Hello Kimberly

Thank you for accepting my submission “The influence of involvement with faculty and mentoring on the self-efficacy and academic achievement of African American and Latino college students” with revisions. Below I have noted how I have addressed the comments of the reviewers. Please contact me if you have further concerns.

Reviewer B suggested no revisions therefore none were done with this reviewer in mind.

Reviewer A was unclear about a sentence on page 2. That sentence was restructured.

Reviewer C also wanted self-efficacy to be defined. That definition was added. In addition, the reviewer wanted a more clear explanation of how self-efficacy mediates the relations between mentoring, faculty-student involvement and academic achievement. That was done more explicitly in the paragraph right before **The Current Study**. There was also a concern that there was a selection bias in the extant literature such that students who were more likely to interact with faculty or to be involved with mentoring would have done better academically anyway than those who did not choose these activities. It was noted that this was not addressed in the introduction. I chose not to address this in the introduction but in the limitations section of the paper. I noted that my study was correlational as was much of the extant literature. I noted the difficulty with the development of an experimental study on this topic.

Both reviewers A and C wanted the hypotheses to be more explicitly outlined. This was done in the section, **The Current Study**. Three hypotheses are clearly shown.

Reviewer A wanted the type of institution noted in the paper. This was added to the Methods section.

There were some issues with tables that reviewer A wanted me to address. In Table 1, I modified the name to note that there were only means in the table. In addition, I noted review A stated confusion about the asterisk in the table however it seems convention that it would note a significant difference between African Americans and Latinos on the variable therefore I did not change it.

Reviewer A was concerned that there were not more comparisons between African Americans and Latinos. I chose not to do those comparisons because as noted in Table 1, there were only significant differences between the two groups on age. Examining differences between these groups based on age was not of interest to me and I had no theoretical reason to examine it, therefore I used age as a control variable in the regression analyses.

Reviewer A requested to see the results of the t-test that I conducted to find difference between African Americans and Latinos on study variables. I conducted an ANOVA for this so I reported the results for the significant finding in the results section. Reviewer A felt that I should use ANCOVA to explore mediation however I used the well established method put forth by Baron and Kenny (1986) using regression to establish mediation therefore there was no need to do ANCOVA. To make this clearer, I added an additional regression table that shows the test of self-efficacy as a mediator of the relationship between involvement with faculty and GPA. In addition, Reviewer A felt that the title of table 3 did not represent the variables however it included the main study variables and merely left out the control variables. This is a standard practice.

Reviewer A wanted me to make it clearer as to why faculty-student relationships are so important for African American and Latino populations. I included further information about the common belief of members of these populations that they are being negatively perceived by their professors so positive interactions are crucial to changing these perceptions. Both reviewers A and C requested that I talk more about the connection between self-efficacy and faculty-student involvement in the implications. I expanded that section.

In addition, both reviewers A and C wanted other factors that may mediate the relationship between involvement with faculty and GPA to be examined. I conducted additional analyses with intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation did not mediate the relationship between involvement and GPA therefore I chose not to include it in the paper. I felt that it just made the findings seem unfocused. However, if you would like for me to include these findings in the paper, I will include them. I suggested that future research examine the possibility that involvement with faculty increase students’ knowledge of course assignments and course material.

Both reviewers A and C expressed concern about verb tense. I believe they may be having a problem with the section **Mentoring, Involvement with Faculty and Self-Efficacy** being in present tense. This section was not discussing past research but current theoretical views of self-efficacy therefore it was appropriate to discuss them in the present tense. There were other areas where present tense was used inappropriately and those were modified.

Reviewer A suggested that the article contained APA style errors. I changed the format to double spacing. I noted in the submission criteria for the journal one place suggests single spacing while another suggests double. I chose double to be in line with APA style. I also indented all paragraphs.

Reviewer C addresses a partial entry in the references section but this was done to preserve a blind review. It will be corrected before publication.

Thank you for your consideration and do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further concerns or questions.