ED 400 307   TM 025 671

AUTHOR   Williams, Janice E.; Coombs, William T.
TITLE   An Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of
            Bandura's Multidimensional Scales of Perceived
            Self-Efficacy.
PUB DATE   Apr 96
NOTE   26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
            American Educational Research Association (New York,
            NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
            Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Bound Students; Construct Validity; Factor
            Analysis; Factor Structure; High Schools; *High
            School Students; *Self Efficacy; *Student Attitudes;
            *Test Reliability; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS Academic Self Concept; *Multidimensional Scales of
            Perceived Self Efficacy; Scree Test; *Self
            Regulation

ABSTRACT
            The reliability of A. Bandura's Multidimensional
Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy (MSPSE) was studied using the
Cronbach alpha measure of internal consistency. The divergent
validity of the MSPSE was also examined using subscale correlations,
and the construct validity of the measure was studied through
application of principal axes factor analysis. A sample of 500
college-bound high school students completed the MSPSE. A
three-factor model was selected based on previous empirical findings,
application of the scree test of R. B. Cattell, and consideration of
the theoretical nature of the factors. The three factors were
identified and labeled as: (1) social efficacy; (2) academic
efficacy; and (3) self-regulatory. Interrelationships among the
factors are examined, and potential uses of the MSPSE were discussed.
(Contains 5 tables and 16 references.) (Author/SLD)

Running head: SELF-EFFICACY

An Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of Bandura's

Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy

Janice E. Williams

William T. Coombs

Oklahoma State University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the (a) reliability of Bandura's <u>Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy</u> (MSPSE) using the Cronbach alpha measure of internal consistency, (b) divergent validity of the MSPSE using subscale correlations, and (c) construct validity of the MSPSE through application of principal axes factor analysis. A sample of 500 college-bound high school students completed the MSPSE. A three-factor model was selected based upon (a) previous empirical findings, (b) application of Cattell's scree test, and (c) consideration of the theoretical nature of the factors. The three factors were identified and labeled (a) Social Efficacy, (b) Academic Efficacy, and (c) Self-Regulatory. Interrelationships among the factors are examined, and potential uses of the MSPSE are discussed.

An Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of Bandura's

Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy

Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy guided the development of the Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy (Bandura, 1989). Self-efficacy is concerned with the estimation that one has the ability to produce desired outcomes (Bandura, 1994). Bandura proposes that individuals who perceive themselves as capable tend to attempt and successfully execute tasks or activities. Self-efficacy studies in education have clarified and extended the role of efficacy beliefs as one mechanism underlying behavioral intention (Hill, Smith, & Mann, 1987), goal setting (Locke & Latham, 1990), persistence (Gorrell & Capron, 1988), and actual academic achievement (Collins, 1982). Precise and detailed measurement of efficacy judgements are typically highly related to subsequent school performance (Schunk, 1991).

The Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy were developed in response to the theoretical and applied importance of the self-efficacy construct. The utility of such measures is based upon the integrity of the scores produced by the instrument. Studies using this instrument have recently been cited in the literature (e.g., Caprara, Pastorelli, & Bandura, 1992). Further, researchers have begun administering separate subscales from the instrument (see Zimmerman, Bandura, Martinez-Pons, 1992). However, there is very little psychometric data available on the measure. The purpose of this study was to

examine the reliability and validity of this assessment tool which is now being used to measure student self-efficacy.

Method

Participants

Participants (N = 500) were predominantly white, middle-class junior or senior public high school students attending one of nine university-sponsored ACT preparation workshops. Students attended the workshop for a variety of reasons, including personal choice, parental desire, or upon the advice of their school counselor. All students voluntarily completed the MSPSE during the day-long workshop. The composition of the sample was as follows: 50% female (N = 248), 40% male (N = 202), and 10% did not indicate their gender (N = 50).

Instrument

The Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy (MSPSE) is a 57-item self-report measure which includes nine subscales. Each subscale is comprised of from four to 11 items rated along a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not well at all, 3 = Not too well, 5 = Pretty well, 7 = Very well). Larger student scores indicate higher self-efficacy beliefs. The number of items for each subscale is as follows: Social Resources (4), Academic Achievement (9), Self-Regulated Learning (11), Leisure (8), Self-Regulatory (9), Other's Expectations (4), Social (4), Self-Assertive (4), and Parental Support (4).

Procedure

One of the coauthors administered the MSPSE to students

attending university-sponsored ACT Preparation Workshops. The
researcher detailed the purpose for the administration of the
instrument. Students were asked to respond to each of the items
within the allotted time.

<div align="center">Results</div>

Descriptive Statistics

Shown in Table 1 are means and standard deviations for each
of the nine MSPSE subscales. In order to place descriptive
statistics in the same metric as the original Likert-type scale,
subscale scores for each participant were divided by the number
of items on that subscale prior to computing the mean and
standard deviation for that subscale. For example, the Social
Resources Subscale Score for each individual was divided by four
prior to computing the mean (5.3) and standard deviation (.84)
since there are four items on the Social Resources subscale. The
subscale means, ranging from 5.1 to 6.0, indicated that this
college-bound sample tended to have positive attitudes about
their capabilities to produce desired performance levels. The
standard deviations were relatively homogeneous, suggesting that
the students used the nine efficacy scales in similar ways.

Insert Table 1 about here

Reliability

The scores from this measure produced an overall Cronbach's
(1951) alpha reliability coefficient of 0.92. This indicated

that the instrument had strong internal consistency, since
coefficient alpha represents a lower bound of the proportion of
variance in the scores explained by common factors underlying
item performance (Crocker & Algina, 1986). Shown as diagonal
elements in Table 1, alpha coefficients ranged from 0.61 to 0.87
for the Social Resources and Self-Regulated Learning subscale
scores, respectively. These values demonstrate adequate response
consistency.

Validity

Divergent Validity. Correlations between subscale pairs are
shown as off-diagonal elements in Table 1. These coefficients
were relatively small, ranging from 0.13 (Academic Achievement-
Parental Support Subscales) to 0.56 (Self-Regulated Learning-
Other's Expectations Subscales). This revealed a fairly low rate
of measurement overlap between the nine subscales, with anywhere
from 2% to 31% of the variance shared. Thus this instrument may
be able to discriminate between the nine self-efficacy constructs
assessed with this measure.

Construct Validity. To ascertain the structure of the 57-
item MSPSE, (common) factors were extracted using (a) principal
factor analysis, (b) squared multiple correlations as initial
communality estimates, (c) the raw score data set, and (d) PROC
FACTOR in SAS. A promax rotation (Hendrickson & White, 1964) was
selected with varimax (Kaiser, 1958) prerotation where power of
k=3 was chosen to compute the target pattern. This resulted in
eight factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Approximately

89% of the total variance was accounted for by the eight-factor

solution. Inspection of Cattell's (1966) scree test suggested

that three factors may better represent the self-efficacy factor

structure. Gorsuch (1983, p.208) suggests when interpreting

obliquely rotated factors, ideally the (a) factor structure

matrix, (b) rotated factor pattern matrix, and (c) reference

structure matrix would be presented so that the reader would have

the greatest amount of information to guide conclusions. Shown

in Table 2 are the (a) variable-factor correlations (factor

structure) and (b) variance explained by each factor ignoring

other factors (that is, the sum of the squared elements of the

factor structure corresponding to each factor). The three

factors in combination accounted for approximately 62% of the

total variance of the item set. For interpretational clarity, a

salient loading (Gorsuch, 1983, p.208) of 0.35 was selected as

one that is sufficiently high to assume a variable-factor

relationship exits. The nature of the factors obtained were

intuitively attractive and were labeled (Social Efficacy,

Academic Efficacy, Self-Regulatory) by the authors.

Insert Table 2 about here

Shown in Table 3 are standardized regression coefficients

for predicting the variables from the factors (rotated factor

pattern).

Insert Table 3 about here

Shown in Table 4 are the (a) semipartial correlations between variables and factors, removing from each factor the effects of other factors and (b) variance explained by each factor eliminating the effects of other factors (that is, the sum of the squared elements of the reference structure corresponding to each factor).

Insert Table 4 about here

Shown in Table 5 are pairwise factor correlations.

Insert Table 5 about here

Discussion

The _Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy_ appears to provide a promising measure for investigating high school students' self-efficacy. The scores from the measure were sufficiently reliable in terms of internal consistency. The divergent and construct validity results, taken together, seem to indicate that the general theoretical framework, and the scales designed to assess it, were valid. The nine subscales measured general self-efficacy components that were distinguishable from each other. These components produced three underlying

measurement dimensions.   Additionally, the three efficacy factors located here (Social, Academic, and Self-Regulation) strongly resemble those identified in a prior study (Caprara, Pastorelli, & Bandura, 1992).   Further research is need to assess the stability of these factors across different samples and groups within academic settings.

References

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). The multidimensional self-efficacy scales. Unpublished test, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. Encyclopedia of human behavior. San Diego, Academic Press.

Caprara, G.V., Pastorelli, C., & Bandura, A. (1992). Impact of perceived academic self-efficacy on interpersonal and emotional behavior. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Cattell, R.B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1(2), 245-276.

Collins, J. (1982, March). Self-efficacy and ability in achievement behavior. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical & modern test theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Gorrell, J., & Capron, E.W. (1988). Effects of instructional type and feedback on prospective teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. Journal of Experimental Education, 57, 231-244.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). Factor analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hendrickson, A.E., & White, P.O. (1964). A quick method for rotation to oblique simple structure. British Journal of Statistical Psychology, 17(1), 65-70.

Hill, T., Smith, N.D., & Mann, M.F. (1987). Role of efficacy: expectations in predicting the decision to use advanced technologies: The case of computers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 307-313.

Kaiser, H.F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 23(3), 187-200.

Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (1990). A theory of goal setting and task performance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schunk, D. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist, 26, 207-231.

Zimmerman, B.J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. American Educational Research Journal, 29, 663-676.

Table 1

<u>Correlation Matrix, Descriptive Statistics, and Reliabilities for</u>

<u>the Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy (N = 500)</u>

Subscale	SR	AA	SRL	L	SR	OE	S	SA	PS
Social Resources (SR)	.61								
Academic Achievement	.24	.74							
Self-Regulated Learning	.37	.47	.87						
Leisure (L)	.31	.24	.32	.74					
Self-Regulatory (SR)	.22	.22	.41	.12	.80				
Other's Expectations	.41	.34	.56	.30	.44	.74			
Social (S)	.44	.21	.33	.45	.15	.44	.83		
Self-Assertive (SA)	.32	.23	.25	.43	.13	.40	.53	.84	
Parental Support (PS)	.48	.13	.33	.31	.27	.39	.34	.26	.71
<u>M</u>	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.2	6.0	5.3	5.9	5.6	5.1
<u>SD</u>	.84	.73	.86	.85	.89	.91	.92	1.03	1.14

<u>Note 1.</u> Statistics reported in the main diagonal are internal consistency estimates using coefficient alpha.

<u>Note 2.</u> Subscale scores for each participant were divided by the number of items on that subscale prior to computing the mean and standard deviation for that subscale.

Table 2

Factor Structure (Correlations), Eigenvalues, and Percent of Variance for the
MSPSE (N = 500)

	Factor 1 Social Efficacy	Factor 2 Academic Efficacy	Factor 3 Self-Regulatory
1. How well can you get teachers to help you when you get stuck on school work?		.36	
2. How well can you get another student to help you when you get stuck on homework?			
3. How well can you get adults to help you when you have social problems?	.38		.37
4. How well can you get a friend to help you when you have social problems?	.41		
5. How well can you learn general mathematics?			
6. How well can you learn algebra?		.43	
7. How well can you learn science?		.52	
8. How well can you learn biology?		.52	
9. How well can you learn reading and writing language skills?		.46	
10. How well can yo learn to use computers?			
11. How well can you learn a foreign language?		.40	
12. How well can you learn social studies?		.43	
13. How welll can you learn English grammar?		.51	
14. How well can you finish homework assignments by deadlines?		.48	.49
15. How well can you study when there are other interesting things to do?		.53	.48
16. How well can you concentrate on school subjects?		.65	.61
17. How well can you take class notes of class instruction?		.51	.41

Item	Col1	Col2	Col3
18. How well can you use the library to get information for class assignments?		.57	.36
19. How well can you plan your school work?		.64	.58
20. How well can you organize your school work?		.55	.55
21. How well can you remember information presented in class and textbooks?		.62	
22. How well can you arrange a place to study without distractions?		.51	.41
23. How well can you motivate yourself to do school work?		.62	.54
24. How well can you participate in class discussions?	.52	.45	
25. How well can you learn sports skills?	.59		
26. How well can you learn dance skills?	.45		
27. How well can you learn music skills?			
28. How well can you do the kinds of things that are needed to work on the school newspaper?		.40	
29. How well can you do the kinds of things needed to be a member of the school government?	.39	.45	
30. How well can you do the kinds of things needed to take part in school plays?			
31. How well can you do regular physical education activities?	.52		
32. How well can you learn skills needed for team sports (for example, basketball, volleyball, swimming, football, soccer)?	.58		
33. How well can you resist peer pressure to do the things in school that can get you into trouble?			.59
34. How well can you stop yourself from skipping school when you feel bored or upset?			.53
35. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke cigarettes?			.57

36. How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?			.61
37. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke marijuana?			.52
38. How well can you resist peer pressure to use pills (uppers, downers)?			.45
39. How well can you resist peer pressure to use crack?			
40. How well can you resist pressure to have sexual intercourse?			.62
41. How well can you control your temper?			.43
42. How well can you live up to what your parents expect of you?		.41	.61
43. How well can you live up to what your teachers think of you?		.56	.65
44. How well can you live up to what your peers expect of you?	.43		
45. How well can you live up to what you expect of yourself?	.42		
46. How well can you make and keep friends of the opposite sex?	.59		
47. How well can you make and keep friends of the same sex?	.58		
48. How well can you carry on conversations with others?	.73		
49. How well can you work in a group?	.65		
50. How well can you express your opinions when others classmates disagree with you?	.63		
51. How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?	.66		
52. How well can you deal with situations where others are annoying you or hurting your feelings?	.60		
53. How well can you stand firm to someone who is asking you to do something unreasonable or inconvenient?	.60		
54. How much can you get your parent(s) to help you with a problem?	.43		.41

55. How well can you get your brother(s) and sister(s) to help you with a problem?			
56. How well can you get your parents to take part in school activities?			
57. How well can you get people outside the school to take an interest in your school (for example, community groups, churches)?	.37		
Variance explained by each factor ignoring other factors	7.34	7.72	6.74

Note. Only correlations whose magnitude is greater than 0.35 are presented.

Table 3

Factor Pattern (Standard Regression Coefficients) for the MSPSE (N = 500)

	Factor 1 Social Efficacy	Factor 2 Academic Efficacy	Factor 3 Self-Regulatory
1. How well can you get teachers to help you when you get stuck on school work?			
2. How well can you get another student to help you when you get stuck on homework?			
3. How well can you get adults to help you when you have social problems?			
4. How well can you get a friend to help you when you have social problems?	.38		
5. How well can you learn general mathematics?		.35	
6. How well can you learn algebra?		.47	
7. How well can you learn science?		.63	
8. How well can you learn biology?		.58	
9. How well can you learn reading and writing language skills?		.50	
10. How well can yo learn to use computers?			
11. How well can you learn a foreign language?		.43	
12. How well can you learn social studies?		.49	
13. How welll can you learn English grammar?		.52	
14. How well can you finish homework assignments by deadlines?		.36	
15. How well can you study when there are other interesting things to do?		.44	
16. How well can you concentrate on school subjects?		.55	
17. How well can you take class notes of class instruction?		.41	

18. How well can you use the library to get information for class assignments?		.47	
19. How well can you plan your school work?		.47	.36
20. How well can you organize your school work?		.39	.37
21. How well can you remember information presented in class and textbooks?		.60	
22. How well can you arrange a place to study without distractions?		.40	
23. How well can you motivate yourself to do school work?		.49	
24. How well can you participate in class discussions?	.43		
25. How well can you learn sports skills?	.65		
26. How well can you learn dance skills?	.42		
27. How well can you learn music skills?			
28. How well can you do the kinds of things that are needed to work on the school newspaper?		.36	
29. How well can you do the kinds of things needed to be a member of the school government?		.39	
30. How well can you do the kinds of things needed to take part in school plays?			
31. How well can you do regular physical education activities?	.55		
32. How well can you learn skills needed for team sports (for example, basketball, volleyball, swimming, football, soccer)?	.65		
33. How well can you resist peer pressure to do the things in school that can get you into trouble?			.57
34. How well can you stop yourself from skipping school when you feel bored or upset?			.52
35. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke cigarettes?			.66

36. How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?			.70
37. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke marijuana?			.57
38. How well can you resist peer pressure to use pills (uppers, downers)?			.49
39. How well can you resist peer pressure to use crack?			
40. How well can you resist pressure to have sexual intercourse?			.62
41. How well can you control your temper?			.41
42. How well can you live up to what your parents expect of you?			.52
43. How well can you live up to what your teachers think of you?			.49
44. How well can you live up to what your peers expect of you?	.36		
45. How well can you live up to what you expect of yourself?	.36		
46. How well can you make and keep friends of the opposite sex?	.59		
47. How well can you make and keep friends of the same sex?	.57		
48. How well can you carry on conversations with others?	.70		
49. How well can you work in a group?	.60		
50. How well can you express your opinions when others classmates disagree with you?	.60		
51. How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?	.66		
52. How well can you deal with situations where others are annoying you or hurting your feelings?	.59		
53. How well can you stand firm to someone who is asking you to do something unreasonable or inconvenient?	.58		
54. How much can you get your parent(s) to help you with a problem?	.38		.36

55. How well can you get your brother(s) and sister(s) to help you with a problem?			
56. How well can you get your parents to take part in school activities?			
57. How well can you get people outside the school to take an interest in your school (for example, community groups, churches)?			

Table 4

Reference Structure (Semipartial Correlations) for the MSPSE (N = 500)

	Factor 1 Social Efficacy	Factor 2 Academic Efficacy	Factor 3 Self-Regulatory
1. How well can you get teachers to help you when you get stuck on school work?			
2. How well can you get another student to help you when you get stuck on homework?			
3. How well can you get adults to help you when you have social problems?			
4. How well can you get a friend to help you when you have social problems?	.36		
5. How well can you learn general mathematics?			
6. How well can you learn algebra?		.40	
7. How well can you learn science?		.54	
8. How well can you learn biology?		.50	
9. How well can you learn reading and writing language skills?		.43	
10. How well can yo learn to use computers?			
11. How well can you learn a foreign language?		.37	
12. How well can you learn social studies?		.42	
13. How welll can you learn English grammar?		.45	
14. How well can you finish homework assignments by deadlines?			
15. How well can you study when there are other interesting things to do?		.38	
16. How well can you concentrate on school subjects?		.48	
17. How well can you take class notes of class instruction?		.35	

18. How well can you use the library to get information for class assignments?		.41	
19. How well can you plan your school work?		.41	
20. How well can you organize your school work?			
21. How well can you remember information presented in class and textbooks?		.52	
22. How well can you arrange a place to study without distractions?			
23. How well can you motivate yourself to do school work?		.42	
24. How well can you participate in class discussions?	.41		
25. How well can you learn sports skills?	.62		
26. How well can you learn dance skills?	.40		
27. How well can you learn music skills?			
28. How well can you do the kinds of things that are needed to work on the school newspaper?			
29. How well can you do the kinds of things needed to be a member of the school government?			
30. How well can you do the kinds of things needed to take part in school plays?			
31. How well can you do regular physical education activities?	.52		
32. How well can you learn skills needed for team sports (for example, basketball, volleyball, swimming, football, soccer)?	.62		
33. How well can you resist peer pressure to do the things in school that can get you into trouble?			.50
34. How well can you stop yourself from skipping school when you feel bored or upset?			.46
35. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke cigarettes?			.59

36. How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?			.63
37. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke marijuana?			.51
38. How well can you resist peer pressure to use pills (uppers, downers)?			.44
39. How well can you resist peer pressure to use crack?			
40. How well can you resist pressure to have sexual intercourse?			.55
41. How well can you control your temper?			.37
42. How well can you live up to what your parents expect of you?			.46
43. How well can you live up to what your teachers think of you?			.44
44. How well can you live up to what your peers expect of you?			
45. How well can you live up to what you expect of yourself?			
46. How well can you make and keep friends of the opposite sex?	.56		
47. How well can you make and keep friends of the same sex?	.54		
48. How well can you carry on conversations with others?	.67		
49. How well can you work in a group?	.57		
50. How well can you express your opinions when others classmates disagree with you?	.57		
51. How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?	.63		
52. How well can you deal with situations where others are annoying you or hurting your feelings?	.57		
53. How well can you stand firm to someone who is asking you to do something unreasonable or inconvenient?	.55		
54. How much can you get your parent(s) to help you with a problem?	.36		

55. How well can you get your brother(s) and sister(s) to help you with a problem?			
56. How well can you get your parents to take part in school activities?			
57. How well can you get people outside the school to take an interest in your school (for example, community groups, churches)?			
Variance explained by each factor eliminating other factors	5.54	3.92	3.81

Table 5

Inter-Factor Correlations (N = 500)

Factor	Social Efficacy	Academic Efficacy	Self-Regulatory
Social Efficacy	1.00		
Academic Efficacy	.31	1.00	
Self-Regulatory	.17	.45	1.00

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC ®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: An Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of Bandura's Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy

Author(s): Janice E. Williams   William T. Coombs

Corporate Source: Oklahoma State Univ.	Publication Date: April, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

Sample sticker to be affixed to document ← [X]

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

——— Sample ———

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document ➡ [ ]

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

——— Sample ———

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Janice E. Williams	Position: Asso. Prof.
Printed Name: Janice E. Williams	Organization: Okla. State Univ.
Address: 323 N. Murray Hall Stillwater, OK 74075	Telephone Number: (405) 744-9457
	Date: 4-22-96

CUA

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
Department of Education, O'Boyle Hall
Washington, DC 20064
202 319-5120

February 27, 1996

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratulations on being a presenter at AERA[1]. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a written copy of your presentation.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can drop off the copies of your paper and Reproduction Release Form at the **ERIC booth (23)** or mail to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 1996/ERIC Acquisitions
             The Catholic University of America
             O'Boyle Hall, Room 210
             Washington, DC 20064

This year ERIC/AE is making a **Searchable Conference Program** available on the AERA web page (http://tikkun.ed.asu.edu/aera/). Check it out!

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

---

[1]If you are an AERA chair or discussant, please save this form for future use.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation