Background

- FO is an umbrella term for one's thoughts and feelings about the future (Alm & Laftman, 2016).
- Cognitive component refers to an individual's views of the future as being internally or externally controlled; extension of time perspective one judges their future with.
- Motivational component refers to perceived values for the future; various life domains such as educational attainment, as well as job and family status.
- Affective component refers to feelings of optimism/pessimism about their future (Alm & Laftman, 2016).
- Previous research focused largely on the affective component in children and adolescents, found it acts as a protective factor and promote positive outcomes (Alm & Laftman, 2016; Schumacher, 2010; Ohri, 2016).
- Research on FO in college student populations is relevantly sparse.
- Perceived parental support acts as a protective factor and an in terms of frequency (Trommsdorff, 1983).
- SS is a buffer between socioeconomic status and academic performance (Malecki, 2006).
- Family support correlates with higher GPA, regardless of economic support (Cheng, 2012).
- No research to date has examined FO and SS together as predictors of college student's GPA.
- Research Questions: 1) How does FO develop over time for college students? 2) How are FO, SS, and GPA interrelated?

Methods

- Participants: 99 students from a comprehensive southeastern 4-year university.
- 70.7% white, 26.3% men, and 3% - transgender, 64.6% of respondents identified as Caucasian, 23.2% African American, 8.1% Hispanic/Latino, 1% Asian, 2% mixed, and 1% other.
- Materials: 4-Item FO scale (Crespo & Jose, 2013), 12 item Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet, 1988), demographics such as age, gender, GPA, credit hours earned, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status.
- Procedure: Anonymous online survey.
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Table 1 - Descriptive Statistics for FO, SS, and GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Special person</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Friends</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Family</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SS</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Intercorrelations between SO, FO, and GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SS-Special person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SS-Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SS-Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

- One-way ANOVA showed there were no significant differences in FO among classes, F (2, 96) = 3.95, p = .03 (Figure 1).
- Bivariate correlations revealed overall total SS significantly and positively correlated with Fo, r (97) = .22, p < .03 (Table 1).
- Only significant support source correlated with FO was from a special person, r (97) = .28, p < .01 (Table 2).
- For GPA, family SS was seen to positively correlate with GPA, r (97) = .26, p = .01, as well as FO, r (97) = .24, p = .01 (Table 2).
- A hierarchical linear regression analysis showed family support was a significantly unique contributor to GPA, β = .40, p < .05 after accounting for significant variance in three sources of SS, R² = .11 F (3, 95) = 3.75, p = .01 (Table 3).
- After accounting for significant amount of variance from FO, ΔR² = .08, F (1, 94) = 0.08, p < .001, support from a special person was revealed to be negatively correlated with GPA, β = -.28, p = .03 (Table 3).

Discussion

- FO is important to consider on its own because it has been shown to act as a protective factor and promote students' academic success.
- Not all sources of social support are equal in how they affect students' academic performance.
- Essential for future research to use larger, more representative sample.
- Helpful to use more comprehensive scale for FO to include all components.
- Important for future research to extend on type of relationship one has with a special person and quality of support they are receiving since it could affect that student's performance in their academics.
- Campus service personnel could utilize these findings and try to replicate benefits of family support to promote students' success, as well as incorporate programming to inform students of the effects romantic relationships and FO levels may have on their academic performance.
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