically Black College who have the ability to control their impulses, maintain optimism in the face of setbacks and adversity, and resolve conflict will be more academically resilient, as represented by higher grade point averages, than will their counterparts who are deficient in controlling and regulating their emotions. Secondary objectives of this research study were to (a) contribute new information to the scientific literature regarding affective factors as facilitators of academic resilience, (b) examine factors that contribute to resilience in undergraduate population comprising African American students, and (c) examine the reliability of emotional intelligence and related measures within this population.

Research Questions

The concept of emotional intelligence implicitly assumes that individuals who are able to control their impulses, soothe anxiety, manage anger, and display optimism in the face of setbacks will be resilient. To guide the collection of data with which to test these assumptions, I posed the following research questions:

1. Do academically resilient and academically nonresilient African American students attending a Historically Black College differ significantly in emotional intelligence?

2. Do academically resilient and academically nonresilient African American students attending a Historically Black College differ significantly in emotional control?

3. Do academically resilient and academically nonresilient African American students attending a Historically Black College differ significantly in impulse control?

4. Do academically resilient and academically nonresilient African American students attending a Historically Black College differ significantly in optimism?

5. Do academically resilient and academically nonresilient African American students attending a Historically Black College differ significantly in attitudes reflective of resilience?

Importance of the Study

This research is important for several reasons. First, the study will contribute new information to the scientific literature. A thorough review of the literature revealed that only one empirical study has been conducted on examining emotional intelligence in African American populations, which yielded significant results. Second, few studies on resilience have used African American college students as subjects. Hence, as a result of this study, we may better understand factors contributing to academic success, which may be useful to those working with younger populations. Finally, significant results may warrant additional research and the development of modules to teach young African American students how to be emotionally intelligent.

Definitions of Terms

To facilitate clarity, the following terms are defined in the context in which they are used in this dissertation.

Academically resilient—the ability to thrive and achieve above average academic performance (3.0 or greater GPA) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or environmental challenges.

Academically nonresilient—the inability to thrive and achieve above average academic performance (3.0 or greater GPA) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or environmental challenges.

African Americans—people having their origin in any of the Black racial groups of Africa (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000).

Emotional intelligence—the ability to control one's impulses, soothe anxiety, avoid depression, maintain optimism in the face of adversity, direct anger appropriately, respond well to the emotional reactions of others, engage in nonjudgmental listening and speaking, resolve conflicts in relationships, and show concern and helpfulness towards others (Goleman, 1996).

Inner-city—residential district located directly within a large city.

Protective factors—"Specific influences that modify, ameliorate, or alter an individual's response to environmental demands, thereby reducing the chance of a maladaptive outcome" (Mrazek & Mrazek, 1987, pp. 358-359).

Risk factors—"Characteristics of the individual, family, community, culture, or overall environment that may facilitate the development of maladaptive behaviors" (Garmezy, 1993, p. 127).

Rural—residential district located in the country.

Suburban—residential district located directly on the outskirts of a large town or city.

Overview of the Study

Chapter I contains information regarding the statement of the problem, research questions, purpose of the study, importance of the study, definition of key terms, and an overview of what will be discussed in the following chapters.

Chapter II is a review of the literature on topics relevant to the study. Developmental antecedents that contribute to delinquency in African American adolescent populations are discussed. Also, theories, models, and criticisms of resilience and emotional intelligence are discussed.

Chapter III contains information related to the methodology of the study. The research hypotheses along with issues related to procedures, instrumentation, and the data analysis procedures are discussed.

Chapter IV contains information related to the results of the reliability analysis, instrument scale correlations, and the findings of the study. Specifically, demographic information, correlations, and findings from the independent-samples *t* test are addressed.

Finally, Chapter V contains a summary of the research. Specifically, the interpretation of results, implications of the study, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and additional questions are posed to facilitate thinking among researchers interested in resilience studies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter contains a review of the literature relevant to this study. The chapter begins with a discussion of literature on the developmental antecedents of some African American youths' becoming delinquent. Then, writings on resilience and emotional intelligence are reviewed. Specifically, theoretical frameworks, studies involving resilience and emotional intelligence, and criticisms of both theories are discussed.

Developmental Antecedents of Some African American Youths' Becoming Delinquent

To find effective ways to prevent or ameliorate an adolescents' propensity toward academic problems and other forms of delinquency such as violence and drug abuse, one must first understand the contextual issues that contribute to the problem. Although no definitive answer exists that would make it possible to predict exactly which individuals will experience academic problems or become delinquent, certain factors have been identified through empirical research as contributing to a child's risk profile. Biological factors, childrearing conditions, ineffective parenting, emotional and cognitive development, gender differences, sex role socialization, relations to peers, cultural milieu, social factors such as economic inequality, lack of opportunity, and media influences are all thought to be factors that contribute to delinquent behavior (American Psychological Association, 1993).

Poverty

It has long been established that poverty and socioeconomic inequality are major determinants of violence and delinquency. Violence and delinquent behaviors are most prevalent among the poor, regardless of race. Despite public stereotypes, it is likely that socioeconomic inequality, rather than race, leads to higher rates of delinquent behavior and violence among ethnic minority groups. Few differences among the races have been found in rates of delinquency when people at the same income level have been compared. But beyond mere income level, it is the socioeconomic inequality of the poor, their sense of relative deprivation, and their lack of opportunity to ameliorate their life circumstances that engender higher rates of delinquency.

Poverty is not merely a lack of money. Economic deprivation defines the very context in which people live, in terms of access to information, healthcare (mental as well as physical), exposure to cultural and educational opportunities. In other words, to be poor in America is to be segregated, cut off from the rest of the world, often in decaying inner cities, in which crime and threat of crime confine the poor to fear and isolation at best and to injury and death at worst.

Violence rates in central cities are 41.3 per thousand, but in suburbs and nonmetropolitan areas they are 25.2 per thousand (U.S. Department of Justice, 2002a). In comparison to nonminorities, higher proportions of ethnic minority populations live in cities. Poverty refers to relative deprivation as well as absolute deprivation. Not only do the poor in America lack the basic necessities, but they also are aware that they do not have the things that most other Americans do. In addition, poor individuals lack the opportunities needed to obtain a secure future. Media depictions of other Americans who

are living "the good life" serve only to compound the already untenable conditions of poverty with a heightened sense of deprivation.

African American children have always carried a disproportionate share of the burden of poverty and economic despair in America, and they are at a substantially higher risk than White children for experiencing an array of socioemotional problems (Hickner, 1999). The proportion of African American children living in poverty soared during the 1980s. Between 1979 and 1985, the rate of poverty for African American children 18 years and under increased from 36% to 41%, compared to 12% to 13% for White children during the same period (Duncan, 1988).

Felner et al. (1995) investigated interrelations among conditions of household socioeconomic disadvantage, proximal environmental experiences, and adaptational outcomes in a sample of 398 middle-grade, early adolescents from a predominantly poor, rural area. Findings of the study indicated that level of disadvantage was related to both socioemotional and academic adjustment, with those from relatively disadvantaged backgrounds faring most poorly. Specifically, youths from homes in which adults were employed in low-income, unskilled occupations were found to have lower levels of school performance and achievement as compared to those from homes in which adults were employed in higher paying semi-skilled or skilled/professional occupations. Furthermore, youths from families in which neither parent had graduated from high school exhibited significantly worse socioemotional and academic adjustment than did those whose parents had higher educational levels.

Urban neighborhoods with high rates of poverty and rapid population turnover have higher rates of violence than poor but stable neighborhoods and stable affluent neighborhoods (Lynn & McGeary, 1990). Several factors might contribute to this

relationship. First, on an individual level, frequent changes of residence disconnect people from their support systems, and people living in highly mobile neighborhoods often experience a sense of isolation that causes them to feel restricted and hopeless. In addition, it is believed that some of the problems plaguing African American adolescents are a function of changes in the age structure and other recent demographic trends in African American communities.

Despite the slight increases in the African American population and demographic trends in central cities, social problems affecting inner-city adolescents have become significantly worse since the 1960s (Hawkins, 1995). For example, although the African American population grew only moderately during the 1980s, the period from 1960 to 1980 saw a dramatic increase in the percentage of African American adolescents living in central cities. During the 1960s alone, the number of African American adolescents ages 16 to 19 increased by nearly 75% in central cities, compared to a 14% increase in the number of White adolescents in the same age group (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1972). By 1980, more than half (56%) of African Americans under age 25 were located in central cities, twice the percentage of Whites in the same age group (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1982). In 2000, the number of African American adolescents living in central cities stood at approximately 60% (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). Accompanying these changes in the demographics of central cites, poverty, violence, unemployment, and drug addiction have increased (Fox, 2000).

J. Q. Wilson (1983) argued that the dramatic increase in the size and concentration of African American adolescents in central cities had "an exponential effect on the rate of certain social problems" (p. 24). More specifically, abrupt and large increases in the number of African American adolescents created a critical mass in

central cities that triggered a self-sustaining chain reaction, resulting in "an explosive increase in the amount of crime, addiction, welfare dependency, and other social problems" (p. 24).

According to Crane (1991), limited legal opportunities are the primary determinants of drug dealing and drug addiction, which lead to higher incarceration rates among employable adults and young adults. Because the African American adolescent population is expected to continue to increase significantly, these youths are likely to continue to contribute disproportionately to such social problems as crime, violence, teen pregnancy, unemployment, and drug addiction (Staveteig & Wigton, 2000).

Changes in the age structure alone are not sufficient enough to account for the precipitous rise in social problems among African American adolescents in central cities. The major sources of their difficulties are rooted in fundamental changes in the structure of local economies and in the economic and social marginalization that has occurred in the inner cities during the past several decades (Darity & Myers, 1995b; Hoffman & Duncan, 1995; Wacquant & Wilson, 1989). Industrial decentralization, combined with structural shifts in city economies from centers of goods-producing or manufacturing activities to higher order service-providing industries, has severely affected the employment opportunities for inner-city African Americans, especially the job prospects of poorly educated African American adolescents.

According to Kasarda (1989), such structural changes have substantially reduced the number of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in those industries that have traditionally attracted and economically upgraded previous generations of urban African Americans. " Loss of these employment opportunities, in turn, has devastating effects on African American families, which has further exacerbated the problems of the economically

displaced" (p. 27). Consequently, widespread crime, intractably high levels of poverty, accelerating physical decay, and unemployment have become prevalent (Kasarda, 1985).

Unemployed individuals are at a greater risk than employed persons of being arrested and incarcerated. It has been estimated that about 30% of inmates were unemployed at the time of their arrest (Meyers & Simms, 1988). Furthermore, Freeman (1991) estimated that incarceration reduces men's number of weeks worked by about 20% to 25% and probation/parole by about 10% to 15% percent. Moreover, survey data have indicated that one year after release, as many as 60% of former inmates were unemployed, which further increased the likelihood that these men would engage in illegal activities to support their families and thus increased the likelihood of their returning to prison.

A substantial segment of urban African Americans are far more isolated and concentrated in extreme-poverty areas within central cites today than several decades ago. The proportion of all African Americans residing in extreme-poverty areas (i.e., census tracts with a population of at least 40 living in poverty), as Wacquant and Wilson (1989) found, grew substantially during the 1970s, so that by 1980, "fully 38 percent of all poor African Americans in the 10 largest American cities lived in extreme-poverty tracts, contrasted with 22 percent a decade before, and with only 6 percent of poor non-Latino/a Whites" (p. 10). In contrast, in 1999, 10% of the nation's young children lived in extreme poverty (National Center for Children in Poverty, 1999). Specifically, that equates to families with incomes 50% below the poverty line. Among young children, the extreme poverty rate is growing faster than the overall poverty rate.

The growing spatial and socioeconomic segregation of the African American urban poor has been accelerated by the exodus of working-class and middle-income

African American families in record numbers from the inner cities to other neighborhoods in metropolitan areas and the suburbs (W. J. Wilson, 1987). These developments, in turn, have exacerbated the problems of African American adolescents by depriving them of those role models, support systems, and institutions that have been critical to success and mobility in the larger society.

Chronic poverty severely constricts choices in virtually all domains of life (e.g., choices of neighborhood, recreational activities, and educational opportunities). Poverty also renders an individual more subject to control by others (e.g., social workers), and increases the probability that a child will be perceived negatively and receives less positive attention and more criticism from teachers and parents (Institute for Research on Poverty, 1998).

Individuals who are poor are confronted with other negative life events (e.g., physical illness, eviction, violence, criminal assault, hunger, drug-infested communities, and separation from family of origin) in the context of chronically stressful, ongoing life conditions such as inadequate housing and dangerous neighborhoods that together increase the exigencies of day-to-day living. Due to the extremely limited financial resources, negative life events often precipitate additional crises, such that stressors are highly contagious (Casper & Fields, 2000). It is very easy to see how children who face these conditions on a daily basis succumb to depression and other types of mental illness. Dressler (1985) found that chronic economic stress (e.g., worrying about money, not having enough money for basic needs, and difficulty making ends meet) was the strongest predictor of depression among African Americans living in randomly selected households.

In October 1983, the United States Labor Department announced a decline in the overall national rate of unemployment to 8.8%, but unemployment among African American youths had risen to 48.3%, which was more than twice the 21.6% rate among all teenagers. In contrast, in 2000, the overall poverty rate was 11.3%, down half a percentage point from 1999. However, the unemployment rate for African American youths was 31% compared to 13% for White teenagers and 16% for all teenagers (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). If African American youths are unable to find jobs, it is impossible for them to develop the work skills, habits, and attitudes that are necessary and imperative in a competitive, highly technological, and global economy.

Recent studies have indicated that chronically unemployed African American males constitute a disproportionately high percentage of those workers who become discouraged and completely drop out of the job-seekers market. Without gainful employment, they will increasingly be tempted to participate in the underground alternative economy of the urban environments—the illegal system of prostitution, gambling, drugs, and stolen goods. The prospect of a rapidly increasing cadre of unemployed and unemployable urban youths socialized to a nonproductive life on the streets has major implications in terms of the development of a permanent urban underclass.

Poverty has been linked to a variety of socioemotional problems in both African American and White children of varying ages. These problems include such difficulties as depression (Oxendine, 1999), strained peer relations (Reynolds, 1990) low self-confidence, conduct disorders, and higher levels of overall social maladaptation and psychological disorders (Petersen et al., 1993).

Prejudice and Discrimination

A second factor contributing to academic problems and other forms of delinquency among African American adolescents is prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice and discrimination foster social and psychological difficulties for all vulnerable populations. Although many discriminatory laws have been challenged and overturned, others remain that continue to relegate African Americans to second-class status.

Prejudice and discrimination are also expressed in countless acts of interpersonal behavior each day. This blatant type of discrimination fosters vast differences in economic status among the various ethnic minority groups and nonminority Americans. It also damages the self-confidence and self-esteem of those discriminated against and lays a foundation for anger, discontent, delinquency, and violence.

Access to Firearms

A third factor contributing to academic problems, delinquency, and violence among African American adolescents is their access to firearms. There is considerable evidence that the alarming rise in youth homicides is related to the availability of firearms.

Between 1979 and 1989, there was a 61% increase in homicides by shootings committed by 15- to 19-year-old White and African American youths. During the same period, the rate of homicides by objects other than guns declined by 29%. Approximately 15% of African American adolescents in the 15 to 19 age group were arrested in 1979. In contrast, in 2000, the percentage of African Americans adolescents in the 15 to 19 age group grew to 25.1% (Federal Bureau of Investigations Crime Statistics, 2000). Further, African American juveniles were arrested more frequently for robbery, rape, homicide, and aggravated assault than were Whites. They were also more likely than White

juveniles to be arrested for violent personal crimes, disorderly conduct, sexual misbehavior, and handling stolen property.

In 2000, African American youth committed 51% of the violent juvenile crimes in the United States and only 27% of property crimes (U.S. department of Justice, 2000a). Because African Americans constitute about 12% of the population and account for 21% of all juvenile arrests, it can easily be seen that African American juveniles are disproportionately more likely to be arrested than Whites.

Whether or not access to firearms can continue to account for the widespread discrepancy between arrest rates of African American and White youths, the fact remains that African American youths are disproportionately involved in the juvenile justice system, resulting in severe limitations on their educational and occupational opportunities and creating a vicious cycle of incarceration, delinquency, drug addiction, recidivism, unemployment, and maladaptation. Moreover, the primary victims of African American juvenile crime are the juveniles themselves and the African American community.

In 1980, homicide was the second leading cause of death among African American youths in the 15 to 24 age group. In 1980 alone, more than 2,000 African American youths, ages 10 to 19, were murdered, most of them by other African American teenagers. In contrast, in 2000, homicide was the leading cause of death for African Americans in the 15 to 24 age group as well as the 10 to 19 age group, and it still is in 2002 (National Center for Health Statistics, 2000b, 2002). For Whites, the leading causes of death in both age groups were a result of accidents. In addition, the rate of victimization due to crimes of violence is generally greater for African Americans at all income levels and the victimization rate of residents of central cities is roughly twice that of residents of urban and suburban areas.

In 2000, 95% of those who committed crimes against African Americans were themselves African American, and the majority of these crimes were committed by youths under the age of 24 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a). Inner-city neighborhoods are increasingly being brutalized by youths who vandalize buildings, burglarize public and private property, and terrorize the disabled, elderly, and vulnerable.

According to the National Center for Health Statistics (2000b, 2002), firearms accounted for about three fourths of the killings by African American youths. It is unclear why young people carry guns. However, in some cases, carrying a weapon may be part of a youth's bonding to a gang or to a drug dealer's organization. Also, it is believed that some adolescents carry guns because they are afraid of others who have guns.

Alcohol and Drugs

A fourth factor contributing to academic, delinquent, and violent behavior among African American adolescents is their involvement with alcohol and other drugs. Drug abuse among African American youths has increased in the past 20 years. It has also spread from the inner cities into the suburbs, and the users have become progressively involved with "hard drugs" such as heroin and cocaine, which are tied to street crime. Moreover, a study by the Centers for Disease Control (1999) predicted an increase in drug abuse among African American and Latino/a youths because they constitute the fastest-growing segment of the population and because of their current usage patterns.

In 2000, 28.1% of African American adolescents were arrested for drug-abuse violations, illustrating the relationship with delinquent behaviors, poor decision making, and drug abuse. In addition, alcohol appears to lower youths' inhibitions against violent behavior (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a).

In about 65% of all homicides, perpetrators, victims, or both had been drinking, and alcohol was a factor in at least 55% of all fights and assaults in the home (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a). Other drugs also have the potential to contribute directly to academic problems and delinquent behavior. Drug use among teens is highly correlated to low school achievement, delinquency, and accidental deaths (National Center for Health Statistics, 2000b). Drug addiction inevitably involves teenagers in activities that will increase access to drugs, whether these involve stealing, dealing, or hustling sex in order to "get high." Addicts lose interest in school and work, and family ties gradually deteriorate while "getting high" becomes the major motivation of each day as they become worthless or useless in their environment.

In addition to creating economic problems, addiction also increases the risk of arrest and imprisonment, physical and mental illness, and death by overdosing among African American youth. Because some drugs are so addictive and expensive, many users of these drugs commit crimes involving violence to support their addiction. Also, because many drugs are illegal and valuable commodities, drug dealers frequently become involved in violence related to the marketing of drugs. Youths who are involved in the business of drug trafficking have a greater risk of becoming involved in violence as well as dropping out of school in order to capitalize on the lucrative drug trade.

Anti-Social Groups

A fifth factor contributing to academic, delinquent, and violent behavior among African American adolescents is their involvement in anti-social groups. According to Jew and Green (1998), many troubled youths have fragmented families and support networks. Consequently, they are motivated to join gangs to meet the same developmental, social, and emotional needs that all youths are seeking to meet in order to

have a strong sense of connection, belonging, and self-definition. In the gang, they hope to find peer friendships, pride, and an identity separate from their families, self-esteem enhancement, status, excitement, and the acquisition of resources. The positive social identity they gain from group membership partly depends on the group's perceived status and rank. In this respect, individuals act out to obtain group affection.

However, only a small percentage of youths who join delinquent gangs and the absolute amount of violent behavior by gang members are small. Nonetheless, homicide and aggravated assault are three times more likely to be committed by gang members than by nongang delinquents (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000a). It is important to recognize this because many minority groups who are nongang delinquents are depicted as such by the school systems and other institutions. Consequently, these individuals are deprived of educational opportunities and often are turned off by educators, who are viewed as oppressors for the system.

An estimated 26,000 gangs were active in the United States in 1999, down 9% from 1998 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a). Since 1998, the number of gangs has decreased by 11% in suburban counties, 19% in small cities, and 23% in rural counties. Large cities, however, which account for 49% of all gangs, reported a 1% increase in the number of gangs since 1998.

An estimated 840,500 gang members were active in the United States in 1999. This number represents an 8% increase from 1998. The most significant changes from 1998 to 1999 occurred in suburban counties (27% increase) and rural counties (29% decrease). Large cities, which account for 60% of all gang members, reported a 4% increase, and small cities reported a 2% increase.

Fifty percent of gang members in 1999 were ages 18 to 24, an increase from 46% in 1998 and 37% in 1996. The proportion of gang members ages 15 to 17 decreased to 26% from a high of 34% in 1996. Almost 90% of gang members are ethnic minorities. Numerically, the majority of gangs are either African American or Latino, accounting for 78%. Approximately, 47% of gang members are Latino, 31% are African American, 13% are White, 7% are Asian, and 2% are of other ethnic backgrounds.

Fifty percent of gang members were reported as underclass, 35% working class, 12% middle class, and 3% upper middle class (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000a). Although these numbers may reflect law enforcement's disproportionate focus on ethnic minority youths and an undercount of White non-Latino youths, they nevertheless point to incontrovertible gang problems facing ethnic communities across the United States. They also underscore the importance of cultural awareness and sensitivity in planning interventions for delinquent youths.

Part of the explanation for the prevalence of gang membership in these communities may lie in the stressful environment of poverty, unemployment, and economic and social inequality in which these ethnic minorities live. These stressful conditions may limit youths' access to positive means of meeting their developmental needs. As needs increase under difficult life conditions, the satisfaction gained from connection with a gang also increases (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000).

Exposure to Violence in the Mass Media

The sixth factor contributing to academic difficulties and delinquent behavior among African American adolescents is their exposure to violence in the mass media. Nearly 4 decades of research on television viewing and other media have documented the

almost universal exposure of American children to high levels of violence in the media. For example, 98% percent of American homes have at least one television, which is viewed by children between the ages of 2 and 11 for 28 hours and for 23 hours by teenagers on a weekly basis (Straub, 1996).

Straub went on to posit that children from low-income families are the heaviest viewers of television. The level of violence on commercial television has remained constant for nearly 2 decades. Aggressive habits learned early in life are the foundation for later behavior. Aggressive children who have trouble in school and in relating to their peers tend to watch more television; the violence they see there, in turn, reinforces their tendency toward aggression, compounding their academic and social failure.

Also, film and television portrayal of women in victim roles and ethnic minorities in aggressive and violent roles exacerbates the violence experienced by women and ethnic minorities. The effects of aggressive behavior on video and film modeling violent behaviors have been demonstrated consistently and conclusively in the psychological literature (Straub, 1996). Although the television and film industries can be credited with showing more ethnic minorities and women in a wider range of roles in recent years, the more common portrayals of such group members remain negative.

Ethnic-minority-group members continue to be cast as criminals, gang members, or delinquents exhibiting aberrant or antisocial behavior. In some situations, the showing of specific films depicting ethnic minority group members in this way has been linked to episodes of violence, including sexual violence. Sexual violence in the media includes explicit sexualized violence against women, including rape and murder, as well as the nonexplicit sexual aggression shown on commercial television and cable and on videos available for viewing at home. Male youths who view sexualized violence or depictions

of rape on television or film are more likely to display callousness toward female victims of violence, especially rape. Also, they are more likely to abandon their children, which is a major problem affecting African American adolescents (Miller & Zubaty, 1995).

For example, in 1965, 24% of African American infants and 3.1% of White infants were born to single mothers. In 1990, the rates had risen to 64% for African American infants and 18 percent for White infants. Currently, 62% of African Americans infants are born out of wedlock compared to 26% of White infants (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). To a large extent, "the higher birthrate for African American teenagers can be accounted for by the earlier initiation of sexual intercourse (on average 2 years earlier than Whites); less use of contraception; less likelihood of abortion; and almost universal decision to keep and rear children who are born, rather than offering them for adoption" (National Center for Health Statistics, 2000a). Often, individuals fail to consider and examine the physical and psychosocial consequences as well as negative implications for the young girls, babies, and families involved.

First, teenage mothers are more likely to drop out of high school, to go on welfare, to have complications in pregnancy, and to experience physical and psychological problems associated with pregnancy than adult women who bear their first child. Moreover, teenage mothers are more likely to have larger families, to experience less occupational stability and economic mobility, and to be less competent and effective as parents.

Second, children born to teenage mothers are more likely to have low birth weight and other prenatal and postnatal problems, to have poor health, and to experience abuse or neglect. Infant mortality rates are highest among teenage mothers and nearly twice as high among African Americans (21.7 per 1,000 live births in 1978) as among

Whites. In contrast, a report from the National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control (2000a), showed that the 1999 infant mortality rate of 7.0 infant deaths per 1,000 live births was 3% lower than the 1998 rate and 21% lower than the rate of 8.9% at the beginning of the decade. However, African American women still have the highest incidence of infant mortality, a rate of 14.0 deaths per 1,000 live births. Although this number is down from 1978, it is still four times higher than that of the groups with the lowest rates, which is 2.9 for Chinese mothers and 3.4 for Japanese mothers. If the children of these teenage mothers survive, it is believed that they will be less healthy, less successful in school academically, more likely to grow up in a single-parent, welfare-dependent family, and more likely to become single parents themselves.

Although the impact of these out of wedlock births on African American families has yet to be fully understood and documented, some studies have indicated that children reared in single-parent homes have fewer social supports, which, in turn, limits their ability to grow up in successfully functioning families and eventually form stable family units of their own. For example, in an article in the *Washington Times*, Miller and Zubaty (1995), reported that 85% of prisoners, 78% of high school dropouts, 82% of teenage girls who become pregnant, and the majority of drug and alcohol abusers come from households headed by single mothers. In contrast, they also reported that less than 1% of the people in any of these categories come from households headed by single fathers. This statistic seems to underscore the need for African American fathers to be present in their children's lives.

There appears to be an increasing trend of African-American children living in single-parent homes. Since 1960, the proportion of African American children living with a single parent more than doubled, from 22% in 1960 to 53.3% in 2000. In 1995,

the percentage of African American children living in two-parent homes reached a historic low of 33%, only half the percentage (67%) in 1960. Since 1980, the majority of African American children have lived in single-mother households, which currently constitute 92% of all African American single-parent households. Of the African American children living in single-parent homes, 84% lived with their mothers. Finally, in 2000, 7.7% of African American children lived with relatives rather than a mother or father, and 1.5% lived with nonrelatives, which were often of low-income status (Casper & Fields, 2000).

Low-income and ethnic-minority children and youths are presented with a television world that is often quite different from their own. The contrast between the television "haves" and their own "have not" status can elicit strong desires in youths eager to share in the consumer products shown in programs and commercials. Furthermore, television programs often demonstrate how these desirable commodities can be obtained through the use of aggression and violence. However, the effects of viewing violence on television can be mitigated.

For example, children can be taught critical viewing skills by parents and in schools so that they can better interpret what they see on television. Also, children can learn to distinguish between fictional portrayals and factual presentations. Moreover, children can be taught to recognize ways in which violence is portrayed unrealistically (e.g., when it is portrayed without any negative consequences). Children can also learn to think about alternatives to the violence portrayed, a strategy that is particularly effective when an adult viewing the violence with the child expresses disapproval of violence as a means of solving problems and then offer alternatives. The availability of such protective

measures for some parents, however, does not absolve the film and television industries from their responsibility for reducing the level of violence portrayed on the screen.

Parents' Psychological and Emotional States

The seventh and final factor contributing to academic, delinquent, and violent behavior among African American adolescents, is the psychological and emotional states of their parents, who are often experiencing economic hardship. Adults who are poor have more mental health problems than their economically advantaged counterparts. Several researchers have reported an inverse relationship between socioeconomic status and various forms of psychological distress and mental disorder (Brown, Gary, Green, & Milburn, 1992; Compas, Orosan, & Grant, 1993; Nettles & Pleck, 1994).

Wood (1995) found perceived psychological distress to be significantly higher among single African American women with lower incomes, compared to those with higher incomes. Individuals who are poor are confronted with an unremitting succession of negative life events (e.g., eviction, physical illness, criminal assault, and single parenting) in the context of chronically stressful, ongoing life conditions such as inadequate housing and dangerous neighborhoods that together increase the exigencies of day-to-day existence.

Studies have indicated that both African American and White adults experiencing job loss or severe income loss, as compared to individuals who are employed or whose income loss is less severe, are more depressed, anxious, and hostile and have elevated feelings of victimization and dissatisfaction with themselves and their lives (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992). In addition, they consume more alcohol, have more somatic complaints as well as eating and sleeping problems, and are at a higher risk of neurosis, psychotocism, and suicide.

Adding to their situation is the fact that poor single mothers are more socially isolated and generally view their interaction with the public welfare system as demeaning and dehumanizing (DuBois, Felner, Meares, & Krier, 1994; McLoyd, 1990). Pearlin and Johnson (1977) said it best: "The combination most productive of psychological distress is to be simultaneously single, isolated, exposed to burdensome parental obligations and most of all poor" (p. 714).

Similarly, Wood (1995) found that being single, poor, young, and African American were the combination most productive of dissatisfied parenting and lack of parental fulfillment. Because they are more emotionally distressed than their advantaged counterparts, poor parents capacity for supportive, sensitive, and involved parenting is diminished.

Numerous studies of both African American and White adults, in which both interview and observational methods were used, have indicated that mothers who are poor, when compared to their advantaged counterparts, are more likely to use power-assertive techniques in disciplinary encounters and are generally less supportive of their children. They value obedience more, are less likely to use reasoning, and more likely to use physical punishment as a means of disciplining and controlling the child. Moreover, lower-class parents are more likely to issue commands without explanation, less likely to consult the child about his or her wishes, and less likely to reward the child verbally for behaving in desirable ways. Poverty also has been associated with diminished expression of affection and less responsiveness to the socioemotional needs explicitly expressed by the child (Wallerstein, 1988). In addition, McLoyd (1988) found that single, economically disadvantaged mothers who reported higher levels of economic deprivation

hit and scolded their children more frequently than mothers who were economically advantaged.

Another problem associated with high stress levels and poverty among low-income parents is abuse. Child abuse represents an extreme form of punitive parenting that occurs more frequently in families experiencing economic decline than in those with stable resources (Garbarino, 1976). Analyzing data over a 30-month period, Steinberg, Catalono, and Dooley (1981) found that increases in child abuse were preceded by periods of high job loss. In contrast, Wang and Gordon (1994) noted that most resilient children have at least one strong relationship with an adult, not always a parent, which diminishes the risks associated with family discord. Fostering resilience in children requires family environments that are caring and structured, hold high expectations for children's behavior, and encourage participation in the life of the family (Wang & Gordon, 1994). However, this is problematic and often difficult particularly, for children who are mentally and physically abused.

For example, in Horowitz and Wolock's (1985) study of abusing families who received public assistance, it was found that African Americans experienced greater material deprivation and environmental difficulties than Whites, and they reportedly inflicted greater physical harm on their children. This difference, as well as race differences in the use of power assertion by nonabusing parents, may be partly due to inequality in material resources and environmental supports and, in turn, differential levels of psychological distress (Kessler & Neighbors, 1986). These authors endorsed the view that psychological distress is an important source of race differences in the parenting behaviors of low-income adults.

Other factors and conditions, however, also may explain these differences. For example, African American lower-class women, compared to White lower-and middle-class women, begin childbearing earlier, have more children, and have children who are spaced closer together. These factors increase emotional strain and foster parenting that relies more on coercion than on negotiation and reasoning (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000).

A growing body of data, mostly from mothers of infants and preschoolers, has directly tied parental punitiveness, inconsistency, and unresponsiveness to negative emotional states in the parent. These data are consistent with those from studies showing that parents respond to economic loss with increased irritability, hostility, and depression and, in turn, with punitive and erratic behavior toward their children (McLoyd, 1990).

Conger, McCarty, Yang, Lahey, and Kropp (1984) conducted an observational study of African American and White mothers and children (mean age 7.5 years) from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Mothers who reported high emotional distress, as compared to those reporting lower stress, exhibited fewer positive behaviors (e.g., hugs supportive statements, and praise) and more negative behaviors toward their children (e.g., derogatory statements, threats, and slaps). Similarly, maternal depression and emotional distress have been found to be associated with physical abuse, use of aversive and coercive discipline, and diminished maternal sensitivity and satisfaction with parenting (Barber & Eccles, 1992).

Children whose parents have experienced job loss, severe income loss, or periods of unemployment have more socioemotional problems than their advantaged counterparts. These problems include depression, loneliness, emotional sensitivity, social withdrawal, low self-esteem, and behavioral problems (Darity & Myers, 1995a).

Summary

As the statistics in this section indicate, African American adolescents have been and continue to be at a greater risk for a host of personal, social, cognitive, and environmental problems including: single parenting, drug addiction, incarceration, homicide, unemployment, academic problems, poverty, and depression. Although African Americans are doing better academically and economically than during any other period in American history, the problems that continue to exist within the African American community cannot be ignored.

Many studies and statistics continue to inform the literature of the types of problems and issues African Americans are experiencing. However, very few studies have indicated how to eradicate the problems that exist within the African American adolescent population, particularly in the academic arena. Parents, educators, and other institutions (i.e., the justice system and social workers) continue to scramble to find answers. In this study, I will attempt to answer some of these difficult questions, in order to facilitate academic resilience among African American adolescents. This study differs from other studies in that affective variables were examined as facilitators of academic resilience, an aspect that has been ignored in the scientific literature.

Although there is a significant amount of literature on risk factors, fewer researchers have addressed factors that facilitate academic resilience among African American adolescents and young adults. Expanding the knowledge base regarding factors that contribute to academic resilience among African American students is critical to the profession for several reasons. First, enhancing the knowledge base might facilitate the development of intervention strategies and modules that could contribute to the reduction of African American male representation in the criminal justice system (i.e.,

prison, probation, parole, and juvenile detention). Second, because African American adolescents have been identified as the most at-risk population for mental health services, expanding the knowledge base will help mental health professionals provide adequate services to meet their unique individual needs while reducing diagnostic and curative measures. Finally, research in this area is critical due to the scarcity of research as well as the failure to examine affective variables.

Poor academic performance among African American adolescents is a pervasive problem that warrants considerable and immediate attention. However, literature focusing specifically on this problem is scarce. Also, much of the existing research has focused on deficit models as opposed to positive characteristics associated with success despite harsh environmental circumstances. Moreover, very few, if any, researchers have examined variables that influence the mental and emotional strength of African American adolescents.

Research examining the affective domain as a contributor to academic resilience is important for two reasons. First, it has been suggested that children who show a fearless, impulsive temperament very early in life may have a predisposition to delinquent behavior. For example, children with a difficult temperament, who are hard to comfort when they are infants, and who have a pattern of temper tantrums as children are also at risk for delinquent behavior in childhood and late adolescence. Second, such research is critical because problems with stress management, coping techniques, anger management, and poor academic performance are more prevalent among African American adolescents than their White counterparts.

In early childhood, aggressive, delinquent, and disruptive classroom behavior contributes to poor school achievement and poor peer relations. In addition to academic

failure contributing to later delinquent behavior, it now seems that early antisocial and delinquent behavior patterns learned at home and elsewhere also may interfere with school learning and with the development of positive peer relations in the school context.

In addition to family and childrearing factors, Chesley-Carter (1998) noted that when some African American adolescents experience racism, they respond with anger and rebelliousness by resisting mainstream socialization, performing poorly in school, rebelling against school authority figures who are perceived as prejudiced, and ultimately dropping out of school. However, there are other African American adolescents who share similar experiences but do not express their emotions in a manner that is self-destructive or counterproductive. What are the factors that contribute to this difference? It is my contention that academically resilient African American students will exhibit high levels of emotional intelligence, emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience, which serve as protective factors in managing the negative emotions that are associated with environmental stressors.

Resiliency Theory

The concept of resilience has emerged and become a popular research topic as a direct result of early research studying at-risk populations (Glantz & Johnson, 1999). Researchers have examined the influences of stress, vulnerability, risk factors, coping strategies, and protective factors on adjustment and adaptation in adolescents living in poverty, or those individuals who were at risk for developing severe emotional, mental, and behavioral problems (Garmezy, 1986).

This research has led to attempts to identify particular variables and unique personality and behavioral characteristics of individuals who have coped effectively with stress and thrived despite exposure to extreme adversity and less-than-desirable

circumstances (Garmezy & Masten, 1986; Luthar, 1991; Rutter, 1987; Werner, 1989). Despite adverse circumstances associated with crime, poverty, violence, health issues, and other social concerns, some African American students defy the odds and become resilient, which contributes to their academic and overall success.

In general, resilience has been defined as the ability to overcome stress, trauma, and setbacks while successfully adapting and coping. Despite this general definition, operationalizing the concept of resilience has been problematic because the term *resilience* has been given diverse meanings in different studies. For example, in education, resilience has been associated with hardiness, stress resistance, competence, ego strength, and invulnerability (Garmezy, 1993). On the other hand, in the social sciences, resilience has been linked to coping, adjustment, adaptation, and stress management.

Resilience has been defined as a cause, a personality trait, an outcome, and a process (Glantz & Johnson, 1999). Initial studies involving resilience examined the construct in individuals as solely a personality trait and focused more on risk factors instead of protective factors. However, more recently, researchers have begun to examine resilience as a process as well as the role of protective factors in influencing positive outcomes (Freitas & Downey, 1998).

Kinard (1998) posited that three general types of resilience can be found in the literature. These are (a) resilience as competent functioning in the face of chronic life stressors, (b) resilience as recovering from traumatic experiences, and (c) resilience as positive results and outcomes despite poverty and exposure to high-risk environments.

Glantz and Johnson (1999) examined Kinard's (1998) three types of resilience and suggested that research on resilience should clearly identify the type of resilience

being examined. For example, if resilience entails an individual's surviving an abusive-dysfunctional family, the resilience should be labeled familial resilience. If resilience entails the ability to achieve academically, despite coming from adverse social and environmental circumstances, the resilience should be labeled academic resilience. It is difficult to get a true measure of resilience due to the various ways the construct is operationalized. Consequently, the literature on resilience is filled with conceptual and methodological issues that must be addressed. For the purposes of this study, academic resilience is defined as the ability to thrive and achieve above average academic performance (3.0 or greater GPA) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or environmental challenges.

Ickovics and Park (1998) concluded that a great deal of research in the field of psychology and other social sciences involving resilience has focused on negative factors, psychopathology, and environmental stressors as it relates to pathological processes. Few studies have focused on factors that contribute to positive outcomes and healthy functioning, particularly among African American populations. Consequently, the scientific literature has been bombarded with similar studies that have highlighted deficiencies, overexamined variables, and failed to bring awareness and produce models that will enhance the scientific literature on resilience. More recently, the field of psychology has shifted from a deficiency model to one that emphasizes personal strengths (Ickovics & Park, 1998).

Before this, there were only a few studies on resilience among African Americans that demonstrated significant relationships between resilience and measures of cognitive superiority, sociability, sensitivity, inner control, and cooperativeness (Garmezy & Rutter, 1983; Murphy & Moriarity, 1976; Werner & Smith, 1982). The cognitive

appraisal theory supported those findings. Developed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), the cognitive appraisal theory asserts that what we decide to do as individuals' regarding stressful situations or events is partially a determinant of how those situations or events are appraised, processed, and interpreted.

Fifteen years later, Jew, Green, and Kroger (1999) used the cognitive appraisal theory of stress and coping to conceptualize resilience. According to this particular theory, an individual will do several things when faced with stress. First, the individual will perceive or experience stress in his or her environment. Second, the individual will appraise the situation. Third, the person will decide on a coping response or inaction, depending on his or her cognitive set based on the appraisal, values, beliefs, and previous learning, etc. Finally, the individual will reappraise the situation to see if additional action is necessary to eliminate or reduce the stress.

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) defined stress as a multidimensional phenomenon that manifests itself differently across various situations. The authors postulated that there is positive as well as negative stress. Positive stress may serve as motivation for an individual to embrace a difficult or challenging situation. In contrast, negative stress may produce anger, anxiety, hopelessness, and nervousness, contributing to an individual's negative behavior. In addition, negative stress may contribute to mental and physical illness.

According to this theoretical framework, when an individual is faced with stress and other adverse circumstances, cognitive processes are triggered that cause the individual to appraise the stressful situation. The appraisal process comprises two steps. The first step involves primary appraisal and the second step involves secondary

appraisal. During the primary appraisal process, the individual will make one of three choices regarding an adverse circumstance or stressful situation.

First, the individual will appraise the situation or stressor as irrelevant (i.e., an encounter with the stressor does not have a negative impact on one's well-being). Second, the individual will appraise the situation as benign-positive. This occurs when the outcome of an encounter with stress is positive. Third, the individual will appraise the situation as stressful, which involves an actual or perceived loss; a threat with potential negative consequences; or a challenge in which the individual is able to cope, manage stress, and overcome adverse and stressful circumstances.

After the individual has completed the primary appraisal process and identified possible options that will produce positive outcomes, the individual can then move to the secondary appraisal process which involves making a decision about what can be done about the negative situation. Most individuals realize that something must be done to manage the stressful situation and adverse circumstance. Once he or she chooses a particular response, the individual might reappraise the situation in order to decide whether further action is needed to alleviate additional stress and eradicate additional danger or harm.

My argument for examining emotional intelligence and related constructs, specifically, emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience as key variables is that they require self-appraisals (i.e., emotional and cognitive appraisal) and emotional regulation. Emotional intelligence requires an appraisal and regulation of emotions that might influence an individual's behavioral response to a stressful environmental situation or event (i.e., a racial fight or an incident

within the school, or negative comments regarding an African American's intellectual or cognitive abilities within the classroom).

Glantz and Johnson (1999) argued that coping skills and abilities should be considered in developing models of resiliency. They stated that individuals tend to organize their coping responses into three distinct domains: (a) problem-focused coping, which entails efforts to resolve life stressors by seeking information, taking direct action, and finding alternative rewards; (b) appraisal-focused coping, which entails defining, interpreting, and understanding a given situation or event; and (c) emotion-focused coping, which involves attempting to manage emotional reactions to stressors by regulating one's feelings, expressing anger, and accepting a negative situation (Glantz & Johnson, 1999, p. 65). I did not use coping as a key variable in this study because coping is included in various aspects of emotional intelligence. Specifically, emotional intelligence primarily involves behaviors consistent with characteristics found in appraisal-focused and emotion-focused coping.

Wolin and Wolin (1993) developed a theory of resilience based on clinical interviews they conducted with approximately 25 of their clients from their private practice. The researchers postulated that resilience develops over time in the form of skills. These specific skills, labeled lasting strengths or resiliencies become a fixed part of the individual. According to the researchers, these skills include independence, initiative, insight, creativity, humor, morality, and interpersonal skills.

These resiliencies or abilities tend to "cluster" by personalities. Of course, different people learn to be vulnerable to adverse circumstances and stress. The authors argued that overcoming adverse circumstances is a matter of learning to restructure negative thinking and behaviors. Also, they contended that an individual can discover his

or her resilient self by examining the success of survivors of similar adverse circumstances.

According to Wolin and Wolin (1993), the field of psychology's obsession and preoccupation with pathology is the primary cause of making people vulnerable to stress and other adverse circumstances. The researchers argued that because the field of psychology has a preoccupation with pathology, people are conditioned to be nonresilient. As a result, Wolin and Wolin developed the damage model to explain the etiology of vulnerability and pathology among individuals. Pathology is manifested in the form of pathological thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. It should be noted that the damaged model is theoretical in nature and cannot be validated through empirical research. However, the model offers a sound theoretical framework for examining resilience.

The damage model is countered by the challenge model, which attempts to explain how people overcome stressful environments that contribute to adverse circumstances. Like the damage model, the challenge model is theoretical in nature and cannot be validated through empirical research. According to this model, vulnerable individuals must refrain from and restructure their conceptualization regarding life in order to become resilient.

Wolin and Wolin (1993) postulated, that by reading their book regarding resilience, "an individual can heighten awareness regarding strengths and retrieve lost memories of successfully overcoming adversity and pain" (p. 18). The key in overcoming painful thoughts and memories is to restructure thinking from victim to survivor. The researchers cited case reports as evidence for the challenge model (pp. 18-

19). Moreover, they contended that a number of experiments on resilience had added to their conceptualization of how survivors overcome obstacles.

Models of Resilience

In an effort to provide a complete picture regarding resilience, I contend that, in addition to the theoretical frameworks discussed above, it is equally important to discuss models of resilience. Currently, there are several models of resilience that are intended to expand our knowledge and understanding of resilience. A major problem facing many of the current models on resilience is their inability to move beyond equating resilience with simply possessing specific protective factors (Glantz & Johnson, 1999). It is rare for models of resilience to define the construct as a process. However, a few models of resilience attempt to capture the essence of resilience as it relates to the population of interest in the present study. These models include but are not limited to the ecological, life cycle, and the transactional models of resilience. The models reviewed are Mrazek and Mrazek's (1987) ecological model, Flach's (1988) life-cycle model, and Glantz and Johnson's transitional model.

Mrazek and Mrazek (1987) developed an ecological model of resilience and defined the construct as an outcome of interactions among risk factors, protective factors, and personality traits. The researchers identified and highlighted 12 personal characteristics and skills that they believed facilitate resilience: (a) maturity, (b) rapid responsivity to danger, (c) information-seeking, (d) decisive risk-taking, (e) altruism, (f) cognitive restructuring of painful experiences, (g) positive projective anticipation, (h) idealization of an aggressor's competence, (i) formation and utilization of relationships for survival, (j) the conviction of being loved, (k) optimism and hope, and (l) disassociation of affect (Mrazek & Mrazek, 1987, pp. 359-362).

A year after Mrazek and Mrazek developed the ecological model of resilience, Flach (1988) conceptualized resilience as a process and developed the life-cycle model. According to Flach, an individual will progress through the following eight stages during his or her life: birth, childhood, adolescence, young single adulthood, young marriage, parenthood, middle age, and aging. According to this model, each stage has a specific set of challenges, responsibilities, characteristics, and opportunities that require a person to adapt and change in order to cope effectively with environmental stressors. Growth and maturity enable the individual to move from one stage to the next. Movement from one stage to the next induces stress within the individual. However, stress prepares the individual for the next level of development.

Bifurcation occurs between each life cycle and the next. Bifurcation is defined as the point where individuals respond to the stress, adversity, and problems encountered in everyday life. During these various stages of the life cycle, individuals might struggle mentally, physically, and behaviorally. Negative behavioral responses are indicative of the need to change, in terms of forfeiting thinking, attitudes, and behaviors that may be potentially harmful to the individual. In order to grow and develop during the life cycle, one must replace negative thinking, attitudes, and behaviors with more mature ways of thinking and behaving.

Although the conditions of a life stage differ from stage to stage, universal issues recur every time an individual moves through bifurcation points. These universal issues include (a) giving up people and things we love because they die or go away, (b) balancing our ability to be independent against our need for others, (c) forming new relationships and renewing old ones, (d) reconsidering of one's self-image and holding on

to and restoring self-esteem, (e) redefining or reaffirming our purposes in life, and (f) adapting to changing external circumstances.

Flach (1988) went on to identify and highlight specific traits that he believed contribute to an individual's resiliency. According to Flach, attitudes reflective of resilience are implied in those traits, and include: (a) a high level of personal discipline, (b) a sense of personal responsibility, (c) recognition and development of one's special gifts and talents, (d) open-mindedness and receptivity to new ideas, (e) a strong support network, (f) good interpersonal skills, (g) a strong sense of self, (h) independence of thought and action, (i) a keen sense of humor, (j) a high tolerance of stress, (k) an ability to maintain focus, (l) a wide range of interests, (m) a willingness to dream and set goals, and (n) insight into one's feelings and the feelings of others, and the ability to communicate them effectively with others.

A decade after the development of both the ecological and life-cycle models of resilience, Glantz and Johnson (1999) developed a transitional model of resilience. They defined the construct as the outcome of dynamic interactions between (a) personal characteristics of the resilient person, (b) reintegration or positive outcome after negative life experiences, (c) environmental precursors, commonly called risk and protective factors, and (d) dynamic processes that mediate between the person and the environment, and the person and the outcome.

Although it is reasonable to believe that these three models facilitate an understanding of resilience within an individual, one of the problems and weaknesses with these models is their inability to offer reasonable explanations of how these traits, processes, and outcomes occur within an individual. However, one of the strengths

associated with these models is that they provide mental health professionals with a set of skills that can be used in therapy.

I contend that the aforementioned models offer a solid conceptualization of resilience. It is my belief that the population classified as academically resilient in the current research will possess several of the characteristics and traits identified in the various models of resilience.

Resiliency Studies Involving African Americans

The overwhelming majority of studies on resilience have been conducted on African American adolescents (Clark, 1991; Garmezy, Masten, & Tellegen, 1984; Garmezy & Tellegen, 1984; Lee, Winfield, & Wilson, 1991; Luthar, 1991; Werner & Smith, 1982). However, these studies have failed to focus on affective factors as facilitators of resilience, which was a major reason for conducting this particular study.

A few researchers have examined resilience within the college population. For example, Thompson (1998) examined predictors of resilience in African American college students and adults. That study was unique because both a qualitative and a quantitative approach were used to identify predictors of resilience. The qualitative portion of the study was based on interview data extracted from African American adults. In contrast, the quantitative section of the study was based on data from a paper and pencil instrument administered to African American college students.

The primary findings from the study suggested that college students who grew up in poverty and experienced extreme environmental conditions were less likely to consider themselves to be as resilient as other African American college students in the same age group. This finding supports other empirical research suggesting that poverty has a negative effect on resilience within the African American population. Additional

research examining the college population is needed in order to understand what factors have facilitated resilience in African American students, particularly those living in poverty-stricken areas, who have overcome adverse circumstances

After several decades of research on resilience, several gaps in the scientific literature remain. First, the majority of studies on resilience have been conducted using preadolescent and younger children as subjects (Garmezy & Tellegen, 1984; Garmezy et al., 1984; Werner & Smith, 1982). Second, many of the variables used in these studies have been overexamined, with socioeconomic status being the most commonly investigated sociodemographic variable in risk research. Finally, the majority of researchers have failed to examine emotional factors as facilitators of resilience while overexamining cognitive, personality, and environmental factors. Studies that have focused on cognitive, personal, and environmental factors are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Three major studies of resilience were conducted during the 1970s and 1980s (Garmezy & Rutter, 1983; Murphy & Moriarity, 1976; Werner & Smith, 1982). In these studies, variables were examined in relation to resilience. In general, results of these studies indicated that sensitivity, sociability, inner control, cooperativeness, and cognitive superiority were related to resilience. However, a major limitation of these studies was that the findings were based largely on clinical observations, with some of the findings based on data from standardized instruments and surveys.

Two major studies on resilience were conducted in the 1990s (Luthar 1991; Winfield, 1991). These studies were improvements over the earlier studies in that the researchers used standardized instruments to examine selected variables, making the results more reliable and valid.

Luthar (1991) examined factors that allow children to maintain socially competent behaviors despite experiencing stress and other environmental problems. Subjects for the study were 144 inner-city ninth-grade students whose mean age was 15.3 years. The participants represented three ethnicities; 45% were African American, 30% were Latino/a, and the remaining students were Caucasians and other ethnicities.

Scores on a negative life events scale were used in operationalizing stress, and definitions of social competence were based on peer ratings, teacher ratings, and school grades. Moderator variables examined in the study were intelligence, internal locus of control, social skills, ego development, and positive life events. Luthar followed theoretical models developed by Garmezy and Rutter and made distinctions between compensatory factors, which were directly related to competence, and protective factors, which interacted with stress in influencing competence. Findings from the study indicated that ego development was compensatory against stress. Internal locus of control and social skills proved to be protective factors, whereas intelligence and positive life events were involved in vulnerability processes. In addition, the findings indicated that children labeled resilient were significantly more depressed and anxious than were competent children from low-stress backgrounds.

Winfield (1991) examined two variables that Luthar previously examined. These were social skills and positive life events. Winfield found that seeking help as a coping technique and participating in sports enhanced subjects' self-esteem and fostered resilience.

Expanding on Luthar's (1991) and Winfield's (1991) research, Lee et al. (1991) studied a nationally representative sample of high-achieving African American eight graders who scored above the national average on reading achievement tests. Lee et al.

found that students were able to overcome obstacles through the use of such academic behaviors as spending more time reading, studying, and seeking information. This study differed from Luthar's and Winfield's studies in that academic behaviors were examined as well as help seeking, which is a social skill.

A number of researchers examining resilience in African American populations have used social skills as a variable. For example, Clark (1991) posited several variables that contribute to the academic competence of African American adolescents, who are often considered at risk due to environmental stressors, such as poverty, violence, unemployment, racism, and discrimination. These variables include individual attributes such as achievement motivation and personal identity. However, Clark believed that social skills may be more important than these individual attributes.

Specifically, Clark (1991) contended that African American youths who establish a bicultural identity perform better academically than those who lack such an identity. She further noted that developing a bicultural identity engenders the development of skills that are problem focused (i.e., discussing the problem) instead of emotion focused, which entails fighting or insulting another as an attempt to cope with environmental stressors. Furthermore, Clark contended that the foregoing attitude can immensely influence one's academic resilience. If one is experiencing racism and discrimination and adopts a bicultural identity, he or she is likely to use effective problem-solving skills to resolve the problem.

Clark noted that African American adolescents exist in a Eurocentric culture predicated on competitive relationships between African Americans and Whites, in which the former are relegated to a subordinate status. She further noted that some African Americans acknowledge that institutional racism and discrimination are matters to be

reckoned with and learn to cope effectively and thus develop a bicultural identity. Finally, Clark noted that most African Americans who have adopted bicultural identities are not at risk for academic failure. Biculturality, therefore seems to be related to academic resilience. However, in a study conducted by Ford, Okojie, and Lewis (1996), biculturality was not found to be a significant predictor of academic resilience in a sample of African American college students.

Social support is another variable that appears to contribute to academic resilience (Clark, 1991). Clark claimed that social support serves as a buffer against stress and enhances self-esteem during stressful times. Accordingly, Clark posited that those who are successful in school have social support systems that seem to facilitate academic resilience.

After several researchers in the early 1990s focused on social skills variables, research trends began to shift to cognitive and environmental variables. For example, Wilson-Sadberry, Winfield, and Royster (1991) examined resilience and transition of African American males from high school to college and found that an important factor that facilitated academic success was planning. Specifically, African American males who progressed through college were more likely to have formulated their plans during their senior year in high school. The researchers also found that fatherhood and unemployment were formidable barriers to African American males attending college.

After Wilson-Sadberry et al. (1991) deviated from the earlier trends and expanded the literature on resilience to include cognitive and environmental variables, other researchers began to examine sociocultural and family functioning variables. For example, Ensminger and Slusarcick (1992) studied a first-grade cohort of African Americans who were at risk for school dropout. The longitudinal research focused on

protective factors that led to high school graduation. Performing poorly during the first year of school put both males and females at a disadvantage, but specially males. In contrast, students who achieved high grades during the first year of school had a high likelihood of graduation.

Maternal education also was found to be related to high school graduation (Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992). Having a mother with a high school education increased the likelihood that males who performed poorly in first grade would graduate. Being from a dual-parent household was protective for the girls. Having strict rules during adolescence helped the females compensate for their low grades in first grade and increased their rate of graduation. In addition, the researchers posited that the children who performed well in school initially would receive greater rewards, which, in turn, would facilitate their commitment to school, thereby increasing their self-efficacy.

Gordon's (1995) study was similar to the aforementioned studies examining social skills, ego development, and cognitive variables in that it focused on the role of self-concept (ego development) and motivation (inner-control) in aiding resilient African American high school sophomores obtain academic competence. However, Gordon's research is different in that it is one of the few research studies in which an attempt has been made to operationalize academic resilience. In that study, participants from an impoverished, stressful background with grade point averages of 2.75 or above were considered academically resilient. To determine subjects' resiliency status, socioeconomic status was determined using the Hollingshead Two Factor Index, and stress was determined through a self-report measure. The High School Assessment of Academic Self-Concept and the Assessment of Personal Agency Beliefs were used to measure self-concept and motivation. Findings of the study indicated that resilient

students had a higher self-concept, placed more emphasis on material gain, and had a stronger belief in their cognitive goals than their nonresilient counterparts.

Although the studies discussed in this section were desperately needed, the vast majority of them focused on similar variables that did not expand the literature or our understanding of other factors such as emotional or affective variables that might facilitate academic resilience within the African American population. The current research was undertaken to fill this gap in the scientific literature by examining affective variables as facilitators of academic resilience.

Major Criticisms of the Resiliency Literature

Studies on resilience have improved in the last few years and have shown promising developments with regard to models and conceptualizations of resilience (Jew et al., 1999; Kinard, 1998). However, according to Kumpfer (1999), studying resilience remains a daunting task due to a lack of agreement among researchers about how to operationalize the construct. For example, researchers cannot agree on whether resilience is a fixed personality trait, a changing personality trait, or a process.

Through empirical research, researchers have identified factors that may contribute to or detract from the development and manifestation of resilience. However, they have not identified a particular method of fostering resilience. Several other pertinent issues also contribute to problems in the resiliency literature; however, only the most salient of those issues are discussed here. Common concerns regarding the literature on resilience are (a) the excessive amount of attention given to problem behaviors and negative circumstances as either predictor or outcome variables, (b) the failure of researchers to develop and validate an instrument that will measure specific types of resilience (i.e., academic resilience), (c) the limited number of studies clearly

stating what factors are needed to achieve optimal resilience and functioning, (d) the lack of a unified conceptual framework, and (e) ambiguous definitions of risk and protective factors.

As stated before, a significant problem concerning the resiliency literature is that the definitions of risk factors, protective factors, and the construct of resilience itself are ambiguous and vary from study to study. The ambiguity in definitions makes it difficult to integrate and generalize the research findings. For example, a protective factor in study X may very well be a risk factor in study Y.

In additional, finding studies that used a common psychological theory is extremely difficult. As mentioned earlier, several frameworks have been used to conceptualize the construct of resilience (Flach, 1988; Glantz & Johnson, 1999; Mrazek & Mrazek, 1987). These conceptual frameworks have modeled resilience differently. For example, Mrazek and Mrazek, viewed resilience as a fixed or unchanging trait, whereas Flach conceptualized resilience as a process.

Moreover, the field of psychology's obsession and preoccupation with problem behaviors and negative environmental circumstances has stagnated the scientific literature, preventing the field of psychology from moving forward. Previously, the literature focused on and emphasized risk factors and negative environmental circumstances, particularly among African American populations. However, researchers in the field of psychology are beginning to examine factors that will produce positive outcomes and prevent pathology. This direction holds promise in terms of conducting studies that will examine and highlight protective influences that will facilitate resilience within the African American population.

In an effort to further explain protective factors, Kaplan, Turner, Norman, and Stillson (1996) identified 20 such factors that, in their estimate, contribute to and facilitate resilience. They identified these protective factors into four distinct categories: (a) community protective factors (b) school protective factors, (c) family protective factors, and (d) individual attributes. Community protective factors consist of (a) positive community norms, and (b) solid community resources. School Protective Factors consist of (a) caring/supportive school atmosphere, (b) high but realistic expectations for student academic performance, and (c) opportunities for involvement in school decision making. Family protective factors consist of (a) extended support networks, (b) positive parental modeling of resilience and coping, (c) family responsibilities and household tasks, (d) high but realistic family expectations, (e) positive family environment and bonding, and (f) consistent, warm, positive relationships with a caring adult. Individual attributes consist of (a) adaptive distancing, (b) humor, (c) the capacity to understand and respond to other's feelings, (d) sense of direction or mission, (e) social problem-solving skills, (f) realistic appraisal of the environment, (g) high self-efficacy, (h) intellectual capabilities consisting of verbal and communication skills, and (i) easy-going temperament or disposition (pp. 159-160).

As previously stated, the majority of studies examining resilience within the African American population have overexamined variables that focus primarily on cognitive, social, and environmental factors. In addition, the majority of studies have used adolescent populations as subjects. Using adolescents as subjects is limiting because information is not gained regarding factors that contribute to college success. To date, the scientific literature has not provided a great deal of insight into the role of affective factors as facilitators of resilience. The present study differs from previous

studies in two ways. First, emotional factors are examined in this study in hopes of contributing new information to the scientific literature. Second, young adults are the subjects in this study because they might provide insight into factors that facilitated their academic successes and failures, thus providing a framework to better prepare young African American children and adolescents for academic success.

Theories of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is a fairly new construct deserving attention in empirical studies. Much of the information on emotional intelligence is theoretical in nature; only one empirical study has been conducted on this construct with the exception of one study (see Ford et al., 1996). Therefore, a substantial body of literature providing empirical evidence of the usefulness of this construct does not currently exists. This gap in the scientific literature served as the motivation and impetus for examining emotional intelligence in the current study. Although emotional intelligence does not have a great deal of empirical support, the construct has been examined in populations for norming purposes to address issues of reliability and validity, and favorable results have been achieved in the populations sampled (see Chapter III).

In the 1930s, the study of social intelligence largely pertained to how people made judgments regarding others and the accuracy of these judgments. By the 1950s, however, this work had become divided into an intelligence tradition that was interested in abilities of person perception, and a social-psychological tradition that focused on the social determinants of person perception. The two areas had diverged in a manner that caused researchers in one area to be unaware of the work of researchers in a different area (Walker & Foley, 1973).

Since the 1970s, there has been a growing convergence of these and other areas, as intelligence researchers have become more interested in social intelligence, psychologists have become more interested in cognitive determinants of perceptions (e.g., Fiske & Taylor, 1991), a group of evolutionary psychologists have become interested in nonverbal behavior (Buck, 1984), and more recently, psychologists have become more interested in the emotional aspects of intelligence (Goleman, 1996; Mayer & Salovey, 1995)

Social intelligence has been less studied because it is the hardest of the three broad classes of intelligence to distinguish from other types of intelligence, both theoretically (e.g., Mayer & Salovey, 1993) and empirically (Cronbach, 1960). Interest in social intelligence, however, recently has undergone a revival (see Legree, 1995). Rather than simply dropping social intelligence, it has been argued that it would make sense to distinguish it more clearly from other intelligences by subdividing it into emotional and motivational intelligences. Motivational intelligence would involve understanding motivations such as the need for achievement, affiliation, or power, as well as understanding tacit knowledge related to those motivations (e.g., Wagner & Sternberg, 1985) and the goal setting related to them (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987).

In contrast, emotional intelligence involves recognizing emotion, reasoning with emotion and emotion-related information, and processing emotional information as a part of general problem-solving ability (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Although Gardner (1983) did not use the term *emotional intelligence*, his concept of social intelligence, which included intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence, provided a strong foundation for formulating the models and theories of emotional intelligence. According to Gardner, intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to recognize one's own emotions. Conversely,

interpersonal intelligence is the ability to understand other individuals' intentions, motivations, and emotions. Based on models developed by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and Goleman (1996), the construct of emotional intelligence includes both intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) first coined the term emotional intelligence and postulated that emotional intelligence consists of the following three categories of adaptive abilities: appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotions, and utilization of emotions in problem solving and decision making. The first category, appraisal and expression of emotion consist of verbal and nonverbal perception and empathy. Emotional expression involves behavioral changes associated with the experience of emotion, such as smiling, frowning, crying, storming out of a room, or all-out aggression. The second category, regulation of emotions, involves enhancing one's ability to maximize happy feelings, overcome depressed moods, and control harmful impulses. In addition, emotional regulation involves attempts to repair unpleasant moods while maintaining pleasant ones, as well as the ability to alter affective reactions to others (e.g., the ability to calm distressing emotions in other individuals; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

The recognition of emotion may be the best starting place for empirical measurement of emotional intelligence because there are provisionally agreed-upon ways to identify what someone is experiencing (Mayer & Salovey, in press). In contrast, more complex emotional problems require extremely careful consideration before emotional reasoning and its outcomes can be fairly evaluated (Mayer & Salovey, 1995). Because the ability to recognize emotions is basic to a person's emotional well-being, considerable research on this topic already exists. Its potential importance to daily

functioning has also been noted. For example, Reik (1952) associated mental health with the ability to recognize one's emotion, and mental illness with the inability to recognize it. Consider his example:

> A patient was having an affair with a married man. . . One day she asked the married man to promise her that he would not come from his home when he visited her and that he would not return home when he left her. She formulated what she expected from him more clearly the next day. "You must not come from her or go to her when you see me." It is obvious that the wife of her lover was meant. . . .She spoke of it as if it were an indifferent thought that had occurred to her, a convenient arrangement, yes, even a kind of amusing idea. . . .But the analyst could put himself into the place of the patient. . . .he got an inkling. . . .of the emotions of his patient: her jealousy, her suffering from the thought that her lover left her to go home to his wife. (pp. 309-311)

A person like the aforementioned patient, who is unable to connect her thoughts to her own emotions, may find herself at a social disadvantage while appearing irrational and demanding. A person like the therapist who can "hear" the emotions in another's thoughts may excel at handling certain social demands. Sometimes the task of emotional identification requires considerable perspective taking, as in the preceding sample. At other times, such inferences may be more direct. People simply may sense that pleasant thoughts indicate pleasant moods (Forgas, 1995). In addition, they may recognize the correlations between thoughts of injustice and anger, perceptions of threat and fear, and so forth, that stem from emotional appraisals of events (Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988).

The third category of adaptive abilities, utilization of emotions, consists of creative thinking, motivation, redirected attention, and flexible planning. Marshaling emotions in the service of a goal is essential for selective attention, self-motivation, and so forth. According to Goleman (1996), emotional self-control and delay of gratification underlie all human accomplishment.

Three of these categories of adaptive abilities are significant in providing a framework to address the level of emotional development among African American

adolescents, particularly, the regulation and utilization of emotions. The lack of emotional development and the ability to manage negative emotions may explain why more African American adolescents when compared to their White peers are experiencing academic problems and trouble with the law.

Recent research conducted by Malouff and Schutte (1998), Shutte et al. (1998), and Schutte and Malouff (1998) indicated that component parts of Salovey and Mayer's (1990) model are highly related. The researchers also discovered that emotional intelligence is associated with other adaptive characteristics and outcomes, such as optimism and academic performance. Building on Salovey and Mayer's model, Goleman (1996) presented various correlates of emotional intelligence. He expanded the construct to include a number of specific self-management, communication, and social skills influenced by the expression and understanding of emotions. Goleman defined emotional intelligence as the ability to control impulses, soothe anxiety, avoid depression, maintain optimism in the face of adversity, direct anger appropriately, respond well to the emotional reactions of others, engage in nonjudgmental listening and speaking, resolve conflicts in relationships, and show concern and helpfulness toward others.

African American college students who are susceptible to negative social and academic outcomes seem to be stifled in part by unmanageable emotionality (Barbarin, 1993a). Consequently, several detrimental issues arise due to their inability to manage negative emotions. Some of these issues include dropping out of school; becoming depressed while losing a sense of direction, focus, purpose, and hope; and responding with negative attitudes and harmful tactics. None of the aforementioned coping styles or behaviors is productive or beneficial to the individual behaviorally, academically, physically, mentally, or emotionally. As a result of these poor coping styles and

behaviors, many African American adolescents find themselves locked out of society and relegated to dead-end opportunities.

The aforementioned point is captured by Goleman's view that cognitive intelligence may help individuals gain admission to particular settings, but their emotional intelligence determines how successful they are within these settings. Supporting Goleman's notion, Schutte et al. (1998) found that emotional intelligence predicted success during the first year of college. Although there is some compelling evidence supporting emotional intelligence as a predictor of success, there is a lack of research using this variable to predict academic resilience in African American populations.

Studies Involving Emotional Intelligence

There is little empirical evidence supporting the construct of emotional intelligence. However, Ford et al. (1996) examined the role of several psychosocial variables (emotional intelligence, bicultural behaviors, locus of control, and social support) in facilitating academic resilience. The study sample comprised 104 African American male college students' ages 18 to 24 who were raised in urban areas. Ninety percent of the subjects were enrolled at an inner-city Historically Black College located in the southern region of the United States, and 10% were participating in a summer program at a Big Ten university and were enrolled at colleges in various parts of the country. All subjects were from urban communities and reported experiencing high stress. Fifty-four subjects had grade point averages below 3.0 and were classified as academically nonresilient, whereas 50 subjects had grade point averages of 3.0 and above and were classified as academically resilient.

Ford et al. used regression analysis and descriptive statistics to determine whether the abovementioned variables contributed significantly to academic resilience in African American males. Of the five variables examined, only emotional intelligence proved to be a significant predictor of academic resilience. Emotional intelligence explained approximately 5.5% ($p <$. 0091) of the variance.

Barbarin (1993) noted that when some African American adolescents experience racism and discrimination, they respond with anger and become rebellious. These adolescents may manifest their anger and rebelliousness by resisting and rejecting mainstream socialization, performing poorly in school, and rebelling against school authority figures whom they perceive as prejudiced. However, Barbarin contended that if a student is experiences racism and discrimination and has a high level of emotional intelligence, he or she will not perceive the purveyors of knowledge in academic institutions as the enemy. As a result, the student will not attempt to undermine the efforts of school authority figures. Such an attitude is conducive to learning and high academic achievement.

The primary finding in the Ford et al. (1996) study was the impact and subsequent importance of emotional intelligence in mediating and facilitating academic resilience. Therefore, in an endeavor to facilitate academic resilience, it is essential that parents and schools work to help African American adolescents develop or increase their emotional intelligence. The findings from Ford et al.'s research served as the impetus for the current research.

Investigating emotional intelligence as a predictor of academic resilience among African American adolescents has beneficial implications for the field of psychology. For example, if emotional intelligence is found to be a significant variable in predicting

academic resilience, modules could be developed to teach emotional intelligence to African American children in grammar school. Nonetheless, using this variable as a key construct to predict academic resilience is warranted in part due to the lack of knowledge about it and the possible benefits it could have for the African American adolescent population and the African American community in general.

Criticisms of the Emotional Intelligence Construct

The construct of emotional intelligence encompasses a set of conceptually related psychological processes involving the processing of affective information. These processes include (a) the verbal and nonverbal appraisal and expression of emotion in oneself and others, (b) the regulation of emotion in oneself and others, and (c) the use of emotion to facilitate thought (see Mayer & Geher, 1996; Salovey & Mayer, 1990, 1994).

Although various authors have proposed that emotional intelligence is a type of intelligence, in the traditional sense, contemporary research and theorizing lack any conceptual model of intelligence within which the construct might be placed. The theory of fluid and crystallized intelligence ability proposed by Cattell (1987), Horn (1988), and their associates (see, e.g., Horn & Noll, 1994) is arguably the most efficacious empirically based psychometric model of intelligence (see Stankov, Boyle, & Cattell, 1995). It may be speculated that, within this theory, emotional intelligence will constitute an additional aspect of possibly one or more primary mental abilities underlying crystallized ability. This assertion is based on the assumption that the appraisal, expression, regulation, and use of emotion develop through experience and social interaction in much the same way as do other psychological processes constituting crystallized intelligence.

The concept of emotional intelligence also overlaps with Gardner's (1983) social intelligence, which he referred to as a type of "personal intelligence." Part of Gardner's definition focuses specifically on the processing of affective information. According to Gardner, interpersonal intelligence includes the ability to understand other people and know what they feel. In contrast, intrapersonal intelligence involves access to one's own feelings, the capacity to effect discrimination among these feelings, and draw on them as a means of guiding behavior.

The available evidence tends to suggest that emotional intelligence is composed of a number of components that are akin to "low order" or primary factors. For example, the perception of emotion has been found to be related to the expression of emotion (see, e.g., Ekman, Friesen, & Ancoli, 1980). Both emotional appraisal (the ability to accurately identify another's emotions) and emotional expression (the ability to reexperience these emotions) also appear to be related to empathy (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Although empathy is viewed as an ability within the emotional intelligence framework, much of the work on empathy has considered it a personality characteristic. Moreover, this suggests that the appraisal of one's own feelings and the appraisal of the feelings of others may be inseparable. In addition, empathy may involve both one's ability to identify with the feelings of others and general access to one's own feeling state.

The regulation of emotion in the self refers to the meta-experience of mood, or monitoring, evaluating, and acting to change one's mood. This emotional regulation concerns attempts to repair unpleasant moods while maintaining pleasant ones. Regulation of emotion also includes the ability to alter the affective reactions of others (e.g., the ability to calm distressing emotions in other individuals; Salovey & Mayer,

1990). This construct has been poorly operationalized, although there is some evidence that it has been assessed using the emotional intelligence model developed by Goleman (1996).

Marshaling emotions in the service of a goal is essential for selective attention, self-motivation, and so forth. According to Goleman, emotional self-control and the delay of gratification underlie all human accomplishment. The Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989) is thought to measure this component of emotional intelligence. The instrument consists of four scales reflecting aspects of the control of emotion in difficult or trying circumstances: Aggression Control, Rehearsal, Benign Control, and Emotional Inhibition. Until now, the measure has not been used in the empirical investigation of the emotional intelligence construct. This measure was used in the present study.

Another criticism of the emotional intelligence construct is that assessments measuring emotional intelligence are all based on self-report measures. As Mayer and Salovey (in press) have pointed out, if emotional intelligence resembles a cognitive ability in the traditional sense, then it is important to use tests of emotional intelligence that directly measure this construct. This principle follows from the fact that it is obviously better to have direct, objective assessment techniques rather than an individual's self-descriptions of how emotionally intelligent they are (Mayer & Salovey, in press).

If emotional intelligence is a type of intelligence, then its distinguishability from various personality traits found in the literature must be demonstrated (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). As Mayer and Salovey (in press) pointed out, "a trait is a behavioral preference, rather than an ability" (p. 9). As is the case with many measures of emotional

intelligence, the typical instruments for assessing personality rely on self-report techniques. If emotional intelligence is to qualify as a form of intelligence, it must be shown to be independent from personality traits. A number of tests measuring aspects of emotional intelligence are already known to have moderate to high correlations with personality constructs. Consider, for example, the four subscales derived from the Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989). Rehearsal, specifically, dissatisfaction with interpersonal encounters and an inability to resolve interpersonal conflict) has been found to have a significant correlation with neuroticism.

Similarly, Emotional Inhibition has been found to have a noteworthy negative correlation with extraversion. Furthermore, Benign Control, which is viewed primarily as an index for impulsivity, correlates with the Psychotocism scale of the ECQ (Roger & Najarian, 1989). This finding should come as no surprise, given the fact that the Psychotocism scale contains items assessing an individual's tendency to act impulsively.

Another criticism of the emotional intelligence construct is that it is often linked to social intelligence, but the status of the latter construct remains in dispute, particularly in relation to broad, crystallized abilities. Thorndike (1936), found that tests designed to measure social intelligence had loadings on factors defined by verbal ability. Moreover, several putative indexes of social intelligence are, in fact, self-report measures. Considering the overlap in context between measures of verbal and social intelligence, equivocal findings would not be unusual.

As Mayer and Salovey (1993) pointed out, social knowledge is required in responding to items on many verbal intelligence tests. Therefore, it is worth noting that two studies have reported finding a factor of social intelligence that is orthogonal to verbal abilities. Ford and Tisak's (1983) results indicated that a social component could

be distinguished from general academic abilities. Marlowe and Bedell (1982) also claimed that their results supported the existence of an independent factor of social intelligence. In exploring the status of emotional intelligence in relation to social intelligence, it is important to note that one's own and others' emotions frequently occur in social situations, and evidence demonstrating a distinction between social and emotional aspects of behavior is required.

Summary

Theories of resilience and emotional intelligence provide insight into characteristics that enhances one's ability to excel in spite of obstacles and adversities. Because many African American adolescents are susceptible to delinquency and high dropout rates (Ford, 1990) as a result of stressful environmental conditions, economic hardships, and social deprivation, there is a need to study new variables that facilitate academic resilience. Emotional intelligence is a new variable that appears promising, particularly in light of the results of the study by Ford et al. (1996). In that study, emotional intelligence was found to be the only significant predictor of academic resilience among five variables. The other four variables were biculturality, stress, locus of control, and social support.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

My primary purpose in this study was to determine whether academically resilient and academically nonresilient (as measured by grade point average) groups of African American college students exhibit significant differences in emotional intelligence and related constructs, which include emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience. This chapter provides information regarding the procedures followed in carrying out the study, research participants, instruments used in the study, and data analysis procedures.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to analyze the data collected in this study.

1. Academically resilient African American college students will differ significantly from academically nonresilient students in terms of emotional intelligence.

2. Academically resilient African American college students will differ significantly from academically nonresilient students in terms of emotional control.

3. Academically resilient African American college students will differ significantly from academically nonresilient students in terms of impulse control.

4. Academically resilient African American college students will differ significantly from academically nonresilient students in terms of optimism.

5. Academically resilient African American college students will differ significantly from academically nonresilient students in terms of attitudes reflective of resilience.

Procedures

Recruitment of the Sample

The study was carried out at a southern inner-city public Historically Black College. This institution was chosen because it comprises predominantly African American students who come from diverse socioeconomic and environmental backgrounds, including: inner-city, rural, suburban, low-income, first-generation, high-socioeconomic, southern, midwestern, east coast, and west coast communities.

I talked with the department chair of psychology and the assistant department chair of psychology and explained the purpose and significance of the research. Both of them agreed to allow students enrolled in several psychology classes to be used in the study. The assistant department chair discussed the study with other psychology professors, and they agreed to allow time for their classes to be used for the research.

Surveys were sent to the assistant department chair who is also a professor of psychology. He scheduled and coordinated times with the other psychology professors who agreed to let their classes be used for the study; he also administered and collected the surveys. Data were collected during normal class sessions. Before administering surveys, the assistant department chair gave the students a brief description of the research (see Appendix A for the statements made by the professor).

Students were informed that their participation in the research was completely voluntary and that there would be no consequences if they chose not to participate. No compensation was given for students' participation in the study. In addition, before the

surveys were administered, students were asked to read and sign a consent form, which informed them of their rights as participants and provided instructions of what to do if any questions or problems arose. Moreover, the consent form provided the participants with a description of the study, information on how to contact the investigator, purpose of the study, and instructions for completing the surveys. However, as an inducement for completing the surveys, a $50 cash prize was offered.

Research Participants

Participants were taken from 10 undergraduate psychology classes in the college's psychology department. Five of the classes were general psychology courses; participants in these classes were non-psychology majors. Psychology majors were enrolled in the remaining five classes: a developmental psychology class, a social psychology class, a statistics class, an introductory psychology class, and an abnormal psychology class. In general, it took students between 30 and 45 minutes to complete the surveys. Surveys were completed by 217 students. However, after I carefully examined the surveys, I found that only 129 could be used in the study. Eighty-eight surveys were discarded for several reasons. First, some participants failed to provide identifying information. That information was important to obtain their true grade point averages from the registrar's office. Second, other participants simply failed to complete the surveys, resulting in a large amount of missing data. Third, some participants did not meet the racial requirement but participated in the study (European, East Asian, and African). Finally, several surveys were discarded because they showed no variation in responses. It appeared that several participants tired during the survey and began to mark the same responses just to finish it.

Grade point averages served as a measure of academic resilience. Participants with a grade point average of 3.0 and above were classified as academically resilient. Conversely, participants who had a grade point average below 3.0 were classified as academically nonresilient. I obtained college grade point averages of the participants from the registrar's office. In this study, the predictor variable was grade point average. The criterion variables were emotional intelligence, emotional control, impulse control, optimism/pessimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience.

Instrumentation

A demographic questionnaire was used to obtain information from participants concerning their parent's level of education and socioeconomic status (SES). This information was useful in understanding the level of developmental, emotional, and social support by the participants had received as adolescents. Also, information on the participants' place of birth was obtained. Researchers have suggested that individuals from inner-city and rural areas experience higher rates of adolescent behavior problems (e.g., juvenile delinquency and incarceration rates) (Schlosser, 1998). Suburban participants were included for comparative purposes.

Five instruments were used to collect data for this study. They were (a) the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Schutte et al., 1998), (b) the Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989; Roger & Nesshoever, 1989), (c) the Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985), (d) the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (Patton, Stanton, & Barratt, 1995), and (e) the Resiliency Attitudes Scale (Biscoe & Harris, 1994).

The first four instruments were selected because they represent the most reliable and valid measures of emotional intelligence to date. These measures have been empirically validated through research. However, they have not been normed on African

American samples. The final measure, the RAS, was used because it is based on a sound conceptualization of resilience. In addition, the measure has an internal consistency of .87 (Kelso, 1999). Moreover, the RAS was used because it may support findings consistent with participants who score high on emotional intelligence scales and are classified as being academically resilient. With the exception of the RAS scale, the information reported below can be found as stated in "Measuring Emotional Intelligence and Related Constructs" by Schutte and Malouff (1999).

The Emotional Intelligence Scale

The Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) is a 33-item self-report measure that was developed to assess an individual's ability to recognize emotion, express emotion, regulate emotion, and harness emotions (Schutte et al., 1998). The authors used Salovey and Mayer's (1990) model of emotional intelligence to generate an initial pool of 62 items. On the basis of factor analysis, which generated one strong factor, the authors selected the final 33 scale items. These items, which were the ones with the highest loadings on the first factor, represented all dimensions of Salovey and Mayer's model.

Relationship to emotional intelligence. The EIS is intended to assess emotional intelligence as conceptualized by Salovey and Mayer's (1990) model. Items assess the ability to adaptively recognize, express, regulate, and harness emotion in the self and in others. An individual who agrees with items such as "I am aware of my emotions as I experience them," and "I have control over my emotions" recognizes his or her emotions and is able to regulate emotions.

Administration and scoring. Respondents use a 5-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5) to answer each item. Items 5, 28, and 33 are

reverse coded. The sum of all items equals the total scale score, which can range from 33 to 165. Higher scale scores indicate greater emotional intelligence.

Reliability. In a community sample, the internal consistency of the scale as measured by Cronbach's alpha was .90, and for a sample of college students internal consistency was .87 (Schutte et al., 1998). Two-week test retest reliability was .78 (Schutte et al., 1998).

Validity. Higher scores on the emotional intelligence scale have been found to be associated with greater optimism, more impulse control, more attention to feelings, greater clarity of feelings, better mood repair, less alexithymia, less depression (Schutte et al., 1998), greater empathy, and more self-monitoring (Schutte & Malouff, 1998). Studies have also indicated that higher scores on the measure predicted higher first-year college grades (Schutte et al., 1998) and better paraprofessional-counselor performance (Malouff & Schutte, 1998). Finally, females' scores have been higher than males' and college seniors' scores have been higher than freshmen (Schutte & Malouff, 1998).

The Emotional Control Questionnaire

The Emotional Control Questionnaire (ECQ) is a 56-item self–report measure that was developed to assess the tendency to inhibit expression of emotional responses (Roger & Najarian, 1989; Roger & Nesshoever, 1989). It should be noted that this questionnaire has not been updated since its initial development. The items were generated by adapting items from previous personality scales and from a list of emotional experiences and reactions to those experiences provided by a group of students. After the initial factor analyses resulted in factors labeled rehearsal, emotional inhibition, aggression control, and benign control, Roger and Najarian carried out validation work with the subscales defined by these factors. They then revised some of the items in the original scale and

added 34 items to expand the pool of items. Examination of the response frequencies for the items and the results of a factor analysis of the larger pool of items led to the creation of the 56-item ECQ. Factor analyses again identified the four factors of rehearsal, emotional inhibition, aggression control, and benign control.

The relationship to emotional intelligence. The ECQ taps dimensions of emotional intelligence related to the expression of emotion and the regulation of emotion. Aggression control and benign control of emotions are adaptive, whereas, excess rehearsal of emotions and inhibition of emotions are maladaptive. Respondents agreeing with items such as "If someone insults me I try to remain as calm as possible" from the Aggression Control subscale "Almost everything I do is carefully thought out" from the Benign Control subscale are less likely to engage in interpersonal altercations and are more likely to channel emotions productively. Individuals who agree with items such as "I remember things that upset me or make me angry for a long time afterwards" from the Rehearsal subscale are more likely to experience negative feelings. Those who agree with items such as "When someone upsets me, I try to hide my feelings" may have difficulties in interpersonal relationships.

Administration and scoring. Respondents use a true-or-false format to indicate how they feel about each item. Items 2, 5, 7, 9-12, 17-19, 21, 23-26, 28-30, 36, 40, 42, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, and 56 are reverse coded. Each of the four subscales consists of 14 items. Following are the items that comprise each of the subscales: Rehearsal, 3, 9, 13, 22, 28, 31, 32, 34, 38, 41, 46, 49, 51, 53; Emotional Inhibition, 1, 6, 8, 11, 16, 20, 23, 25, 30, 37, 43, 50, 52, 56; Aggression Control, 2, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 24, 26, 27, 33, 36, 40, 44, 48; and Benign control, 4, 5, 7, 14, 17, 21, 29, 35, 39, 42, 45, 47, 54, 55.

Reliability. In a sample of university students, which is the most recent norming data, Roger and Najarian (1989) found good internal consistency for the four ECQ subscales, as measured by the Kuder-Richardson formula, as follows: Rehearsal, .86; Emotional Inhibition, .77; Aggression Control, .81; and Benign Control, .79. Seven-week test-retest reliability was as follows: Rehearsal, .80; Emotional Inhibition, .79; Aggression Control, .73; and Benign Control, .92 (Roger & Najarian, 1989).

Validity. Roger and Najarian (1989) found a pattern of relationships between scores on the subscale and other measures that provided evidence of construct validity. For example, higher Rehearsal subscale scores were related to more neuroticism and less interpersonal control, higher Emotional Inhibition subscale scores were related to more introversion and less interpersonal control, and higher Aggressive Control subscale scores were related to less verbal hostility and less assaultiveness. Roger (1995) reported that several studies have indicated that higher Rehearsal subscale scores are related to delayed heart rate recovery and more cortisol secretion during times of stress. Further, Rector and Roger (1996) found that a combination of high Rehearsal subscale scores and low self-esteem predisposed individuals to poor health after a stressful period.

The Life Orientation Test

The Life Orientation Test (LOT) is self-report measure that is widely used to assess optimism and pessimism. The original scale (Scheier & Carver, 1985) is a 12-item scale consisting of eight key items and four filler items. The revised scale (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994) is a 10-item scale consisting of six key items and four filler items. The two versions of the scale are highly related, correlating at .95 (Scheier et al., 1994).

Scheier and Carver (1985) generated an initial pool of 16 items assessing outcome expectancies. The final items were selected on the basis of results of factor analyses. Four items were keyed in a positive direction and measured optimism, four were keyed in a negative direction and measured pessimism, and four were filler items intended to disguise the purpose of the scale.

Marshall, Wortman, Kusulas, Hervig, and Vickers (1992) suggested that the clear two factor solution representing the dimensions of optimism and pessimism that they found in their research with the scale lent itself to the creation of Optimism and Pessimism subscales. A meta-analysis of a number of studies using the scale also indicated support for the bi-dimensional nature of the scale, supporting the use of the Optimism and Pessimism subscales (Anderson, 1996).

Relationship to emotional intelligence. Individuals with a more optimistic outlook may tend to perceive more positive emotions, repair moods more effectively, and be more adept at regulating emotions than people with a more pessimistic outlook. For example, an individual who agrees with the statement "In uncertain times, I usually expect the best" may be more attuned to positive elements of ambiguous situations and may be better able to maintain adaptive emotions in such situations.

Administration and scoring. Respondents use a 5-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (4) to answer each of the items. To obtain a total score for the 12-item scale, Items 3, 8, 9, and 12 are reverse scored and then summed together with scores from items 1, 4, 5, and 11. To obtain a total score for the 10-item scale, items 3, 7, 9 are reversed scored and then summed together with scores from items, 1, 4, and 10. For both versions of the scale, higher scores indicate a more positive outlook.

The findings of Marshall et al. (1992) suggested the creation of Optimism and Pessimism subscales when using the 12-item scale. The Optimism subscale comprises of Items 1, 4, 5, and 11. The Pessimism subscale comprises Items 3, 8, 9, and 12.

Reliability. Scheier and Carver (1985) found that, for a sample of college students, the eight key items in the 12-item LOT had an internal consistency, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, of .76, and 4-week test-retest reliability of .79. The six key items in the 10-item revised scale had an internal consistency, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, of .78, a 4-month test-retest reliability of .68, and 28-month test-retest stability of .79 (Scheier et al., 1994).

Validity. Using the original 12-item version of the LOT, Scheier and Carver (1985) found that, as predicted, individuals who scored high on the scale, indicating a more positive outlook, showed a greater internal locus of control, more self-esteem, and less hopelessness, depression, perceived stress, alienation, social anxiety, and physical symptoms. Supporting the validity of the LOT, Scheier et al. (1994) found that high scores on the test were associated with less depression and better coping, even when other variables, such as neuroticism, anxiety, and self-esteem, were covaried out.

Scheier et al. (1994) found that higher scores on the 10-item LOT were related, as predicted, to greater self-mastery and self-esteem, and to less anxiety and neuroticism. Anderson (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of 56 studies that had used the LOT and found a consistent relationship between high scores on the scale and better coping, less symptom reporting, and less negative affect. Marshall et al. (1992) found support for the validity of the Optimism and Pessimism subscales in that high scores on the Optimism subscale were associated with extroversion and positive affect, whereas high scores on the Pessimism subscale were associated with neuroticism and negative affect.

The Barratt Impulsiveness Scale

The Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) is a 30-item self-report scale, that measures the impulsiveness of individuals. The latest version of the BIS (Patton, Stanton, & Barratt, 1995) is based on an instrument developed first in 1959 (Barratt, 1959) and then revised and refined over the years (Barratt, 1985, 1993). The 11th and latest version was created by eliminating from the previous version of the scale those items that did not contribute to the reliability or validity of the scale. Patton et al. (1995) factor analyzed the responses of undergraduate students, psychiatric inpatients, and prisoners in a maximum-security facility and found six factors, which they labeled attention, motor impulsiveness, self-control, cognitive complexity, perseverance, and cognitive instability.

Relationship to emotional intelligence. Individuals who are not able to control impulses are likely to have trouble harnessing emotions and are likely to act upon their emotions without considering the consequences. For example, an individual who endorse an item such as "I buy things on impulse" is one who is likely to react to the emotional appeal of items without considering the consequences of the purchase.

Administration and scoring. Respondents rate each of the items on a 4-point scale of frequency. Items 1, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 29, and 30 are reverse coded. The sum of all items is the total scale score. Scores can range from 30 to 120, with higher scores indicating more impulsiveness.

Reliability. Patton et al. (1995) found that the internal consistency of the scale as measured by Cronbach's alpha, ranged from .79 to .82 in samples of students, psychiatric clients, and prisoners.

Validity. Evidence as to the validity of the scale comes from correlational studies that showed that more impulsivity, as assessed by the current version of the scale, was related to less reading accuracy (Barratt, Stanford, Kent, & Felthous, 1997; Harmon-Jones, Barratt, & Wigg, 1997), poorer reading comprehension, greater physical aggression (Harmon-Jones et al., 1997), greater impulsive aggression (Stanford, Greve, & Dickens, 1995), and more risk taking (Stanford et al., 1996). Using a slightly different previous version of the scale, researchers have found a strong association between scale scores and other measures of impulsivity and venturesomeness (Campbell, 1987; Luengo, Carill-de-la-Pena, & Otero, 1991; Carillo-de-la-Pena, Otero, & Romero, 1993).

Patton et al. (1995) used the current version of the BIS to compare the scores of undergraduate students, substance-abuse clients, general-psychiatry clients, and prison inmates. As expected, the prison inmates had higher impulsivity scores than any of the other groups, and the substance-abuse and general-psychiatry clients had higher impulsivity scores than undergraduate students. Barratt et al. (1997) also found that prison inmates had significantly higher scores than others. Royse and Wieche (1988) gave a previous version of the scale to groups of felons and unwed mothers, who they hypothesized would be more impulsive than a sample of individuals drawn from the general population. They found that the scale scores of both felons and unwed mothers were higher than people from the general population. Also using a previous version of the scale, Castellani and Rugle (1995) found that gamblers scored higher on the scale than others, and O'Boyle and Barratt (1992) found that substance-abuse-treatment clients who used multiple substances were more impulsive than those who used only on substance.

The Resiliency Attitudes Scale

The Resiliency Attitudes Scale (RAS) was developed by Biscoe and Harris (1994). In its original format, the RAS contains 72 items that are scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale with responses ranging from *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree.* Thirty-six of the items on the RAS are reversed scored. The RAS scale contains seven subscales: Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative, Creativity/Humor, Morality, and General Resilience. Examples of items from the General Resilience subscale are "Failure is something you learn from rather than feel guilty about" and "I am good at making the most of a bad situation." Research participants indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with the items on each of the seven subscales. A high score on each subscale is indicative of a high level of resiliency. In contrast, a low score on each subscale is indicative of a low level of resiliency. In addition, the RAS provides a composite score of resiliency, which is the sum of scores on 72-items.

Scale development. The first six subscales on the RAS were developed based on Wolin and Wolin's (1993) conceptualization of resilience. The seventh subscale (General Resilience) was added by Biscoe and Harris (1994). The researchers defined general resilience as the belief that one can survive traumatic events and make things better. Such a belief serves as the catalyst that facilitates persistence in working through and overcoming difficulties.

Reliability. The instrument is still under development in that it has not been empirically validated. Therefore, no information is available regarding internal consistency or test-retest reliability for the specific subscales. However, out of curiosity, I calculated the internal reliabilities for each subscale. Results of the reliability analysis revealed that the seven subscales had poor to moderate reliabilities. For example, the

reliabilities are as follows: Insight subscale .36; Independence subscale .47; Relationship subscale .56; Initiative subscale .66; Creativity subscale .64; Morality subscale .43; and the General Resilience subscale .73. However, the internal consistency reliability of all items taken together was .85. This was consistent with Kelso (1999) who reported an internal reliability of .87. Kelso also found that the subscales were moderately correlated with each other (r = .49 to .69). Kelso provided some divergent validity evidence in that the RAS was negatively correlated with the Beck Depression Inventory.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data were analyzed accordingly:

1. The demographic information was analyzed to generate clear and concise descriptive statistics of the sample used in the study.

2. The five scales were subjected to correlation statistics to determine correlations between the five scales and academic resilience, as measured by grade point average.

3. The five scales were subjected to an independent-samples t test to determine mean differences between academic resilient and academic nonresilient samples.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

My primary purpose in this study was to determine whether academically resilient and academically nonresilient (as measured by grade point average) groups of African American college students exhibit significant differences in emotional intelligence and related constructs, which include emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience. The subjects were African American undergraduate students from diverse socioeconomic and environmental backgrounds, including: urban, rural, suburban, low-income, first-generation, high-socioeconomic, southern, midwestern, east coast, and west coast communities.

This chapter begins with descriptive statistics about the study participants. Next, results of the analyses to determine correlations between each of the five scales and academic performance (as determined by grade point average) are presented. In the third section, results of an independent samples *t* test to determine mean differences between academically resilient and academically nonresilient subjects.

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic Information

Demographic information gathered from the subjects included place of birth, environment, age, gender, class, parents' level of education and household income. Students' grade point averages were obtained from the registrar's office with the participants' consent. The descriptive statistics analyzed and discussed in this chapter were from the final sample of 129 subjects who returned usable surveys.

Grade Point Average

Of the 129 participants, 45 (34.9%) had grade point averages of 3.0 or above. Conversely, 84 (65.1%) of the participants had grade point averages below 3.0. The lowest grade point average was 1.24, and the highest was 4.0.

The mean grade point average of participants who reported a place of birth was 2.71. Participants who said they were born in the Midwest had a mean grade point average of 2.6, compared to a mean grade point average of 2.71 for participants who were born in the South, 2.78 for those born in the West, and 2.81 for those born in the Southeast.

The mean grade point average of participants who reported being raised somewhere different from their place of birth was also 2.71. Participants who were raised in the Midwest had a mean grade point average of 2.47, compared to a mean grade point average of 2.72 for participants who were raised in the South, 3.12 for those raised in the West, and 2.70 for those who were reportedly raised in the Southeast.

The 129 participants were classified by the type of environment in which they were raised. The urban participants had a mean grade point average of 2.61, compared to mean grade point averages of 2.80 for suburban students and a 2.83 for rural students respectively. With regard to gender, females had a mean grade point average of 2.75, compared to a mean grade point average of 2.59 for males. Finally, with regard to class, freshmen had a mean grade point average of 2.74, compared to mean grade point averages of 2.52 for sophomores and 2.68 for juniors. Seniors had the highest mean grade point average of 2.96.

Birthplace of Subjects

Participants were asked to identify their place of birth by city and state. This information was categorized into the following regions of the United States: South, Southeast, Southwest, Midwest, West, Northeast, and other. Participants were from various states, providing a diversified sample representing southern, southwestern, midwestern, and western regions of the country. Southern states included Mississippi, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Kentucky. Southeastern states included Georgia, Florida, Virginia, and North Carolina. Southwestern states included Texas and Oklahoma. Midwestern states included Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, Indiana, Missouri, Wisconsin, and Kansas. Western states included: Colorado, California, and Arizona. One participant was from Africa. None of the subjects were from the northeastern region of the country. Some of the major cities that the participants were born in were Atlanta, Miami, Dallas, Houston, Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Denver, and Los Angeles.

Of the 129 participants, of the research study, 92 (71.3%) were from the southern region of the country and 24 (18.6%) were from the midwestern region of the country. Five (3.9%) of the participants were from the southeastern region of the country, and another five (3.9%) were from the western region of the country. Three (2.3%) of the participants were from the southwestern region of the country.

Environment of Subjects

Participants were asked to identify where they grew up by city and state if this area was different from their place of birth. Of the 129 participants, 98 (76%) grew up in the southern region of the country, and 16 (12.4%) grew up in the midwestern region of the country. Eight (6.2%) of the participants grew up in the southeastern region of the

country, four (3.1%) grew up in the southwestern region of the country, and three (2.3%) grew up in the western region of the country.

In addition, participants were asked to indicate the type of environment in which they grew up. These choices were urban, suburban, or rural. I defined urban as living directly inside a large city, suburban as living on the outskirts of a large city or town, and rural as characteristic of the country. Of the 129 participants, 68 (52.7%) grew up in an urban environment, 36 (27.9%) in a rural environment, and 25 (19.4%) in a suburban environment.

Age

Of the 129 students who participated in this study, 15 (11.6%) of the participants were 18 years of age, 26 (20.2%) of the participants were 19 years old, 27 (20.9%) of the participants were 20 years old, 13 (10.1%) were 21 years old, 20 (15.6%) were 22 years old, 7 (5.4%) were 23 years old, 5 (3.8%) were 24 years old, 3 (2.3%) were 25 years old, and the remaining 13 (10.1%) participants ranged between the ages of 26 and 39. The youngest participant was 18 years of age and the oldest participant was 39 years of age; the mean age of all participants was 21.55 years.

Gender

Of the 129 participants, 36 (27.9%) were males. Ninety-three (72.1%) of the participants were female.

Class

Of the 129 participants, 35 (27.1%) were freshmen, and 40 (31.1%) of the participants were sophomores. Twenty-seven (20.9%) of the participants were juniors, and 27 (20.9%) of the participants were seniors.

Mother's Level of Education

Participants were asked to indicate their mothers' level of education. They were provided with 11 options to choose from: did not graduate from high school, GED, high school graduate, some college no degree, 2-year college degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, juris doctorate, Ph.D., M.D./D.O., and unknown or other. The last choice was provided for those participants who did not know or have any contact with their mother.

Of 129 participants, 10 (7.7%) reported that their mothers did not graduate from high school, 5 (3.9%) reported that their mothers received GEDs. Thirty-two (24.8%) participants reported that their mothers were high school graduates, and 25 (19.4%) reported that their mothers had some college experience with no degree. Twenty (15.5%) participants reported that their mothers received a 2-year college degree, and another 20 (15.5%) reported that their mothers received bachelor's degrees. Sixteen (12.4%) participants reported that their mothers received master's degrees. One (.8%) of the participant's mother received a Ph.D.

Father's Level of Education

Participants were asked to indicate their fathers' level of education. Again, they were provided with 11 options to choose from: did not graduate from high school, GED, high school graduate, some college no degree, 2-year college degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, juris doctorate, Ph.D., M.D./D.O., and unknown or other. The last choice was provided for those participants who did not know or have any contact with their father.

Of the 129 participants, 16 (12.4%) reported that their fathers did not graduate from high school. One (.8%) of the participant's father received a GED. Thirty-eight

(29.4%) reported that their fathers were high school graduates, and 28 (21.7%) said that their fathers had some college experience with no degree. Sixteen (12.4%) participants reported that their fathers received a 2-year college degree, 14 (10.9%) said that their fathers received bachelor's degrees, and 9 (7%) said that their fathers received master's degrees. One (.8%) participant's father received a medical degree. Six (4.6%) participants did not know their fathers' educational attainment.

In comparing the parent's educational attainment, the participants' mothers had higher educational levels than the fathers. For example, 20 (15.5%) of the mothers had bachelor's degrees, compared to 14 (10.9%) of the fathers. In addition, 16 (12.4%) of the mothers had master's degrees, compared to nine (7%) of the fathers.

This situation speaks to the problems African American males are facing in terms of educational attainment. If African American fathers are uneducated, often they are relegated to low-paying jobs, which make it difficult for them to provide for their children. Also, it is believed that this problem contributes to these fathers' abandoning their children. For example, in this study, six (4.6%) of the participants did not know their fathers educational status because they did not know their fathers.

Household's Combined Annual Income

Participants were asked to report their annual household income. This information provided with insight into the types of opportunities and exposure the student might have had growing up. Of the 129 participants, 12 (9.3%) reported an annual household income of 0 to $9,999. Twenty-one (16.3%) participants reported an annual household income of $10,000 to $19,999, and 20 (15.5%) participants reported an annual household income of $20,000 to $29,999. Twenty-five (19.4%) participants reported an annual household income of $30,000 to $39,999, 19 (14.7%) had an annual household

income of $40,000 to $49,999, and 8 (6.2%) had an annual household income of $50,000 to $59,999. Ten (7.8%) participants reported an annual household income of $60,000 to $69,999, and 14 (10.8%) reported an annual household income of $70,000 and above.

Academically Resilient

Of the 129 participants, 45 (34.9%) were classified as being academically resilient. This means that these participants had grade point averages of 3.0 or better at the time they were surveyed.

Academically Nonresilient

Conversely, of the participants, 84 (65.1%) were classified as being academically nonresilient. This means that these participants had grade point averages of less than 3.0 at the time they were surveyed.

Discarded Sample

It should be noted that there were no distinguishing characteristics of the discarded sample of participants with regard to grade point average. However, the only detectable difference was their inability to complete the surveys or not meeting the racial requirement.

Results of Reliability Analyses

Before the statistics were run and analyzed, reliability analysis were conducted to determine the reliability of each individual scale and subscale. The results of the reliability analysis were as follows. The Emotional Intelligence Scale had a reliability coefficient of alpha = . 76, compared to an alpha of .90 reported by the developers of the scale (Schutte et al., 1998).

The Emotional Control Questionnaire has four subscales: Rehearsal, Emotional Inhibition, Aggression Control, and Benign Control. The reliability analysis for the Rehearsal subscale resulted in an alpha of .75, compared to an alpha of .86 reported by the developers. The Emotional Inhibition subscale had an alpha of .72, compared to an alpha of .77 reported by the developers. The Aggression Control subscale had an alpha of .64, compared to an alpha of .81 reported by the developers. The Benign Control subscale had an alpha of .60, compared to an alpha of .79 reported by the developers (Roger & Najarian, 1989).

The third scale used in the study, the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale, had an alpha of .79, which was consistent with the alpha range of .79 to .82 reported by the developers of the scale (Patton et al., 1995).

The fourth scale used in the study, the Life Orientation Test, had an overall alpha of .62, compared to an alpha of .76 reported by the researchers (Scheier & Carver, 1985). The Optimism subscale had an alpha of .45, and the Pessimism subscale had an alpha of .70. The researchers did not provide Chronbach Alphas for the Optimism and Pessimism subscales.

Finally, the Resilient Attitudes Scale had an Alpha of .85 compared to .87 reported by Kelso, 1999. The results of the reliability analysis offered the first indication that the overall results of the present study might be insignificant.

Correlations From the Research Study

Overall correlations indicated that, of the five scales used, significant results were found for only two of the subscales, Initiative and Morality, on the Resilient Attitudes Scale. Scores on the Initiative subscale were positively correlated with grade point average at the $p < .019$ level. Also, scores on the Morality subscale were positively

correlated with grade point average at the $p < .049$ level (see Appendix H for individual correlations).

Scale-to-Scale Correlations

A possible explanation of the insignificant results for the remainder of the scales might be that the instruments were measuring too much of the same construct (see Table 1). The following scale and subscale abbreviations are provided to facilitate understanding as to what the scales and subscales mean in Table 1.

EIS- EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

REH- REHEARSAL SUBSCALE

EMO- EMOTIONAL INHIBITION SUBSCALE

AGG- AGGRESSION CONTROL SUBSCALE

BEN- BENIGN CONTROL SUBSCALE

BIS- BARRATT IMPULSIVENESS SCALE

LOT- LIFE ORIENTATION TEST

INS- INSIGHT SUBSCALE

IND- INDEPENDENCE SUBSCALE

REL- RELATIONSHIP SUBSCALE

INI- INITIATIVE SUBSCALE

CRE- CREATIVITY SUBSCLAE

MOR- MORALITY SUBSCALE

RAS- RESILIENT ATTITUDES SCALE

Because of the insignificant results on all but two of the RAS subscales, Initiative and Morality, I ran correlations on three demographic characteristics to determine whether these characteristics correlated with grade point averages. These demographic

Table 1: Scale-to-scale correlations.

		EIS	REH	EMO	AGG	BEN	BIS	LOT	INS	IND	REL	INI	CRE	MOR	RAS
EIS	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.154	.256	.051	-.231	-.364	.153	.286	.294	.367	.266	.336	.328	.300
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.079	.003	.566	.008	.000	.081	.001	.001	.000	.002	.000	.000	.001
REH	Pearson Correlation	.154	1.000	.160	-.436	-.449	-.324	.263	-.051	.344	.249	.281	.124	.335	.264
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.	.069	.000	.000	.000	.003	.563	.000	.004	.001	.160	.000	.002
EMO	Pearson Correlation	.256	.160	1.000	.351	-.110	-.055	.239	.301	.351	.285	.188	.240	.324	.278
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.069	.	.000	.211	.532	.006	.000	.000	.001	.032	.006	.000	.001
AGG	Pearson Correlation	.051	-.436	.351	1.000	.196	.086	-.135	.230	.059	-.013	-.056	-.057	-.048	-.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.566	.000	.000	.	.025	.331	.126	.008	.507	.887	.526	.521	.584	.455
BEN	Pearson Correlation	-.231	-.449	-.110	.196	1.000	.496	-.203	-.160	-.359	-.270	-.418	-.184	-.455	-.275
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.000	.211	.025	.	.000	.021	.069	.000	.002	.000	.036	.000	.002
BIS	Pearson Correlation	-.364	-.324	-.055	.086	.496	1.000	-.301	-.334	-.433	-.381	-.546	-.278	-.508	-.278
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.532	.331	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.001
LOT	Pearson Correlation	.153	.263	.239	-.135	-.203	-.301	1.000	.143	.188	.259	.379	.302	.387	.353
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.081	.003	.006	.126	.021	.000	.	.105	.032	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000
INS	Pearson Correlation	.286	-.051	.301	.230	-.160	-.334	.143	1.000	.292	.396	.409	.261	.216	.155
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.563	.000	.008	.069	.000	.105	.	.001	.000	.000	.003	.013	.078
IND	Pearson Correlation	.294	.344	.351	.059	-.359	-.433	.188	.292	1.000	.252	.330	.320	.457	.289
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.507	.000	.000	.032	.001	.	.004	.000	.000	.000	.001
REL	Pearson Correlation	.367	.249	.285	-.013	-.270	-.381	.259	.396	.252	1.000	.480	.333	.309	.346
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.001	.887	.002	.000	.003	.000	.004	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
INI	Pearson Correlation	.266	.281	.188	-.056	-.418	-.546	.379	.409	.330	.480	1.000	.509	.433	.477
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.001	.032	.526	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
CRE	Pearson Correlation	.336	.124	.240	-.057	-.184	-.278	.302	.261	.320	.333	.509	1.000	.236	.429
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.160	.006	.521	.036	.001	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000	.	.007	.000
MOR	Pearson Correlation	.328	.335	.324	-.048	-.455	-.508	.387	.216	.457	.309	.433	.236	1.000	.380
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.584	.000	.000	.000	.013	.000	.000	.000	.007	.	.000
RAS	Pearson Correlation	.300	.264	.278	-.066	-.275	-.278	.353	.155	.289	.346	.477	.429	.380	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.002	.001	.455	.002	.001	.000	.078	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

characteristics were mother's educational level, father's educational level, and annual household income. Surprisingly, these demographic variables did not correlate with grade point average. This finding is particularly important because the research literature has indicated that individuals whose parents are educated and who have numerous financial resources have a tendency to do well academically.

After running these correlations, I went back to examine the questionnaires and found some inconsistencies in the information reported. For example, several participants reported that both of their parents had advanced degrees, but they reported an annual household income of only $30,000. In contrast, several participants said that neither of their parents had graduated from high school or received GEDs, but they reported annual household incomes of $70,000 or above. Although this might be possible in certain cases, the number of participants who responded in this way seemed inconsistent with real world possibilities. This lead me to believe that the participants were either embellishing the information, did not know the actual household income, or just made unreliable estimates.

Also, because of the insignificant results on all but two of the RAS subscales, Initiative and Morality, I ran correlations on the following individual sample groups: males, females, freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

With regard to gender, results of these separate correlations indicated that for males, grade point average negatively correlated with the RAS Independence subscale at the $p < .014$ level. Females showed significant correlations on three of the seven RAS subscales. The Independence subscale correlated with grade point average at the $p < .016$ level, the Initiative subscale correlated with grade point average at the $p < .026$ level, and the Morality subscale correlated with grade point average at the $p < .044$ level. These

results were somewhat consistent with the overall findings, suggesting that specific subscales on the RAS is a moderate measure of academic resilience.

With regard to class, results of these separate correlations indicated that for freshmen, grade point average negatively correlated with RAS Creativity subscale at the $p < .039$ level. For sophomores, grade point average negatively correlated with the ECQ Aggression Control subscale at the $p < .037$ level, and the RAS Insight subscale at the $p < .037$ level. For juniors, grade point average correlated with the RAS Initiative subscale at the $p < .043$ level. Finally, for seniors, grade point average correlated with the LOT, which measures level of optimism at the $p < .046$ level. Also, grade point average correlated with three RAS subscales: the Independence subscale at the $p < .031$ level, the Creativity subscale at the $p < .028$ level, and the General Resilience subscale at the $p < .023$ level for seniors.

Results of the Independent-Samples *t* Test

An independent-samples *t* test was conducted to determine whether any of the means on the various scales were significant. As expected, none of the means were significant on any of the scales. Most of the differences were consistent with the notion that academically resilient participants would have higher mean scores. Unfortunately, the differences were so small that they do not warrant further discussion. However, in an effort to help the reader gain an understanding of the mean results, they are reported in the following pages.

Going into the research study, I formulated several hypotheses. First, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of emotional intelligence as measured by the EIS. However, the independent-samples t-test revealed that academically nonresilient

participants had a mean score of 132.01 on the EIS, compared to a mean score of 128.87, indicating that academically nonresilient participants had slightly higher levels of emotional intelligence than academically resilient participants, as measured by the EIS.

Second, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of Emotional Control as measured by the ECQ. The independent-samples *t* test provided mixed results, although those results were insignificant. For example, on the Rehearsal subscale, which is considered maladaptive, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 21.49, compared to a mean score of 21.48 for academically resilient participants. On the Emotional Inhibition subscale, which is also considered maladaptive, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 22.42, compared to a mean score of 22.50 for academically resilient participants. On the Aggression Control subscale, which is considered adaptive, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 18.92, compared to a mean score of 18.52 for academically resilient participants. On the Benign subscale, which is also considered adaptive, academically nonresilient research participants had a mean score of 20.14 compared to a mean score of 20.22 for academically resilient participants.

Third, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of impulse control as measured by the BIS. The independent-samples *t* test revealed that, on the BIS academically nonresilient research participants had a mean score of 61.52, compared to a mean score of 60.59 for academically resilient participants. This result was expected, indicating slightly more impulsivity on the part of academically nonresilient participants.

Fourth, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of optimism as measured by the LOT. The independent-samples *t* test revealed that, on the LOT, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 21.48, compared to a mean score of 21.76 for academically resilient participants.

Finally, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of attitudes reflective of resilience as measured by the seven subscales of the RAS. The independent-samples *t* test revealed that, on the Insight subscale, academically nonresilient research participants had a mean score of 35.95, compared to a mean score of 35.02 for academically resilient participants. On the Independence subscale, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 35.23, compared to a mean score of 35.33 for academically resilient participants. On the Relationship subscale, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 32.61, compared to a mean score of 32.39 for academically resilient participants. On the Initiative subscale, academically nonresilient research participants had a mean score of 36.45, compared to a mean score of 37.59 for academically resilient participants. On the Creativity subscale, academically nonresilient research participants had a mean score of 37.26, compared to a mean score of 37.65 for academically resilient participants.

On the Morality subscale, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 43.32, compared to a mean score of 44.96 for academically resilient participants. Finally, on the General Resilience subscale, academically nonresilient participants had a mean score of 41.41, compared to a mean score of 41.65 for academically resilient participants.

In sum, although the independent-samples *t* test revealed that means on 9 of the 14 scales including the subscales were consistent with the research hypotheses, the levels were too small to be statistically significant. In Chapter V, I will attempt to make sense of the results and offer reasonable explanations for the insignificant results. Also, in Chapter V, I will summarize the study, discuss the instruments and hypotheses, interpret the results, discuss implications, discuss limitations, provide recommendations for future research, and raise additional research questions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

My primary purpose in this study was to determine whether academically resilient and academically nonresilient (as measured by grade point average) groups of African American college students exhibit significant differences in emotional intelligence and related constructs, which include emotional control, impulse control, optimism, and attitudes reflective of resilience.

The scientific literature on resilience among African Americans has been stagnant for several reasons. First, the majority of resiliency studies have focused primarily on risk factors. Second, these studies have overexamined cognitive and psychosocial variables (i.e., locus of control, socioeconomic status, and family support). Third, these studies have primarily used children and adolescents as subjects. Finally, with the exception of the Ford et al. (1996) study, which yielded significant results, researchers conducting resiliency studies have not examined affective variables as facilitators of academic resilience within the African American population. Ford et al. (1996) concluded that there is a need for additional research on the relationship between emotional intelligence and resilience, because of the significant gap in the scientific literature.

In this study, I attempted to contribute to the scientific literature and increase our knowledge base by examining emotional intelligence and related constructs as facilitators of academic resilience in African American undergraduate students. This is important because, as Chesley-Carter (1998) noted, when some African American adolescents

experience racism and discrimination, they respond with anger and become rebellious. These adolescents may manifest their anger and rebelliousness by resisting and rejecting mainstream socialization, performing poorly in school, and rebelling against school authority figures perceived as prejudiced. As a result, it is believed that these adolescents may view the school environment as hostile and perceive teachers as oppressive. However, if a student is experiencing racism and discrimination and has a high level of emotional intelligence, I contend that the student will not perceive the purveyors of knowledge in academic institutions as the enemy. As a result, the student will not attempt to undermine the efforts of school authority figures. Such a response is more conducive to learning and high academic achievement, which is why it is particularly important to examine emotional intelligence in facilitating academic resilience among African Americans.

In an effort to examine emotional intelligence and related constructs in facilitating academic resilience, I used five instruments: (a) the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Schutte et al., 1998), (b) the Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989; Roger & Nesshoever, 1989), (c) the Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985), (d) the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (Patton et al., 1995), and (e) the Resiliency Attitudes Scale (Biscoe & Harris, 1994).

I selected the first four instruments because they represented the most reliable and valid measures of emotional intelligence to date. These measures have been empirically validated through research. The final instrument, the RAS, was used because it is based on a sound conceptualization of resilience and does provide some internal consistency (.87) (Kelso, 1999). Finally, the RAS may support findings consistent with participants who score high on the emotional intelligence scales. In addition to the five scales, I

developed a 10-item demographic questionnaire to gather information on participants' place of birth, current residence if different from place of birth, type of environment, age, gender, ethnicity, class, mother's level of income, father's level of income, and household's annual income. This information provided information regarding the types of experiences the participants have been exposed to.

Discussion

Academic resilience was defined as the ability to thrive and achieve above average academic performance (3.0 or greater GPA) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or environmental challenges.

Students who had a grade point average of 3.0 or above were classified as academically resilient. In contrast, students who had a grade point average less than 3.0 were classified as academically nonresilient. The following five hypotheses were formulated to guide the analyses of data in this study.

First, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of emotional intelligence as measured by the Emotional Intelligence Scale.

Second, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of Emotional Control as measured by the Emotional Control Questionnaire.

Third, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of impulse control as measured by the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale.

Fourth, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of optimism as measured by the Life Orientation Test.

Finally, I hypothesized that academically resilient participants would differ significantly from their academically nonresilient counterparts in terms of attitudes reflective of resilience as measured by the seven subscales on the Resilient Attitudes Scale: Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative, Creativity, Morality, and General Resilience on the Resilient Attitudes Scale.

Results of the data analyses did not support the research hypotheses at a statistically significant level. Given the fact that this was the first study to examine emotional intelligence and related constructs within the African American population, several reasonable explanations may explain the results of the study. First, emotional intelligence is a fairly new construct. Second, much of the available information on emotional intelligence is theoretical in nature and has (been gathered in only one empirical study) (see Ford et al., 1996). Third, the majority of norming information is on prison populations, substance-abuse populations, psychiatry inpatients, and a small sample of college students excluding African Americans. Fourth, there is not a great deal of scientific literature providing empirical evidence for the usefulness of the construct. These issues are addressed in greater detail in the following sections.

Given the lack of empirical support for the construct of emotional intelligence, I believe that examining this construct would contribute to the scientific literature in several ways. First, the study would provide information on affective variables as facilitators of academic resilience in African American college students. This topic has not been addressed in the scientific literature. Also, there is a dearth of literature on

resilience in college populations. Second, I thought that examining the emotional intelligence construct in an African American college population might provide some reliability and validity information, which does not currently exist in the scientific literature.

Despite the results of this research, I believe the study contributes to the scientific literature. It provides information on the reliability, validity, and overall usefulness of the emotional intelligence construct in examining academic resilience in African American college populations.

Interpretation

A significant relationship was found between grade point average and two subscales, Initiative and Morality, on the Resilient Attitudes Scale. When gender was examined separately, a significant negative relationship between grade point average and one subscale, Independence, was found on the Resilient Attitudes Scale for males. For females, a significant relationship was found on three subscales, Independence, Initiative, and Morality, on the Resilient Attitudes Scale.

When class was examined separately, a significant negative correlation was found between grade point average and one subscale, Creativity, on Resilient Attitudes Scale. For sophomores, a significant negative correlation between grade point average and the Aggression Control subscale and the Insight subscale. For juniors, a significant correlation was found between grade point average and the Initiative Subscale. Finally, for seniors, a significant correlation between grade point average was found on the Life Orientation Test, Independence subscale, Creativity subscale, and the General Resilience subscales. What does this mean?

Trends in the study consistently pointed to correlations between grade point average and the subscales on the Resilient Attitudes Scale, suggesting that the Resilient Attitudes Scale, specifically the Initiative and Independence Subscales is a moderately reliable measure in predicting academic resilience within the African American college population. These findings suggest that research participants who were more independent, as opposed to being dependent on others for various resources, (i.e., information, financial, emotional, social, etc.), were more likely to have higher grade point averages. In addition, these findings suggest that participants who showed more initiative in taking control of the academic and other aspects of their lives had higher grade point averages than those who might habitually procrastinate about taking control of all aspects of their lives. It is not surprising that individuals who scored high on the Independence subscale also scored high on the Initiative subscale. Results of the analysis revealed that these two subscales correlated with each other at the $p < .000$ level, which is highly significant. Thus, it would appear, even at a superficial level, that individuals who showed a high level of initiative would also be independent.

An interesting finding is the significant correlation between grade point average and scores on the Morality subscale. Results of the study indicated that individuals who had a high level of morality also had higher grade point averages. These research findings suggest that participants who were less likely to engage in immoral academic behaviors (i.e., cheating), who were easily able to choose right from wrong, and who were involved in community service projects were likely to have higher grade point averages. This makes sense conceptually in that one would expect a more intelligent and academically prepared student to be less likely to engage in dishonest academic behaviors that would jeopardize his or her academic standing. Further, one would expect a highly

motivated and academically prepared student to be more independent and show a high level of initiative. Results of the study indicated that the Morality subscale correlated highly with the Initiative and Independence subscales at the $p < .000$ level.

Of the emotional intelligence constructs, only the Aggression Control subscale on the Emotional Control Scale and the Life Orientation Test had significant correlations with grade point average among individual samples. For example, the Aggression Control subscale had a significant negative correlation with the juniors, which indicates that academically nonresilient research participants had higher levels of aggression control. However, the scale has been criticized for measuring personality traits as opposed to a form of intelligence. This issue is discussed further in the implications section. In addition, a significant correlation was found between grade point average and scores on the Life Orientation Test for seniors, which measures levels of optimism and pessimism. This finding is consistent with a group of research participants' having overcome various obstacles throughout their academic careers and being on the verge of actualizing their goals and dreams. Here, one would expect seniors to have higher levels of optimism based on their ability to survive 3 years of college, which is often a period of adversity, obstacles, and character building. This is consistent with Schutte and Malouff's (1998) finding that seniors had a higher level of optimism as measured by the LOT.

With regard to the remainder of the emotional intelligence variables that did not have significant correlations with the participants' grade point averages, I believe that these variables did not have significant correlations for several reasons. First, grade point average might not be a robust independent variable in detecting emotional intelligence. This is true because in some studies, academically resilient students have been

characterized in several ways. For example, academically resilient students have been defined as those who have overcome overwhelming previous and current social and environmental circumstances to achieve academically. Further, academic resilient students have been classified as those coming from impoverished, stressful backgrounds and having a grade point average of 2.75 or above (Gordon, 1995). Thus, it is reasonable to believe that academic resilience was poorly operationalized in the current study.

Second, several of the related emotional intelligence scales had low reliabilities when they were analyzed for this particular population. For example, the Aggression Control subscale on the Emotional Control Questionnaire reported a reliability of .64, which was significantly lower than what has been reported for other samples. The Benign Control subscale had a reliability of .59, which was significantly lower than what has been reported for other samples. The Life Orientation Test had a reliability of .62, which was significantly lower than what has been reported for other samples. When the Optimism subscale was analyzed separately, its reliability was .45, which suggests it is not a good measure with this population. Subscales of the Resilient Attitudes Scale that did not show significant correlations had low reliabilities ranging from .21 to .61. This information suggests that it is reasonable to assume that these are not reliable measures when used with African American populations. Given the fact that these measures have not been normed on African American populations, this assumption makes sense.

Implications of the Study

The findings from this research offer limited information regarding the reliability, validity, and overall usefulness of emotional intelligence and related constructs when examining affective variables in African American college populations. Other researchers should strive to develop a reliable measure of academic resilience as well as

emotional intelligence, specifically for use with African American populations. This will eradicate problems with poorly operationalizing the construct of academic resilience. Also, it will enhance the field of psychology's understanding regarding the role of affective variables in facilitating academic resilience in African American students. The current scientific literature continues to provide information that has been overexamined without giving any attention to the role of affective variables in facilitating academic resilience in African American students.

With regard to the theoretical models of resilience and emotional intelligence, the findings from this study moderately supported certain aspects of the resiliency models. The findings did not support the emotional intelligence models. However, the findings do give credence to the criticisms directed at the construct, which are discussed in the theoretical models of emotional intelligence section.

Resilience

In general, resilience has been defined as the ability to overcome stress, trauma, and setbacks while successfully adapting and coping. Despite this general definition, operationalizing the concept of resilience has been problematic because the term *resilience* has been given diverse meanings in different studies. For example, in education, resilience has been associated with hardiness, stress resistance, competence, ego strength and invulnerability (Garmezy, 1993). On the contrary, in the social sciences, resilience has been linked to coping, adjustment, adaptation, and stress management.

Resilience has been defined as a cause, a personality trait, an outcome, and a process (Glantz & Johnson, 1999). Initial studies involving resilience examined the construct in individuals as solely a personality trait and focused more on risk factors than

on protective factors. However, more recently, researchers have begun to examine resilience as a process as well as the role of protective factors in influencing positive outcomes (Freitas & Downey, 1998).

Kinard (1998) posited that three general types of resilience can be found in the literature. (a) resilience as competent functioning in the face of chronic life stressors, (b) resilience as recovering from traumatic experiences and (c) resilience as positive results and outcomes despite poverty and exposure to high-risk environments. After examining Kinard's three types of resilience, Glantz and Johnson (1999) suggested that research on resilience should identify the type of resilience being examined. For example, if resilience entails an individual surviving an abusive-dysfunctional family, the resilience should be labeled familial resilience. If resilience entails the ability to achieve academically, despite coming from adverse social and environmental circumstances, the resilience should be labeled academic resilience. It is difficult to get a true measure of resilience due to the various ways the construct has been operationalized. Consequently, the literature on resilience is filled with conceptual and methodological issues that must be addressed.

The current study was not without the conceptual problems identified in the scientific literature due to the fact that academic resilience in this study was operationalized differently than it has been in other studies. This is potentially a methodological flaw that contributed to the insignificant results on several subscales of the Resilient Attitudes Scale. Specifically, the Insight, Independence, Relationship, Creativity, and the General Resilience Subscales yielded insignificant results.

Several resiliency models put forth several personal characteristics that are likely to enhance an individual's resiliency. For example, Flach (1988) identified and

highlighted specific traits that he believed contribute to an individual's resiliency. According to Flach, attitudes are reflective of resilience and are implied in traits such as: (a) a high level of person, (b) A sense of personal responsibility, (c) recognition and development of one's special gifts and talents, (d) open-mindedness and receptivity to new ideas, (e) a strong support network, (f) good interpersonal skills, (g) a strong sense of self, (h) independence of thought and action, (i) a keen sense of humor, (j) a high tolerance of stress, (k) an ability to maintain focus, (l) a wide range of interests, (m) a willingness to dream and set goals, and (n) insight into one's feelings and the feelings of others and the ability to communicate them effectively with others.

Results of this study are consistent with Flach's theory that specific traits facilitate resilience within the individual, as measured by subscales on the Resilient Attitudes Scale. For example, the overall scales indicated that individuals who had higher grade point averages also showed a significant difference from those with lower grade point averages on the Insight and Morality subscales. A high level of personal discipline, sense of responsibility, and a sense of self can be viewed as components of morality.

In addition, when the samples were examined individually, results were consistent with Flach's theory on specific subscales. For example, for males, grade point average negatively correlated with the Independence subscale and for females, grade point average correlated with Independence, Initiative, and Morality subscales. With regard to class, for freshmen, grade point average negatively correlated with the Creativity subscale; for sophomores, grade point average negatively correlated with the Aggression Control and Insight subscales; for juniors, grade point average correlated with the Initiative subscale; and for seniors, grade point average correlated with the Life

Orientation Test, and with the Independence, Creativity, and General Resilience subscales.

Findings on the specified subscales of the Resilient attitudes Scale were consistent with Flach's traits of a high level of personal discipline, a sense of personal responsibility, open-mindedness and receptivity to new ideas, a strong sense of self, independence of thought and action, an ability to maintain focus, a wide range of interests, a willingness to dream and set goals, and insight into one's feelings and the feelings of others and the ability to communicate them effectively with others.

Emotional Intelligence

As stated before, the findings from this study did not support the emotional intelligence models. However, the findings do give credence to the criticisms directed at the construct, which denounce the construct for measuring personality traits rather than a type of intelligence.

Salovey and Mayer first coined the term *emotional intelligence* and postulated that emotional intelligence comprises the following three categories of adaptive abilities: appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotions, and utilization of emotion in problem solving and decision making.

The regulation of emotions in the self refers to the meta-experience of mood, or monitoring, evaluating, and acting to change one's mood. This emotional regulation involves attempts to repair unpleasant moods while maintaining pleasant ones. Regulation of emotion also includes the ability to alter the affective reactions of others (e.g., the ability to calm distressing emotions in other individuals; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). This construct has remained poorly operationalized, although there is some

evidence that it has been assessed using the emotional intelligence model developed by Goleman (1996).

The Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989) is thought to measure this component of emotional intelligence. The instrument consists of four scales reflecting aspects of the control of emotion in difficult or trying circumstances: Aggression Control, Rehearsal, Benign Control, and Emotional Inhibition. Before now, this measure has not been used in relation to an empirical investigation of the emotional intelligence construct.

Another criticism of the emotional intelligence construct is that assessments measuring emotional intelligence have been based on self-report measures. As Mayer and Salovey (in press) pointed out, if emotional intelligence resembles a cognitive ability in the traditional sense, it is important to use tests of emotional intelligence that directly measure this construct. This contention follows from the fact that it is obviously better to have direct, objective assessment techniques rather than individuals' self-descriptions of how emotionally intelligent they are (Salovey & Mayer, in press).

If emotional intelligence is a type of intelligence, then its distinguishability from various personality traits cited in the literature must be demonstrated (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). As Mayer and Salovey (in press) have pointed out, "a trait is a behavioral preference, rather than an ability" (p. 9). As is the case with many measures of emotional intelligence, the typical instruments for assessing personality rely on self-report techniques. If emotional intelligence is to qualify as a form of intelligence, it must be shown to be independent from personality traits. A number of tests measuring aspects of emotional intelligence are known to have moderate to high correlations with personality constructs. Consider, for example, the four subscales derived from the

Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989). Rehearsal, specifically, the dissatisfaction with interpersonal encounters and an inability to resolve interpersonal conflict), has been found to have a significant correlation with Neuroticism.

Similarly, Emotional Inhibition has been found to have a noteworthy negative correlation with extraversion. Furthermore, Benign Control, which is viewed primarily as an index for impulsivity, has been found to correlate with the Psychotocism scale of the Emotional Control Questionnaire (Roger & Najarian, 1989). This finding should come as no surprise given the fact that the Psychotocism scale contains items assessing an individual's tendency to act impulsively.

Although results of this study are not consistent with the emotional intelligence models, they are however, consistent with the criticisms directed at the construct itself. Overall, in this study, examining the results of the study, there were no significant correlations between grade point average and emotional intelligence and related constructs. However, the criticisms of emotional intelligence directly and explicitly point out that the construct is flawed in several ways.

First, there is not a true conceptual model of emotional intelligence that separates it from social and other types of intelligence. Second, all of the emotional intelligence measures are based on self-report items that require participants to endorse personal behavioral preferences. Two problems exist with these types of measures. First, participants' behavioral preferences can change from day to day. Second, participants might have a hard time endorsing items that they perceive to make them bad. Hence, objective assessment techniques would strengthen these measures.

After I carefully reviewed some of the items on the various emotional intelligence scales, it became apparent that it might be difficult to endorse certain items due to

ambiguity and participants' personal preferences from day to day. I raise this point because, in this study, several surveys were discarded because participants endorsed more than one item or noted on the surveys that how they would respond to various items depended on the day, mood, or specific situation. This led me to believe that certain questions on the various instruments were ambiguous and unreliable. For this reason, more objective measures would be appropriate in assessing emotional intelligence.

Despite the results of this study, I still believe that affective variables are important in examining academic resilience in African American students. With a stronger research design that included empirically validated instruments that had been normed on a large African American sample, results of the study would have been different. Researchers who are particularly interested in resilience in African American populations should pay attention to the limitations and recommendations sections, where I attempt to correct methodological flaws and offer suggestions for improving future studies.

Limitations of the Research Study

Internal Validity

This study had several limitations. Since it was not a true experimental study with a truly random sample, a cause-and-effect relationship cannot be inferred. I can only describe relationships that may or may not exist between the independent and dependent variables.

Reliability and Validity of Measures

With regard to the demographic variables, the absence of a direct measure of family economic circumstances such as family income or an index of economic strain

(e.g., debt-to-asset ratio) limited the study. There were several inconsistencies in what the research participants reported regarding their parents' educational status and their reported income. For example, some participants reported that both parents had attained advanced degrees, but reported a household income of $20,000 to $29,999. In contrast, some participants reported that neither parent was not formally educated, but they reported household incomes exceeding $70,000. Although this might be possible in some cases, it was reported too frequently, which lead me to believe that the information might be unreliable.

Also, allowing the students to report whether they had been born and raised in urban, suburban, or rural environments limited the research study. In some cases, participants were either unsure or confused as to the classification of their particular environments. I had to correct several of the surveys due to this problem. For example, several participants from Jackson, Mississippi, classified the city differently; some thought of it as rural, some as suburban, and others as urban. This misclassification is problematic because the literature has indicated that most of the problems with students are those who come from the city and rural areas. Other research participants were probably uncertain of how to classify their environments, which might have influenced the results of the study.

There are two major limitations to my operational definition of academic resilience. First, academic resilience was defined as having a grade point average of 3.0 or better. However, a 2.0 is considered a passing grade and could also denote academic resilience. Second, my definition suggests a fixed trait, although resilience is best or more appropriately understood as a continuum. This implies that an individual who might have been labeled academically nonresilient in this study could adaptively change

over time and become an academically resilient student. Thus, a longitudinal study might more adequately reflect changes over time.

In addition, as previously mentioned, reliability of some of the testing measures did not yield strong alphas, which was a serious limitation of the study. For example, the Aggression Control subscale had a reliability score of .64, the Benign Control subscale had a reliability score of .59, the Life Orientation Test had a reliability score of .62, the Optimism subscale on the Life Orientation Test had a reliability score of .45; and six of the seven subscales of the Resilient Attitudes Scale had poor to moderate reliability scores. These scores are as follows: Insight subscale .36, Independence subscale, .47, Relationship subscale, .56, Initiative subscale, .66, Creativity subscale, .64; Morality subscale, .43, and General Resilience Subscale, .73. These reliability scores speak to the weakness of the measures, particularly with this population. In addition, because the Resilient Attitudes Scale has not been empirically validated and test-retest reliabilities have not been reported for the scale, it is impossible to determine whether the internal reliability scores calculated in the current research study are reliable or problematic with this particular sample.

Another serious limitation of the study has to do with the criteria used in determining the sample. Because I did not use a valid instrument to assess SES, stress experienced by the participant, and type of environment in which the participant had been born and raised, it was impossible to determine the types of experiences the participants had been exposed to as children. Research has indicated that students whose parents have higher levels of education and financial resources have higher grade point averages (Felner et al., 1995). These results were not corroborated based on the operationalization of academic resilience in this study, further indicating that the demographic information

might have been unreliable or unrepresentative of the sample I was trying to identify. However, if academic resilience was defined as achieving a 2.0 or above, 83% of the research participants in this study would have been classified as academically resilient. This would have corroborated the results of the study.

Only 11.6% of the participants reported that their mothers had less than a high school diploma, 24.8% had a high school diploma, and 19.4% attended college without obtaining a degree. This means that 44.2% of the participants had mothers with an associate's degree or higher. In addition, only 13.2% of the participants reported that their fathers had less than a high school diploma, 29.4% had a high school diploma, and 21.7% attended college without obtaining a degree. This means that 31.1% of the participants had fathers with an associate's degree or higher. In addition, 4.6% of the participants did not know their father's educational status. With regard to income, only 25.6% of the participants reported an annual household income of less than $20,000. This means that 74.4% of the participants reported an annual household income ranging from $20,000 to $70,000 and above. Approximately 71% of the participants were born and 76% of the participants grew up in the southern region of the country. In addition, their families were reportedly earning between $20,000 to $70,000 dollars per year, which is a sufficient annual income for that region of the country. This would suggest that the study participants probably did not grow up in harsh environmental circumstances.

I have discussed several reasons why the current study yielded insignificant results (i.e., in accuracy of self-report measures, poor reliability of emotional intelligence scales, and the operationalization of academic resilience). However, I believe the primary reason for the insignificant results is the homogeneity of the sample with regard

to parents' level of education, annual household income, region of the country, and the percentage of students who had grade point averages above 2.0.

The operationalization of academic resilience in this study was based on information in the scientific literature that African American children from urban and rural environments are at a greater risk than Whites for behavioral, emotional, and mental problems. In addition, Kinard's (1998) third type of resilience, in which resilience is seen as positive results and outcomes despite poverty and exposure to high-risk environments, was used to as a framework to operationalize academic resilience.

Because I used this framework to operationalize academic resilience, several methodological flaws and limitations occurred. First, I failed to include empirical measures that would assess chronic life stressors as well as traumatic life experiences. Second, I did not use an empirically validated instrument that would appropriately measure SES. Consequently, I relied too heavily on self-report measures to draw inferences regarding the participants' environmental experiences, as well as the types of developmental, emotional, and financial support they received.

The findings from this study are inconsistent with what I expected to find. For example, the literature stated that rural students have a tendency to perform poorly academically when compared to suburban and urban students. However, in this study, rural students were found to have the highest mean grade point average of 2.83.

Also, the literature stated that low-income or unemployed parents are more likely to be depressed, anxious, hostile, punitive, and addicted, as compared to employed parents with higher incomes. These characteristics have deleterious influence on their parenting skills and the child's development.

Moreover, the literature stated that children who grow up in poverty are likely to experience environmental stressors such as violence, criminal assault, inadequate housing, hunger, separation from family of origin, eviction, inadequate nutrition, poor medical care, and family disruption. As a result, they are rendered economically dependent, which contributes to shame, poor self-esteem, and restricted recreational and academic opportunities.

Because I did not use empirical instruments to assess stress and SES, it was difficult to draw inferences regarding the negative situations the participants had experienced as children. This was a major limitation of the research. The overwhelming majority of students (83%) had grade point averages above 2.0, and only a small percentage of the participants reported that their parents were not well educated and that their annual household income levels were low. Thus, it is reasonable to infer that this group of participants had not experienced high levels of stress, economic deprivation, or any of the problems cited in the literature that one might expect to find in a poor population. As a result, it is my contention that this group of participants were too homogeneous in their income levels and academic ability for significant differences in the variables to be detected. My contention is supported by the fact that in 1999, the Mississippi Board of Education voted to make entrance to all 4-year universities uniform. Prior to this decision, the university where the participants were sampled had an open admissions policy. The open admissions policy allowed any high school graduate to attend the university regardless of high school grade point average, rank, or American College Test score. Currently, students admitted to the university must score a minimum of 18 on the ACT. Select students who score below 18 are admitted on active academic probation and are required to take remedial courses for no credit. In addition, these

students are given two semesters to prove themselves academically. If they are unsuccessful academically after two semesters, they are dismissed from the university. Given this information, it appears that the university is now recruiting and admitting students who are entering the university academically resilient, as evidenced by their academic success in high school and ACT scores.

Generalizability of Results

Because African American students from inner-city, suburban, and rural backgrounds constituted the sample for this study, the findings cannot be generalized to other populations (i.e., students from other ethnic backgrounds or international students). Second, using samples comprising African American students from majority institutions might yield different results. However, the sample from the Historically Black College used in the current study consisted of African American students from a variety of inner-city, suburban, and rural areas, whereas at the local majority institution, there was not a wide variety of students from various inner-city, suburban, and rural areas. Third, the study findings cannot be generalized to African Americans from the northeastern region of the United States because students from that area were not represented in the current sample. Having a sample of African Americans from New York, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Boston, New Jersey, and Baltimore might have yielded different results due to the types of experiences encountered in these various cities. Fifth, because just a few participants were from the western and southwestern regions of the country, the findings of the current study cannot be generalized to African Americans in those regions. Sixth, because the sample included only a small number of males, the findings probably are not generalizable to males. Finally, because a selection criterion was not used, results of this study cannot be generalized to African Americans who are from impoverished and

stressful backgrounds. Moreover, the results cannot be generalized to African Americans who have experienced traumatic events.

Recommendations for Future Research

The recommendations made in this chapter are an attempt to rectify design errors and offer suggestions for future research. Although this study yielded insignificant results on all but two of the scales used for measurement, it is still imperative that research be conducted on the affective development of African American students. This is important because research on the emotional development of African Americans remains virtually nonexistent. The majority of current research on African Americans focuses on pathological processes or does not offer any new information in that various variables continue to be overexamined (i.e., locus of control).

The problem with these studies is that they continue to focus on atypical behavior. However, there is not a great deal of research informing the scientific literature about how numerous African American adolescents learn to manage their emotions with regard to environmental circumstances such as racism and discrimination and resource deficits such as poverty and unemployment to become well-adjusted and successful adults. The following are suggestions of ways to strengthen this type of research.

1. Identify and utilize emotional intelligence scales that have been exclusively normed on college samples that include a significant number of African Americans.

2. Identify and utilize an instrument that specifically measures academic resilience.

3. Utilize a more heterogeneous sample using African Americans from community colleges, majority institutions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and African American students on active academic probation.

4. Restrict the use of self-report measures, specifically, those assessing certain demographic information (i.e., SES relative to parents' income, stress levels, environments, and grades). Also, decide on an appropriate amount of income for selection criteria. In doing so, restrict sample to include subjects whose parents make x amount of dollars.

5. Utilize control samples and samples who have been identified through empirically validated instruments as coming from stressful backgrounds and low SES for comparison purposes.

6. Utilize instruments that are not highly correlated with each other. This will prevent too much measurement of the same construct.

7. Include in the sample, students with a wider range of grade point averages (i.e., 0-1.999-- academically nonresilient to 2.0-4.0-- academically resilient).

8. Shorten surveys and provide better directions to improve participation and sample size. Having a larger sample could provide greater statistical power and thus strengthen the data analysis.

9. Examine various variables, such as (a) sociocultural variables (SES and extended- family involvement), (b) family functioning variables (parental involvement [emotional, social, and financial support] and conflict-resolution skills learned in the home), and (c) environmental variables (single-parent household, drug problems, prostitution problems, and crime rates).

10. Qualitative studies might enrich knowledge regarding academic resilience within the African American population.

11. Use a multiple regression or path analysis to analyze data.

12. Examine grade inflation in higher education.

13. Develop a single instrument extracting the most reliable and valid questions from the various instruments using a large sample to field test the instrument.

To clarify the above-stated suggestions, they are discussed in greater detail in the following paragraphs. The expansive comments follow the order in which the suggestions were listed above.

First, although the Emotional Intelligence Scale had good reliability for this particular sample, because it has not been normed on African American populations, it is difficult to surmise whether the insignificant results were the result of a poor measure, research flaws, or the homogeneity of the sample with regard to parents' income, educational attainment, and grade point average. In addition, because emotional intelligence is a fairly new construct and because it has been labeled as a type of personality trait and coping mechanism, it may be better to use empirically validated coping measures until the Emotional Intelligence Scale has been normed on larger and more diverse samples.

Second, because academic resilience has been operationalized differently in various studies, it is difficult for researchers to agree on what academic resilience entails. Furthermore, researchers are continuing to operationalize academic resilience differently, so the results from these studies cannot be generalized or compared to various populations. Although this type of research is beneficial to selected samples, it is not benefiting larger groups of at-risk adolescents as a whole because results that are for one sample might be insignificant for another. Hence, it is crucial that an empirically validated measure of academic resilience be developed in order to combat the current problem regarding the resilience literature and also to provide more efficient and appropriate interventions to at-risk populations.

Third, because the study included only African Americans from an inner-city public Historically Black College, representing small segments of various regions, the results of this study are not generalizable. For example, because northeastern African Americans were not represented in this study, essential data were missing from participants who grew up in major urban areas with significant at-risk residents, like New York, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Boston, New Jersey, and Baltimore. These cities offer environmental experiences that might have provided variation in the current study.

In addition to using participants from Historically Black Colleges and Universities, using African Americans from majority institutions also might offer variation to these types of studies as well. This might add variation because typically, but certainly not always, African Americans who are accepted into majority institutions are from higher SES families, have higher high school grade point averages, and have higher entrance exam scores (U.S. Department of Education, 2002a). Equally important, many majority institutions have enrollments of African American students that are similar to those of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Also, including African American participants from community colleges could provide variation in the sample because these students might have enrolled in a community college because they did not have high enough grade point averages, or high entrance-exam scores, or could not afford to attend a 4-year college or university.

Although the sample for this study was a diversified sample, numbers of participants from the Southeast, Southwest, Midwest, and West were relatively small. In addition, participants from the northeastern region of the country were not represented, which limited variation in the sample. Moreover, because the overwhelming majority of

participants in this study were from the South, obtaining more regional diversity would strengthen future studies on academic resilience.

Fourth, because some students have a tendency not to follow and/or understand directions, it is imperative to restrict certain types of demographic information, such as grades, parents' income, stress levels, and traumatic experiences in the environment, sought through self-report measures. Although grades were obtained from the registrar's office, the present study was probably weakened because important demographic information such as parents' income and environmental information was obtained through self-report measures. Whether students were embarrassed, uncertain, or confused regarding their parent's income and environmental information, inconsistencies occurred as a result of these self-report measures.

For example, with regard to parents' income, some participants who reported that neither of their parents had graduated from high school also claimed that their annual household income was $70,000 or higher. In contrast, some participants who reported that both parents had advanced degrees also said that their annual household income was between $20,000 to $29,999 dollars. Although such a discrepancy between education and income might be possible, it seems unlikely given the types of employment opportunities available in the southern region of the United States for individuals with limited education as well as high levels of education. Future studies should decide on an appropriate amount of income as a selection criteria and restrict sample to include subjects whose parents earn X number of dollars.

Several inconsistencies also were apparent with regard to the type of environment in which participants had been born and raised in, several inconsistencies also occurred. For example, some participants who were from Jackson, Mississippi, labeled it variously

as urban, suburban, and rural. Given the definition provided in the current study, Jackson, Mississippi should have been labeled an urban environment. There is no way to determine whether such discrepancies were pervasive throughout the study. To strengthen future studies, researchers should obtain this type of information from the registrar's office.

Fifth, this study was weakened because of its reliance on self-report measures to assess poverty and exposure to high-risk environmental areas. Future researchers examining academic resilience might attempt to identify African Americans who are from privileged backgrounds who have not experienced high stress levels or traumatic events, as well as those who are from underprivileged backgrounds who have experienced high levels of stress and traumatic events, and compare the two groups on emotion-focused and coping types of variables. One of the limitations of this study was that the participants were too homogeneous relative to their parents' income levels and their academic attainment. Only 13 (17%) of the 129 research participants in this study had grade point averages below 2.0, which means that 83% of them had at least a C average in college. Future research studies can avoid this problem by utilizing control samples.

Sixth, one of the problems with this study was that the instruments used were measuring too much of the same construct. For example, the Emotional Control Questionnaire has four subscales. Emotional control is related to emotional intelligence in that they both involve assessing the expression and regulation of emotion. The Barratt Impulsiveness Scale is related to emotional intelligence in that they both assess an individual's ability to control impulses. Moreover, the Life Orientation Test is related to emotional intelligence in that like, the Emotional Control Questionnaire, they both assess

an individual's ability to regulate emotions. Finally, the Resilient Attitudes Scale is related to emotional intelligence in that its subscales, particularly, the General Resilience subscale, assess individuals' insight into their feelings. One problem with the scales' being highly correlated and measuring too much of the same construct is that with the exception of the EIS and the BIS, the scales and subscales have moderate to low reliabilities.

Initially these particular instruments were used for several reasons. First, these instruments had good reliabilities in the norming samples, which gave me reason to be optimistic about using them in this study. Second, because the emotional intelligence instruments have not been normed on African American samples, I wanted to determine whether they were solid measures for use with African American samples. Because the current research study yielded insignificant results on the emotional intelligence scales, future researchers should identify and use affective variables that have been normed on African American samples.

Seventh, as previously stated, operationalizing academic resilience has been problematic throughout the scientific literature. Two major problems exist in operationalizing academic resilience. First, no universal criterion exists for defining academic resilience. For example, Gordon (1995) defined academic resilience as achieving a grade point average of 2.75 despite coming from an impoverished and stressful background. In contrast, Ford et al., (1996) defined academic resilience as achieving a grade point average of 3.0 or above despite coming from a stressful inner-city background. Finally, in this study, academic resilience was defined as the ability to thrive and achieve above average academic performance (3.0 or greater GPA) despite economic, sociocultural, and/or environmental challenges. These operationalizations are

problematic because one study might have poverty as the sole criterion, another might have stress as the sole criterion, and still another might have both or altogether different criteria.

A second problem involving criteria has to do with the cutoff scores for grade point averages. For example, as stated above, one study might use 2.75 as a cutoff, whereas others might use 3.0 as a cutoff. Future researchers examining academic resilience should consider lowering the cutoff to 2.0 because it is a passing grade. Future researchers should also consider assessing traumatic events that participants experienced within the last year and using academic probation as a selection criterion. Using academic probation may prove useful in assessing a student's ability to overcome academic obstacles and adversity. Further investigating what constitutes a more appropriate grade point average indicating an African American student's ability to exhibit resiliency and overcome barriers can only prove useful to the scientific literature.

Eighth, because the directions in the current study might have been confusing, it is important for future researchers to simplify directions and shorten surveys in order to alleviate problems for participants. Also, the surveys might have been too long for some participants; a significant number of them appeared to give up, whereas others seem to have marked the same answer for every question. Consequently, several participants were eliminated which weakened the study. Future researchers, examining academic resilience should simplify directions and shorten surveys to improve subject participation.

Ninth, in addition to examining SES, stress, and social support, assessing environmental variables such as parents' marital status, drug problems and violence within the community, and crime rates, could provide demographic information about stress and traumatic events experienced by the participants. Also, future researchers

should identify and utilize instruments that assess an individual's emotion coping responses to stress, obstacles, and other negative experiences encountered in one's environment.

Tenth, because the majority of studies involving resilience have been quantitative, case studies involving African Americans who have overcome insurmountable odds might enrich the resiliency literature. Their discussions and descriptions of the types of hardships encountered as well as how they overcame these hardships to become resilient individuals can only enhance the knowledge base.

Eleventh, using a multiple regression or path analysis to analyze the data might offer more insight into which variables contributed to more of the variance.

Twelfth, because grade inflation is a contemporary problem in higher education, it should be examined to ascertain whether grade point average is a solid reflection of true resiliency.

Finally, as previously stated, because the combined instruments comprised over 200 questions, developing a single instrument extracting only the most reliable and valid questions from the various instruments would be more appropriate. This instrument should be field tested on a large sample of African Americans to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument.

Although the current study raised more questions than were answered as a result of insignificant results on all but two of the subscales, it is the researcher's intent to offer recommendations that will improve this type of research. Because of the current social problems and conditions encountered by young African Americans, particularly, in the academic arena, it is imperative that this type of research continues.

Because the resilience literature lacks information regarding factors that contribute to academic resilience in African American adolescents, it is important for researchers interested in academic resilience in this population to take chances in exploring variables that have been neglected or overlooked. I hope that the limitations that have been highlighted in this study will serve as motivation for other researchers to develop studies that will improve the literature on academic resilience. Ultimately, I hope that future researchers examining academic resilience will identify variables that will facilitate the emotional, social, and cognitive development of African American children, adolescents, and young adults.

Additional Research Questions

Would the use of different or additional independent variables strengthen the study?

What design improvements would advance the study?

What new distinctions or criteria should be formulated for identifying at-risk populations?

How should academic resilience be operationalized?

Would a different dependent variable improve the current research study?

Would more male representation strengthen future studies?

Would students in junior college or on academic probation provide more variation?

Would longitudinal studies enhance academic resilience studies?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

**** IMPORTANT INFORMATION ****

Many African American adolescents and young adults experience adversity due to environmental stressors. Researchers have examined various factors that facilitate people's resilience even though they come from adverse environments. I will examine and analyze the salient factors that facilitate resilience among African American undergraduate students. The primary factor that I will examine is emotional intelligence. Your participation in this study is needed to help answer some of these difficult questions. It is my belief that answering these questions will not cause emotional distress. However, you may skip questions if you experience discomfort or seek assistance at the Jackson State University Counseling Center. Participants of the research project will have a chance of being randomly selected from a pool of participants to receive a cash payment of $50 as an inducement to participate in this research project. For drawing purposes, your name will be detached from the informed consent form and used in the drawing. Finally, Jackson State University professors are not linked to this study in any way. Therefore, you are not expected or required to participate in the research project, and if you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any manner. Additionally, I am requesting your permission to obtain your GPA from the registrar's office. This information is only needed to link your GPA to your responses. My research advisor and I will be the only people who have access to this information. This information will be locked in a briefcase and destroyed immediately after the GPAs have been linked to responses. Your participation is **completely voluntary.** You will be provided with an additional copy of the informed consent form for your records.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1. You have been informed that you must be 18 to participate in the study.

2. You have been informed that your responses are confidential.

3. You have been informed that the investigator is seeking permission to obtain your GPA from the registrar's office and identifying information is **only** needed for that purpose. Once the information is obtained and linked to your responses it will be **destroyed immediately.**

4. You have been informed that risks are minimal in this study.

5. You have been informed that you can withdraw your participation at any time without any consequences.

6. You have been informed that the survey packet will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

7. You have been informed that you have a chance of being randomly selected from a pool of participants to receive a cash payment of $50 dollars as an inducement for participating in this study.

8. Any questions or concerns regarding this research project should be directed to Dr. Gloria Smith or Morris Lewis at 517-355-8508. Additionally, if you would like the results of the study please email me @ or contact me at the number mentioned in this section.

9. If you have any questions regarding your role and rights as a subject of research, at Jackson State University, contact Dr. Felix A. Okojie, Vice President of Research Development Support and Federal Relations at 601-979-2931. At Michigan State University, contact Dr. Ashir Kumar, University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects at 517-355-2180.

10. You have been informed that your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

11. The purpose of this study has been explained to you, and you have had ample time to ask any questions regarding your involvement.

12. You have been informed that you will be provided a copy of the information and informed consent form to take home for you records.

13. You freely consent to participate in this study.

Name (Participant)	Signature	Phone # & Date
Name (Researcher)	Signature	Date

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

Name: _____

Student #: _____

GPA _____ **(Please leave blank)**

1. Please indicate the city and state of your birthplace _____

2. Where have you lived for the last 5-10 years if different from your birthplace? Indicate the city and state _____

3. Please indicate the type of environment you grew up in ___ Rural
___ Suburban
___ Urban

Rural--characteristic of the country
Suburban--residential district on the outskirts of a large town or city
Urban--residential district located directly within a large city

4. Age: _____

5. Gender: _____Male
_____Female

6. Ethnicity:_____African American
_____ Latino/a / Chicano/a
_____ White
_____ American Indian
_____ Asian American
_____ Pacific Islander

7. Class: _____ Freshman (College) At Least 2nd Semester
_____ Sophomore (College)
_____ Junior (College)
_____ Senior (College)

8. What is your mother's level of education?

____Did not graduate from high school
____GED
____High school graduate
____Some college no degree
____2-yr college degree
____Bachelor's degree
____Master's degree
____Juris Doctorate (Law Degree)
____Ph.D.
____M.D., D.O. (Medical Doctor)
____Other (Please specify _____)

9. What is your father's level of education?

____Did not graduate from high school
____GED
____High school graduate
____Some college no degree
____2-yr college degree
____Bachelor's degree
____Master's degree
____Juris Doctorate (Law Degree)
____Ph.D.
____M.D., D.O. (Medical Doctor)
____Other (Please specify _____)

10. Household's combined annual income (yearly salary). Use only the parent you live with unless parents are still married or stepparent is present.

____0-9,999.
____10,000-19,999
____20,000-29,999
____30,000-39,999
____40,000-49,999
____50,000-59,999
____60,000-69,999
____70,000-above

APPENDIX C

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE (EIS)

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE DECIDE WHETHER A STATEMENT IS GENERALLY TRUE FOR YOU. USE THE 5-POINT SCALE TO RESPOND TO THE STATEMENT.

1= STRONGLY DISAGREE
2= SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
3= NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
4= SOMEWHAT AGREE
5= STRONGLY AGREE

1. I KNOW WHEN TO SPEAK ABOUT MY PERSONAL PROBLEMS TO OTHERS. _____
2. WHEN I AM FACED WITH OBSTACLES, I REMEMBER TIMES I FACED SIMILAR OBSTACLES AND OVERCAME THEM. _____
3. I EXPECT THAT I WILL DO WELL ON MOST THINGS I TRY. _____
4. OTHER PEOPLE FIND IT EASY TO CONFIDE IN ME. _____
5. I FIND IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND NONVERBAL MESSAGES OF OTHER PEOPLE. _____
6. SOME OF THE MAJOR EVENTS OF MY LIFE HAVE LED ME TO RE-EVALUATE WHAT IS IMPORTANT AND NOT IMPORTANT. _____
7. WHEN MY MOOD CHANGES, I SEE NEW POSSIBILITIES. _____
8. EMOTIONS ARE ONE OF THE THINGS THAT MAKE MY LIFE WORTH LIVING. _____
9. I AM AWARE OF MY EMOTIONS AS I EXPERIENCE THEM. _____
10. I EXPECT GOOD THINGS TO HAPPEN. _____
11. I LIKE TO SHARE MY EMOTIONS WITH OTHERS. _____
12. WHEN I EXPERIENCE A POSITIVE EMOTION, I KNOW HOW TO MAKE IT LAST. _____
13. I ARRANGE EVENTS OTHERS ENJOY. _____
14. I SEEK OUT ACTIVITIES THAT MAKE ME HAPPY. _____
15. I AM AWARE OF THE NONVERBAL MESSAGES I SEND TO OTHERS. _____

16. I PRESENT MYSELF IN A WAY THAT MAKES GOOD IMPRESSIONS ON OTHERS. _____

17. WHEN I AM IN A POSITIVE MOOD, SOLVING PROBLEMS IS EASY FOR ME. _____

18. BY LOOKING AT THEIR FACIAL EXPRESSIONS, I RECOGNIZE THE EMOTIONS PEOPLE ARE EXPERIENCING. _____

19. I KNOW WHY MY EMOTIONS CHANGE. _____

20. WHEN I AM IN A POSITIVE MOOD, I AM ABLE TO COME UP WITH NEW IDEAS. _____

21. I HAVE CONTROL OVER MY EMOTIONS. _____

22. I EASILY RECOGNIZE MY EMOTIONS AS I EXPERIENCE THEM. _____

23. I MOTIVATE MYSELF BY IMAGINING A GOOD OUTCOME TO TASKS I TAKE ON. _____

24. I COMPLIMENT OTHERS WHEN THEY HAVE DONE SOMETHING WELL. _____

25. I AM AWARE OF THE NONVERBAL MESSAGES OTHER PEOPLE SEND. _____

26. WHEN ANOTHER PERSON TELLS ME ABOUT AN IMPORTANT EVENT IN HIS OR HER LIFE, I ALMOST FEEL AS THOUGH I HAVE EXPERIENCED THIS EVENT MYSELF. _____

27. WHEN I FEEL A CHANGE IN MY EMOTIONS, I TEND TO COME UP WITH NEW IDEAS. _____

28. WHEN I AM FACED WITH A NEW CHALLENGE, I GIVE UP BECAUSE I BELIEVE I WILL FAIL. _____

29. I KNOW WHAT OTHER PEOPLE ARE FEELING JUST BY LOOKING AT THEM. _____

30. I HELP OTHER PEOPLE FEEL BETTER WHEN THEY ARE DOWN. _____

31. I USE GOOD MOODS TO HELP MYSELF KEEP TRYING IN THE FACE OF OBSTACLES. _____

32. I CAN TELL HOW PEOPLE ARE FEELING BY LISTENING TO THE TONE OF THEIR VOICE.

33. IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO UNDERSTAND WHY PEOPLE FEEL THE WAY THEY DO. _____

APPENDIX D

BARRATT IMPULSIVENESS SCALE (BIS)

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE DECIDE WHETHER A STATEMENT IS GENERALLY TRUE FOR YOU. USE THE 4-POINT SCALE TO RESPOND TO THE STATEMENT.

1= RARELY/NEVER
2= OCCASIONALLY
3= OFTEN
4= ALMOST ALWAYS/ALWAYS

1. I PLAN TASKS CAREFULLY. _____
2. I DO THINGS WITHOUT THINKING. _____
3. I MAKE UP MY MIND QUICKLY. _____
4. I AM HAPPY-GO-LUCKY. _____
5. I DO NOT "PAY ATTENTION." _____
6. I HAVE "RACING" THOUGHTS. _____
7. I PLAN TRIPS WELL AHEAD OF TIME. _____
8. I AM SELF-CONTROLLED. _____
9. I CONCENTRATE EASILY. _____
10. I SAVE REGULARLY. _____
11. I "SQUIRM" AT PLAYS OR LECTURES. _____
12. I AM A CAREFUL THINKER. _____
13. I PLAN FOR JOB SECURITY. _____
14. I SAY THINGS WITHOUT THINKING. _____
15. I LIKE TO THINK ABOUT COMPLEX PROBLEMS. _____
16. I CHANGE JOBS. _____
17. I ACT "ON IMPULSE." _____
18. I GET EASILY BORED WHEN SOLVING THOUGHT PROBLEMS. _____

19. I ACT ON THE SPUR OF THE MOMENT. _____

20. I AM A STEADY THINKER. _____

21. I CHANGE RESIDENCES. _____

22. I BUY THINGS ON IMPULSE. _____

23. I CAN ONLY THINK ABOUT ONE PROBLEM AT A TIME. _____

24. I CHANGE HOBBIES. _____

25. I SPEND OR CHARGE MORE THAN I EARN. _____

26. I OFTEN HAVE EXTRANEOUS THOUGHTS WHEN THINKING. _____

27. I AM MORE INTERESTED IN THE PRESENT THAN THE FUTURE. _____

28. I AM RESTLESS AT THE THEATER OR LECTURES. _____

29. I LIKE PUZZLES. _____

30. I AM FUTURE ORIENTED. _____

APPENDIX E

LIFE ORIENTATION TEST (LOT)

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE DECIDE WHETHER A STATEMENT IS GENERALLY TRUE FOR YOU. USE THE 5-POINT SCALE TO RESPOND TO THE STATEMENT.

0= STRONGLY DISAGREE
1= DISAGREE
2= NEUTRAL
3= AGREE
4= STRONGLY AGREE

1. IN UNCERTAIN TIMES, I USUALLY EXPECT THE BEST. _____
2. IT'S EASY FOR ME TO RELAX. _____
3. IF SOMETHING CAN GO WRONG FOR ME IT WILL. _____
4. I ALWAYS LOOK ON THE BRIGHT SIDE OF THINGS. _____
5. I'M ALWAYS OPTIMISTIC ABOUT MY FUTURE. _____
6. I ENJOY MY FRIENDS A LOT. _____
7. IT'S IMPORTANT FOR ME TO KEEP BUSY. _____
8. I HARDLY EVER EXPECT THINGS TO GO MY WAY. _____
9. THINGS NEVER WORK OUT THE WAY I WANT THEM TO. _____
10. I DON'T GET UPSET TOO EASILY. _____
11. I'M A BELIEVER IN THE IDEA THAT "EVERY CLOUD HAS A SILVER LINING." _____
12. I RARELY COUNT ON GOOD THINGS HAPPENING TO ME. _____

APPENDIX F

EMOTIONAL CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE (ECQ)

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE DECIDE WHETHER A STATEMENT IS GENERALLY TRUE OR FALSE FOR YOU. IF YOU THINK THAT AN ITEM IS NEITHER TRUE NOR FALSE, PLEASE CHOOSE THE ALTERNATIVE THAT IS MOST LIKE YOU. PLEASE USE A 1 FOR TRUE STATEMENTS AND A 2 FOR FALSE STATEMENTS.

1= TRUE
2= FALSE

1. WHEN SOMEONE UPSETS ME, I TRY TO HIDE MY FEELINGS. _____
2. IF SOMEONE PUSHED ME, I WOULD PUSH BACK. _____
3. I REMEMBER THINGS THAT UPSET ME OR MAKE ME ANGRY FOR A LONG TIME AFTERWARDS. _____
4. I SELDOM FEEL IRRITABLE. _____
5. I OFTEN TAKE CHANCES CROSSING THE ROAD. _____
6. PEOPLE FIND IT DIFFICULT TO TELL WHETHER I'M EXCITED ABOUT SOMETHING OR NOT. _____
7. I OFTEN DO OR SAY THINGS I LATER REGRET. _____
8. I FIND IT DIFFICULT TO COMFORT PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN UPSET. _____
9. I GENERALLY DON'T BEAR A GRUDGE. WHEN SOMETHING IS OVER, IT'S OVER, AND I DON'T THINK ABOUT IT AGAIN. _____
10. NO ONE GETS OVER ON ME, I DON'T TAKE THINGS LYING DOWN. _____
11. WHEN SOMETHING UPSETS ME, I PREFER TO TALK TO SOMEONE ABOUT IT THAN TO BOTTLE UP. _____
12. I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN MANY FIGHTS AND ARGUMENTS. _____
13. I GET "WORKED UP" JUST THINKING ABOUT THINGS THAT HAVE UPSET ME IN THE PAST. _____
14. I'M NOT EASILY DISTRACTED. _____
15. IF I'M BADLY SERVED IN A SHOP OR RESTAURANT, I DON'T USUALLY MAKE A FUSS. _____

16. IF I RECEIVE BAD NEWS IN FRONT OF OTHERS, I USUALLY TRY TO HIDE HOW I FEEL. _____

17. I FREQUENTLY CHANGE MY MIND ABOUT THINGS. _____

18. IF A PASSING CAR SPLASHES ME, I SHOUT AT THE DRIVER. _____

19. IF SOMEONE WERE TO HIT ME, I WOULD HIT BACK. _____

20. I SELDOM SHOW HOW I FEEL ABOUT THINGS. _____

21. I OFTEN SAY THINGS WITHOUT THINKING WHETHER I MIGHT UPSET OTHERS. _____

22. I OFTEN FIND MYSELF THINKING OVER AND OVER ABOUT THINGS THAT HAVE MADE ME ANGRY. _____

23. IF I'M PLEASANTLY SURPRISED, I SHOW IMMEDIATELY HOW PLEASED I AM. _____

24. I TEND TO SNAP AT PEOPLE. _____

25. IF I GET ANGRY OR UPSET I USUALLY SHOW HOW I FEEL. _____

26. IF SOMEONE SAYS SOMETHING STUPID, I TELL THEM SO. _____

27. IF I SEE SOMEONE PUSHING INTO A CROWD AHEAD OF ME, I USUALLY JUST IGNORE IT. _____

28. I CAN USUALLY SETTLE THINGS QUICKLY AND BE FRIENDLY AGAIN AFTER THE ARGUMENT. _____

29. MY INTERESTS TEND TO CHANGE QUICKLY. _____

30. I DON'T FEEL EMBARRASSED ABOUT EXPRESSING MY FEELINGS. _____

31. IF I SEE OR HEAR ABOUT AN ACCIDENT, I FIND MYSELF THINKING ABOUT SOMETHING SIMILAR HAPPENING TO ME OR PEOPLE CLOSE TO ME. _____

32. I THINK ABOUT WAYS OF GETTING BACK AT PEOPLE WHO HAVE MADE ME ANGRY LONG AFTER THE EVENT HAS HAPPENED. _____

33. I'D RATHER CONCEDE AN ISSUE THAN GET INTO AN ARGUMENT. _____

34. I NEVER FORGET PEOPLE MAKING ME ANGRY OR UPSET, EVEN ABOUT SMALL THINGS. _____

35. I SELDOM "PUT MY FOOT IN MY MOUTH." _____

36. I LOSE MY TEMPER QUICKLY. _____

37. I THINK PEOPLE SHOW THEIR FEELINGS TOO EASILY. _____

38. I FIND IT HARD TO GET THOUGHTS ABOUT THINGS THAT HAVE UPSET ME OUT OF MY MIND. _____

39. ALMOST EVERYTHING I DO IS CAREFULLY THOUGHT OUT. _____

40. I DON'T THINK I COULD EVER "TURN THE OTHER CHEEK." _____

41. I OFTEN DAYDREAM ABOUT SITUATIONS WHERE I'M GETTING BACK AT PEOPLE. _____

42. I FIND LONG JOURNEYS BORING—ALL I WANT IS TO GET THERE QUICKLY. _____

43. EXPRESSING MY FEELINGS MAKES ME FEEL VERY VULNERABLE AND ANXIOUS. _____

44. IF A FRIEND BORROWS SOMETHING AND RETURNS IT DIRTY OR DAMAGED, I USUALLY JUST KEEP QUIET ABOUT IT. _____

45. I CAN'T STAND TO WAIT FOR ANYTHING. _____

46. IF I SEE SOMETHING THAT FRIGHTENS OR UPSETS ME, THE IMAGE OF IT STAYS IN MY MIND FOR A LONG TIME AFTERWARDS. _____

47. I HATE BEING STUCK BEHIND A SLOW DRIVER. _____

48. IF SOMEONE INSULTS ME, I TRY TO REMAIN AS CALM AS POSSIBLE. _____

49. THINKING ABOUT UPSETTING THINGS JUST SEEMS TO KEEP THEM GOING, SO I TRY TO PUT THEM OUT OF MY MIND. _____

50. I USUALLY MANAGE TO REMAIN OUTWARDLY CALM, EVEN THOUGH I MAY BE CHURNED UP INSIDE. _____

51. IF I LOSE OUT ON SOMETHING, I GET OVER IT QUICKLY. _____

52. I CAN'T HELP SHOWING HOW I FEEL, EVEN WHEN IT ISN'T APPROPRIATE TO DO SO. _____

53. IF I HAVE TO CONFRONT SOMEONE, I TRY NOT TO THINK TOO MUCH ABOUT IT BEFOREHAND. _____

54. I LIKE PLANNING AHEAD RATHER THAN JUST SEEING HOW THINGS TURN OUT. _____

55. I SOMETIMES JUST COME OUT WITH THINGS THAT EMBARRASS PEOPLE I'M WITH. _____

56. SOMETIMES I JUST CAN'T CONTROL MY FEELINGS. _____

APPENDIX G

RESILIENT ATTITUDES SCALE (RAS)

Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5

1. I usually can't predict what other people will do. _____
2. I avoid accepting responsibility for other people's problems. _____
3. When others think badly of me, there's probably a good reason for it. _____
4. I try to notice signals from other people that will spell trouble. _____
5. It doesn't do any good try and figure out why things happen. _____
6. Often I find myself taking responsibility for other people's problems. _____
7. I am willing to ask myself tough questions and answer them honestly. _____
8. I have had a hard time telling what someone new is like until I get to know the person well. ____
9. I can fix hurts from my past that could keep me from letting people get close to me. _____
10. I try to figure out why people act the way they do. _____
11. I will often stay with someone, even though I know that person is bad for me. _____
12. I am able to step back from troubled family members and see myself as OK. _____
13. If you care about someone, you should try to do what the person wants, even if it seems unreasonable. _____
14. I can't help acting like a child around my parents. _____
15. I am able to recognize when I'm in a bad relationship and end it. _____
16. I can stay calm around troubled people because I understand why they act the way they do. _____
17. I realize that I can't change other people; they have to change themselves.
18. It's hard for me to stay calm when someone I care about is being unreasonable. _____
19. If I love someone, I can put up with that person hurting me. _____
20. I often find myself around people who aren't well adjusted. _____
21. There are few people that I can really count on. _____

22. I am good at sizing up people. _____

23. I try to figure out why a relationship was not healthy and avoid repeating it. _____

24. I am good at starting relationships with other people. _____

25. I can't do anything about whether people like me or not. _____

26. It's hard for me to believe that I'll ever find a good relationship. _____

27. I'm shy around people I know. _____

28. I can't really tell if a relationship is going to be good until I try it. _____

29. I am good at keeping relationships going. _____

30. I am able to love others and be loved by them. _____

31. It's beyond me how most things work. _____

32. I often talk myself through a problem. _____

33. I can learn from the past and use that information to make the future better. _____

34. I have hobbies or other activities that I take seriously. _____

35. I often get really frustrated when dealing with problems and can't figure out what to do. _____

36. I am successful in taking care of my physical and emotional needs. _____

37. I don't like to try to find out how things work. _____

38. There are few things that I am good at doing. _____

39. I do enough to get by, but not much more. _____

40. I enjoy getting involved in constructive activities. _____

41. Sometimes I forget my problems when I'm pursuing creative activities. _____

42. I don't think that I'm creative. _____

43. I'm good at finding new ways to look at things. _____

44. One way to express my feelings is through my artwork, dance, music, or writing. _____

45. The positive feelings I get from creating help make up for the pain of my past. _____

46. Using my imagination doesn't help to solve problems. _____

47. It's hard for me to see the humor in a bad situation. _____

48. One has to take life very seriously to get by. _____

49. I am good at using humor to reduce tension between others and myself. _____

50. Most problems have only one solution. _____

51. I find it easy to choose between right and wrong. ____

52. It's a dog eat dog world where one has to do what it takes to get by. _____

53. I can't help repeating the mistakes that my parents made. _____

54. I like to help other people. _____

55. There's no way I could make a difference in people's lives. _____

56. I don't always do what I know is right. _____

57. I stand up to people when I see them being dishonest, petty, or cruel. _____

58. I am willing to take risks for the sake of doing what I think is right. _____

59. Sometimes I feel like I'm just drifting along with no purpose in life. _____

60. I almost always stand up for underdogs. _____

61. I like to help others even if they are not willing to help themselves. _____

62. I am involved in things that will make people's lives better. _____

63. No matter what happens, if I keep trying I'll get through it. _____

64. There are things that I can do to make my life better. _____

65. Sometimes it's hard, but I don't let things get me down. _____

66. Even if bad things happen, I can deal with them. _____

67. It's not the hand you are dealt, but how you play it. _____

68. No matter how hard I try, I can't make things right. _____

69. I am willing to go with any approach that will work. _____

70. I'm good at making the most of a bad situation. _____

71. When life gives me lemons, I make lemonade. _____

72. Failure is something you learn from rather than feel guilty about. _____

APENDIX H

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

BIRTHPLACE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Southeast	5	3.9	3.9	3.9
	Midwest	24	18.6	18.6	22.5
	West	5	3.9	3.9	26.4
	South	92	71.3	71.3	97.7
	Southwest	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

CURRENT RESIDENCE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Southeast	8	6.2	6.2	6.2
	Midwest	16	12.4	12.4	18.6
	West	3	2.3	2.3	20.9
	South	98	76.0	76.0	96.9
	Southwest	4	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

ENVIRONMENT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	36	27.9	27.9	27.9
	Suburban	25	19.4	19.4	47.3
	Urban	68	52.7	52.7	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

AGE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	18	15	11.6	11.6
	19	26	20.2	20.2
	20	27	20.9	20.9
	21	13	10.1	10.1
	22	20	15.6	15.6
	23	7	5.4	5.4
	24	5	3.8	3.8
	25	3	2.3	2.3
	26	1	.8	.8
	27	2	1.5	1.5
	28	1	.8	.8
	30	2	1.5	1.5
	31	1	.8	.8
	32	1	.8	.8
	34	2	1.5	1.5
	35	1	.8	.8
	38	1	.8	.8
	39	1	.8	.8
	Total	129	100.0	100.0

GENDER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	36	27.9	27.9	27.9
	Female	93	72.1	72.1	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

ETHNICITY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African American	129	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

CLASS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Freshman	35	27.1	27.1	27.1
	Sophomore	40	31.1	31.1	58.2
	Junior	27	20.9	20.9	79.1
	Senior	27	20.9	20.9	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

MOTHER'S EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Graduate From High School	10	7.7	7.7	7.7
	GED	5	3.9	3.9	11.6
	High School Graduate	32	24.8	24.8	36.4
	Some College No Degree	25	19.4	19.4	56.8
	2-Yr College Degree	20	15.5	15.5	72.3
	Bachelor's Degree	20	15.5	15.5	87.8
	Master's Degree	16	12.4	12.4	99.2
	PH.D.	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Graduate From High School	16	12.4	12.4	12.4
	GED	1	.8	.8	13.2
	High School Graduate	38	29.4	29.4	42.6
	Some College No Degree	28	21.7	21.7	64.3
	2-Yr College Degree	16	12.4	12.4	76.7
	Bachelor's Degree	14	10.9	10.9	87.6
	Master's Degree	9	7.0	7.0	94.6
	M.D., D.O.	1	.8	.8	95.4
	Other	6	4.6	4.6	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

ANNUAL INCOME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-9,999	12	9.3	9.3	9.3
	10,000-19,999	21	16.3	16.3	25.6
	20,000-29,999	20	15.5	15.5	41.1
	30,000-39,999	25	19.4	19.4	60.5
	40,000-49,999	19	14.7	14.7	75.2
	50,000-59,999	8	6.2	6.2	81.4
	60,000-69,999	10	7.8	7.8	89.2
	70,000-above	14	10.8	10.8	100.0
	Total	129	100.0	100.0	

FREQUENCY OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES AMONG RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

		Frequency			
Valid	1.24	1			
	1.32	1			
	1.43	1			
	1.50	1			
	1.53	1			
	1.54	1			
	1.74	1			
	1.78	1			
	1.80	1			
	1.84	1			
	1.88	1			
	1.92	1			
	1.97	1	# Below 2.0	13	17%
	2.00	**1**	**# Above 2.0**	**116**	**83%**
	2.07	**1**			
	2.07	**1**			
	2.08	**1**			
	2.08	**1**			
	2.11	**1**			
	2.14	**2**			
	2.15	**1**			
	2.16	**1**			
	2.16	**1**			
	2.17	**1**			
	2.20	**2**			
	2.21	**1**			
	2.25	**1**			
	2.25	**1**			
	2.25	**2**			
	2.26	**1**			
	2.27	**1**			
	2.29	**1**			
	2.29	**1**			
	2.30	**1**			
	2.31	**2**			
	2.33	**1**			
	2.33	**1**			
	2.33	**2**			
	2.35	**1**			
	2.36	**1**			
	2.37	**1**			
	2.40	**1**			
	2.42	**1**			

	2.43	2			
	2.46	1			
	2.46	1			
	2.50	1			
	2.53	1			
	2.54	1			
	2.55	1			
	2.57	1			
	2.58	1			
	2.58	1			
	2.60	2			
	2.65	1			
	2.66	1			
	2.68	1			
	2.69	1			
	2.74	1			
	2.76	1			
	2.76	1			
	2.77	1			
	2.77	1			
	2.79	1			
	2.81	1			
	2.84	1			
	2.84	1			
	2.85	1			
	2.90	1			
	2.93	1			
	2.94	1			
	2.94	1			
	2.95	1			
	2.95	1			
	2.96	1			
	2.97	1			
	2.98	1			
	3.00	3			
	3.01	1			
	3.02	1			
	3.02	1			
	3.03	1			
	3.04	1			
	3.06	1			
	3.08	1			
	3.10	1			
	3.13	1			
	3.13	1			
	3.15	1			

	3.18	**1**			
	3.20	**2**			
	3.21	**1**			
	3.22	**2**			
	3.24	**1**			
	3.25	**1**			
	3.28	**1**			
	3.30	**1**			
	3.30	**2**			
	3.32	**1**			
	3.36	**1**			
	3.43	**1**			
	3.46	**1**			
	3.47	**1**			
	3.50	**1**			
	3.53	**1**			
	3.54	**1**			
	3.59	**1**			
	3.65	**1**			
	3.66	**1**			
	3.67	**1**			
	3.71	**1**			
	3.71	**2**			
	3.72	**1**			
	3.74	**1**			
	3.80	**1**			
	4.00	**1**			
	Total	129			

CORRELATIONS

OVERALL SCALE & SUBSCALE CORRELATIONS WITH GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Bold type indicates that the correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	-.110
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.213
	N	129
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.904
	N	129
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	.042
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.635
	N	129
AGGRESSION	Pearson Correlation	-.084
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.341
	N	129
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	.-025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.780
	N	27
BIS	Pearson Correlation	.-087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.323
	N	129
LOT	Pearson Correlation	.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.694
	N	129
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	.-059
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.503
	N	129
INDEPENDENCE	Pearson Correlation	.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.682
	N	129
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	.-045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.610
	N	129
INITIATIVE	**Pearson Correlation**	**.205**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019
	N	129
CREATIVITY	Pearson Correlation	.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.628
	N	129
MORALITY	**Pearson Correlation**	**.173**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.049
	N	129
RASG	Pearson Correlation	.085
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.337
	N	129

GROUP SCALE & SUBSCALE CORRELATIONS WITH GRADE POINT AVERAGES

CORRELATIONS FOR MALES

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	-.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.743
	N	37
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	-.163
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.336
	N	37
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	-.151
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.372
	N	37
AGGRESSION	Pearson Correlation	-.268
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.109
	N	37
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	-.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.837
	N	37
BIS	Pearson Correlation	-.158
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.352
	N	37
LOT	Pearson Correlation	.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.767
	N	37
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	-.114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.501
	N	37
INDEPENDENCE	**Pearson Correlation**	**-.402**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014
	N	37
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	-.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.743
	N	37
INITIATIVE	Pearson Correlation	.215
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.202
	N	37
CREATIVITY	Pearson Correlation	-.137
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.419
	N	37
MORALITY	Pearson Correlation	.109
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.521
	N	37
RASG	Pearson Correlation	-.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.552
	N	37

CORRELATIONS FOR FEMALES

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	-.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.115
	N	93
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	.106
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.310
	N	93
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	.084
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.422
	N	93
AGGRESSION	Pearson Correlation	-.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.804
	N	93
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	-.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.747
	N	93
BIS	Pearson Correlation	-.114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.278
	N	93
LOT	Pearson Correlation	.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.796
	N	93
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.780
	N	93
INDEPENDENCE	**Pearson Correlation**	**.249**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016
	N	93
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	-.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.867
	N	93
INITIATIVE	**Pearson Correlation**	**.231**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026
	N	93
CREATIVITY	Pearson Correlation	.131
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.212
	N	93
MORALITY	**Pearson Correlation**	**.209**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044
	N	93
RASG	Pearson Correlation	.184
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.078
	N	93

CORRELATIONS FOR FRESHMEN

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.549
	N	35
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	-.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.681
	N	35
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	-.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.686
	N	35
AGGRESSION	Pearson Correlation	-.112
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.520
	N	35
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.803
	N	35
BIS	Pearson Correlation	-.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.571
	N	35
LOT	Pearson Correlation	-.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.823
	N	35
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	-.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.732
	N	35
INDEPENDENCE	Pearson Correlation	-.182
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.295
	N	35
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	-.151
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.386
	N	35
INITIATIVE	Pearson Correlation	.122
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.485
	N	35
CREATIVITY	**Pearson Correlation**	**-.350**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039
	N	35
MORALITY	Pearson Correlation	.283
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.100
	N	35
RASG	Pearson Correlation	-.132
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.450
	N	35

CORRELATIONS FOR SOPHOMORES

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	-.287
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.073
	N	40
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	-.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.878
	N	40
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	-.241
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.134
	N	40
AGGRESSION	**Pearson Correlation**	**-.330**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.037
	N	40
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	-.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.542
	N	40
BIS	Pearson Correlation	.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.805
	N	40
LOT	Pearson Correlation	-.120
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.459
	N	40
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	**-.331**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.037
	N	40
INDEPENDENCE	Pearson Correlation	-.193
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.233
	N	40
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	-.229
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.155
	N	40
INITIATIVE	Pearson Correlation	.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.734
	N	40
CREATIVITY	Pearson Correlation	-.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.558
	N	40
MORALITY	Pearson Correlation	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.955
	N	40
RASG	Pearson Correlation	.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.775
	N	40

CORRELATIONS FOR JUNIORS

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	-.179
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.371
	N	27
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	-.193
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.336
	N	27
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	.313
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.112
	N	27
AGGRESSION	Pearson Correlation	.318
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.106
	N	27
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	.108
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.592
	N	27
BIS	Pearson Correlation	.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.713
	N	27
LOT	Pearson Correlation	-.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.901
	N	27
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	.152
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.450
	N	27
INDEPENDENCE	Pearson Correlation	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.568
	N	27
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	.235
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.238
	N	27
INITIATIVE	**Pearson Correlation**	**.392**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043
	N	27
CREATIVITY	Pearson Correlation	.333
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.089
	N	27
MORALITY	Pearson Correlation	.179
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.373
	N	27
RASG	Pearson Correlation	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.788
	N	27

CORRELATIONS FOR SENIORS

		GPA
EIS	Pearson Correlation	.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.850
	N	28
REHEARSAL	Pearson Correlation	.297
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125
	N	28
EMOTIONAL	Pearson Correlation	.189
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.337
	N	28
AGGRESSION	Pearson Correlation	-.094
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.633
	N	28
BENIGN	Pearson Correlation	-.129
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.511
	N	28
BIS	Pearson Correlation	-.372
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051
	N	28
LOT	**Pearson Correlation**	**.380**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046
	N	28
INSIGHT	Pearson Correlation	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.883
	N	28
INDEPENDENCE	**Pearson Correlation**	**.409**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.031
	N	28
RELATIONSHIP	Pearson Correlation	.111
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.572
	N	28
INITIATIVE	Pearson Correlation	.340
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076
	N	28
CREATIVITY	Pearson Correlation	**.416**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028
	N	28
MORALITY	Pearson Correlation	.346
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.071
	N	28
RASG	Pearson Correlation	**.429**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023
	N	28

MEANS

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GPA	129	1.24	4.00	2.7062	.60549
Valid N (listwise)	129				

MEAN AGE

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	129	18	39	21.58	3.976
Valid N (listwise)	129				

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE BY CLASS

	Mean	Frequency	Std. Deviation
Freshmen	2.7425	35	.6547
Sophomores	2.5162	40	.5638
Juniors	2.6777	27	.5800
Seniors	2.9596	27	.5533
Total	2.7062	129	.6055

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE BY ENVIRONMENT

	Mean	Frequency	Std. Deviation
Urban	2.6073	68	.6204
Rural	2.8289	36	.6314
Suburban	2.7936	25	.4891
Total	2.7062	129	.6055

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE BY GENDER

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	2.5932	36	.7068
Female	2.7511	93	.5580
Total	2.7062	129	.6055

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE BY BIRTHPLACE

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Southeast	2.8082	5	.6125
Midwest	2.6006	24	.5988
West	2.7770	5	.6288
South	2.7097	92	.6086
Southwest	2.7233	3	.3411
Total	2.7062	129	.6055

MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE BY TYPE OF REGION RAISED IN

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Southeast	2.7030	8	.4944
Midwest	2.4701	16	.5170
West	3.1163	3	.1044
South	2.7180	98	.6158
Southwest	2.7348	4	.7476
Total	2.7062	129	.6055

***T* Test**

Mean differences of Resilient vs. Nonresilient research participants

Resilient research participants are in bold type

	GPARECOD	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EIS	.00	84	132.0119	10.6867	1.1660
	1.00	**45**	**128.8696**	**9.4648**	**1.3955**
REHEARSAL	.00	84	21.4881	3.3275	.3631
	1.00	**45**	**21.4783**	**2.9116**	**.4293**
EMOTIONAL	.00	84	22.4167	2.8632	.3124
	1.00	**45**	**22.5000**	**3.0459**	**.4491**
AGGRESSION	.00	84	18.9167	2.6851	.2930
	1.00	**45**	**18.5217**	**2.5275**	**.3727**
BENIGN	.00	84	20.1429	2.6982	.2944
	1.00	**45**	**20.2174**	**2.4937**	**.3677**
BIS	.00	84	61.5238	9.6723	1.0553
	1.00	**45**	**60.5870**	**10.7983**	**1.5921**
LOT	.00	84	21.4762	4.1347	.4511
	1.00	**45**	**21.7609**	**5.0517**	**.7448**
INSIGHT	.00	84	35.9524	4.1009	.4474
	1.00	**45**	**35.0217**	**4.2504**	**.6267**
INDEPENDENCE	.00	84	35.2262	4.9146	.5362
	1.00	**45**	**35.3261**	**4.6574**	**.6867**
RELATIONSHIP	.00	84	32.6071	5.1601	.5630
	1.00	**45**	**32.3913**	**4.9193**	**.7253**
INITIATIVE	.00	84	36.4524	5.1750	.5646
	1.00	**45**	**37.5870**	**4.8054**	**.7085**
CREATIVITY	.00	84	37.2619	4.6417	.5064
	1.00	**45**	**37.6522**	**6.0377**	**.8902**
MORALITY	.00	84	43.3214	4.5288	.4941
	1.00	**45**	**44.9565**	**4.8257**	**.7115**
RASG	.00	84	41.4048	4.8721	.5316
	1.00	**45**	**41.6522**	**4.3421**	**.6402**

Mean differences of research participants with grade point averages below and above 2.0
Students with grade point averages of 2.0 and higher are in bold type

	GPAREC1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EIS	.00	13	129.5385	13.0104	3.6084
	1.00	**116**	**129.9402**	**10.0733**	**.9313**
REHEARSAL	.00	13	22.4615	1.9839	.5502
	1.00	**116**	**21.3761**	**3.2688**	**.3022**
EMOTIONAL	.00	13	22.3846	2.5993	.7209
	1.00	**116**	**22.4530**	**2.9609**	**.2737**
AGGRESSION	.00	13	18.9231	2.5968	.7202
	1.00	**116**	**18.7607**	**2.6413**	**.2442**
BENIGN	.00	13	20.7692	2.2418	.6218
	1.00	**116**	**20.1026**	**2.6568**	**.2456**
BIS	.00	13	61.0000	10.5357	2.9221
	1.00	**116**	**61.2137**	**10.0454**	**.9287**
LOT	.00	13	21.7692	3.6091	1.0010
	1.00	**116**	**21.5556**	**4.5608**	**.4216**
INSIGHT	.00	13	35.8462	3.9968	1.1085
	1.00	**116**	**35.5983**	**4.1958**	**.3879**
INDEPENDENCE	.00	13	35.4615	5.1900	1.4394
	1.00	**116**	**35.2393**	**4.7862**	**.4425**
RELATIONSHIP	.00	13	34.4615	5.0763	1.4079
	1.00	**116**	**32.3162**	**5.0321**	**.4652**
INITIATIVE	.00	13	35.6923	5.1540	1.4295
	1.00	**116**	**36.9829**	**5.0531**	**.4672**
CREATIVITY	.00	13	37.7692	4.0240	1.1160
	1.00	**116**	**37.3590**	**5.2825**	**.4884**
MORALITY	.00	13	43.3077	4.1910	1.1624
	1.00	**116**	**43.9658**	**4.7469**	**.4389**
RASG	.00	13	40.5385	3.0718	.8520
	1.00	**116**	**41.5983**	**4.8192**	**.4455**

APPENDIX I

RELIABILITY OF SCALES AND SUBSCALES

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS--SCALE (ALPHA)

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	EIS1	4.6154	.7086	129
2.	EIS2	4.4462	.6108	129
3.	EIS3	4.4923	.6256	129
4.	EIS4	4.3769	.8469	129
5.	EIS5	3.5154	1.1828	129
6.	EIS6	4.6385	.6589	129
7.	EIS7	3.8462	.9601	129
8.	EIS8	2.5231	1.1695	129
9.	EIS9	4.1769	.9762	129
10.	EIS10	4.3769	.8740	129
11.	EIS11	3.3385	1.2793	129
12.	EIS12	3.9154	.9321	129
13.	EIS13	3.4615	1.0650	129
14.	EIS14	4.6615	.5645	129
15.	EIS15	3.7385	1.1036	129
16.	EIS16	4.4385	.7153	129
17.	EIS17	4.3385	.7929	129
18.	EIS18	4.0538	.7906	129
19.	EIS19	3.7538	1.2204	129
20.	EIS20	4.0385	.8482	129
21.	EIS21	3.6154	1.1968	129
22.	EIS22	4.0308	.9640	129
23.	EIS23	4.3462	.7646	129
24.	EIS24	4.6154	.6750	129
25.	EIS25	3.8077	.9242	129
26.	EIS26	3.7462	.9907	129
27.	EIS27	3.4769	.8823	129
28.	EIS28	4.6231	.7999	129
29.	EIS29	2.8769	1.1276	129
30.	EIS30	4.2615	.7831	129
31.	EIS31	4.3077	.7860	129
32.	EIS32	3.9000	.9388	129
33.	EIS33	2.5462	1.1420	129

Statistics for Variables	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	
SCALE	129.9000	107.0054	10.3443	33

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 33
Alpha = .7583

BARRATT IMPULSIVENESS SCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	BIS1	2.0846	.8168	129
2.	BIS2	1.7231	.7472	129
3.	BIS3	2.3154	.8630	129
4.	BIS4	2.7692	.9279	129
5.	BIS5	1.8231	.9105	129
6.	BIS6	2.3308	.9267	129
7.	BIS7	2.1462	.9410	129
8.	BIS8	1.5923	.7120	129
9.	BIS9	2.2231	.8828	129
10.	BIS10	2.5077	1.0361	129
11.	BIS11	1.7538	.8265	129
12.	BIS12	1.9385	.8236	129
13.	BIS13	1.9231	.9202	129
14.	BIS14	1.7308	.8145	129
15.	BIS15	2.6385	.9805	129
16.	BIS16	1.5615	.8353	129
17.	BIS17	1.9692	.7967	129
18.	BIS18	1.8000	.7408	129
19.	BIS19	2.1846	.7952	129
20.	BIS20	2.0615	.7949	129
21.	BIS21	1.4385	.8353	129
22.	BIS22	2.4538	1.0647	129
23.	BIS23	2.0462	1.0407	129
24.	BIS24	1.6538	.8779	129
25.	BIS25	1.9231	1.0389	129
26.	BIS26	2.3000	.9617	129
27.	BIS27	2.2923	1.0451	129
28.	BIS28	1.9462	.8919	129
29.	BIS29	2.3692	1.0428	129
30.	BIS30	1.6923	.8150	129

Statistics for Variables	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	
SCALE	61.1923	101.0713	10.0534	30

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 30
Alpha = .7881

EMOTIONAL CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE SUBSCALES

REHEARSAL SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	ECQ3	1.3231	.4695	129
2.	ECQ9	1.3846	.4884	129
3.	ECQ13	1.6077	.4902	129
4.	ECQ22	1.5385	.5004	129
5.	ECQ28	1.7000	.4600	129
6.	ECQ31	1.1615	.3695	129
7.	ECQ32	1.7308	.4453	129
8.	ECQ34	1.5462	.4998	129
9.	ECQ38	1.5462	.4998	129
10.	ECQ41	1.6846	.4665	129
11.	ECQ46	1.5385	.5004	129
12.	ECQ49	1.8154	.3895	129
13.	ECQ51	1.6231	.4865	129
14.	ECQ53	1.2846	.4530	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 14
Alpha = .7503

EMOTIONAL INHIBITION SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	ECQ1	1.5769	.4960	129
2.	ECQ6	1.6769	.4695	129
3.	ECQ8	1.8385	.3695	129
4.	ECQ11	1.7154	.4530	129
5.	ECQ16	1.4385	.4981	129
6.	ECQ20	1.4846	.5017	129
7.	ECQ23	1.8615	.3467	129
8.	ECQ25	1.6769	.4695	129
9.	ECQ30	1.7538	.4324	129
10.	ECQ37	1.7077	.4566	129
11.	ECQ43	1.7077	.4566	129
12.	ECQ50	1.1538	.3622	129
13.	ECQ52	1.3385	.4750	129
14.	ECQ56	1.5154	.5017	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 14
Alpha = .7150

AGGRESSION CONTROL SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	ECQ2	1.6692	.4723	129
2.	ECQ10	1.6077	.4902	129
3.	ECQ12	1.2615	.4412	129
4.	ECQ15	1.4538	.4998	129
5.	ECQ18	1.5308	.5010	129
6.	ECQ19	1.7615	.4278	129
7.	ECQ24	1.3615	.4823	129
8.	ECQ27	1.3923	.4902	129
9.	ECQ33	1.2231	.4179	129
10.	ECQ36	1.2846	.4530	129
11.	ECQ40	1.1846	.3895	129
12.	ECQ44	1.6538	.4776	129
13.	ECQ48	1.3923	.4902	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 13
Alpha = .6417

BENIGN CONTROL SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	ECQ4	1.6077	.4902	129
2.	ECQ5	1.4538	.4998	129
3.	ECQ7	1.5000	.5019	129
4.	ECQ14	1.5154	.5017	129
5.	ECQ17	1.5308	.5010	129
6.	ECQ21	1.3538	.4800	129
7.	ECQ29	1.3538	.4800	129
8.	ECQ35	1.4923	.5019	129
9.	ECQ39	1.5385	.5004	129
10.	ECQ42	1.3077	.4633	129
11.	ECQ45	1.3462	.4776	129
12.	ECQ47	1.8154	.3895	129
13.	ECQ54	1.1923	.3956	129
14.	ECQ55	1.1615	.3695	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 14
Alpha = .5906

LIFE ORIENTATION TEST

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	LOT1	2.8615	1.0173	129
2.	LOT3	2.1154	1.1590	129
3.	LOT4	2.9462	.9750	129
4.	LOT5	3.0538	.9750	129
5.	LOT8	2.5462	1.1688	129
6.	LOT9	2.5077	1.0801	129
7.	LOT11	2.7692	.9688	129
8.	LOT12	2.7769	1.1632	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 8
Alpha = .6206

LIFE ORIENTATION TEST
OPTIMISM SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	LOT1	2.8615	1.0173	129
2.	LOT4	2.9462	.9750	129
3.	LOT5	3.0538	.9750	129
4.	LOT11	2.7692	.9688	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 4
Alpha = .4544

LIFE ORIENTATION TEST
PESSIMISM SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	LOT3	2.1154	1.1590	129
2.	LOT8	2.5462	1.1688	129
3.	LOT9	2.5077	1.0801	129
4.	LOT12	2.7769	1.1632	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 4
Alpha = .7003

RESILIENT ATTITUDES SCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS1	2.9000	1.1868	129
2.	RAS2	3.4615	1.2082	129
3.	RAS3	3.9462	1.1365	129
4.	RAS4	4.1846	.7754	129
5.	RAS5	3.8154	1.1191	129
6.	RAS6	3.8154	1.1052	129
7.	RAS7	4.0538	.8565	129
8.	RAS8	2.5000	1.1829	129
9.	RAS9	3.3000	1.1320	129
10.	RAS10	3.6462	1.0333	129
11.	RAS11	3.6154	1.3082	129
12.	RAS12	3.7231	.9402	129
13.	RAS13	3.5538	1.1947	129
14.	RAS14	3.6462	1.3051	129
15.	RAS15	3.6154	1.2475	129

16.	RAS16	3.0846	1.1139	129
17.	RAS17	4.3769	.8560	129
18.	RAS18	2.4308	1.1340	129
19.	RAS19	3.6538	1.2558	129
20.	RAS20	3.5615	1.0926	129
21.	RAS21	1.9000	1.1537	129
22.	RAS22	3.4154	1.0327	129
23.	RAS23	4.2308	.8403	129
24.	RAS24	3.6385	1.0343	129
25.	RAS25	2.2692	1.2746	129
26.	RAS26	3.6538	1.4612	129
27.	RAS27	2.7692	1.3895	129
28.	RAS28	2.3846	1.1903	129
29.	RAS29	3.9308	.9250	129
30.	RAS30	4.3385	.8122	129
31.	RAS31	3.0308	1.0561	129
32.	RAS32	4.0462	.8432	129
33.	RAS33	4.4462	.6940	129
34.	RAS34	4.0615	.9380	129
35.	RAS35	2.7077	1.2417	129
36.	RAS36	3.7692	.9527	129
37.	RAS37	4.0231	.8396	129
38.	RAS38	2.9615	1.4109	129
39.	RAS39	3.8462	1.1029	129
40.	RAS40	3.9615	.9184	129
41.	RAS41	4.0538	.9091	129
42.	RAS42	4.0769	1.0537	129
43.	RAS43	4.0077	.8021	129
44.	RAS44	3.8308	1.2522	129
45.	RAS45	3.4000	1.1385	129
46.	RAS46	3.8615	1.0173	129
47.	RAS47	3.6462	1.1671	129
48.	RAS48	2.4769	1.2465	129
49.	RAS49	3.9538	.9793	129
50.	RAS50	4.0923	.9355	129
51.	RAS51	3.6923	1.2689	129
52.	RAS52	3.0769	1.2365	129
53.	RAS53	4.1000	1.0256	129
54.	RAS54	4.5385	.5590	129
55.	RAS55	4.5000	.7900	129
56.	RAS56	2.6000	1.2174	129
57.	RAS57	3.7538	.9569	129
58.	RAS58	4.0615	.7445	129
59.	RAS59	3.6769	1.3652	129
60.	RAS60	3.4000	.9773	129
61.	RAS61	2.6615	1.2235	129
62.	RAS62	3.8385	.8962	129
63.	RAS63	4.4769	.6614	129
64.	RAS64	4.6077	.5498	129

65.	RAS65	4.2692	.8145	129
66.	RAS66	4.2154	.7469	129
67.	RAS67	4.4385	.7044	129
68.	RAS68	3.7923	1.2116	129
69.	RAS69	3.4154	1.0982	129
70.	RAS70	3.8000	.9757	129
71.	RAS71	4.0462	.9138	129
72.	RAS72	4.4308	.7568	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 72
Alpha = .8523

RESILIENT ATTITUDES SUBSCALES

INSIGHT SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS1	2.9000	1.1868	129
2.	RAS2	3.4615	1.2082	129
3.	RAS3	3.9462	1.1365	129
4.	RAS4	4.1846	.7754	129
5.	RAS5	3.8154	1.1191	129
6.	RAS6	3.8154	1.1052	129
7.	RAS7	4.0538	.8565	129
8.	RAS8	2.5000	1.1829	129
9.	RAS9	3.3000	1.1320	129
10.	RAS10	3.6462	1.0333	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 10
Alpha = .3595

INDEPENDENCE SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS11	3.6154	1.3082	129
2.	RAS12	3.7231	.9402	129
3.	RAS13	3.5538	1.1947	129
4.	RAS14	3.6462	1.3051	129
5.	RAS15	3.6154	1.2475	129
6.	RAS16	3.0846	1.1139	129
7.	RAS17	4.3769	.8560	129
8.	RAS18	2.4308	1.1340	129
9.	RAS19	3.6538	1.2558	129
10.	RAS20	3.5615	1.0926	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 10
Alpha = .4710

RELATIONSHIPS SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS21	1.9000	1.1537	129
2.	RAS22	3.4154	1.0327	129
3.	RAS23	4.2308	.8403	129
4.	RAS24	3.6385	1.0343	129
5.	RAS25	2.2692	1.2746	129
6.	RAS26	3.6538	1.4612	129
7.	RAS27	2.7692	1.3895	129
8.	RAS28	2.3846	1.1903	129
9.	RAS29	3.9308	.9250	129
10.	RAS30	4.3385	.8122	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 10
Alpha = .5554

INITIATIVE SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS31	3.0308	1.0561	129
2.	RAS32	4.0462	.8432	129
3.	RAS33	4.4462	.6940	129
4.	RAS34	4.0615	.9380	129
5.	RAS35	2.7077	1.2417	129
6.	RAS36	3.7692	.9527	129
7.	RAS37	4.0231	.8396	129
8.	RAS38	2.9615	1.4109	129
9.	RAS39	3.8462	1.1029	129
10.	RAS40	3.9615	.9184	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 10
Alpha = .6597

CREATIVITY SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS41	4.0538	.9091	129
2.	RAS42	4.0769	1.0537	129
3.	RAS43	4.0077	.8021	129
4.	RAS44	3.8308	1.2522	129
5.	RAS45	3.4000	1.1385	129
6.	RAS46	3.8615	1.0173	129
7.	RAS47	3.6462	1.1671	129
8.	RAS48	2.4769	1.2465	129
9.	RAS49	3.9538	.9793	129
10.	RAS50	4.0923	.9355	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 10
Alpha = .6423

MORALITY SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS51	3.6923	1.2689	129
2.	RAS52	3.0769	1.2365	129
3.	RAS53	4.1000	1.0256	129
4.	RAS54	4.5385	.5590	129
5.	RAS55	4.5000	.7900	129
6.	RAS56	2.6000	1.2174	129
7.	RAS57	3.7538	.9569	129
8.	RAS58	4.0615	.7445	129
9.	RAS59	3.6769	1.3652	129
10.	RAS60	3.4000	.9773	129
11.	RAS61	2.6615	1.2235	129
12.	RAS62	3.8385	.8962	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 12
Alpha = .4345

GENERAL RESILIENCE SUBSCALE

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RAS63	4.4769	.6614	129
2.	RAS64	4.6077	.5498	129
3.	RAS65	4.2692	.8145	129
4.	RAS66	4.2154	.7469	129
5.	RAS67	4.4385	.7044	129
6.	RAS68	3.7923	1.2116	129
7.	RAS69	3.4154	1.0982	129
8.	RAS70	3.8000	.9757	129
9.	RAS71	4.0462	.9138	129
10.	RAS72	4.4308	.7568	129

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 129.0 N of Items = 10
Alpha = .7304

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association (1993). Violence & Youth: Psychology's Response.

Anderson, G. (1996). The benefits of optimism: A meta-analytic review of the Life Orientation Test. Personality and Individual Differences, 21, 719-725.

Barbarin, O. A. (1993). Emotional and social development of African American children. Journal of Black Psychology, 19(14), 381-390.

Barber, B. L., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). Long-term influences of divorce and single parenting on adolescent family and work-related values, beliefs, and aspirations. Psychological Bulletin, 111, 108-126.

Barratt, E. S. (1959). Anxiety and impulsiveness related to psychomotor efficiency. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 9, 191-198.

Barratt, E. S. (1985). Impulsiveness subtraits: Arousal and information processing. In J. T. Spence & C. E. Izard (Eds.), Motivation, emotion, and personality (pp. 137-146). North-Holland: Elseiver Science Publishers.

Barratt, E. S. (1993). Impulsivity: Integrating cognitive, behavioral, biological, and environmental data. In W. B. McCown, J. L. Johnson, & M. B. Shure (Eds.), The impulsive client: Theory, research, and treatment (pp. 39-56). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Barratt, E. S., Stanford, M. S., Kent, T. A., & Felthouse, A. (1997). Neuropsychological and cognitive psychophysiological substates of impulsive aggression. Biological Psychiatry, 41, 1045-1061.

Biscoe, B. & Harris, B. (1994). RAS: resiliency attitudes manual. Oklahoma City: Eagle Ridge Institute.

Braverman, S., & Paris, J. (1993). The male mid-life crisis is the grown-up resilient child. Psychotherapy, 30, 651-657.

Brown, D. R., Gary, L. E., Greene, A. D., & Milburn, N. G. (1992). Patterns and social affiliation as predictors of depressive symptoms among urban Blacks. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 33, 242-253.

Buck, R. (1984). The communication of emotion. New York: Guilford.

Campbell, J. B. (1987). Measures of impulsivity. Personality and Individual differences, 8, 451.

Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J. F. (1987). Personality and social intelligence. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Carrillo-de-la-Pena, M. T., Otero, J. M., & Romero, E. (1993). Comparison among various methods of assessment of impulsiveness. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 77, 567-575.

Casper, L. M., & Fields, J. (2000). America's families and living arrangements: Population characteristics. Washington, DC: U. S. Census Bureau.

Castellani, B., & Rugle, L. (1995). A comparison of pathological gamblers to alcoholics and cocaine misusers on impulsivity, sensation seeking, and craving. The International Journal of the Addictions, 30, 275-289.

Cattell, R. B. (1987). Intelligence: Its structure, growth and action. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Centers for Disease Control (1999). Drug use and addiction rates among minority adolescents. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Chelsey-Carter, J. (1998). The relationship between "at risk" students' resilient and dropout behavior. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59, 7.

Clark, M. L. (1991). Social identity, peer relations, and academic competence of African American adolescents. Education and Urban Society, 24, 41-52. (Special edition, L. F. Winfield, Ed.)

Comer, J. (1976). The oppositional child: Is the Black child at greater risk? In E. J. Anthony & D. G. Gilpin (Eds.), Three clinical faces of childhood (pp.79-92). New York: Spectrum.

Compas, B., Orosan, P., & Grant, K. (1993). Adolescent stress and coping: Implications for psychopathology during adolescence. Journal of Adolescence, 16, 331-349.

Conger, R., McCarty, J., Yang, R., Lahey, B., & Kropp, J. (1984). Perception of child, childrearing values, and emotional distress as mediating links between environmental stressors and observed maternal behavior. Child Development, 54, 2234-2247.

Crane, J. (1991). Effects of neighborhoods on dropping out of school and teenage childbearing. In C. Jencks & P. E. Petersen (Eds.), The urban underclass (pp. 299-320). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Cronbach, L. J. (1960). Essentials of psychological testing. New York: Harper & Row.

Darity, W., Jr., & Myers, S., Jr. (1995a). Family structure and the marginalization of Black men: Policy implications. In M. B. Tucker & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), The decline in marriage among African Americans: Causes, consequences, and policy implications (pp. 171-203). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Darity, W., Jr., & Myers, S., Jr. (1995b). The widening gap: A summary and synthesis of the debate on increasing inequality. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota.

Dressler, W. (1985). Extended family relationships, social support, and mental health in a southern black community. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 26, 39-48.

DuBois, D. L., Felner, R. D., Meares, H., & Krier, M. (1994). A prospective investigation of the effects of socioeconomic disadvantage, life stress, and social support on early adolescent adjustment. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103, 511-522.

Duncan, G. (1988). The economic environment of childhood. Paper presented at a study group meeting on poverty and children, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Ancoli, S. (1980). Facial signs of emotional experience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 1125-1134.

Ensminger, M. E., & Slusarcick, A. L. (1992). Paths to high school dropout: A longitudinal study of a first-grade cohort. Sociology of Education, 65, 95-113.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). Manual of the Eyesenck Personality Scales. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Farrington, D. P. (1987). Epidemiology. In H. C. Quay (Ed.), Handbook of juvenile delinquency (pp. 33-61). New York: Wiley.

Felner, R., Brand, S., DuBois, D., Adàn, A., Mulhall, P., & Evans, E. (1995). Socioeconomic disadvantage, proximal environmental experiences, and socioemotional and academic adjustment in early adolescence: Investigation of a mediated effects model. Child Development, 66, 774-792.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Flach, F. (1988). Resilience: Discovering a new strength at times of stress. New York: Ballantine Books.

Ford, C. (1990). The educational dilemma in contemporary urban America. In M. Lang (Ed.), Contemporary urban America: Problems, issues, and alternatives (pp. 60-85). Landham, MD: University Press of America.

Ford, C., Okojie, F., & Lewis, M. K. (1996). Factors that contribute to academic resilience among urban "at risk" African American college males. Urban Explorer, 2, 1-7.

Ford, M., & Tisak, M. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 196-206.

Forgas, J. P. (1995). The affect of infusion model (AIM): Review and an integrative theory of mood effects of judgment. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 39-66.

Fox, J. (2000). Homicide trends in the United States. U.S. Department of Justice.

Free, M. D. (1996). African Americans and the criminal justice system. New York: Garland Books.

Freeman, R. B. (1991). Employment and earnings of disadvantaged youths in a labor shortage economy. In C. Jencks & P. E. Petersen (Eds.), The urban underclass. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Freitas, A. L., & Downey, G. (1998). Resilience: A dynamic perspective. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 22(2), 263-285.

Garbarino, J. (1976). A preliminary study of some ecological correlates of child abuse: The impact of socioeconomic stress on mothers. Child Development, 47, 178-185.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic Books.

Garmezy, N. (1993). Children in poverty: Resilience despite risk. [Special issue on children and violence]. Psychiatry Interpersonal and Biological Processes, 56(1), 127-136.

Garmezy, N., & Masten, A. S. (1986). Stress, competence, and resilience: Common frontiers for therapists and psychopathologists. Behavior Therapy, 17, 500-521.

Garmezy, N., Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (1984). The study of stress and competence in children: A building block for developmental psychopathology. Child Development, 55, 97-111.

Garmezy, N., & Rutter, M. (Eds.). (1983). Stress, coping, and development in children. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Garmezy, N., & Tellegen, A. (1984). Studies of stress-resilient children: Methods, variables and preliminary findings. In F. J. Morrison, C. Lord, & D. P. Keating (Eds.), Applied developmental psychology (Vol. 1). New York: Academic Press.

Gibbs, J. (1986). Assessment of depression in urban adolescent females: Implications for early intervention strategies. American Journal of Social Psychiatry, 6, 50-56.

Gibbs, J. (1989). Black American adolescents. In J. Gibbs, L. Huang, & Associates (Eds.), Children of color: Psychological interventions with minority youth (pp. 179-223). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glantz, M. D., & Johnson, J. L. (1999). Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goleman, D. (1996). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Gordon, K. A. (1995). Self-concept and motivational patterns of resilient African-American high school students. Journal of Black Psychology, 21, 239-255.

Gouldner, H. (1978). Teacher's pets, troublemakers, and nobodies: Black children in elementary school. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Harmon-Jones, E., Barratt, E. S., & Wigg, C. (1997). Impulsiveness, aggression, reading, and the P300 of event-related potential. Personality and Individual Differences, 22, 439-445.

Hawkins, D. (1995). Ethnicity, race, and crime. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hawkins, J. G., Catalono, R. F., & Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for school and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse and prevention. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 64-105.

Hickner, J. (1999). Percentage of poor young children with working parents reaches highest level in decades as poverty rate falls. National Center for Children in Poverty.

Hoffman, S., & Duncan, G. (1995). The effects of incomes, wages, and AFDC benefits on marital disruption. Journal of Human Resources, 30, 19-41.

Horn, J. L. (1988). Thinking about human abilities. In J. R. Nesselroade & R. B. Cattell (Eds.), Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology (2nd ed., pp.645-685). New York: Plenum.

Horn, J. L., & Noll, J. (1994). System for understanding cognitive capabilities: A theory and the evidence on which it is based. In D. K. Detterman (Ed.), Current topics in human intelligence: Vol. 4. Theories of intelligence (pp. 151-204). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Horowitz, B., & Wolock, I. (1985). Maternal deprivation, child maltreatment, and agency interventions among poor families. In L. Pelton (Ed.), The social context of child abuse and neglect (pp. 137-184). New York: Human Sciences Press.

Ickovis, J. R., & Park, C. L. (1998). Paradigm shift: Why a focus on health is important. Journal of Social Issues, 54(2), 227-244.

Institute for Research on Poverty. (1998). How many children are poor? http://www.sbc.wisc.edu/inp/fa96.htm

Jew, C. L., & Green, K. E. (1998). Effects of risk factors on adolescents' resiliency and coping. Psychological Reports, 82, 675-678.

Jew, C. L., Green, K. E., & Kroger, J. (1999). Development and validation of a measure of resiliency. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32, 75-89.

Kaplan, C. P., Turner, S., Norman, E., & Stillson, K. (1996). Promoting resilient strategies: A modified consultation model. Social Work in Education, 18, 158-168.

Kasarda, J. D. (1989). Urban industrial transition and the underclass. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 501, 26-47.

Kelso, T. W. (1999). A study to establish the validity of a measure of resiliency. Dissertation Abstracts International. Master's thesis, Humboldt State University.

Kessler, R., & Neighbors, H. (1986). A new perspective on the relationships among race, social class, and psychological distress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 27, 107-115.

Kinard, E. M. (1998). Methodological issues in assessing resilience in maltreated children. Child Abuse & Neglect, 22, 669-680.

Kumpfer, K.L. (1999). Factors and processes contributing to resilience: The resilience framework. In M. D. Glantz & J. L. Johnson (Eds.), Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations (pp. 179-224). New York: Klumer Academic/Plenum.

Langner, T., Herson, J., Greene, E., Jameson, J., & Goff, J. (1970). Children of the city: Affluence, poverty, and mental health. In V. Allen (Ed.), Psychological factors in poverty (pp. 185-209). Chicago: Markham.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer.

Lee, V. E., Winfield, L. F., & Wilson, T. C. (1991). Academic behaviors among high achieving African American students. Education and Urban Society, 24, 65-86. (Special edition, L. F. Winfield (Ed.)

Legree, P. J. (1995). Evidence for an oblique social intelligence factor established with a Likert-based testing procedure. Intelligence, 21, 247-266.

Luengo, M. A., Carrillo-de-la-Pena, M. T., & Otero, J. M. (1991). The components of impulsiveness: A comparison of the I.7 Impulsiveness Questionnaire and the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 12, 657-667.

Luthar, S. (1991). Vulnerability and resilience: A study of high-risk adolescents. Child Development, 62, 600-616.

Luthar, S. S., & Zigler, E. (1991). Intelligence and social competence among high-risk adolescents. Development and Psychopathy, 4, 287-299.

Lynn, L., & McGeary, M. (1990). Inner-city poverty in the United States. National Academy Press, 3, 280.

Makosky, V.P. (1982). Sources of stress: Events or conditions? In D. Belle (Ed.), Lives in stress: Women and depression (pp. 35-53). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Malouff, J. M., & Schutte, N. S. (1998). Emotional Intelligence Scale scores predict counselor performance. Paper presented at the Conference of the American Psychological Society, Washington, DC.

Marlowe, H., & Bedell, J. (1982). Social intelligence: Evidence for the independence of the construct. Psychological Reports, 51, 461-462.

Marshall, G. N., Wortman, C. B., Kusulas, J.W., Hervig, L. K., & Vickers, R. R. (1992). Distinguishing optimism from pessimism: Relations to fundamental dimensions of mood and personality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 1067-1074.

Mayer, J. D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. Intelligence, 22, 89-113.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence, Intelligence, 17, 443-450.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. Applied and Preventive Psychology, 4, 197-208.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (in press). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators. New York: Basic Books.

McLoyd, V. C. (1988). Determinants of the mental health of Black and Whites children experiencing economic deprivation. Paper presented at a study group meeting on poverty and children, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

McLoyd, V. C. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on Black families and children: Psychological distress, parenting, and socioemotional development. Child Development, 61, 311-346.

Meckler, L. (1998, July 1). Black out-of-wedlock births still high. Washington Post, p. 3A

Meyers, S. L., Jr., & Simms, M. C. (1988). The economics of race and crime. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Miller, S. & Zubaty, R. (1995, December 19). Reuniting fathers with their families. Washington Times, p. A19.

Mrazek, P. J., & Mrazek, D. A. (1987). Resilience in child maltreatment victims: A conceptual exploration. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 357-366.

Murphy, L., & Moriarity, A. (1976). Vulnerability, coping, and growth from infancy to adolescence. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Murray, C.B., & Fairchild, H. H. (1989). Models of Black adolescent underachievement In R. L. Jones (Ed), Black adolescent. Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Myers, H. F., & King, L. (1983). Mental health issues in the development of the black American child. In G. Powell, J. Yamamoto, A. Romero, & A. Morales (Eds.), The psychosocial development of minority group children (pp. 275-306). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

National Center for Children in Poverty. (1999). Young children in poverty fact sheet.

National Center for Health Statistics (2000a). Contraceptive practices of African American teenage females. Centers for Disease Control.

National Center for Health Statistics. (2000b). Leading causes of violence-related deaths among African American male and female adolescents. Health, United States, 2000.

National Center for Health Statistics. (2000c). Patterns of infant mortality. NVSR 50, #4.

National Center for Health Statistics. (2002). Leading causes of violence-related deaths among African American male and female adolescents.

Nettles, M. S., & Pleck, J. H. (1994). Risk, resilience, and development: The multiple ecologies of Black adolescents in the United States. In R. Haggerty, L. Sherrod, & M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, risk, and resilience in children and adolescents (pp. 147-181). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Neubeck, K. (2001). Welfare racism: Playing the race card against America's poor. New York: Routledge.

O'Boyle, M., & Barratt, E. S. (1993). Impulsivity and DSM-III-R personality disorders. Personality and Individual Differences, 14, 609-611.

Ortony, A., Clore, G. L. & Collins, A. (1988). The cognitive structure of emotions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxendine, J. (1999, October/November). Not just the blues--Recognizing and treating depression. Closing the gap. (Office of Minority Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services).

Patton, J. H., Stanton, M. S., & Barratt, E. S. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 51, 768-774.

Pearlin, L., & Johnson, J. (1977). Marital status, life strains, and depression. American Sociological Review, 42, 704-715.

Petersen, A., Compas, B., Brooks-Gunn, J., Stemmler, M., Eysenck, S., & Grant, K. (1993). Depression in adolescence. American Psychologist, 48, 155-168.

Rector, N. A., & Roger, D. (1996). Cognitive style and well-being: A prospective examination. Personality and Individual Differences, 21, 663-674.

Reik, T. (1952). Listening with the third ear: The inner experience of a psychoanalyst. New York: Farrer, Straus.

Reynolds, W. M. (1990). Introduction to the nature and study of internalizing disorders in children and adolescents. School Psychology Review, 19, 137-141.

Roger, D. (1995). Emotional control, coping strategies, and adaptive behavior. Stress and Emotion, 15, 255-264.

Roger, D., & Najarian, B. (1989). The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring emotion control. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 845-853.

Roger, D., & Nesshoever, W. (1989). The construction and validation of a preliminary validation of a scale for measuring emotional control. Personality and Individual Differences, 8, 527-534.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 609.

Royse, D., & Wieche, V. R. (1988). Impulsivity in felons and unwed mothers. Psychological Reports, 62, 335-336.

Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57, 316-331.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9, 185-211.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1994). Some final thoughts about personality and intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Personality and intelligence (pp. 303-318). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. Health Psychology, 4, 219-247.

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem: A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 1063-1078.

Schlosser, E. (1998). The prison-industrial complex, part two. Atlantic Monthly.

Schutte, N.S., & Malouff, J. M. (1998). Developmental and interpersonal aspects of emotional intelligence. Paper presented at the Convention of the American Psychological Society, Washington, DC.

Schutte, N. S., & Malouff, J. M. (1999). Measuring emotional intelligence and related constructs. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, 167-177.

Short, J. (1997). Poverty, ethnicity, and violent crime. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Snyder, J., & Patterson, G. (1987). Family interaction and delinquent behavior. In H. C. Quay (Ed.), Handbook of juvenile delinquency (pp. 216-243). New York: Wiley.

Stanford, M. S., Greve, K. W., & Dickens, T. J. (1995). Irritability and impulsiveness: Relationship to self-reported impulsive aggression. Personality and Individual Differences, 19, 757-760.

Stankov, L., Boyle, G. J., & Cattell, R. B. (1995). Models and paradigms in intelligence research. In D. Saklofske & M. Zeidner (Eds.), International handbook of personality and intelligence (pp. 15-44). New York: Plenum.

Staveteig, S., & Wigton, A. (2000, March). Racial and ethnic disparities: Key findings from the national survey of America's families. Urban Institute.

Steinberg, L., Catalono, R., & Dooley, D. (1981). Economic antecedents of child abuse and neglect. Child Development, 52, 975-985.

Straub, E. (1996). Altruism and aggression in children and youth: Origins and cures. In R. Feldman (Ed.), The psychology of adversity (p. 471) Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Thompson, G. L. (1998). Predictors of resilience in African American adults. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(4-A), 1082.

Thorndike, R. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 27, 231-233.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1982). Characteristics of the Black population living in central cities. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1989). Characteristics of the population below the poverty level: 1989 (Current population reports, Series P-60). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). Characteristics of the Black population. General population characteristics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (2001, March). Characteristics of the Black population. Current population characteristics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1972). Employment rates of Blacks in central cities, National Center for Employment Statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1983). Unemployment rates of Black youth, National Center for Employment Statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Center for Employment Statistics. (2000). Unemployment rates of African American high school students. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2002). A profile of the working poor (Report No. 957). National Center for Employment Statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (2002a). Demographic statistics of African American students. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (2002b). The educational progress of African American students. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2000). Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice. (2000a). Crime statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice. (2000b). Homicide statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002). Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Wacquant, L. J., & Wilson, W. J. (1989). The cost of racial and class exclusion in the inner city. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 501, 8-25.

Wagner, R. K., & Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Practical intelligence in real-world pursuits: The role of tacit knowledge. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 436-458.

Walker, R. E., & Foley, J. M. (1973). Social intelligence: Its history and measurement. Psychological Reports, 33, 839-864.

Wallerstein, J. (1988). Children of divorce: Stress and developmental tasks. In N. Garmezy & M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, coping, and development in children (pp. 265-302). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wang, M. C., & Gordon, E. W. (1994). Educational resilience in inner-city America. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Werner, E. E. (1989). High–risk children in young adulthood: A longitudinal study from birth to 32 years. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59, 72-81.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, J. Q. (1983). Thinking about crime. New York: Vintage.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago: University Press.

Wilson-Sadberry, K. R., Winfield, L. F., & Royster, D. A. (1991). Resilience and persistence of African American males in postsecondary enrollment. Education and Urban Society, 24, 87-102.

Winfield, L. F. (1991). Resilience, schooling, and development in African American youth: A conceptual framework. Education and Urban Society, 24, 5-14. (Special edition, L. F. Winfield, Ed.)

Wolin, S. J., & Wolin, S. (1993). The resilient self: How survivors of troubled families rise above adversity. New York: Villard.

Wood, R. (1995). Marriage rates and marriageable men: A test of the Wilson hypothesis. Journal of Human Resources, 30, 163-193.

Zimmerman, M. A., Salem, D. A., & Maton, K. I. (1995). Family structure and psychosocial correlates among urban African American adolescent males. Child Development, 66, 1598-1613.