

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

7-31-2014

An Examination of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Perceptions of the Community College Environment, Their Quality of Effort, Gains, and Inclination to Persist.

William Melvin Johnson Sr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Johnson, William Melvin Sr., "An Examination of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Perceptions of the Community College Environment, Their Quality of Effort, Gains, and Inclination to Persist." (2014). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 991.
<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/991>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khgerty@memphis.edu.

AN EXAMINATION OF TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL
AFRICAN AMERICAN MALE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY
COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT, THEIR QUALITY OF EFFORT, GAINS, AND
INCLINATION TO PERSIST

by

William Melvin Johnson, Sr.

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Major: Higher and Adult Education

The University of Memphis

August 2014

Copyright © 2014 William Melvin Johnson, Sr.
All rights reserved.

Dedication

First, I give thanks and honor to God for providing the strength, both mentally and physically, to complete this academic process. I further dedicate this dissertation to my family and friends whom provided patience, understanding, and support throughout my academic journey.

To my parents Louis Melvin Johnson, Joann Johnson-Polite, and Franklin D. Polite, SR., your sacrifices have allowed me to grow up a happy child. The love you have shown to me has provided a sense of security, self-worth, and confidence. I cannot express how thankful I am. Because of your loving contributions, I have been able to follow my dreams, uninhibited. Thank You!

To my wife Tiffany, I love you! Your willingness to follow my lead has been incredible. You are a talented, strong wife, a friend, and a very loving mother. Thanks for listening to my research (even when you didn't want to). I thank you for sharing my passion in the arts and in education.

To my most cherished accomplishments, my children: Breanna, William, Dorian, and Kai. The four of you have been my greatest sources of inspiration. I thank you for being so patient while your "Daddy" has devoted so much energy towards his goals. I hope to have instilled the love of learning within each of you. Thank you for your smiling faces, they really got me through!

To Richard and Wendy Cutting, I am very grateful to have you guys in my life. Your level of understanding and support has been amazing. Thank you for always being there for us.

I must thank a few special people for the phone calls, visits, and consistent encouragement: Renty Johnson, Franklin Polite, Jr. and Joseph Polite, Dr. Briant Williams III., Dr. Lawanda Johnson, James and Michelle Dekle, Ronald Thompson, Glenn Eichelberger and my Uncle Randy, relatives and close friends. You guys have been more than friends to me and my family; and I say thank you.

I would like to acknowledge my Florida A&M University “Marching 100” family and HVJ Marching Band Students, and to my fraternity brothers of Phi Mu Alpha and Kappa Alpha Psi.

A special thank you goes to my mentors Lt. Benjamin McKnight, Jr. and Mr. Eugene Gilbert. I will always strive to be a good leader with your teachings, wisdom, and advice. Thank You!

Acknowledgements

I must acknowledge the many people that supported my journey to through the doctoral process. This network of support has made my journey successful.

To Dr. Larry McNeal, your example of leadership has been an inspiration to me. You have taught me a great deal about myself, and allowed me to see my potential for success. You instilled a sense of belonging in me, and cultivated my transition into several dimensions of my life. This section is not large enough to express my gratitude for your efforts. To you, I am truly grateful!

To Dr. Lou “Captain” Franceschini, you have brought the world of statistics to life for me. Your casual conversations, interesting stories, and aggressive approaches to research has shaped and challenged skill set. You truly a great educator/researcher and your guidance have been significant. I thank you for believing in me and my abilities, and look forward to many more years of research together.

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Dr. Reginald L. Green. Your level of continued success and determination has been an inspiration. I have much respect for you and the educational legacy that you have created. Thank you for your meaningful contribution to my research, and your uncompromising structure and commitment to excellence.

I would also like to thank Dr. William C. Hunter agreeing to serve as a committee member.

I would also like to acknowledge the entire Department of Leadership; specifically, the Higher and Adult Education professors, staff, and students. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. Katrina Meyer, Dr. Barbara Mullins-Nelson, Dr. William Akey,

and Dr. Patricia Murrell, Ms. Sarah Sutton, Mrs. Nancy Matthews, and Ms. Cathy Wilhelm for sharing your knowledge, support, and friendship with me.

I would like to give special thanks to Dr. Jeff Wilson and Dr. Mitsu Misawa for taking a special interest in me and allowing me to follow my passions. I would not have been successful without the level of insight and care that you two extended to me.

Next, I would like to acknowledge my Southwest Tennessee Community College family for their support during the doctoral process. I would like to extend a special thanks to Dr. Cynthia Calhoun for introducing the areas of institutional finance and retention to me. Further, to Mr. Don Myers for true mentorship in the area of institutional research. Lastly, to the Men of Southwest Tennessee (MOST) program for allowing me to conduct my residential research. Finally, to the Division of Music at SWTCC for maintain its flexibility and understanding during my tenure in the doctoral program.

Lastly, I would like to extend my appreciation to the University of Memphis' Graduate School and College of Education's - Dean's office. Specifically, Dr. Karen Weddle-West, Dr. Ernest Rakow, Dr. Lorraine Allen, Ms. Michelle Stout, Ms. Jan Brownlee, Mrs. Stormy Warren, Ms. Georgette Kearney and the *Presidential Service Tuition Scholars Program*. *THANK YOU!*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	11
Purpose Statement	11
Research Questions	12
Significance of the Study	13
Theoretical Framework	14
Assumptions	14
Limitations	15
Delimitations	15
Definition of Terms	16
Study Overview	18
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	20
Overview	20
The Origins of Higher Education	20
The First College: Henricopolis	20
The First College of Massachusetts	21
Legislative Impacts for African American Access to Education	22
The Emancipation Proclamation	23
The Morrill Acts	24
The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944	26
The Higher Education Act of 1965	28
History of Community Colleges	37
Functions of the First Community Colleges	38
Community College Access	42
Persistence and Retention: A Firm Definition	42
Factors affecting African American Male Community College	
Students': Persistence, Retention, and Attrition	44
Engagement of African American Male Students	
At Community Colleges	45
Chapter Summary	58
III. METHODOLOGY	59
Introduction	59
Research Questions	60
Research Design	60
Sample	61
Instrument	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		PAGE
	Variables	63
	College Environment	65
	Quality of Effort	66
	Estimate of Gains	77
	Tendency to Persist	79
	Data Analysis	79
	Limitations	81
IV.	RESULTS	82
	Introduction	82
	Description of the Sample	83
	Research Question 1 (College Environment)	84
	Research Question 2 (Quality of Effort)	89
	Research Question 3 (Perceived Gains)	93
	Research Question 4 (Inclination to Persist)	100
	Research Question 5 (Mediated By Age)	105
	Summary of Chapter	106
V.	DISCUSSION	108
	Summary of Discussion Findings	110
	Practical Implications of Findings	113
	Faculty and Administrators	113
	Faculty and Student Personnel	114
	Recommendations for Future Research	114
	Conclusion	117
	REFERENCES	118
	APPENDICES	133
	A. IRB Approval Form	133
	B. Permission for Use of CCSEQ Data	134
	C. CCSEQ (Sample Questionnaire)	145

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Variables Selected for Analysis in this Study	64
2	Perceptions of the College Environment	65
3	Quality of Effort Scales	67
4	Items Related to Course Activities	68
5	Items Related to Library Activities	69
6	Items Related to Faculty Interaction	70
7	Items Related to Student Acquaintances	71
8	Items Related to Art, Music, and Theatre	72
9	Items Related to Writing Activities	73
10	Items Related to Science Activities	74
11	Items Related to Career/Occupational Skills	75
12	Items Related to Computer Technology	76
13	Items Related to Estimate of Gains	78
14	Items Related to Tendency to Persist (Index)	79
15	Categorization of Respondents Analyzed in this study	84
16	Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Students' Perceptions of the College Environment	86
17	Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Nine CCSEQ Quality of Effort Scales by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students	91
18	Item Numbers, Reliability, Means, Standard Deviation, and Effort Sizes of Quality of Effort Scales	92
19	Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Estimate of their Gains	95

TABLE	LIST OF TABLES (Continued)	PAGE
20	Principal Components Grouping for CCSEQ Items Concerning with Gains	98
21	Means, Standard Deviations, Effect Size Differences for Factors Categorized as Career, Worldview, and Academic by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students	99
22	Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Factors Categorized as Career, Worldview, and Academic by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students	99
23	Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Tendency to Persist According to Four Criteria	104
24	Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Mean Tendency to Persist	104
25	Correlations between Mean Intent to Persist Index and Other CCSEQ Outcomes by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students	106

Abstract

Johnson, Sr., William Melvin. Ed.D. The University of Memphis. August 2014. An Examination of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Perceptions of the Community College Environment, their Quality of Effort, Gains, and Inclination to Persist. Major Professor: Larry McNeal, Ph.D.

African American males at community colleges are facing greater challenges regarding persistence in today's higher education environment. Several studies address institutional retention efforts of African Americans at 4-year institutions; however, a significant gap exists of research concerning African American male students' persistence efforts within the community colleges setting. This study assist policy makers, higher education administrators, institutional researchers, and program directors in regards to best practices of programs that promote student persistence at the community college level. Guided by C. Robert Pace's theory of quality of student effort, this study was conducted to examine the differences among traditional and non-traditional African American male students' perceptions of the community college environment, their quality of effort, gains, and inclination to persist. Several statistical procedures were conducted to analyze a national data aggregate of the *Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire* (CCSEQ) acquired from the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at the University of Memphis. A secondary data analysis was conducted among 1,948 student respondents from eight Community Colleges that responded to the electronic version of the questionnaire during the academic years 2010-2013.

To address the five research questions presented within this study, the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) was used to conduct multiple analyses that addressed four groups of dependent variables (perceptions of the college environment,

student quality of effort, students' perceived estimate of gains, and an index of students' tendency to persist). The independent variables were traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students.

The results of this study indicate that significant differences do exist in the responses of traditional and non-traditional aged African American male community college student sample. The most notable difference is the affinity of traditional aged students' and the perceptions of the college environment. Differences were also observed among students' perceived quality of effort, their estimates of gains and their inclination to persist at the community college.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Wood and Ireland (2014) identified that “in the community college context, African American males are one such subgroup that has been the topic of increasing concern over recent years” (p. 154). This concern is prompted by low achievement rates among African American male students in higher education environments, specifically at community colleges. The research of Wood (2012) indicates “11.5 percent of Black males students will depart from a community college within one year of admission, 48.9 percent of these students leave after three years, and 83 percent leave after six years; all without achieving (or successfully making progress for) their intended certificate or degree” (p. 305). In the context of higher education, the ability of an institution to retain a student from admission through graduation institutional (retention) is affected by their persistence, or ability to continue enrollment for consecutive semesters. Further, in the community college environment, the high level of attrition among the African American male subgroup often translates into unrealized collegiate persistence, declining enrollments and abysmal rates of degree completion (Harper & Kuykendall, 2012; Wood & Turner, 2011). Therefore, an understanding of engagement strategies which influence persistence among African American male community college students is vital to increase achievement rates.

According to Harper and Kuykendall (2012) “educators, administrators, policymakers, and concerned others have grappled with the question of what must be done to improve Black male student success” (p. 23). A resulting questions, seek to determine if the lack of African American male student achievement stems from the

perspective of the student (persistence) or from the perspective of the institution (retention). Scholarly research concerning student success often uses persistence and retention interchangeably; which explains Seidman (2005) statement that “a more established definition of persistence and retention from scholarly research is needed” (p. 14).

Berger and Lyons (2005) defines student persistence as “the desire and action of a student to stay within the system of higher education from beginning through degree completion” (p. 22); thus, persistence is irritated when a student “stops out” or leaves an institution for a semester or more (U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 2008). The term retention is defined by Berger and Lyons (2005) as “the ability of an institution to retain a student from admission through graduation” (p. 22).

Essentially, retention is determined in the fall semester of each academic year, regardless if the student enrolled during the spring or summer terms; and student persistence is determined by a student’s enrollment during consecutive semester (U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 2008).

To be successful at retaining collegiate students at the community college level, two-year institutions must be proactive in employing engagement strategies that inspire persistence; and facilitates student engagement within their academic and social community college environments.

Models and Theories Significant to Student Success

Several models and theories address engagement, persistence, retention, and attrition among college students (Astin, 1984; Bean, 1980; Mason, 1998; Pace, 1984; Pascarella, 2006; Tinto, 1975). Astin (1984) developed a theory of student involvement

that addresses student engagement. Astin's research defined involvement as "the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 518). According to Seidman (2005), Astin's theory postures that "the more involved a student is with the college, the higher likelihood of student retention" (p. 13).

Mason (1998) developed a model of persistence for African American male students. Set in an urban community college, the model developed and applied a construct identifying "modes of action, program enhancements, and activities within the college to increase persistence levels" (p. 752). The advantage of this persistence model considers factors of support uniquely designed to support African American male students' persistence.

Tinto (1975) developed a model of academic and social integration which addresses collegiate student retention. As cited by Burnett (2013), Tinto's (1975) Academic and Social Integration Theory suggest that "to be successful in college, a student must successfully integrate into the academic and social environment of the institutions" (p. 13). DeRemer (2002) concurs stating "there is a direct positive relationship between the level of a student's social integration and the level of satisfaction the student experiences with the college" (p. 15).

Bean's (1980) Casual Model of Student Attrition provides insight into how the institutional researchers can identify patterns of student attrition. Bean's model "synthesized research findings on turnover in work organizations and [its relationship to] student attrition" (p. 155); and, suggests how "organizational attitudes and reward structures affect student satisfaction and persistence" (Seidman, 2005, p. 13).

Fundamentally, the model provides an opportunity to understand attrition in several contexts, including the community college environment.

Impact of Theoretical Models

Tinto's (1998) research on persistence has been used to develop policies that "promote persistence... and provide programs (e.g., freshman year seminars, and mentoring programs) designed to enhance the likelihood that students will persist to degree completion" (pp. 167-168). Persistence, associates the student's abilities to engage within their campus environment (Tinto, 1987); moreover, Tinto's (1998) research suggest that "two-year institutions have limited opportunities to engage [students] with classrooms, other students, and faculty" (p. 169). Astin (1984) suggests that one institutional barrier to student engagement is the formulation of a "hook that will stimulate students to get more involved in the college experience" (p. 527). Tinto's (1998) model of student persistence states that a student's ability to integrate into their social and academic college environment predicts whether or not the student is likely to remain enrolled in college.

Research conducted by Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, and Gonyea (2008) suggest ways to improve grades and persistence among first-year college students, and revealed "African American students benefit more from increasing their engagement in educationally effective activities" (p. 551). Further, community colleges can restructure their learning environments, and consider the characteristics that influence persistence; while providing outlets to integrate students by addressing social and cultural engagement. Culturally homogenous or similarly grouped interaction with peer groups have positive engagement effects on collegiate student outcomes; and, supports Astin

(1993) suggestions that “students tend to change their values, behavior, and academic plans in the direction of the dominant (whether constructive or not) orientation of their peer group” (p. 4). Activities like culturally based clubs and organizations; African American targeted mentoring programs, and multi-cultural study groups at the community college, may lead to higher persistence and graduation rates among participating African American male students. Further, the suggestions of Museus and Quaye (2009) state that “ethnic student organizations and ethnic studies departments’ aid in the adjustment and retention of students of color” (p. 71); and are consistent with higher education developmental theories that students involved with campus activities positively correlated with persistence to degree completion (Astin, 1984; Tinto, 1975).

Examples of programs devoted to persistence of African American male students. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Minority Male Student Success Database provides a listing of active male student success programs. The missions of these programs seek to inspire student persistence, retention, and the assistance of educational goal attainment among minority male students attending two-year institutions. According to Marshall (2014) this database “offers organizations an up close and personal view of innovative programs and strategies, that helps thousands of men of color advance their academic and career goals” (p. 1). One example is Brother-2-Brother program at Manchester Community College (MCC) in Manchester, CT. An explanation of the program is provided:

The [Brother-2-Brother] program is designed to connect with African-American and Latino males enrolled at MCC with resources they need to be successful in college life. Six components are provided to their student

membership: (1) Mentoring; (2) Academic support and recognition; (3) community engagement and service; (4) Brother-2-Brother scholars; (5) Brother-2-Brother ambassadors; and (6) Brother-2-Brother Summer boot camp. (AACC, 2014a)

A second program dedicated to African American male community college persistence is The QUEST: African American Male Learning Cohort, located at Baltimore City Community College (BCCC) in Baltimore, MD. A program description is provided:

The QUEST program is an accelerated academic program designed to foster, motivate and stimulate academic growth for African American men; and prepares African American men for the Associate's Degree in one of four programs: Allied Human Services, Business, Early Childhood Education and General Studies. (AACC, 2014b)

Another program designed to increase persistence is the Black & Hispanic Male Initiative Program at Westchester Community College (WCC) in Valhalla, NY. A Program description is provided:

The mission of the Black & Hispanic Male Initiative Program (BHMI) at the Westchester Community College (WCC) is to support male students of color in achieving a better educational outcome at the college and beyond. We [BMHI] work to increase the graduation and retention rates among participating students. We provide our students with information on academic scholarships, assistance in transferring to a four-year college, and support services such as mentoring, tutoring, and counseling. Through our "contact model" approach we keep an

uninterrupted contact with students of color during and after the school year ends.
(AACC, 2014c)

Implications and Impacts of Low Persistence

Mason (1998) suggests a correlation exists between adequate levels of engagement and interaction in the collegiate environment among students at the community college level to (Manson, 1998). Essentially, Specifically, Astin (1984) characterizes that “typically an uninvolved students, are those who neglect their studies, spend little time on campus, abstain from extracurricular activities, and has infrequent contact with faculty members or other students” (p. 518).

The benefits of student engagement was theorized by Astin (1984), but heightened by Pace (1984) who created the theoretical concept pertaining to the quality of student effort. Pace (1984) defined, Quality of Effort as “the amount, scope, and quality of the effort that students put into taking advantage of the opportunities offered to them by the college” (p. 6). Therefore, the more effort a student puts into engagement, the more positive their outcome of degree completion (Pace, 1984). Although much narrower, Pace’s concept is closely tethered with the concepts of the student involvement theory (Astin, 1984); which explains why an analysis that employs the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) is appropriate. The CCSEQ questionnaire was developed by Friedlander, Pace, Murrell, and Lehman (1990) to measure their engagement via in-class and out-of-class activities; and examine students’ self-perceptions of their educational outcomes.

The persistence of African American male students, specifically at community colleges can be influenced in three major ways (a) successful degree completion, (b)

participation in workforce development, and (c) funding associated with institutional performance.

Degree Completion

Rates of completion among African American male community college students show significant differences in achievement between first-time full-time students who complete their programs within six years and students who stop-out. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2006) more than half of the African American males who graduated from high schools (63.1%) chose to attend community colleges, regardless of the institution's public or private status. The low levels of African American male degree completion, however, has concerned the research community (Brown, 2007; Bush, 2004; Fortson, 1994, Harper & Kuykendall, 2012; Jordan, 2008; and Pope, 2006); and has projected troubling images of community colleges as venues failing to improve African American male students' livelihoods (Bush, 2004). This result is based upon the lack of first-time, full-time, African American male students who fail to graduate within six years. Therefore, unsuccessful attempts to engage students coupled with high levels of attrition have translated into lower levels of degree completion; which appears as a wasted use of public financial resources.

On a national stage, high levels of financial waste are associated with community college attrition. Schneider and Yin (2011) published research on behalf of the American Institution for Research (AIR) noting that "from 2004 to 2009, federal, state, and local governments spent almost \$4-billion in student aid and appropriation on community colleges students who dropped out" (p. 2). These data points help to strengthen the

argument of external stakeholders like CCA and their criticism of the efficacy and efficiency of American higher education.

This dialogue about community college persistence data is important because state-level higher education funding agencies, that employ performance funding strategies, have shifted state financial support “from a system based on student enrollment (headcount) to one based on performance (towards degree attainment), reducing the time it takes for students to complete their degrees and transforming remedial education” (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 1). As a result, this study should inform institutional administrators and program directors of factors that promote student persistence among African American male students at the community college level.

Workforce Development

A second advantage of persistence to degree completion is how successful graduates impact the workforce. When a student’s persistence efforts are successful, the student is empowered and qualified to gain employment with businesses that have jobs available. Shaffer (2013) stated “business and political leaders are counting on community colleges to prepare workers for jobs that require more than a high school education” (p. 237). This means that community colleges have the ability to provide specialized training for times where markets are changing.

The American landscape is realizing changing perspectives in regards to its current labor force. It is increasingly becoming more difficult for businesses to find skilled labor to meet their market demands. This gap in the labor market provides a niche for community colleges students; specifically, those who choose not to pursue degrees at four-year institutions.

Those African American male community college students, who fail to persist, contribute to a potential workforce because of unskilled labor. That is, citizens without the skill set to successfully complete specialized tasks, which forces manufacturers to lag in production. This subjected is illuminated in the *2011 Skills Gap Report*, where Morrison et al. (2011) depicts the “skills gap is having a major economic impact on 67 percent of U.S. manufacturers; and companies surveyed stated the lack of *qualified* [emphasis added] workers was affecting their ability to maintain production schedules and expand operations” (p. 6).

Financial Policy Implications

Evaluating and suggesting ways to increase African American male student persistence has important policy implications. Community college funding is increasingly becoming linked to greater levels of performance funding accountability, making the concept of performance-based funding (PBF) in the American higher education system popular. D’Amico, Katsinas, and Friedel (2012) asserts that “states are moving toward a privatized model of higher education with greater reliance on tuition; and . . . community colleges may be further disadvantaged in state appropriations processes in future years” (p. 628).

D’Amico et al. (2013) suggest that “the main premise of performance funding and budgeting is that measuring success based on a series of indicators will potentially influence behavior” (p. 233). For community colleges, a measure of attainment requires that they develop programs that inspire students to persist and graduate. This idea is supported by D’Amico et al. who noted that “in the higher education context, community colleges that are dependent upon state funds take actions to . . . improve program and

student outcomes” (p. 233). Thus, an unintended consequence of PBF for community colleges is the pressure of graduating those students who traditionally have not persisted. This sustains an argument that an examination of students who have represented low degree attainment, like traditional and nontraditional African American male students, in a self-reported format, should be studied. Such an analysis of results can be utilized to identify successful persistence strategies that inspire persistence. Thus, the outcomes of this study may prove useful to community college administrators, advisors, and program directors that encourage African American male students' persistence towards graduation.

Statement of the Problem

African American males at community colleges are facing greater challenges regarding persistence in today's higher education environment. Several studies address institutional *retention* efforts of African Americans at 4-year institutions; however, a significant gap exists of research concerning African American male students' *persistence* efforts within the community colleges setting. Bush and Bush (2010) have described the current availability of African American male community college persistence and retention literature as a scarcity; therefore, a need exists for more information addressing the bleak levels of success within the community college environment (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; McCabe, 2000; Pigg, 2000). This study will examine differences between traditional and non-traditional African American male students in community colleges.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to examine the differences of traditional and non-traditional African American Male students' perceptions of the college environment, their perceived gains, and quality of effort. A secondary purpose is to determine the strength of

relationship between a students' tendency to persist and their perception of the collegiate environment, perceptions of gains, and quality of effort. This study analyzed the aggregate of secondary data of the *Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire* (CCSEQ) that is secured at the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at the University of Memphis.

African American male students experience barriers that challenge their access to remain enroll in higher education. Retention theories exist which address issues of student success within higher education; however, such higher education retention theories fail to address issues unique to the African American male community college student. Research that identifies a student's tendency to persist is also needed. In addition to quality of effort, perceived gains, and perceptions of the collegiate environment, this study aims to identify four factors (job responsibilities, family responsibilities, generational status [first or second generation status], and time spent studying) which are significant regarding persistence of traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the purposes of this study, the following research questions are presented:

RQ 1: To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Perceptions of the Collegiate Environment* on the CCSEQ?

RQ 2: To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Quality of Effort* on the CCSEQ?

RQ 3: To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Perceived Gains* on the CCSEQ?

RQ 4: What is the strength of relationship between traditional and non-traditional students' tendency to persist and their perception of the college environment, perceived gains, and quality of effort?

RQ 5: Is the strength of the relationship mediated by a students' traditional or non-traditional status?

Significance of the Study

This study should assist policy makers and program designers in regards to best practices of programs that promote student persistence at the community college level, while adding to previous research that addresses African American male community college students degree completion, workforce development, financial aspects of institutions through the student success and degree attainment of traditional and nontraditional aged African American male community college students.

Pascarella (2006) suggest more research should be devoted to the students' "academic and out-of-class experiences that influence intellectual and personal development" (p. 516). Meredith (2004) suggests that "additional research concerning not only community college students generally, but also minority students specifically is warranted" (p. 4).

This study is guided through the theoretical lenses of Pace's (1984) "Quality of Effort" and Astin's (1984) theory of student involvement. Further, the use of self-reported responses from students who answered the CCSEQ shall be analyzed to identify

successful strategies which are determined to encourage persistence among African American male students within a community college setting.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical lens guiding this study is associated with Pace's (1984) quality of effort theory. According to Pace (1982) quality of effort is associated with "the amount, scope, and quality of effort they [students] invest in their own learning and development, and specifically, in using the facilities and opportunities that are available in the college setting" (p. 2). Glover and Murrell (1998) detail that Pace's theory "describes that what students learn in college depends to a considerable degree upon how actively they engage in the experiences and opportunities offered by them in college" (p. 6).

Pace (1984) took the concept of student involvement (Astin, 1984) and created a measurable scale around that idea. Pace builds on the idea that education is both a process and product. Pace's theory suggests that if one analyzes the process of student achievement, institutions can build better rates of success for its students. This leads into the research question of does effort have a significant relationship to student achievement. Just like the studies conducted by Astin, Pace notices that student achievement has a linkage to how involved a student is; or, can be determined by what degree or "quality" of that involvement.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are basic to this study:

1. Student attitudes can be measured with the proper use of validated questionnaires.

2. Students who attend community colleges in the United States have perceptions concerning their college environment.

3. Respondents will answer completely all items on the questionnaire which asks for data concerning information that may be personal in nature.

Limitations

Limitations associated with this study are the due to information not available in the CCSEQ data:

1. Student data such as grades in previous courses and socio-economic status (SES) are not included in the CCSEQ.
2. This study does not include the roles or responsibilities specific to the African American family.
3. This study analyzes aggregate data from volunteer two-year institutions; therefore, a generalization cannot be made to all community colleges, or their African American male students.

Delimitations

The delimitations of this study are:

1. This study will only extract and analyze self-reported questionnaire results of African American male community college students from the CCSEQ aggregate database.

2. This study only involves institutions who are consenting CCSEQ participants within the United States; and their African American male students within their community college student populations.

3. This study has included both full-time and part-time students within this study.

Definition of Terms

Certain words and terms to be used in this study require definition for understanding of their implications. These words and terms are as follows:

Attrition. A student who fails to reenroll at an institution in consecutive terms.

Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ). First published in 1990 by Pace, Friedlander, and Lehman, the CCSEQ is a self-assessment instrument that provides information on the quality of students' educational experience as well as students' progress toward important educational goals.

Complete College Tennessee Act (CCTA). A comprehensive reform agenda that seeks to transform public higher education through changes in academic, fiscal, and administrative policies at the state and institutional level.

Degree/Certificate Seeking Students. Students enrolled in courses for credit who are recognized by the institution as seeking a degree or other formal award. At the undergraduate level, this is intended to include students enrolled in vocational or occupational programs.

Engagement. The act of being involved as a college student. Students who are considered engaged are involved in endeavors both academic, and social in nature.

First-Time Student. A student with no prior postsecondary experience attending any institution for the first time at the undergraduate level; including students enrolled in academic or occupational programs. Also includes students enrolled in the fall term who attended college for the first time in the prior summer term, as well as students who entered with advanced standing (college credits earned before graduation from high school).

Full-Time Student. *Undergraduate*- a student enrolled for 12 or more semester credits, or 12 or more quarter credits, or 24 or more contact hours a week each term.

Graduation Rate. The rate required for disclosure and/or reporting purposes under the Student Right-to-Know Act.

Non-Traditional Aged. Category of college student aged 25 to 65 years of age.

Normal Time to Completion. The amount of time necessary for a student to complete all requirements for a degree or certificate according to the institution's catalog. This is typically 2 years (4 semesters or trimesters, or 6 quarters, excluding summer terms) for an associate's degree in a standard term-based institution.

Persistence. The desire and action of a student to stay within the system of higher education from beginning through degree completion.

Part-Time Student: *Undergraduate*- a student enrolled for either 11 semester credits or less, or 11 quarter credits or less, or less than 24 contact hours a week each term.

Postsecondary Education Institution. An institution that has its sole purpose or one of its primary missions, the provision of postsecondary education.

Postsecondary Teachers (instruction only). An occupational category used to classify persons whose specific assignments are customarily made for the purpose of providing instruction or teaching. Regardless of title, academic rank, or tenure status, these employees formally spend the majority of their time providing instruction or teaching.

Quality of Effort. A conceptual framework developed by Pace (1984). This concept measures and rates the quality of engagement via students' self-reported

perceived gains. Pace (1984) defined quality of effort as “the amount, scope, and quality of effort that students put into taking advantage of the opportunities offered to them by the college” (p. 6).

Retention. Ability of an institution to retain a student from admission through graduation.

Student Involvement. The amount of physical and psychological energy a student devotes to the academic experience.

Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR). A system that consists of 46 institutions with a combined annual enrollment of over 200,000 students. The mission is to educate more Tennesseans in order to provide Tennessee with the workforce it needs for sound economic development.

Traditional Aged College Student. Category of college student ages 18 to 24 years of age.

Two –Year Institutions. A postsecondary institution that offers programs of at least 2 but less than 4 years’ duration. Includes occupational and vocational schools with programs of at least 1,800 hours and academic institutions with programs of less than 4 years, not including Bachelor’s degree-granting institutions where the baccalaureate program can be completed in 3 years.

Study Overview

Chapter 1 has presented a brief overview of student persistence among African American male students attending community colleges and addressed motivators affecting this population such as degree completion, workforce development and financial impacts at the institutional levels. Using the conceptual frameworks of

Alexander Astin and Robert Pace this study seeks to determine successful strategies, if any, that may be employed to encourage persistence among African American males at the community college levels. Chapter 2 presents a historical overview of higher education in America, missions of community colleges, and an overview of legislative efforts which have increased higher education access for African Americans.

Additionally, relevant literature addressing engagement, persistence, retention and attrition of African American male community college students is presented. Chapter 3 will give information concerning the conceptual frameworks guiding the study, the instrument, and procedure for the analysis of results. Chapter will include a presentation of results; and Chapter 5 will present a discussion with recommendations and possibilities for further research.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Overview

This chapter provides a review of the literature pertinent to the study of student success in regards to African American male students in the community college setting. Four sections comprise this review: a history of higher education, a history of community colleges, and a review of African American male community college engagement, persistence, retention and attrition.

The Origins of American Higher Education

The movement for higher education in the United States had its beginning during the colonial period with the establishment of the Virginia Colony in 1607. The Colonial Period marked a migration of various cultural groups looking for a fresh start in the new world. Cohen and Kisker (2010) note “the [Colonial] settlers’ were determined to form a way of life different from the governmental and familial rigidities they had left in Europe” (p. 13); and, characterized by an “influx of English families, adventurers, and indentured servants, along with Africans who were brought unwillingly” (p. 14). As each colony was settled, royal charters were established to formulate structured societies, of which, schools and colleges were established.

The First College: Henricopolis. Several historians of higher education identify Harvard College as the first institution of American higher education (Cohen & Kisker, 2010; Quincy, 1860; Thelin, 2011); however, there is evidence of another institution with an older heritage- the College of Henrico. The institution had two names: first, The College of Henrico; and second, its ‘royal’ namesake, Henricopolis (McCabe, 1922). The

college was established in the Virginia Colony, which resulted from a 1609 royal charter executed by the Virginia Company of London (Vacik & Miller, 1995). McCabe (1922) says the college was named “in honor of (the expectancy and rose) England’s (fare state) Henry, Prince of Whales, son of James the First, and grandson of the beautiful [Mary], Queen of Scots” (p. 9). Moreover, Henricopolis was established in 1619 for the purpose of educating English and Native American Indian students (McCabe, 1922; Vacik & Miller, 1995; Williams, 1935). Williams (1935) describes the landscape and demise of the institution:

The campus was composed of 10,000 acres with purposes of educating two groups of students. One thousand acres were allocation for the education and Christianizing of Native Americans, (also known as the Indian College) and the remaining nine thousand acres were to be used for a college and university for the English...the massacre of 1622 ended the young colony’s venture into higher education after a brief 3-year career. (p.1)

From the massacre the college would probably have survived; but only two years later the King withdrew the charter of the London Company, Virginia became “a royal province under the King, and the college lands were confiscated, bringing to an end the college in Virginia” (p.3). Although the College of Henrico experienced a short existence, there would be a 14 year span before the next Colonial institution, Harvard.

First College of Colonial Massachusetts: Harvard. Harvard College was modeled after the institutions which specialized in the Western tradition of education. An approval in 1636 of 400 pounds was given to the Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England for the establishment of a ‘school or college’ (Harvard University

Archives, 2014). When instruction began in 1638, it served as a boarding school, affiliated with the Congregationalist Puritans (Calvinist). The college according to Cohen and Kisker (2010) “developed around the notion of acculturating the young, passing on the wisdom of the classics, an preparing people not only for service as clergymen but as public servants” (p. 21). The population of the early schools primarily serviced wealthy, white male students; and in 1642, the college celebrated its first commencement with nine graduates.

Higher Education: Legislative Impacts for African Americans Access.

Cohen and Kisker (2010) notes that “Africans were brought unwillingly” (p. 14) to the New World by English settlers. The initial intent for Africans was to provide services as slaves who toiled in agricultural and domestic capacities. Thus, enslaved Africans were not provided opportunities of formalized education at the beginning of America’s higher education movement; however, their fate changed significantly, resulting from several pieces of legislation. Specific pieces of legislation are the Emancipation Proclamation, the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act (G.I. Bill), and the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

Before 1890, there were few colleges willing to admit descendants of African slaves. Further, there were few options for those African descendants, freed or otherwise, who could afford to attend college. The participation of African American students in the higher education environment has experienced periods of growth and decline (Allen, 1992); and are a direct product of significant “legal, social and moral agents” (Allen, 1992, p.2). This section shall address significant legislative actions which impacted the facilitation of access to higher education for African American students.

The Emancipation Proclamation. The Emancipation Proclamation was conferred by President Abraham Lincoln in (1865). It declared that Africans bound by slavery in the southern Confederate State of America (CSA) be declared free. Although President Lincoln had no Constitutional basis for eradicating slavery in the country, his formulation of the proclamation heavily persuaded America's Southern enslaved descendants of Africans to flee and reside in Northern region of the Union States.

Ten states were affected by the proclamation, all of which were a part of the Civil War's Confederate alliance. According to Klingaman (2001) the affected states were "Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia" (p. 231). Additionally, States representing the North or Union were not affected by the proclamation's banning of slavery until the ratification of the 13th Amendment which freed all slaves in America.

After the Emancipation Proclamation the United States' experienced a Reconstruction Period, or period of time designated by Congress for the Southern States to reconstruct their society before they could rejoin the Union. Cohen and Kisker (2010) describe this period as a "so-called era in which the South was to be punished" (p. 108).

Prior to 1863, institutions were already established to educate African Americans; however, such schools were funded privately and primarily located in northern regions of the country. For instance, the Institute for Colored Youth, now Cheyney University of Pennsylvania (CUP), was founded 26 years before the Emancipation Proclamation in 1837. In *About CU* (2010), Cheney University of Pennsylvania discusses its historical origins with the help of Richard Humphreys, "a Quaker philanthropist who bequeathed \$10,000, to design and establish a school to educate the descendants of the African race"

(par.1). His generosity was inspired by the difficulty Blacks endured finding jobs in the North regions of the United States. Pagliaro and Bingham (2010) notate that Humphrey's vision of the school was "to instruct the descendants of the African Race in school learning, in the various branches of the mechanic Arts, trades and Agriculture, in order to prepare and fit an qualify them to act as teachers" (p. 3).

During the Reconstruction period, opportunities of educational access for descendants of Africans grew, mainly resulting from private institutions with missions to educate former slaves who fled to northern States. Norman, Ault, Jr., Bentz, and Meskimen (2001) suggest "many schools were opened for Black children as part of the reconstruction effort" (p. 1105). Thus, the impact of the Civil War and Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation had profound effects upon the early access and education of African Americans.

The Morrill Acts. Access to higher education for African descendants was significantly promoted a result of funding from the Morrill Act. Burke (1982) states the Morrill Act served as "the first large-scale Federal aid (to institutions) to education for all sections of the nation" (p. 92). Educational change was inspired via two pieces of established legislation, the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Morrill Act of 1890; and both will be discussed in regards to impacts which proved critical to the education of African Americans.

Cohen and Kisker (2010) stated "the Morrill Act of 1862 permitted every state to select 30,000 acres of federal land times its number of congressmen" (p. 115). Pincus (1980) notes the land gave states the ability to "endow colleges specializing in the agricultural and industrial arts" (p. 335). Although states utilized funds provided by the

Morrill Act of 1862, many states were reluctant to admit African Americans at their institutions (Rudolph, 1962). The behavior to deny admission based upon race caused Congress to take additional measures and introduce another piece of legislation that insured the education of all persons. As a result, the Morrill Land Act of 1890 was established.

Before the second Morrill Act was passed by Congress on July 2, 1862, African Americans were given little access to predominantly White public or private institutions before the late 19th century. Referencing collegiate access during the mid-to-late 19th century, Cohen and Kisker (2010) state that “universities could not or would not matriculate everyone who sought upward mobility through higher education, ... several other institutions forms developed” (p. 119). According to Cross (1999) the Morrill Act of 1862 authorized “separate but equal” facilities; however, only Mississippi (Alcorn State College, est. 1871) and Kentucky (Berea College, est. 1855) established institutions for African American under this law. Therefore, many African Americans were still being denied access to higher education, particularly, the southern regions of the United States.

The impact of the Morrill Land Act of 1890 marked significant legislation. Rudolph (1962) states “It [Morrill Act of 1890] stipulated that no appropriations would go to states that denied admission to the colleges on the basis of race unless they also set up separate but equal facilities” (p. 254). During this time, seventeen states were compelled to provide institutions to African American students, thus forming the Black Land-Grant Institutions.

The Morrill Act of 1890 provided an opportunity for institutions known as Historical Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) which “served as the primary provider of postsecondary education for African Americans in a social environment of racial discrimination” (p. 32). Brown and Davis (2001) notes:

HBCUs are participants in a social contract within the post-bellum American society. Prior to the Civil War, the combination of slavery and segregation restricted educational access and opportunity for African Americans. Although there were a few Northern exceptions (e.g., Amherst College, Oberlin College), African American students were summarily denied entry to institutions of higher learning. (p. 33)

Thus, newly freed slaves and their offspring benefitted from an expanding higher education curriculum that until that time encompassed the Liberal Arts with professional schools of theology and law. The curriculum afforded to African American students; however, consisted primarily of the agricultural sciences and mechanical studies. The Morrill Act of 1890 gave African American students educational skills to contribute within an Industrial movement, lending support to Henderson and Henderson (1982) concept of a “need for agricultural, industrial, mechanical and mercantile education” (p. 4).

The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944. The G.I. Bill of Rights, also known as the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, was one of the most important pieces of legislation in American higher education history. It provided veteran benefits to military servicemen, specifically, those who participated in World War II. Kisker (1994) notes “the measure put an entire generation of veterans among the most educated and

financially well-off generations in U.S. history” (p. 128). Gladieux, King, and Corrigan (2005) notes:

Starting with the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, or G.I. Bill, federal student assistance has helped transform attending college in American from an elite to al mass activity. Congress passed the GI Bill to reward veterans who had served their country during wartime and to help them catch up with their peers whose lives had not been interrupted by military service. (p. 174)

Several benefits were promised as a result of the G.I. Bill. A major caveat was that race was not a factor for receiving such benefits; which proved beneficial for Americans in general. For instance, Turner and Bound (2003) notes:

Educational benefits extended from a minimum of one year to four years, depending on the length of service and age, and men serving between September 1940 and July 1947 were eligible. In addition to providing annual tuition payments of up to \$500, the bill also provided a monthly cash allowance. A notable feature of the program was that benefits were awarded to individuals rather than institutions, allowing veterans to use them for any educational or training programs to which they were accepted. G.I. benefits not only covered enrollment at colleges and universities, but also provided opportunities for vocational, technical, and apprenticeship training. (p.16)

The impact of the G.I. Bill on World War II veterans, including African American access to college was significant. Gladieux, King, and Corrigan (2005) notes “the G.I. Bill sent thousands of men and women to college who otherwise would not have had the opportunity” (p. 174). Turner and Bound (2003) states “the portable aid available to all

veterans through the G.I. Bill held the promise of significantly reducing black-white gaps in educational opportunity” (p. 146). The money, as marked by Trow (1993) provided by the federal government empowered African American students financially to “take their tuition payments and stipends anywhere they wished” (p. 59). African American veterans joined a growing number of students who chose to attend college after their return from World War II. Additionally, the Baby Boom generation coupled with veterans from the Korean war supplied higher education with consumers well into the 1960s (Hansen & Stampen, 1981). At the inception of the Bill, an estimated 800,000 veterans were anticipated to participate in higher education; however, by the time the G.I. Bill’s education title officially ended over 2.2 million veterans utilized its benefits (Olson, 1973). The significant increase in enrollment created a movement of construction in efforts of institutional attempts to accommodate student aspirations.

The Higher Education Act of 1965. According to Hanna (1996) “the Higher Education Act was initially passed in 1965 as an omnibus bill authorizing a variety of institutional, student, and programmatic aid programs for higher education” (p. 500). According to Public Law 89-329 (1965) the primary purpose of this law was “to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education” (p.1219). This piece of legislation created grants, loans and other programs to help students obtain a college education. In regards to the financial impact of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Gladieux et al. (2005) notes:

As part of President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society, the Higher Education Act of 1965 embodied, for the first time, an explicit federal commitment to equalizing

college opportunities for needy students. Programs were designed to identify the college-eligible poor and to facilitate their access with grants, replacing contributions their families could not afford to make. Colleges and universities that wanted to participate in the new Educational Opportunity Grant program were required to make “vigorous” efforts to identify and recruit students with “exceptional financial need”. The legislation also authorized Federal Work-Study to subsidize the employment of needy college students and the federally guaranteed student loan program to ease the cash-flow problems of the middle-income college students and their families. (p. 163)

The original duration of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 lasted for three years, during the academic years of 1965-66 to the end of the 1967-68 academic years. This piece of legislation was reauthorized nine times between 1968 (the year for which its pilot ended) and 2013. The initial version of the HEA included eight ‘Titles’ or subsections which addressed its benefits. The original Titles of the legislation are provided below with description:

Title I: Community Service and Continuing Education Programs- The HEA (1965) details the legislation’s purposes were to supply funding for “community issues as “housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. This section further provided \$25 million for the first fiscal year (1966) and \$50 million for years 2 and 3 of the bill (FYs 1967-68 & 1968-69); and, additional funding required periodic Congressional approval” (Sec. 101). Further, states were required to designate a state agency or institution broadly representative of higher education in the state to administer community service programs developed under

this title. However, states could not use funds for the preparation of religious educational interest.

Title II: College Library Training and Research- The HEA's (1965) purpose of Title II funds were to "assist and encourage institutions in the acquisition for library purposes of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related materials" (including necessary binding) (Sec. 201) A total of \$50 million dollars (\$5 million for year 1966, \$6.3 million for FY 1966-67, and \$7.7 million for FY 19667-68) were allocated to this section, and the establishment of an Advisory Council on College Library Resources (ACCLR) was "required of all states who participated in this Federal program; and "no library would receive more than \$5,000 per institutional branch" (HEA, 1965, sec. 205). Lastly, no institution could use the money for activities connected with divinity or religious instruction.

Title III: Strengthening Developing Institutions- The HEA's (1965) purpose of Title III funding was to assist in "raising the academic quality of colleges which had the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of the nation but which for financial and other reasons were struggling for survival and were isolated from the main currents of academic life" (Sec. 301). The Title appropriated \$55 million to facilitate the initiatives of Title III.

The program authorized the commissioner to pay those "developing institutions" regardless of public or nonprofit status; requiring that "the institutions admitted high school graduates, and the institution would provide educational programs that awarded at least the two year certificate and/or degree" (HEA, 1965, sec. 302). Institutions were

required to acquire and maintain affirmation within accrediting agency or associations; plus, have formative reviews every five years to ascertain quality of training, and efforts to improve administrative staff and student services.

A Council on Developing Institutions (CDI) was required of states who utilized the Federal funds. Further, the grants could be used for the exchange of faculty or students (and visiting scholars from developing institutions). The HEA (1965) states the Commissioner was authorized to “award fellowships to graduate students and junior faculty to teach at developing institutions” (sec. 305). In addition, faculty and administration improvement programs (professional development) were also allowed to receive developmental grant funding. There was a limited stipend available and only lasted for a period of two years. Further, “fellowships leading to advanced degrees, the introduction of new curriculums and materials, and joint use of facilities such as libraries and laboratories were also available to receive federal benefits” (HEA, 1965, sec. 306).

Title IV: Student Assistance- The purpose of Title IV funds were to “provide through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid” (HEA, 1965, sec. 401). A total of \$70 million dollars was allocated in 1966 to help such student which qualified for such need programs. This section of the Higher Education Act is composed of two major topics: grants and loans.

Part A: Educational Opportunity Grants. Students who qualified for the need-based Educational Opportunity Grants (EOGs) were required to be accepted for

enrollment as a full-time student, show evidence of good standing in their course of study, prove that attendance to post-secondary study not be possible without the financial assistance.

Federal assistance was also provided to post-secondary institutions that were efficient in providing data of growth or decline. Restated, federal assistance would be provided to institutions based upon the ratio amount of students enrolled on a full-time basis. The HEA (1965) stipulated that “institutions would provide data based upon the most recent year available” (sec. 406). Thus, this served as the platform of state allocations based upon student headcount.

The conditions of Title III funding stipulated that institutions consider the source of the student individual income and all individuals upon whom the student relied primarily for support (e.g., parents or guardians). Institutions were also required to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities. However, to ensure that federal funds were not abused, a program was established where institutions could secure loans not to exceed \$100,000 in efforts to recruit recruit/encourage students to enroll via marketing, and/or efforts of reclamation (e.g., enrollment of prior college dropouts).

Public and private institutions who participated in EOGs had three major requirements: (1) to secure institutional insurance of at least \$1 million dollars, (2) to provide reasonable access to a State or private nonprofit program of student loan insurance, and (3) agree to pay a portion of the interest on loans approved to students under a State direct loan program. In addition, \$17.5 million dollars were allocated as

reserve funding for State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs (HEA, 1965, sec. 409).

Part B: Federal, State, and Private Programs of Low-Interest Insured Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education. This purpose of this section was to encourage States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish adequate loan insurance programs for students in eligible institutions (HEA, 1965, sec. 435). A secondary purpose was to provide a Federal loan program for students. One stipulation to offer such loans was for institutions to secure a \$1 million dollar insurance fund, and there was annual interest attached to the loan. The Federal government allocated \$17.5 million dollars of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance for this program.

During the enactment of this legislation, no Graduate or Professional student could be awarded more than \$1,500 per academic year, and \$1,000 for other students (e.g., Undergraduate & Vocational students). Plus the insurance on loans unpaid could not exceed \$7,500 for Graduate and Professional student; and \$5,000 for Undergraduate students. However, under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Commissioner agreed to be responsible for insurance liability of Vocational student up to 100 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan (but not to include interest).

The HEA states that students who qualified as borrowers for student loans were required “to be in good standing and be enrolled in at least one-half of their institution’s normal full-load” (Sec. 427). Students were required to sign a written contract agreeing to repay the loans after study; making payments of no less than \$360 dollars per year.

Loans were determined based upon the cost of attendance, including room and board and whose adjusted family income was less than \$15,000 at the time of loan origination. The loan program was open to any state or nonprofit private institution.

Part C: College Work-Study Program. The college work study program (CWS) was designed to provide funds for part-time employment to help needy students to finance the cost of college. The first allocation for the program in 1966 summed a total of \$129 million dollars. Following fiscal years were \$165 million for FY 1966-67 and \$200 million for 1967-68. For students who participated in the program earned no less than the federal minimum wage (Department of Education, 2014). Additionally, the Department of Education (2014) notes that “students can be employed by the institution itself; a federal, state, or local public agency; a private nonprofit organization, or a private for-profit agency” (p. 1).

The impact upon African American student and their enrollment was realized by significant opportunities to fund their education within higher education. Through grants, loans, and opportunities for employment, the federal government had solidified avenues of access for any student who otherwise could not pay for college.

Title V: Teacher Programs, National Teacher Corps- the HEA provided supervision of an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation through the Commissioner on Education. The purpose was to “review the administration and operation of the programs that carried out under Title V” (Sec. 501). Members of the council were not full time employees and only received \$100 dollars to cover meals and travel away from home.

The National Teacher Corps resulted from the HEA of 1965. According the HEA (1965) the purpose was to “strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation” (sec. 511). The program attracted qualified teacher into low income areas and trained those teachers who were deemed inexperienced teachers or interns.

Teacher education programs received funding for the programs under this title. The title also provided financial support for three months of training of teachers, before they serviced schools in low income areas. Additionally, funds were allocated for teachers to acquire advanced degrees (whenever applicable); and those teachers would receive a stipend of \$2,500 per academic year.

This title provided an opportunity for quality teachers to work and engage in low income areas. Schools in low-income areas were not being supported with Federal funding to inspire quality education for the teachers. Further, African American students, being serviced by quality instructors gave a higher probability for low income students to be better academically prepared for post-secondary study.

Title VI: Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction. Funding was also allocated to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas at colleges. The initial funding amount was \$35 million (FY 1965-66), \$50 million (FY 1966-67), and \$60 million (FY 1967-68). This provided a direct allotment of funding to the state institutional governing agencies. Allocation was awarded based on the number of full-time students that attended the State’s institutions and the enrollment of full-time equivalent part time students enrolled in school.

In addition to the Federal funding, the Higher Education Act of 1965 required that participating states and territories be governed by the Commissioner of Education, adhere to its guidelines, and provide fiscal control and fund accounting information annually. Funding was also allocated for foreign territories. Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam received allocations between 33 and 66 % of their enrollment outcome (HEA, 1965, sec. 602).

Title VI also provided faculty development programs such as short-term or regular session workshops. According to the HEA (1965) money went to those “preparing to engage in the use of educational media equipment in teaching...and those in higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialist using such media” (sec. 621). Media specialist and librarians were also given stipends of \$75 per week for attendance at workshops.

Title VII: Amendments to Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. This section provided amendments to the HEA Title I funding procedure for institutions receiving funds for facilities. Issues of construction and technical amendments were addressed under this Title. For instance, the HEA (1965) Title VII grant would approve construction of academic facilities if “an urgent need was presented based upon significant enrollments changes, or changes resulting in facilitating and extension and continuing education program on the campus” (sec. 701). Additionally, changes were made under this section [702] for community colleges and technical institutions, nursing programs and interest rates for Title III funding.

Title VIII: General Provisions. Under this Title, clarification was given to describe definitions of higher education institutions, States and territories, public and

private status of institutions and state agencies providing instruction for grades K-12. Further, clarification was given in regards to payment methods from the Federal Government and recognized leadership within the U.S. Office of Education. Issues of control regarding clubs and organizations were also addressed.

Title VIII of the HEA (1965) stipulated the Federal Government would not “direct, supervise, or control the membership or internal practices of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization” (sec. 804); however, this section did not apply to and U.S. service academies or the Coast Guard academy.

The initial intentions of a college education in early America was to educate the good man, the intelligent man, for a life of cultural and scientific attainments (Henderson & Henderson, 1982). The development of America as a nation has encouraged and influenced a pace of ongoing change within higher education. Brown (2001) mentions such evolutions “includes the development of institutions, the proliferation of curricular models, and the provision of myriad forms of access” (p. 1).

History of Community Colleges

The early two-year colleges were called junior colleges. Through expansion of student services and number of institutions, the name community college was adopted to reflect the types of services provided for student. Cowen and Brawer (2008) state:

The term junior college was applied more often to the lower-division branches of private universities and two-year colleges supported by the churches or organized independently, while community college came gradually to be used for the

comprehensive, publicly supported institutions. By the 1970s, the term community college was usually applied to both types. (p. 4)

The names reflect the evolution and progression of two-year colleges; however, by 1970, the term community college was used to describe these institutions. Further, institutional desire to accommodate the growing enrollments marked significant expansion among these institutions. This evolution was fueled by the massive growth which resulted from institutional approximation to students. Thornton (1972) reports “in 1921 there were 207 such colleges” (p. 52) and Floyd and Skolnik (2005) reported 1,184 [U.S.] community colleges in 2000” (p. 53). Thus, the creation of the community college has been a significant development within the evolution of American higher education. Since inception, the community college has evolved to meet the needs and challenges of its diverse student population. Community colleges have become attractive institutions primarily because of proximity to learners, affordability in regards to tuition, and vast curriculum opportunities.

Functions of the first Community Colleges. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) address *Community Colleges Past to Present* identifies Joliet Junior College as the oldest existing public two-year college (Phillippe & Patton, 2000). Initially, the functional uses of Junior colleges were to strengthen student preparation for collegiate study among four-year institutions. Bogue (1948) mentions the concern of four-year college administrators who felt “the universities were burdened with such large responsibilities for preparatory work that upper division and professional education were greatly handicapped” (p. 286). This feeling towards academically unprepared students prompted strategies for intervention.

Initially four-year colleges recognized the problems of weak students and attempts were made to correct such issues. According to Eells (1931) attempts by flagship colleges “included university branch campuses offering lower-division work either on the parent campus or in separate facilities” (as cited by Cohen & Brawer, 2008) were provided. However, scholars like Brogue (1948) notes the uses of the Junior colleges quickly filled the educational gap by providing an alternative which aided students for the transition from high school to college, stating that “the process of advancement into upper division work would become smoother and more fluid” (p. 290) if programs existed that focused on the general coursework normally offered in the first two years of a college degree program. Thus the initial functions of two-year institutions were clear in its early beginnings. In regards to the junior colleges before 1950, Cohen (1985) states:

They offered transfer education, enabling students to complete the first two years of baccalaureate studies; occupational programs leading to certificates of completion for curricula that might take two year or less to complete; and post-secondary school terminal curricula for students who would not go on to the university but who sought an additional year or two of preparation for home and family living or for clerical and other entry-level jobs in business. (p. 151)

Thus, a new type of students became a reality in higher education. The name community college changed to reflect institutional growth and ability to offer services to a broader group of potential students. For instance, the addition of cultural and educational programs, and remedial education provided the colleges began to offer a broader range of services to the community. Not all students were committed to the idea of obtaining a

four-year degree; which led to a realization of two-year institutions serving students for two primary functions: developmental and preparatory.

The growing economic and manufacturing needs were inspired during the industrial period created a need for specialized skill sets. Pigg (2000) further supported this thought by expressing “the growth of the manufacturing industry, around the turn of the century [18th] up through World War I and II brought a demand for a skilled workforce” (p. 11). Therefore, vocational students used the community college as a “stepping stone to better jobs and higher earnings” (Santibáñez, Gonzalez, Morrison, & Carroll, 2007, p. 52). Which provides rationale for the community college’s two most significant areas of focus: transfer programs and occupational.

First, due to the different skill sets and experiences afforded by incoming matriculating students, community college evolved to service changing needs; specifically in regards to student development. Thornton (1972) identified developmental functions of the community colleges to “addressed (1) improvement of learning skills for disadvantaged students; (2) general education for all students; (3) part-time education and community service for the entire high school population; and (4) counseling and guidance of students” (p. 63). These functions gave community colleges the opportunity to cultivate students with broad ranges of abilities; that is executed in two type of programs, transfer and occupational. Lombardi (1978) gives a description of each:

- a. Transfer—liberal arts, baccalaureate-oriented, college or university parallel, pre professional academic, professional, and advanced;
- b. Occupational—technical, vocational, career, occupational extension, supplementary vocational, apprenticeship. (p. 13)

These two functions of preparation, was used to ensure students were ready either for further post-secondary study or immediate submersion into the job force. First, the transfer programs provide more academically enriched instruction to students. Course offerings such as advanced mathematics, science and English reinforced skills needed for academic success at four-year institutions. In regards to program quality or status, Cohen and Brawer (2008) states “the more programs resembled university courses, the higher their status” (p. 347). Thus, the greater the instruction a student receives in the community college parallel program the more likely a transfer student would persist towards graduation within the four-year institutional environment.

Secondly, it was the vocational and/or occupational focus, which provides students the opportunity to receive relevant real-time occupational training from community colleges. Pincus (1980) views the vocational and technical programs as “terminal programs where students could be taught specialized skills and after graduation enter one of the middle-level occupations that could provide them with more job satisfaction and economic security than most jobs requiring a degree” (p. 333). Since the term vocational was greatly in the high schools to describe the type of instruction that gave students rudimental and practical skill sets, two-year institutions utilize the terms technical or occupational denoting training for immediate skills of jobs requiring less than two years of college training (Grubb & Lazerson, 1975; Lombardi, 1978).

As the number of institutions grew, so did the services which were provided. Community college students were offered numerous resources of support to promote student academic success, mental well-being, and ultimately graduation. Cohen and Brawer (2008) supports this statement by noting that “counseling, tutoring, study skills

seminars and a variety of special interventions occurred to better assist students” (p. 295). These programs in conjunction with the established academic curriculums, approached the development of a more well-rounded student; thus, strengthening the relevance of the community college.

The functions of the junior and community college models remained a significant service to students. More campus locations, increased curriculums, increased financial assistance, and support programs increased the community college’s ability to provide education “for all who are interested regardless of academic ability and socioeconomic class (Rayfield, 2012, p. 19).

Community College Access. Access to two-year college students was significant in two major ways: increased expansion of locations and “open enrollment/access” admission policies. First the expansion of two-year institutions in the early 1900s grew at a rapid rate (Thornton, 1972); plus, the rapid construction of two-year institutions became inextricably linked to the increase in student enrollment.

During the 1950s increases in the rate of college students prompted states to build more junior colleges that were designed to accommodate growth, resulting from the open access, or non-selective policy requirements for academic admission (Doyle, 2010). Cohen (1985) states “the junior colleges were open in nearly every state and were admitting students with little regard for their prior academic preparation” (p. 151). However, by 1930, 440 two-year colleges existed; further, by the 1970s such colleges enrolled 34 % of all student in U.S. higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Persistence and Retention: A Firm Definition. A firm definition is needed in the research literature concerning two terms: (a) student persistence and (b) student retention. First, Berger and Lyons (2005) define persistence as “the desire and action of a student to stay within the system of higher education from beginning through degree completion” (p. 22); and, Rovai (2003) states that persistence is “the behavior of continuing an action despite the presence of obstacles” (p. 6). Both definitions suggest that persistence is a concept seen through the perspective and efforts of the student. The student’s efforts or action to persist involves an internally processed commitment to acclimate into their collegiate environment towards degree attainment.

On the other hand, retention is defined as “the ability of an institution to retain a student from admission through graduation” (Berger & Lyons, 2005). Thus retention includes an institution’s efforts, and ability to keep the student’s interest. Hagedorn (2005) defines retention as “staying in school until completion of a degree” (p. 91). Seidman (2004) further explains that campus leaders incorporate program retention “to track the full-time, first-time student in a degree program over time to determine whether the student has completed the program” (p.15).

The two perspectives provide a better understanding of both: (a) student retention and (b) student persistence. These definitions should aid researchers in their categorization of persistence studies of college students. The U.S. Department of Education (2008) provides insight on this topic:

The difference between these two perspectives reflects the fact that many students transfer out of the first institution attended. When beginning students leave the institution where they first enrolled and then enroll at a different institution, they continue to persist

in postsecondary education, but from the perspective of the institution where they started, they have no longer been retained.

Traditional-aged and Nontraditional-aged Community College Students.

Community collegiate students exist within two distinct categories: traditional aged and non-traditional aged college students. Present research on student persistence at community colleges reference age as a factor relating to success (Adelman, 2003; Cohen, 1995). Adelman (2003) suggest “the average age of community college students is 29 years of age” (p. 1); which is reduced from 32 years old, just eight years earlier (Cohen, 1995).

Both traditional and nontraditional aged community college students exhibit characteristics that affect persistence toward degree completion; however, research reveals differences which affect students’ decision to persist. Traditional aged students, which are defined as 24 years old or younger, represent 40 % of the current student population at American community colleges (AACC, 2014). Also known as *adult* [emphasis added] students, nontraditional community college students compose about 60 percent of the current population at American community colleges (AACC, 2014). Bean and Metzner (1985) identify nontraditional students as “older than 24[years old]...less engaged with faculty, spend less time with student acquaintances, and have many responsibilities outside of the collegiate environment” (p. 489).

Traditional and Nontraditional students are often part-time, and have family responsibilities that significantly impact time and energy needed for academics (Tinto, 1975). In regards to decisions to persist at community colleges, Sorey and Duggan (2008) state:

For traditional-aged students, encouragement and support, academic integration, fall grade-point average, and an expressed intent to leave were [are] most predictive of institutional persistence. Chief among the predictors of persistence for adult (nontraditional aged) students were social integration, institutional commitment, degree utility, encouragement and support, finances, and expressed intent to leave, and academic integration. (p. 75)

Thus, the age of a community college student is correlated with potential characteristics that affect a students' decision to persist at two-year institutions.

Factors affecting African American male community college students': engagement, persistence, retention, & attrition. Shannon and Smith (2006) states "if there is one overarching concept of that defines the community college it is the open door mission" (p. 20). This mission provides the opportunity for anyone who desires to learn a chance for post-secondary education; including African American male students. Although open enrollment requires community colleges to be less selective regarding admission requirements, the ability to achieve degree completion in higher education continues to be problematic for African American male students (Brown & Rivas, 1995).

Research studies identify a growing concern regarding the patterns of degree completion among African American male students. Horn et al. (2002) stated "more African American students attend two-year institutions that they attended four-year institutions" (p.1); but, their rates of persistence and degree completion are abysmal (Lee & Frank, 1990; Strayhorn, 2012; Wood & Turner, 2010). Nora and Cabrera (1996) notes that "African Americans are still 22 percent likely to drop out than their white counterparts over a six-year period" (p. 119). While many African American male

students persist and complete their postsecondary studies, the majority drop out. Therefore, a relevant question would seek to determine the causes relating to the academic disappointment of African American male students and their disappointing levels of degree attainment at community colleges. A query would seek to determine the research related to strategies, or prior institutional actions that inspire persistence, and increase institutional retention.

Engagement. One major objective of institutions is to establish a level of engagement with its students. The level in which a student interacts with facets of the college environment can have a significant affect upon whether the student attempts to persist for another semester. Alexander Astin created a theory of student involvement, which posits the more a students' spends in the campus environment, the more likely he should persist and graduate (Astin, 1984). Astin (1984) illustrated two types of college students in his theory of student involvement: (1) highly involved college students and (2) uninvolved college students. First Astin (1984) defines highly involved students as those who “devote considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students” (p.518).

Adversely those uninvolved collegiate students are identified by Astin (1984) as one who “neglects studies, spends little time on campus, abstains from extracurricular activities, and has infrequent contact with faculty members or other students” (p. 518).

Student Involvement Theory. The research of Alexander Astin (1984) gives clarity to research regarding student development in higher education. Involvement as defined by Astin (1985) refers “to the amount of physical and psychological energy that

the student devotes to the academic experience” (p. 36). Astin’s research theory focuses on ways to motivate the students while encouraging educators to “focus less on what they do and more on what the student does” (p. 522) Astin’s theory suggest that students can make better use of their time by engaging with numerous facets of their campus (e.g., listening to professors, reading books, or discussions with other students).

Astin’s (1984) study performed a longitudinal study which identified that “every institutional policy and practice can affect the way students spend their time and the amount of effort they devote to academic pursuits” (p. 523). For instance, holding a job on campus, or participation in a club or campus organization, eating within campus facilities and spending time with other college students were observed positive for student retention. Based on this assumption, activities which exist on campus or are academic in nature are positively associated with retention. Adversely, Astin (1984) notes “the student’s chances of dropping out are substantially greater at a two-year college than at a four-year college” (p. 524). The researcher noted that interaction between the faculty, the commuter status of the institution, part-time employment of community college faculty; and students’ jobs off campus were negatively associated with community college retention. Astin’s study also viewed persistence regarding “the students’ ability to identify with the institution” (p. 524). The 1975 study revealed that:

...students are more likely to persist at religious colleges if their own religious backgrounds are similar; Blacks are more likely to persist at Black colleges than at White colleges; and students from small towns are more likely to persist in small than in large colleges. (p. 524)

Choi and Rhee (2013) examined whether the strength of association between student engagement and development of generic student competencies varied for students enrolled in Korean colleges. Their research indicated “specific types of engagement were linked to particular learning outcomes, which meant that not every engagement type has equal impact upon students” (p. 1).

Choi and Rhee (2013) believes “Astin’s student involvement types [of student engagement and learning outcomes] surely laid a foundation for understanding the way students are engaged during college” (p. 4) One can derive that institutions must determine which types of engagement activities are appropriate for certain students. It is pertinent to mention, however, that Choi and Rhee (2013) executed this study from a national representative sample of students attending universities in Korea.

Persistence. A number of studies address the persistence of African American male students (Allen, 1992; Cuyjet, 2006; Flowers, 2004; Hagedorn, Maxwell, & Hampton, 2001; Stoecker, Pascarella, & Wolfe, 1988; Strayhorn, 2012) and strategies and/or programs to influence their decisions to stay in college.

Mason (1998) developed a model of persistence for African American male students. Set in an urban community college, the model developed and applied a construct identifying “modes of action, program enhancements, and activities within the college to increase the persistence levels; and used variables which had been previously identified as having a possible relationship to persistence” (p. 752). Mason’s model yields four variables which were found to have a significant influence to increase persistence: (1) educational goals; (2) outside encouragement; (3) utility; and (4) the

helplessness/hopelessness factor. The following exhibits Mason's explanations of the variables:

1. Educational Goals- the clearer the students were about what they wanted to achieve, and the greater their depth of internalization, the more likely they were to persist. This result was built into staff training programs to improve effectiveness of counseling and mentoring.
2. Outside Encouragement- The more support the student had received from outside the college (this was generally found to be from a significant female--mother, girlfriend, and/or wife), the more likely the student was to persist. Active encourage should be given to students to share their academic experiences with their families.
3. Utility- If a student really believed the program would benefit his future, the more likely he will persist. Thus, interaction with alumni and mentors is invaluable in improving persistence.
4. The Helplessness/Hopelessness Factor- This newly identified factor summarized the belief of many students that no matter what they did or achieved they would not get a job or be successful. Academic success counseling and mentorship, in partnership with job placement services could increase the students' desire to persist. (p. 758)

Mason's persistence model is helpful to institutional administrators because it incorporates the variables strategically into academic support programs, counseling, and mentorship initiatives in efforts to inspire persistence within pre-developed structured

activities. However, further research is needed that applies this model of persistence in multiple community college environments.

The ability to persist can be related to the level of family support for African Americans. Herndon and Hirt (2004) examined the relationship between African American students and the role of their families while enrolled in college. The researchers asserted that the African American community values education and their family support structures were a form of support that contributed an optimistic perspective on success. Further Herndon and Hirt (2004) stated that “family influence consisted of ongoing encouragement as well as financial, moral, and social support...including values instilled by parents and other family members early on in their lives” (p. 499). The study ascertained that family support was a positive source of motivation, perspective of the students’ race, provided a sense of community, reinforced early spiritual relations, and provided positive role models and family expectations. According to Herndon and Hirt (2004) the study offered some important implications for the African American students and their families, and for “those who work to recruit African American student to higher education and those who assist those student in succeeding” (p. 505).

Additional research is available that reveals family responsibilities to be negatively correlated with the persistence of African American male students. For instance, Wood (2012) examined Black (African American) male students in public two-year institutions to ascertain reported reasons for leaving college. The researcher indicated that “odds of Black male departure due to family responsibilities were greater for Black males... opposed to academic problems, financial problems, military or scheduling issues” (p.

303). His study examined Black (African American) male students at public two-year institutions to ascertain their reasons for leaving college.

African American students and their desires to persist can be directly affected by finance. St. John, Paulsen, and Carter (2005) studied the relation between the cost of college, student financial aid, and college opportunities for diverse groups according to race. The researchers examined student background (e.g., gender, parents' educational attainment, familiar status), finance-related reasons for choosing college (e.g. proximity), aspirations (e.g., degree offerings, vocation), prices and subsidies (e.g., fixed cost, controllable cost, living cost and work), and living cost (e.g., food and housing)" (p. 550). Their findings suggested choosing a college because of student aid was positively associated with persistence for African American students.

Faculty interaction with African American males can be a significant factor in predicting persistence among African American male students. Wood and Turner (2010) examined the experiences of African American males in the community college in order to identify factors that affect their academic success. The researchers used students' perspective on what affects their personal success in college; including their relationship with faculty/mentors. Results found that being friendly and caring from the onset, monitoring and proactively addressing students' academic progress, and listening to students' concerns were significant to African American male students. Wood and Turner (2010) also determined that "encouraging students to succeed contributed positively to African American male student persistence" (p. 137).

Chang (2005) studied faculty-student interactions with students of color at the community college. This research studied the level of faculty-student interaction on two-

year campuses, examined student characteristics correlated with faculty contact, and considered how interaction differed among racial subgroups of students. She believes “faculty-student interaction has been conceptualized as a form of academic involvement, consisting of both formal and informal aspects” (p. 770). The study utilized the Transfer and Retention of Urban Community College Students (TRUCCS) survey. The results showed that groups were significantly different regarding frequency of contact with faculty members. African American students exceeded all other racial subgroups in the study; but may have been influenced by two-year institutions in urban settings.

Retention. Retention efforts are those efforts that individuals and institutions make to keep students enrolled until graduation (Powell, 2009, p. 665). Gerlach (2008) notes “recruiting and enrolling students, particularly African American students, is important to universities, but retention of these students can be a more pressing concern” (p. 2). Thus this section provides an examination of literature, from the institutional perspective, related to African American male retention.

Several research studies of student retention cite Tinto’s (1975) Student Integration Model (Calhoun, 2003; Gerlach, 2004; Nora & Cabrera, 1996; Strayhorn, 2012). Tinto extended the work of Spady (1970) and his analysis of Durkheimian’s (1951) suicide model. Tinto (1975) believes “the longitudinal process of “dropping out” is a consequence of the meaning that students ascribe [take from] their interactions in the academic and social realms of college” (p. 360). Therefore, decisions to leave school are associated with how a student perceives or interpret their college experiences; which also support Burnett’s (2013) statement that “that to be successful in college, a student must

successfully integrate into the academic and social environment of the institutions” (p. 13). Haplain (1990) summates Tinto (1975) theoretical model by stating,

The model posits that individuals enter social organizations- in this case, institutions of higher education- with varying background attributes and experiences, as well as varying personal educational achievement expectations (goal commitments) and initial levels of affinity for the particular college (institutional commitments). As members of the college community, students interact with the college environment which is comprised of two primary systems- the academic and the social system. (p. 22).

Tinto’s (1975) Student Integration Model also incorporates the thoughts of other research models (Bean, 1980; Van Gennep, 1960). Tinto’s (1975) model of student retention incorporated Arnold Van Gennep’s (1960) rites of passage, a model of society characterized by three stages: separation, transition and incorporation. Van Gennep defined rites of passage as “rites which accompany every change of place, state, social position and age” (as defined by Turner, 1994). Turner (1994) states “the innate predispositions of the human psyche to think and act in certain ways, regardless of culture or race, are surely implicit in the forms of ritual behavior” (p. 3).

Tinto (1987) stated that the process of student persistence is similar to that of becoming incorporated into the life of human communities, a process that is usually marked by similar stages of passage to those to which students must typically pass through in order to persist in college. The result of unsuccessful negotiation of this process is that the individual fails to become integrated into the intellectual and/or social fabric of the institution. (p. 263)

Van Gennepe's rites of passage model are composed of three stages. The first stage, separation is defined by Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) as "the extent to which an individual identifies with or shares and incorporates the normative attitudes and values of his or her instructors and classmates, and becomes a member of the college community" (p. 3). Boyle (1989) depicts Van Gennepe position "that separation from the former environment is viewed as the first step in a successful movement followed by a transitional period and incorporation. Tinto (1975) student integration theory expounds upon Van Gennepe's first stage of separation, with the idea that students must disassociating themselves from their home environment to properly integrate into the collegiate social and academic environment (Tinto, 1975).

Van Gennepe's second stage within the rites of passage model is margin. During the intervening liminal period, the state of the ritual subject (student) is ambiguous. The second phase would be akin to the transitional challenges faced by students in their first year of postsecondary study. It is this premise which Tinto uses to predict whether students are likely to remain enrolled in college (Hausmann, Ye, Schofield & Woods, 2009).

Gennepe's third stage is incorporation; which determines how a student is able to merge his precollege (background) experiences with their new college experiences. Sorey and Duggan (2008) stated that "Tinto (1975) model assumes that student persistence depends largely upon successful integration into an institution's academic and social system" (p. 80). Therefore, one could assume that, the better a student adjust to school work and the social life of the college environ, the more likely a student will persist to graduation from the institution. Moreover, one could deduce that successful integration

creates a feeling or sense of belonging, which is absent in Tinto's original model of student integration (Tinto, 1975). The absence of a student's sense of belonging as a variable in Tinto's model has caused researchers like Hurtado and Carter (1997) to criticize Tinto's theory for lacking this information. Since integration is a subjective perspective of the student, then sense of belonging could be a potentially significant variable to derive a perspective of how a student feels they are fitting in; and predict retention behavior. Hurtado and Carter (1997) also mention that Tinto "modified his model three times (1975, 1987, 1993) incorporating many of the criticisms of the model" (p. 326).

Hurtado and Carter (1997) define sense of belonging as a student's "psychological sense of identification and affiliation with the campus community" (p. 650). Emerging research (Hausmann et al., 1997) exist that attempts to apply a student's sense of belonging with mainstream thoughts of Tinto's student integration theory. For instance, Hausmann et al. (1997) designed a study to examine whether subjective sense of belonging is positively related to student persistence. The researchers compared first-year White and African American college students. In addition to sense of belonging Hurtado and Carter (1997) "measured each of the constructs in their final structural model: encouragement from friends and family, financial attitudes, academic and social integration, institutional and goal commitment, college GPA, intentions to persist, and actual persistence" (p. 652). The study, however, did not find sense of belonging to be a beneficial impact for first-year African American students (in contrast to first-year White students). Further, Hurtado and Carter suggest that a consideration of issues facing

African American students should be taken into consideration when structuring programs to foster a sense of belonging among such students.

Kember, Lee, and Li (2010) investigated the sense of belonging in part-time students; and, tested whether “students were more easily able to affiliate with their class groups or teaching staff than with their department or college when sense of belonging was achieved” (p. 326). The study found that sense of belonging for part-time students could be promoted with relationships/interactions with teaching staff, good quality teaching and access to facilities. Although this study found sense of belonging to positively impact part-time students, it failed to include African American students in their study.

Strayhorn (2012) studied the impact of Tinto’s model on the academic and social integration of African Americans at the community college level. His study drew upon the Tinto’s (1993) retention theory and Astin’s (1993) input-environment-outcome model; and, utilized the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) to collect extract data from a sample of African American male students. Results revealed that the institutional environment should be welcoming with a myriad of diverse opportunities and experiences.

Collegiate Student Attrition. An area of concern involves those collegiate students who leave school before graduation and how their actions contribute to the attrition rate. Although 75% of graduating seniors indicate interest in pursuing higher education, more than half will abandon their studies before (Kim, Kirby, & Bragg, 2006). The previous statistic highlights a reason for institutional leaders to focus on the number of students they maintain enrolled (Elkins, Braxton, & James, 2000; Zusman, 1994).

Traditional-Aged Students Attrition. Bean (1980) found that “research on work turnover was useful in studies of student’s attrition” (p. 155). Applied in the context of traditional-aged college students, his [Bean’s] (1980) casual model was “developed by synthesizing research findings on turnover in work organizations and student attrition” (p. 155). Seidman (2005) states that Beans theory “examines how organizational attributes and reward structures affect student satisfaction and persistence” (p. 13). Bean’s (1980) study questioned over a thousand college freshmen to investigate the determinants of student attrition via results on turnover in work organizations. Bean (1980) employed a quantitative study and utilized a multiple regression for analysis of data.

Several factors exist which identify possible reasons for African American men leaving the institutional setting. Elkins, et al. (2000) studied the persistence of first-time, full time freshmen students. The researchers questioned how various dimensions of separation influenced students desire to leave college. Their results indicated that attitudes of support and rejection significantly impacted the decision to persist among students. Therefore the goal of institutions should be to provide experiences which positively impact the attitudes of the students which they serve.

Non-traditional Aged Student Attrition. The most salient research on attrition of college students above the age of 25 is anchored in Bean and Metzner (1985) theory of nontraditional student attrition. Bean and Metzner believe that environmental factors have a greater impact on departure decisions of adult students than academic variables. In this model of attrition, four sets of variables were identified as the bases of the withdrawal decision for the adult college student: (1) academic performance, (2) intent to leave, (3) background and defining variables, and (4) environmental variables.

The first barrier identified by Bean and Metzner (1985) was academic performance. Further, students with poor academic performance, measured by a student's grade point average, were more likely to drop out.

Chapter Summary

The relevant research which relates to traditional and nontraditional African American male community college students' engagement, persistence, retention, and attrition is significant because "black men are more likely to seek out postsecondary opportunities at two-year colleges opposed to four-year colleges" (Wood & Williams, 2013, p.1). Many studies highlight challenges faced by African American male community college students; however, the remaining question about which elements combine to create a tendency to persist among these groups require more examination.

Organization of the Study

The remaining chapters will focus on the methodology used to execute this study, a discussion of results and recommendations for future research. Chapter 3 will present a variables, instruments, and procedures used for analysis. Chapter 4 shall present the results of the study, and Chapter 5 shall provide a discussion of results, implications and recommendations.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the differences of traditional and non-traditional African American Male students' perceptions of the college environment, their perceived gains, and quality of effort. A secondary purpose is to determine the strength of relationship between a students' tendency to persist and their perception of the collegiate environment, perceptions of gains, and quality of effort. This study shall analyses an aggregate of secondary data of the Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) that is secured at the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at the University of Memphis. This chapter provides a description of the major elements of the study, including the research design, instrumentation, variables, participants, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures.

Statement of the Problem

African American males at community colleges are facing greater challenges regarding persistence in today's higher education environment. Several studies address institutional retention efforts of African Americans at 4-year institutions; however, a significant gap exists regarding research concerning African American male students' persistence efforts within the community colleges setting. The use of self-reported responses from students who answered the electronic version of the CCSEQ shall be analyzed to identify and successful strategies which to encourage persistence among African American male community college students.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the purpose of this study, the following research questions are presented:

RQ 1: To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their Quality of Effort on the CCSEQ?

RQ 2: To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their Perceived Gains on the CCSEQ?

RQ 3: To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their Perceptions of the Collegiate Environment on the CCSEQ?

RQ 4: What is the strength of relationship between traditional and non-traditional students' tendency to persist and their perception of the college environment, perceived gains, and quality of effort?

RQ 5: Is the strength of the relationship mediated by a students' traditional or non-traditional status?

Research Design

This study shall employ a quantitative secondary data analysis procedure. Hakim (1982) defines secondary analysis as “any further analysis of an existing dataset which presents interpretations, conclusions, or knowledge additional to, or different from, those presented in the first report on the inquiry as a whole and its main results” (p. 28).

Separate statistical procedures will be utilized to determine differences between students' perceptions of the collegiate environment, their perceived gains, and their quality of effort. Further, a statistical procedure will determine the strength of relationship between

students' tendency to persist and their perceptions of the collegiate environment, their perceived gains, and their quality of effort. A final procedure will determine if a difference exist between traditional and non-traditional students' perceptions in regards to this study.

Sample

The population of this study derived from the national aggregate of CCSEQ respondents who completed the CCSEQ's electronic version between the academic years of 2010-2013. Eight community college institutions participated with a total of (N = 1,948) student respondents.

The respondents were divided into two groups. The first group, traditional aged African American male students yield 105 respondents. The second group, non-traditional aged African American male students yield 51 respondents. Respondents that were extracted identified themselves as Black or African American and male. All respondents who did not identify themselves as African American and male (as their ethnicity and gender) were referred as Non-African American male, and were excluded from the analyzed sample.

CCSEQ data for the study was available through the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) located at the University of Memphis. Approval was received from Dr. William Akey, Interim Director of the CSHE, to analyze the national aggregate of student responses; and, approval was also gained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Memphis (protocol #3069) for research involving human subjects (see Appendix A).

Instrument

An area that influences and motivates students towards a tendency to persist is the interaction between the students and the college environment, and the effect of the quality and quantity of students' involvement among activities both: in-and-out of class, on their outcomes. According to Hardy (2005) "knowledge about what learners do and how they respond to the institution's efforts to provide a rich educational environment can add an important dimension in the understanding of the impact of the educational experience" (p. 23). Further, this knowledge can influence a student's decision to return to an institution, transfer, or stop-out completely.

The Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) obtains information from community college students about the nature of their two-year institutional experiences and measures the amount, breadth, and quality of effort students put into taking advantage of the resources and opportunities available in the college setting (Friedlander & Macdougall, 1992). The questionnaire was revised in 1999 by Friedlander, Pace, Murrell, and Lehman, and serves as an instrument that can measure perceptions of a students' college program, perceptions of their college courses, their estimate of gains, their college environment, college activities, and a students' quality of effort.

Pearson, Gould, Ethington, and Murrell (2009) stated that "the CCSEQ has been adapted to fit the changing characteristics, goals, experiences and outcomes of community college students" (p. 1). Thus, by providing information pertaining to students' personal, social, and academic integration, the CCSEQ connects the concept of persistence to what the student does with what the campus provides. Such a connection,

explores personal, social, and academic events that may appear to be significant to the student, and correlate those experience to student outcomes.

According to the CCSEQ test manual (4th edition), the CCSEQ is useful in this study because it focus on four main areas:

- Who are the students and why are they at the college?
- What do they do at the college, or more specifically, how extensively and productively do they use the facilities and opportunities the college provides?
- What are some of their [students] impressions about the college?; and,
- What progress do they think they have made toward important goals?

(Pearson, et al., 2009)

Variables

The variables used in this study will be constructed from questionnaire items included in the CCSEQ constructed from Astin’s (1984) classification of student involvement, and Pace’s (1985) classification of quality of effort. Expressed by age, gender and race there are two independent variables. The dependent variables are multi-item variables expressed in four groups. A complete listing of variables to be used in this study is located in Table 1.

Table 1
Variables Selected for Analysis in this Study

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
Traditional African American Male Students	Perceptions of the College Environment
Non-traditional African American Male Students	Quality of Effort Perceived Gains Tendency to Persist

Independent Variables. The independent variables of this study were based upon students' age, gender and race. Respondents who identified themselves as Black or African American and male were chosen. Further, the respondents categorized into two groupings: traditional aged and non-traditional aged African American male students. The traditional aged students were students who identified themselves as 18-22 years of age. Non-traditional aged students identified themselves as 23 years old and older. Traditional aged students were coded as one and non-traditional students were coded as two.

Dependent Variables. Four sets of variables represent the dependent variables of this study. The four groupings are college environment, quality of effort, perception of gains, and tendency to persist.

College Environment

The first set of dependent variables used within this study is the college environment, which indicates the students' perceived satisfaction with resources offered by the college. This section has 8 items, and students are asked to rate the level of support from other students, instructors, and support staff members. Students perceived engagement with the collegiate environment are important to the African American male community college students' overall satisfaction with their institution. Data gathered from this section was analyzed by age among the African American male participants and used to determine if differences exists based upon age strata. The items of this section are located in Table 2 below.

Table 2
Perceptions of the College Environment

Scale Items
1. If you could start over again would you go to this college?
2. How many of the students you know are friendly and supportive of one another?
3. How many of your instructors at this college do you feel are approachable, helpful, and supportive?
4. How many of the college counselors, advisors, and department staff you have had contact with would you describe as helpful, considerate, and knowledgeable?
5. How many of your courses at this college would you describe as challenging, stimulating, and worthwhile?
6. Do you feel that this college is a stimulating and often exciting place to be?
7. Are there places on the campus for you to meet and study with others?
8. Are there places on campus for you to use computers and technology?

Quality of Effort

The second group of dependent variables is students' quality of effort (see Table 3). Pace (1984) created the quality of effort concept as a scale that reflects the analysis of the students' involvement in the college process. Pace expands the concept of Astin's (1984) model of student development into quantifiable and measureable scales, known as "Quality of Effort" scales. In Pace's (1979) report to the Spencer Foundation he writes:

The most striking finding from this study are the discovery that quality of effort is the most important factor in accounting for students attainment, and that after all other

influences have been added together, quality of effort still makes a substantial additional contribution. (p. 30).

For this study, nine quality of effort (QE) scales were analyzed for mean differences among traditional and nontraditional African American male community college students (see Table 3). Each of the 9 Quality of Effort scales exist within the CCSEQ, from scales representing the student’s self-perceived quality of effort in courses activities (QECOURSE), effort in the campus library (QELIB), interaction with faculty and counselors (QEFAC), effort with student acquaintances (QESTACQ), effort in art, music, and theater (QEAMT), effort in the writing activities (QEWRITE), effort in science activities (QESCI), effort in career/occupational skills (QECOS), and effort with computer technology (QECOMTECH).

Table 3

Quality of Effort Scales

Scale	Number of Items	Scale Range
Course Activities	10	10-40
Library Activities	7	7-28
Faculty	9	9-36
Student Acquaintances	6	6-24
Art, Music, and Theatre	9	9-36
Writing Activities	8	8-32
Science Activities	11	11-44
Career/Occupational Skills	9	9-36
Computer Technology	8	8-32

Outcome Measure: Course Activities. There are 10 items (see Table 4) included in the course activities section (QECOURSE) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these

items will indicate their quality of effort in course related activities. These activities as explained by Friedlander, Murrell & MacDougall (1993) reflect activities “that would enhance their [students] skills in such areas as critical thinking, independent inquiry, writing, class participation, and collaborative learning” (p. 201). Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with course activities, the scale range is 4-40. These items are provided in Table 4.

Table 4
Items Related to Course Activities

Scale Items	
Q1	
Q2	Participated in class discussions.
Q3	Worked on a paper or project which combined ideas from different sources of information.
Q4	Summarized major points and information from readings or notes.
Q5	Tried to explain the material to another student.
Q6	Did additional readings on topics that were introduced and discussed in class.
Q7	Asked questions about points made in class discussions or readings.
Q8	Studied course materials with other students.
Q9	Applied principles and concepts learned in class to understand other problems or situations.
Q10	Compared and contrasted different points of view presented in a course.
	Considered the accuracy and credibility of information from different sources.

Outcome Measure: Library Activities. There are 7 items (see Table 5) included in the course activities section (QELIB) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort in activities involving use of the library. Several studies argue the positive (Ory and Braskamp, 1988) and negative (Terenzini, 1996)

relationships concerning student benefits with campus libraries. However, it was Friedlander and Macdougall (1992) that states “the greater the use of the library as a resource and research tool, the greater the progress students reported making toward developing the ability to lean on their own and pursue ideas, and find information they need” (p. 21). Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with the library, the scale range is 7-28. These items are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

Library Activities

<i>Scale Items</i>	
Q1	Used the library as a quiet place to read or study material you brought with you.
Q2	Read newspapers, magazines, or journals located in the library or on-line.
Q3	Checked out books and other materials to read at home.
Q4	Used the computer to find materials the library had on a topic.
Q5	Prepared a bibliography or set of references for a term paper or report.
Q6	Asked the librarian for help in finding materials on some topic.
Q7	Found some interesting material to read just by browsing in the stacks.

Outcome Measure: Interaction with Faculty. There are nine items included in the course activities section (QEFAC) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort involving casual interaction with members of the college faculty. Pascarella (1980) “significant positive associations exist between extent and quality of student-faculty informal contact and students’ educational aspirations, their attitudes toward college, their academic achievement, intellectual and personal development and their institutional persistence” (p.45). Students are given the response

options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with faculty, the scale range is 9-36. These items are provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Items Related to Faculty Interaction

<i>Scale Items</i>	
Q1	Asked an instructor for information about grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.
Q2	Talked briefly with an instructor after class about course content.
Q3	Made an appointment to meet with an instructor in his/her office.
Q4	Discussed ideas for a term paper or other class project with an instructor.
Q5	Discussed your career and/or educational plans, interests, and ambitions with an instructor.
Q6	Discussed comments an instructor made on a test or paper you wrote.
Q7	Talked informally with an instructor about current events, campus activities, or other common interests.
Q8	Discussed your school performance, difficulties or personal problems with an instructor.
Q9	Used e-mail to communicate with your instructor.

Outcome Measure: Student Acquaintances. There are six items (see Table 6) included in the course activities section (QESTACQ) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort in activities involving student acquaintances. Carnevale and Fry (2000) state “a diverse student body enhances the environment for learning, enriches intellectual dialogue, and helps students develop the mutual respect” (p. 45). Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with other students, the scale range is 6-24. These items are provided in Table 7.

Table 7

Items Related to Student Acquaintances

<i>Scale Items</i>	
Q1	Had serious discussions with students who were much older or much younger than you.
Q2	Had serious discussions with students whose ethnic or cultural background was different from yours.
Q3	Had serious discussions with students whose philosophy of life or personal values were very different from yours.
Q4	Had serious discussions with students whose political opinions were very different from yours.
Q5	Had serious discussions with students whose religious beliefs were very different from yours.
Q6	Had serious discussions with students from a country different from yours.

Outcome Measure: Art, Music, and Theatre. There are nine items (see Table 8) included in the art, music and theatre activities section (QEAMT) of the CCSEQ. Students are asked to rate their experiences at their college pertaining to engagement with the arts. Experiences range from elective classroom discussions, talking about artist, creating sculptures, listening to and/or performing music. The CCSEQ questionnaire is unique about asking students of their art, music and theatre experiences during the current school year. The students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. Results of the African American male community college students will be compared by age and analyzed for possible differences in perceptions of their experiences in art, music, and theater. All art, music and theater items are listed in Table 8.

Table 8
Items Related to Art, Music, and Theatre Activities

<i>Scale Items</i>	
Q1	Talked about art (painting, sculpture, architecture, artists, etc.) with other students at the college.
Q2	Talked about music (classical, popular, musicians, etc.) with other students at the college.
Q3	Talked about theater (plays, musicals, dance, etc.) with other students at the college.
Q4	Attended an art exhibit on the campus.
Q5	Attended a concert or other musical event at the college.
Q6	Attended a play, dance, concert, or theatre performance at the college.
Q7	Participated in an art event, musical event, or theatre performance at the college.
Q8	Attended an OFF-CAMPUS art exhibit, musical event, or theatre performance <u>for course credit</u> .
Q9	Participated in an OFF-CAMPUS art exhibit, musical event, or theatre performance <u>for course credit</u> .

Outcome Measure: Writing Activities. There are eight items (see Table 9) included in the course activities section (QEWRITE) of the CCSEQ. Harper (2012) states that “compared to same-race female counterparts, Black men take fewer notes in class, spend less time writing papers and completing class assignments” (p. 7). The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort in activities involving writing.

Results of the African American male community college students will be compared by age and analyzed for possible differences in perceptions of writing activities. Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with writing, the scale range is 8-32.

Table 9

Items Related to Writing Activities

<i>Scale Items</i>	
Q1	Used a dictionary [or computer spell-check/thesaurus] to look up the proper meaning, definition, and/or spelling of words.
Q2	Prepared an outline to organize the sequence of ideas and points in a paper you were writing.
Q3	Thought about grammar, sentence structure, paragraphs and word choice as you were writing.
Q4	Wrote a rough draft of a paper or essay and revised it before handing it in.
Q5	Used a computer to write a paper.
Q6	Asked other people to read something you wrote to see if it was clear to them.
Q7	Spent at least 5 hours or more writing a paper.
Q8	Asked an instructor for advice and help to improve your writing or about a comment he/she made on a paper you wrote.

Outcome Measure: Science Activities. There are eleven items see (Table 10) included in the science activities section (QESCI) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort in activities engaging in computer technology. Further, questions about the rigor, instruction, and demand placed upon such students are provided.

Results of the African American male community college students will be compared by age and analyzed for possible differences in perceptions of their science activities. Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with computers, the scale range is 11-44.

Table 10

Science Activities

<i>Scale Items</i>	
Q1	Memorized formulas, definitions, and technical terms.
Q2	Practiced to improve your skills in using laboratory equipment.
Q3	Showed a classmate how to use a piece of scientific equipment.
Q4	Attempted to explain an experimental procedure to a classmate.
Q5	Tested your understanding of some scientific principle by seeing if you could explain it to another student.
Q6	Completed an experiment/project using scientific methods.
Q7	Talked about social and ethical issues related to science and technology such as energy, pollution, chemicals, genetics, etc.
Q8	Used information you learned in a science class to understand some aspect of the world around you.
Q9	Tried to explain to someone the scientific basis for environmental concerns about pollution, recycling, alternative forms of energy, etc.
Q10	Did paid or volunteer work OFF-CAMPUS to help the environment after learning about environmental issues in class.
Q11	Applied information or skills you learned in a science class to work (either volunteer or paid) outside of class.

Outcome Measure: Career/Occupational Skills. There are nine items (see Table 11) included in the course activities section (QECOS) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort in activities engaging in their intended career/occupation. Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with computers, the scale range is 9-36.

Table 11

Career/Occupational Skills

Scale Items	
Q1	Read about how to perform a procedure (occupational task, vocational skill).
Q2	Listened to an instructor explain how to do a procedure.
Q3	Watched an instructor demonstrate how to do a procedure.
Q4	Practiced a procedure while being monitored by an instructor or other student.
Q5	Practiced a procedure without supervision.
Q6	Identified that there was a problem and located information from an instructor or other resource about what to do.
Q7	Diagnosed a problem and carried out the appropriate procedure without having to consult any resource.
Q8	Applied occupational skills learned in class to a job situation outside of class.
Q9	Participated in an internship, cooperative, practicum, etc. with a local business, facility, or organization <u>for course credit</u> .

Outcome Measure: Computer Technology. There are eight items (see Table 12) included in the course activities section (QECOMTECH) of the CCSEQ. The responses to these items will indicate their quality of effort in activities engaging in computer technology. Students are given the response options of: “never,” “occasionally,” “often,”

and “very often”. When associating a student’s self-perceived effort with computers, the scale range is 10-40.

Table 12
Items Related to Computer Technology

Scale Items	
Q1	Used E-mail to communicate with an instructor or other students about a course.
Q2	Used the Internet (or other computer network) to get information for a class project or paper.
Q3	Used a computer tutorial to learn material for a course or remedial program.
Q4	Used computers in a group (cooperative) learning situation in class.
Q5	Used a computer for some type of database management.
Q6	Used a computer to analyze data for a class project.
Q7	Used a computer to create graphs or charts for a class paper or project.
Q8	Wrote an application using existing software or programming languages.
Q9	Used social media (e.g. Facebook) to communicate with other students.
Q10	Used computer technology (e.g. Facebook or Wikis) as part of a course.

Estimate of Gains

This section has 25 items that gives students the ability to rate their progress on educational goals relating to their effort, course activities, and college environment. The goals range from “acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work” to “writing clearly and effectively” to “becoming clearer about your own values and ethical standards”. The estimate of gains section has four choices for each question: “Very Much”; “Quite a Bit”; “Some”; and “Very Little”.

Table 13
Items Related to Estimate of Gains

<i>Items</i>	
<i>Q1</i>	Acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work.
<i>Q2</i>	Gaining information about career opportunities.
<i>Q3</i>	Developing clearer career goals.
<i>Q4</i>	Becoming acquainted with different fields of knowledge.
<i>Q5</i>	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art , music, and theatre.
<i>Q6</i>	Developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature (novels, stories, essays, poetry, etc.)
<i>Q7</i>	Writing clearly and effectively.
<i>Q8</i>	Presenting ideas and information effectively in speaking to others.
<i>Q9</i>	Acquiring skills needed to use computers to access information from the library or the Internet.
<i>Q10</i>	Acquiring skills needed to use computers to produce papers, reports, graphs, charts, tables, or data analysis.
<i>Q11</i>	Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life.
<i>Q12</i>	Becoming clearer about my own values and ethical standards.
<i>Q13</i>	Understanding myself-my abilities and interests.
<i>Q14</i>	Understanding mathematical concepts such as probabilities, proportions, etc.
<i>Q15</i>	Understanding the role of science and technology in society.
<i>Q16</i>	Putting ideas together to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas.
<i>Q17</i>	Developing the ability to learn on my own, pursue ideas, and find information I need.
<i>Q18</i>	Developing the ability to speak and understand another language.
<i>Q19</i>	Interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, textbooks, on TV, or on the Internet.
<i>Q20</i>	Developing an interest in political and economic events.
<i>Q21</i>	Seeing the importance of history for understanding the present as well as the past.
<i>Q22</i>	Learning more about other parts of the world and other people (Asia, Africa, South America, etc.).
<i>Q23</i>	Understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people.
<i>Q24</i>	Developing good health habits and physical fitness.
<i>Q25</i>	Developing the ability to get along with others in different kinds of situations.

Tendency to Persist

The fourth group of dependent variables is an index (see Table 14), which possess four measures of a students' tendency to persist. The four areas are job responsibilities (job_persist), family responsibilities (fam_persist), generational persistence (generation_persist) and the amount of time a student spends studying (study_persist). Table 14 explains each of the persistence measures.

Table 14

Tendency to Persist (Index)

Items	Variable
Job Responsibilities	Job_Persist
Family Responsibilities	Fam_Persist
Generational Persistence	Generation_Persist
Time Spent Studying	Study_Persist

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for this study's data analysis. To address the research questions of this study, separate statistical procedures were conducted for each group of dependent variables. More specifically, the test were performed to determine if African American male students' perceptions of the campus environment, quality of effort, self-perceived gains, and inclination to persist differs significantly based upon age.

CCSEQ data for the study was available through the (CSHE) (see Appendix B) located at the University of Memphis. Approval was received from the CSHE to use the self-reported student data in this study. Approval of the study was also be gained from the

Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Memphis (protocol #3069) for research involving human subjects (see Appendix A).

College Environment. The first dependent variable group, students' perceptions of the community college environment, 8 items exist. The items in this section were first standardized to account for variance scales of the items. Of the 8 items, 5 items were based a four point scale and 3 items were based upon a three point scale. Next, Mann Whitney U test were performed to obtain group means across all 8 items; done with a Cronbach Alpha level of ($\alpha = .77$). Finally, independent *t*-test will be performed to compare both traditional and non-traditional African American Male community college students to determine if their perceptions are statistically significant.

Quality of Effort Scales. There are 9 items within the quality of effort section. The construct of the CCSEQ has previously develop scales and score ranges for each quality of effort scale and its items. Therefore, multivariate *t*-test will be performed to compare the amount, scope and quality of effort among the traditional and non-traditional African American community college students; and determine if such experiences are statistically significant.

Perception of Gains. There are 25 items in the gains section of the CCSEQ. Mann Whitney U non-parametric *t*-test will be executed for each item. Next, a factor analysis will be conducted to determine how the items cluster or correlate between among each other. Finally, an analysis will determine if factor scores differ by traditional and non-traditional African American ale community college students.

Tendency to Persist. There are four measures of persistence involved in this study. A regression procedure will be used to determine the strength of relationship

between students' tendency to persist and the other dependent variable groupings (college environment, quality of effort, perception of gains). Finally, a *t*-test will be used to determine if a difference exist between traditional and nontraditional African American male community college students.

Limitations

Limitations associated with this study are the due to information not available in the CCSEQ data:

1. Student data such as grades in previous courses and socio-economic status (SES) are not included in the CCSEQ.
2. This study does not include the family roles or responsibilities specific to the African American family.
3. This study analyzes aggregate data from volunteer two-year institutions; therefore, a generalization cannot be made to all community colleges within the United States; or, to all African American male community college students.

Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the data and a discussion of the findings as they relate to the research questions.

To review, this study examined the perceptions of traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students as measured by the *Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire* (CCSEQ). Differences among the student respondents' perceptions of the community college environment, quality of effort, and perceived gains were compared. Additionally, this study determined the strength of relationship between a derived index of students' tendency to persist and the aforementioned *CCSEQ* measures. In these analyses, the independent variable was the enrollment status of the African American male respondents to the *CCSEQ*, dichotomously coded as either traditionally-aged or non-traditionally aged. The dependent variables were a mixture of *CCSEQ* outcomes, examined at the level of the individual item as well as the item "scale".

This chapter addresses the results of the statistical procedures used to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Perceptions of the Collegiate Environment* on the *CCSEQ*?

2. To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Quality of Effort* on the *CCSEQ*?
3. To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Perceived Gains* on the *CCSEQ*?
4. What is the strength of relationship between traditional and non-traditional students' tendency to persist and their perception of the college environment, perceived gains, and quality of effort?
5. Is the strength of the relationship among these variables mediated by a students' traditional or non-traditional status?

Description of the Sample

The respondents were students at eight community college institutions that participated in the revised computerized version of the *CCSEQ*, during the last four academic years 2010-2014. Of these respondents, a total of 1,948 completed the electronic version of the *CCSEQ* and, of that number, 156 identified themselves as being both African American and male. This responding subgroup of African American male students was further categorized by age into two groups: traditional and non-traditional. For this study, students classified as traditional were those who identified themselves as being between the ages of 18 and 22 ($n = 101$). Conversely, students who indicated their age as being 23 or older were classified as nontraditional ($n = 51$). In addition to being dichotomously categorized by age, students were also categorized by race and gender. As mentioned in chapter three, those respondents who did not identify themselves as African

American males were categorized as Non-African American male; and were discarded from this study. For an itemized listing of participants see below (Table 15):

Table 15

Categorization of Respondents Analyzed in this study (N = 156)

Respondents	n	% of Respondents
Total Respondents	1948	100
African American Male Respondents	156	0.08
Traditional African American Males	101	0.05
Non-traditional African American Males	51	0.02
Non-African American Male Respondents	1792	91

Research Question 1 (College Environment)

The problem guiding Research Question 1 centered on whether there was a difference in students' perceptions of the community college environment. As stated earlier, the independent variable was the ages of the student respondents. The dependent variable was students' perceptions of the collegiate environment, considered at the level of the individual item as well as the across the eight-item group of such items.

In order to address research question 1, non-parametric Mann Whitney *U* tests were conducted on each of the eight individual items pertinent to the college environment, while a parametric independent *t*-test was conducted on the mean of the

standardized responses to the eight items considered as a “scale.” With respect to the individual items, the Mann-Whitney U test was used because the responses were expressed as ordered categories (e.g. “yes”, “maybe”, or “no”), with no assumption made of equal intervals between the points along the continuum of responses. Moreover, because this aforementioned continuum of responses tended to vary by item, some form of response standardization was required. To achieve this, the responses to each item were converted into z scores ($M = 0, SD = 1$), and subsequently converted into T scores ($M = 50, SD = 10$), to eliminate working with decimal fractions.

To determine whether students differed across the eight items of the college environment section of the *CCSEQ* considered as a single scale, means were computed for those respondents who completed at least six of the eight items. Both the outcomes by item as well as the outcomes for the scale as a whole—which when tested for internal consistency reliability proved to be adequate ($\alpha = 0.77$)—are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Perceptions of the College Environment

Item	Traditional (18-22)				Non-Traditional (23 and up)				Z/t	p =	r	g
	n	M	Mdn	SD	n	M	Mdn	SD				
If you could start over again would you go to this college?	103	56.5	62.4	11.8	50	47.8	44.6	7.8	-4.7	.000	0.38	0.86
How many of the students you know are friendly and supportive of one another?	103	49.8	48.0	12.1	51	50.6	48.0	10.4	-0.5	.611	-0.04	-0.09
How many of your instructors at this college do you feel are approachable, helpful, and supportive?	102	48.2	50.7	10.8	51	48.7	50.7	10.6	-0.4	.721	-0.03	-0.06
How many of the college counselors, advisors, and department staff you have had contact with would you describe as helpful?	102	48.6	48.2	10.2	51	47.4	48.2	10.7	-0.9	.386	0.07	0.15
How many of your courses at this college would you describe as challenging, stimulating, and worthwhile?	102	51.5	48.0	10.7	51	49.4	48.0	10.7	-1.3	.204	0.10	0.21

(Table 16 Continues)

(Table 16 Continued)

Item	<u>Traditional (18-22)</u>				<u>Non-Traditional (23 and up)</u>				<i>Z/t</i>	<i>p</i> =	<i>r</i>	<i>g</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Are there places on the campus for you to meet and study with other students?	101	49.9	55.6	10.1	50	47.4	40.3	7.7	-1.2	.216	0.10	0.21
Are there places on the campus for you to use computers and technology?	104	49.1	42.0	10.0	51	46.6	42.0	7.8	-1.4	.170	0.11	0.24
Scale Mean ($\alpha = 0.77$)	103	50.5	50.3	6.4	51	48.2	47.0	5.9	2.1	.035	0.17	0.37

The analyses conducted for Research Question 1 revealed that traditional and non-traditional African American males differed significantly on only one of the eight college environment items: specifically, *If you could start over again would you go to this college?* Results revealed that traditional students ($Mdn = 62.4$) expressed a greater willingness to attend the same college than non-traditional students ($Mdn = 44.6$) if given the opportunity to start over again ($U = 1522.00, z = -4.66, p < .01, g = 0.86$). Group responses to the other seven items concerning the collegiate environment did not differ statistically between groups, although traditional students were consistently more positive in their perceptions than non-traditional students. While nontraditional students' perceptions of the college environment were higher on two items—specifically, *how many of the students you know are friendly and supportive of one another* and *how many of your instructors at this college do you feel are approachable, helpful, and supportive?*—these items were linked to the smallest effects of any of the comparisons ($g = -0.09$ and $g = -0.06$, respectively).

As previously mentioned, an independent t -test was conducted to examine the differences of means between traditional and non-traditional students across the scale of eight items. Given the aforementioned trends in the data, the collegiate environment scale mean for the traditional students ($M = 50.5, SD = 6.4$) differed significantly from the collegiate environment scale mean of non-traditional students ($M = 48.2, SD = 5.9$), with the difference linked to a small but robust effect size ($t(152) = 2.1, p = .035, g = 0.37$). When compared to the collegiate environment scale mean of the larger population of responding *CCSEQ* students ($M = 50, SD = 10$), no difference was observed with respect to the scale mean obtained for the traditionally-aged African American male students,

although the scale mean seen for the non-traditionally-aged African American male students proved to be slightly below that seen for the “norm”.

Research Question 2 (Quality of Effort)

The problem guiding Research Question 2 centered on *the extent to which traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differed with respect to their Quality of Effort on the CCSEQ*. In response to this question, a two-group Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if any statistically significant differences existed among traditional and non-traditional African American students’ perceptions of their quality of student effort with respect both to the set of nine scales taken together (multivariate testing) and to each of the nine quality of effort scales individually considered (univariate testing). These nine quality of effort scales referenced Course Activities; Library Activities; Faculty; Student Acquaintances, Art, Music, and Theatre Activities; Writing Activities; Science Activities; Career/Occupational Activities; and Computer Technology. Student respondents reported their level of participation on the quality of effort scales by choosing one of the following responses: “very often”, “often”, “occasionally”, and “never”.

Two tables associated with these analyses are presented. The first table (Table 17) provides descriptive statistics pertinent to the group outcomes for each scale, including the scale *alphas*, group means and standard deviations, and the effect sizes linked to the differences when the group means are compared. The second table presents the inferential statistics pertinent to the multivariate and univariate comparisons of the group means.

As shown in Table 18, the overall MANOVA was shown to be significantly different ($F(9, 144) = 1.96; p < .05$), indicating a significant difference in the overall perception of quality of effort among the traditional and non-traditional groups. Further, results in the ANOVA portion of Table 18 indicate significant group differences with respect to three effort scales. The first and largest of these differences was seen for the art, music, and theatre scale. $F(1, 152) = 12.83; p < .001, g = 0.61$. Presumably, the quality of effort exerted in this domain by traditionally aged students ($M = 2.03; SD = 0.89$) was significantly greater than that exerted of non-traditional students ($M = 1.52; SD = 0.68$).

Next, in terms of a statistically significant group difference concerned students' perceptions of their quality of effort in science $F(1, 152) = 4.65; p < .05$). As with the arts, the scale mean obtained for traditionally aged students ($M = 2.36; SD = 0.92$) proved to be significantly higher than that obtained for non-traditionally aged students ($M = 2.07; SD = 0.75$). At the same time, the effect observed for science was much less robust than that observed for the arts ($g = 0.37$).

Proving to be only marginally significant were outcomes involving students' perceptions of the quality of effort in the library $F(1, 152) = 3.77; p < .10$). Again, the mean responses of traditionally aged students ($M = 2.36; SD = 0.92$) indicated a greater tendency to engage in library-related activity than indicated by their non-traditional counterparts ($M = 2.07; SD = 0.75$). However, the effect size associated with this difference was smaller than that observed either for the arts or for science ($g = 0.33$).

Table 17

Item Numbers, Reliability, Means, Standard Deviation, and Effect Sizes of Quality of Effort Scales

Quality of Effort Scales	Number of Items	(α)	Traditional ($n = 103$)		Non-Traditional ($n = 51$)		g
			M	SD	M	SD	
Art, Music, Theatre	9	0.94	2.03	0.89	1.52	0.68	0.61
Career	9	0.96	2.32	1.11	2.36	1.14	-0.03
Computer	10	0.92	2.65	0.93	2.50	0.95	0.16
Course Learning	10	0.93	2.77	0.73	2.82	0.76	-0.06
Faculty	9	0.93	2.44	0.87	2.34	0.65	0.13
Library	7	0.90	2.36	0.92	2.07	0.75	0.33
Science	11	0.97	2.19	0.97	1.84	0.84	0.37
Students	6	0.92	2.44	0.94	2.27	0.80	0.19
Writing	8	0.92	2.67	0.81	2.64	0.86	0.04

Table 18

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Nine CCSEQ Quality of Effort Scales by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students

Source	MANOVA <i>F</i> (9, 144)	ANOVA <i>F</i> (1, 152)		
		QE Arts	QE Career	QE Computer
QE Gains	1.96*	12.83***	0.04	0.91
		QE Course	QE Faculty	QE Library
		0.11	0.56	3.77†
		QE Science	QE Students	QE Writing
		4.65*	1.18	0.06

Note. *F* ratios are Wilks' approximation of *F*. ANOVA = univariate analysis of variance; MANOVA = multivariate analysis of variance.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Research Question 3 (Perceived Gains)

The inquiry guiding Research Question 3 concerned *the extent to which traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differed with respect to their Perceived Gains on the CCSEQ?* To answer this question fully, the analysis proceeded in several steps. First, Mann-Whitney *U* tests were conducted to determine if student perceptions of each of the 25 gains named on the CCSEQ differed by traditionally and non-traditionally aged African American males. Next, a principal components analysis was conducted to determine how the 25 items within the gains sections of the CCSEQ clustered. Finally, after determining an empirical grouping of the items that was both interpretable and statistically reliable, a MANOVA was conducted using the principal components outcomes as a dependent variable and group membership as the independent variable.

As mentioned earlier, 25 items constituted the perceived gains section of the CCSEQ. According to Ethington, Guthrie, and Lehman (2001), this section primarily asks students “to report how much they have gained or made progress towards important educational goals” (p. 11), whether “very little”, “some”, “quite a bit”, or “very much.” Because these item responses are clearly more ordinal than interval in nature, Mann-Whitney *U* tests were conducted to determine whether differences in the individual gains were observed.

As shown in Table 19, results of the Mann-Whitney *U* tests reveal that among the 25 perceived gain items, nine suggested significant group differences at $p < .05$. Those with the most robust effect sizes favored the traditionally-aged students and involved group gains pertinent to such items as “developing the ability to speak and understand

another language” ($g = 0.78$); “developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and theatre” ($g = 0.56$); “interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, textbooks, etc.” ($g = 0.43$) and “developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature (novels, stories, essays, poetry, etc.)” ($g = 0.42$).

To determine how the 25 estimates of gains items clustered, a principal components analysis was conducted, with the results suggesting that the items could be categorized as belonging to one of three domains: (1) Academic ($\alpha = 0.95$); (2) World View ($\alpha = 0.93$); and (3) Career ($\alpha = 0.91$). Table 20 following provides a description of which items aligned with which of the three components.

The analysis employed with respect to the nine “quality of effort” scales, a MANOVA was conducted on the outcomes of the PCA, with the three scales employed as dependent variables and traditional/non-traditional group membership employed as the independent variable. As the results presented in Table 22 indicate, there is a difference on the set of all three scales by traditional and non-traditional groups ($F(3,150) = 3.19$; $p < .05$). Univariate results reveal that among the gains clusters, only students’ perceptions of their worldview gains differed significantly between groups ($F(1, 152) = 7.64$; $p < .01$) with traditionally aged students ($M = 2.77$; $SD = 0.80$) perceiving their gains to be higher than those perceived by their non-traditionally aged counterparts ($M = 2.40$; $SD = 0.75$). The size of the effect linked to this difference in worldview gains was robust ($g = 0.47$), compared to those observed for academic gains ($g = 0.24$) and career gains ($g = 0.16$).

Table 19

Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Estimates of their Gains

Item	Traditional (18-22)				Non-Traditional (23 and up)				Z	p =	r	g
	n	M	Mdn	SD	n	M	Mdn	SD				
Acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work.	103	2.9	3.0	1.0	51	3.0	3.0	1.0	-0.2	0.82	-0.02	-0.04
Gaining information about career opportunities.	103	3.1	3.0	0.9	51	2.9	3.0	0.9	-1.4	0.17	0.11	0.24
Developing clearer career goals.	102	3.1	3.0	0.9	50	2.9	3.0	0.9	-1.5	0.14	0.12	0.26
Becoming acquainted with different fields of knowledge.	101	3.0	3.0	0.9	51	2.9	3.0	0.9	-0.9	0.35	0.08	0.16
Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and theatre.	101	2.8	3.0	1.0	50	2.2	2.0	1.1	-3.1	0.00	0.25	0.56
Developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature (novels, stories, essays, poetry, etc.)	101	2.7	3.0	1.0	51	2.3	2.0	1.0	-2.4	0.02	0.19	0.42
Writing clearly and effectively.	102	2.9	3.0	0.9	50	2.7	3.0	0.8	-1.2	0.24	0.09	0.20
Presenting ideas and information effectively in speaking to others.	101	2.8	3.0	0.9	50	2.6	3.0	0.9	-1.2	0.25	0.09	0.20

(Table 19 continues)

(Table 19 continued)

Item	Traditional (18-22)				Non-Traditional (23 and up)				Z	p =	R	g
	n	M	Mdn	SD	n	M	Mdn	SD				
Acquiring skills needed to use computers to access information from the library or the Internet.	99	2.9	3.0	0.9	49	2.8	3.0	0.9	-1.0	0.33	0.17	0.17
Acquiring skills needed to use computers to produce papers, reports, etc.	103	3.0	3.0	0.9	49	2.8	3.0	1.0	-1.2	0.24	0.05	0.20
Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life.	101	2.8	3.0	0.9	49	2.4	2.0	1.0	-2.1	0.03	0.03	0.38
Becoming clearer about my own values and ethical standards.	103	2.9	3.0	0.9	50	2.8	3.0	0.9	-0.6	0.53	0.18	0.11
Understanding myself-my abilities and interests.	100	3.1	3.0	0.9	50	3.0	3.0	0.9	-0.4	0.70	0.02	0.06
Understanding mathematical concepts such as probabilities, proportions, etc.	99	3.0	3.0	0.9	51	2.6	3.0	0.9	-2.2	0.02	0.17	0.39
Understanding the role of science and technology in society.	102	2.8	3.0	1.0	51	2.8	3.0	1.0	-0.2	0.84	0.08	0.04
Putting ideas together to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas.	100	3.0	3.0	0.9	51	2.7	3.0	0.8	-2.1	0.04	0.34	0.36

(Table 19 continues)

(Table 19 continued)

Item	Traditional (18-22)				Non-Traditional (23 and up)				<i>Z</i>	<i>p</i> =	<i>r</i>	<i>g</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Developing the ability to learn on my own, pursue ideas, and find information I need.	101	3.1	3.0	0.9	51	3.0	3.0	1.0	-0.9	0.34	0.08	0.16
Developing the ability to speak and understand another language.	100	2.6	2.5	1.1	51	1.8	1.0	1.0	-4.2	0.00	0.34	0.78
Interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, etc.	102	2.9	3.0	1.0	50	2.5	2.0	0.9	-2.4	0.02	0.20	0.43
Developing an interest in political and economic events.	102	2.7	3.0	1.1	51	2.5	2.0	1.0	-1.2	0.24	0.09	0.20
Seeing the importance of history for understanding the present as well as the past.	101	2.8	3.0	1.0	51	2.7	3.0	0.9	-0.5	0.64	0.04	0.08
Learning more about other parts of the world and other people	103	2.7	3.0	1.0	51	2.3	2.0	0.9	-2.1	0.03	0.17	0.37
Understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people.	102	2.9	3.0	1.0	51	2.8	3.0	1.0	-0.9	0.35	0.08	0.16
Developing good health habits and physical fitness.	101	2.9	3.0	1.0	50	2.5	2.0	1.0	-2.2	0.03	0.18	0.38
Developing the ability to get along with others in different kinds of situations.	101	2.9	3.0	1.0	50	3.0	3.0	0.9	-0.5	0.64	-0.04	-0.09

Table 20

Principal Components Grouping for CCSEQ Items Concerning with Gains

Item Wording	Factor
Acquiring knowledge/ skills applicable to a specific job/type of work.	3
Gaining information about career opportunities.	3
Developing clearer career goals.	3
Becoming acquainted with different fields of knowledge.	3
Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and theatre.	2
Developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature.	2
Writing clearly and effectively.	1
Presenting ideas and information effectively in speaking to others.	1
Acquiring skills needed to use computers to access information	1
Acquiring skills needed to use computers to produce papers, reports, etc.	1
Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life.	2
Becoming clearer about my own values and ethical standards.	1
Understanding myself-my abilities and interests.	1
Understanding mathematical concepts such as probabilities, proportions, etc.	1
Understanding the role of science and technology in society.	1
Putting ideas together to see relationships, similarities, and differences b/w ideas.	1
Developing the ability to learn on my own, pursue ideas, and find information	1
Developing the ability to speak and understand another language.	2
Interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, textbooks, etc.	1
Developing an interest in political and economic events.	2
Seeing the importance of history for understanding the present and the past.	2
Learning more about other parts of the world and other people.	2
Understanding other people and the ability to get along w/different kinds of people.	2
Developing good health habits and physical fitness.	2
Developing the ability to get along with others in different kinds of situations.	1

Table 21

Means, Standard Deviations, Effect Size Differences for Factors Categorized as Career, Worldview, and Academic by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students

Item Scales	Items	(α)	Traditional ($n = 103$)		Non-Traditional ($n = 51$)		g
			M	SD	M	SD	
Combined	25	0.96	2.90	0.69	2.66	0.65	0.35
Career	4	0.91	3.05	0.80	2.92	0.82	0.16
Worldview	9	0.93	2.77	0.80	2.40	0.75	0.47
Academic	12	0.95	2.95	0.69	2.78	0.72	0.24

Table 22

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Factors Categorized as Career, Worldview, and Academic by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students

Source	MANOVA $F(3,150)$	ANOVA $F(1, 152)$		
		Career Item Gains	Worldview Item Gains	Academic Item Gains
Gains	3.19*	0.845	7.64**	1.91

Note. F ratios are Wilks' approximation of F . ANOVA = univariate analysis of variance; MANOVA = multivariate analysis of variance.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Research Question 4 (Inclination to Persist)

With respect to Research Question 4 and *the strength of relationship between traditional and non-traditional students' tendency to persist*, candidate items were compared across groups and summed to create a persistence index. Although several items were examined, the final set involved only those four that appeared to discriminate between student groups who were traditionally and non-traditionally aged (refer to Table 23). Taken from the Background, Work and Family section of the *CCSEQ*, these four items concerned persistence with respect to jobs, family, generational status, and time spent studying. Across these four items, student respondents are allocated one full point (1 point) for choosing responses consistent with a tendency to persist. Conversely, student respondents were allocated zero points for selecting answers thought to interfere with persistence. Presented below are the specifics regarding scoring of each element of the persistence index and a summary of the results of comparing student respondents on such indices.

The first item constituting the index related to job persistence (job_persist). Specifically, this item asks: *If you have a job, how does it affect your college work?*, with response options including “I don’t have a job”, “My job does not interfere with my college work”, “My job takes some time from my college work”, or “My job takes a lot of time from my college work”. Student respondents who indicated either not having a job or having a job that does not interfere with college work were given a full point towards persistence. As Table 23 reveals, the percentage of respondents differed significantly by age grouping with respect to job persistence, ($\chi^2(3, N = 154) = 4.51, p < .05$) Of the respondents, 81.6 % of traditional students ($n = 84$) and 66% of the non-

traditional students ($n = 33$) indicated their college work was not compromised by having a job. There was a moderate effect from these results ($g = 0.35$) relating to job persistence.

The second item in the persistence index related to family responsibilities (fam_persist). A questionnaire item asks respondents: *If you have family responsibilities, how does this affect your college work?*, with response options including “I don’t have family responsibilities”, “Those responsibilities do not interfere with my college work”, “Those responsibilities take some time from my college work”, or “Those responsibilities take a lot of time from my college work”. Student respondents were awarded one full point (1 point) for indicating not having family responsibilities or having responsibilities that do not interfere with college work.

Again, with reference to Table 23, traditional ($n = 102$) and non-traditional students ($n = 51$) differed significantly in terms of their tendency to persist in regards to family responsibilities. While the ratio between tendencies to persist or not to persist was roughly 80% to 20% for traditionally-aged students, the ratio for non-traditionally students was roughly 55% to 45%. Given the differing ratios, family persistence was determined to be significantly related to student status ($\chi^2(3, N = 153) = 10.93, p < .01, g = .56$).

The third item in the persistence index related to a students’ generational status (generation_persist). A questionnaire item asks respondents: *Do you consider yourself a first generation college student (neither parent attended college)?* The response options included “yes” or “no”. Respondents who indicated “no” were awarded a one point (1 point), while those respondents who indicated “yes” were given zero points (0 points)

towards their tendency to persist. As detailed in Table 23, examination of the generational persistence item proved to discriminate significantly between traditionally aged and non-traditionally aged student groups ($\chi^2(3, N= 152) = 6.64; p < .05, g = 0.43$). Of the former ($n = 101$), some 55.4% did not believe themselves to be first generational, thus had a greater tendency to persist, while among the latter ($n = 51$), some 66.7% thought of themselves as first generational students, with a lesser experience with the post-secondary environment and consequently a lesser tendency to persist.

The final item with the persistence index relates to time spent studying (study_persist). The questionnaire item asks: *About how many hours a week do you usually spend studying or preparing for your classes?*, with response options including “1 to 5 hrs”, “6 to 10 hrs”, “11 to 15 hrs”, “16 to 20 hrs”, or “more than 20 hours.” Student respondents were awarded a full point for indicating devoting more hours than the norm (that is, 1 to 5 hrs) towards time studying or preparing for classes.

As with the previous items, the final persistence index item was statistically significant ($\chi^2(3, N = 154) = 5.81, p < .05, g = 0.40$.) but the outcome trended in a different direction. While only about one-third of the traditionally-aged students suggested that they studied six or more hours a week (roughly 33%), over half of the non-traditionally aged students indicated that they studied at that level (roughly 54%). Given the higher level of commitment, greater persistence—at least as regards this criterion—would seem to follow.

To summarize: all four elements in the persistence index discriminated significantly between groups, with three of the four items favoring the traditionally aged students (who as a group seem to have fewer job and family responsibilities and tend less

often to think of themselves as first generational) and one of the four favoring the non-traditionally aged (who as group would seem to invest more time in classwork). After summing across the four items constituting the index and obtaining means (see Table 24), the two groups of student respondents appear to have differed significantly ($t(152) = 2.48; p < .05, g = 0.42$), with those in the traditional group having a higher mean persistence index ($M = 2.48; SD = 0.89$) than those in the non-traditional group ($M = 2.06; SD = 1.14$).

Table 23

Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Tendency to Persist According to Four Criteria

Criteria	<u>Traditional</u>				<u>Non-Traditional</u>				χ^2	ϕ	G
	Tend Not to Persist		Tend to Persist		Tend Not to Persist		Tend to Persist				
	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%			
Job	19	18.4	84	81.6	17	34.0	33	66.0	4.51*	-0.17	0.35
Family	20	19.6	82	80.4	23	45.1	28	54.9	10.93**	-0.27	0.56
Generation	45	44.6	56	55.4	34	66.7	17	33.3	6.64*	-0.21	0.43
Study	69	66.3	35	33.7	23	46.0	27	54.0	5.81*	0.19	0.40

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 24

Comparison of Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Students' Mean Tendency to Persist

Variable	n	<u>Traditional</u>		N	<u>Non-Traditional</u>		t	r	G
		M	SD		M	SD			
Persistence	103	2.48	0.89	51	2.06	1.14	2.48*	0.20	0.42

* $p < .05$.

Research Question 5

Finally, the fifth research question determines *the strength of the relationships between students' tendency to persist, their perceptions of the college environment, their perceived quality of effort, and their gains, and whether such relationships are mediated by students' traditional or non-traditional status*. To obtain an answer to the first part of this question, correlation coefficients were computed for all students ($N = 154$) and both student subgroups ($n = 103$ and $n = 51$) between students' means on the previously described persistence index and students' means on all other *CCSEQ* outcomes employed in this study (specifically, the college environment scale, nine quality of effort scales, and the three sets of gains). To obtain an answer to the second part of this question, Fisher's r to z transformation was employed to test for significant differences between the correlations obtained for the two groups.

Shown in Table 25, persistence is correlated with some *CCSEQ* outcomes, but none of these correlations appear to be mediated by students' status as traditionally or non-traditionally aged. For the entire sample, about half of the quality of effort outcomes appear to be tied to persistence, most notably quality of effort in art, music, and theatre ($r = 0.20$), quality of effort in science ($r = 0.22$), and quality of effort with respect to student acquaintances ($r = .22$). At about the same magnitude, persistence appears to be linked generally to gains with respect to students' worldviews ($r = 0.23$). While weaker but still statistically significant correlations were observed with respect to persistence and other *CCSEQ* outcomes for the whole group, other, more robust correlations were observed with respect to student subgroups. Among traditionally aged students, the best predictor of student persistence appears to be quality of effort in science ($r = 0.28$). Contrastingly,

what appears to be most indicative of whether a non-traditionally aged student will tend to persist concerns his interactions with people—specifically, his quality of effort apropos “faculty” ($r = 0.28$) and his quality of effort per “student acquaintances” ($r = 0.34$). While testing these two correlations against those obtained for traditionally aged students did not result in statistically significant outcomes, the outcomes that were obtained approached significance and might reach that threshold given a larger sample of older males.

Table 25

Correlations between Mean Intent to Persist Index and Other CCSEQ Outcomes by Traditional and Non-Traditional African American Male Community College Students

Variable	All ($N = 154$)	Traditional ($n = 103$)	Non Traditional ($n = 51$)	Z
	R	r	r	
College Environment	-0.06	-0.18 †	0.03	-1.18
QE Art, Music, and Theatre	0.20 **	0.15	0.24 †	-0.49
QE Career/Occupational Skills	0.10	0.15	0.04	0.62
QE Computer	0.16 *	0.16	0.14	0.13
QE Course Learning	0.12	0.15	0.10	0.31
QE Faculty	0.13	0.04	0.29 *	-1.46
QE Library	0.16 *	0.20 *	0.02	1.04
QE Science	0.22 **	0.28 **	0.05	1.35
QE Student Acquaintances	0.22 **	0.15	0.34 *	-1.19
QE Writing	0.07	0.06	0.08	-0.01
Career Gains	0.10	0.07	0.12	-0.31
Worldview Gains	0.23 **	0.17 †	0.24 †	-0.25
Academic Gains	0.14 †	0.14	0.10	0.25

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Summary of Chapter

Chapter 4 has presented the results of the research question of this study. Four dependent outcomes were examined for their significance in regards to gender race and age. The first outcome, perceptions of the college environment was not significant; however, one item appeared significant. The significant item (item 1) asks: *If you could start over again would you go to this college?* Traditionally aged students showed an affinity towards returning to their college. The second dependent variable, student quality of effort scales appeared to be significant on five of the scales: art, music and theatre; computer; library; science; and student acquaintances. Traditional students' perceptions were significant on four of the quality of effort scales: science and library. Non-traditional students were significant in faculty and student acquaintances. The third dependent variables, perceived gain items were factored into three clusters: career, world view, and academic gains. Student groups appeared significant overall in their perceptions of the worldview and their academic gains. Further, both groups appeared significant in their perceptions of the world view. In the fourth dependent variable, students' tendency to persistence, a 4 item index was analyzed by χ^2 analysis and revealed significant results. Traditionally aged students were higher on three of the items (job and family responsibilities, and generational status). Non-traditional students were significant in the amount of time they spend studying and preparing for class work. Although, student persistence was correlated with some *CCSEQ* outcomes, none of these correlations appear to be mediated by students' status as traditionally or non-traditionally aged.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Previous studies researching the perceptions among African American males and persistence yield mixed results. Some studies have approached discussions from an institutional perspective, while others have addressed persistence from a students' perspective. Sparse levels of research are available on persistence among African American males, specifically in the community college context. This dissertation examined African American male community college students' perceptions of the collegiate environment, their quality of effort, and their perceptions of gains. Further, the study addressed the strength of relation that a student's tendency to persist has with the aforementioned dependent variables. Traditional aged and non-traditional aged African American male community college students were the major independent variables in the study.

The following research questions guided this study and focused on the overarching question of how to increase the persistence levels of African American males at the community college level.

1. To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Perceptions of the Collegiate Environment* on the CCSEQ?
2. To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Quality of Effort* on the CCSEQ?

3. To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their *Perceived Gains* on the CCSEQ?
4. What is the strength of relationship between traditional and non-traditional students' tendency to persist and their perception of the college environment, perceived gains, and quality of effort?
5. Is the strength of the relationship mediated by a students' traditional or non-traditional status?

The purpose of this study was to determine the strategies that contribute to African American male persistence at community colleges and contribute to the research that identifies a student's tendency to persist. A secondary purpose were to examine the strength of relationship among a students' tendency to persist (job responsibilities, family responsibilities, generational status [first or second generation status], and time spent studying) and students' perceptions of the collegiate environment, quality of effort, and perceived gains. Existing retention theories address issues of student success within higher education; however, such higher education retention theories fail to address issues unique to the African American male community college student. This chapter provides a summary of the research conducted, summary and discussion of results, and presents the implications of this study and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Discussion Findings

A population of respondents from 8 community colleges comprised a sample of 1,948 respondents to the electronic version of the CCSEQ. Of the sample (n = 156) were identified as African American male community college students. Further, traditional

aged students (n = 151) represented 67.30% of the sample; and non-traditional students (n = 51) represented 32.70% of the sample of respondents.

Research Question 1 asks: *to what extent do traditional and non-traditional students differ in the perceptions of the college environment.* The analysis undertaken for Research Question 1 revealed that traditional and non-traditional African American males differed significantly on one of the eight college environment items. The significant item (item 1) asks: *If you could start over again would you go to this college?* Traditional students' satisfaction of the college environment was significantly higher than non-traditional students; which also had a large effect (0.86). This means that traditional aged students were happier with their level of satisfaction of the collegiate environment. All other items of the collegiate environment were not significant regarding their perceptions of the college environment.

Nontraditional students' perceptions of the college environment were higher on two items. Item 2: *how many of the students you know are friendly and supportive of one another;* and item 3: *how many of your instructors at this college do you feel are approachable, helpful, and supportive?* However, both items had the smallest effects of all college environment items ($g = -0.09$ and -0.06 respectively).

Research Question 2 asks: *to what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ in their perceived quality of effort on the CCSEQ?* Multiple independent *t*-tests among means of traditional and non-traditional students were run on all 9 quality of effort scales. Mean differences of traditional and non-traditional African American male community college student's perceptions in Art, Music, and Theatre was the only statistically significant outcome in

regards to quality of effort. Therefore, the perception of quality of effort with career, computer, course learning, faculty, library, science, student acquaintances, and writing were not statistically significant. Overall, when the comparison was made to the norm of the national *CCSEQ* aggregate, the extent of traditional and non-traditional students' perceptions of their quality of effort was not significant for African American male community college students by age.

Research Question 3 asks: *To what extent do traditional and non-traditional African American male community college students differ with respect to their perceived gains regarding perceived gains among African American male community college students who responded to the CCSEQ?* Results revealed that traditional and non-traditional students were significantly different on nine of the 25 items listed within the estimate of gains section. Further, a principal components analysis were conducted and revealed that gain items clustered into three primary areas: academic skills, perceptions of the world, and career gains. Of the three clustered areas, students' perceptions of the world gains were significant.

Research Question 4 asks: *What is the strength of relationship between traditional and non-traditional students' inclination to persist and their perception of the college environment, perceived gains, and quality of effort?* Items representing college environment, perceived gains and quality of effort were analyzed simultaneously to determine which items, if any, contributed significantly to a students' tendency to persist. Results yield that 6 out of 13 items that pertain to students' inclination to persist were significant. The significant items for all African American respondents (n = 154) derived

from three major areas: the college environment section, the perception of gains section and the quality of effort.

When respondents were examined by age, student perceptions of the college environment showed a relationship for traditional students ($r = -0.18$) and non-traditional students ($r = 0.03$) from the estimate of gains section, student's world view gains were determined to be significant. This means that students' perceptions of both traditional and non-traditional students felt significant gains were made in regards to their perceptions of the world view. Second, the significant quality of effort activities, related to effort with art, music and theatre and student acquaintances had the greatest relationship in regards to persistence.

Research question 5 asks: *Is the strength of the relationship mediated by a students' traditional or non-traditional status?* Results yield that items exist that were correlated significantly overall and by a student's traditional or non-traditional status. More in depth, traditionally-aged students perceived their effort in the library and science activities were significant. This means that students from 18-22, felt that their effort in the library and in the lab experience science activities were significant contributors towards persistence. For the non-traditional students, their effort with faculty and student acquaintances were revealed to have a significant relationship on persistence. Having the ability to access professors and interact with other students was significant for students 23 and older. Thus, the answer to question five is that although, student persistence was correlated with some *CCSEQ* outcomes; however, the low z-scores show that none of these correlations appeared to be mediated by a student's status as traditionally or non-traditionally aged.

Implications of Findings

The result of this study provides additional support for the urgency of African American male persistence efforts at the community college setting. The finding support the assertion by Astin (1984) concept of student involvement and Pace's (1984) Quality of Effort Theory as a critical element in the learning process. Some of the possible uses of this research by institutional administration, faculty, and student personnel are listed below.

Faculty and Administrators. As mentioned in chapter 1, there is a bleak level of persistence among African American male students within higher education; specifically, at community colleges. Since African American males have a greater affinity to attend community colleges, the institutional retention efforts explain a great deal of the variance in their degree completion. Perhaps African American males have a greater affinity to attend community colleges; the institutional retention efforts explain a great deal of the variance in their degree completion. Astin asserts that a deeper understanding of “what students (African American males at community colleges) are actually doing and how motivated they are and how much time and energy they are devoting to the learning process” (p. 526) would allow institutions to further strategize retention efforts based upon age groupings. This perspective would inspire better uses of institutional resources, and enhance an institutional environment more germane to African American male student success.

Faculty and Student Personnel. In higher education, faculty and counselors often negate and overlook best strategies for creating a sense of belonging, understanding of the student, and strategically designed pathway for success; because they often

concentrate on their own techniques or processes. Although the teaching and advising strategies may be fundamentally and theoretically sound; the strategies still fail to address the needs of the individual student. A more involved approach provides institutional change, and enhances the fiduciary responsibility of an environment tailored to student success.

In summation, the independent variable, age, appeared to be significant in regards to student perceptions of the collegiate environment. This information can be helpful to higher education administrators, faculty and student personnel in regards to best practices when planning activities (academic and social), and providing resources; specifically, when attempting to increase persistence and completion rates.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this research, and the limitations determined while analyzing this aggregate of data. Potential initiatives are available based upon the knowledge gained from student self-perceived responses. Additionally, suggestions for future studies are provided to gain greater insight into the perceptions of the community college student. Further, these recommendations are focused on programs that increase interest, motivate and inspire student persistence of African American male students within the community college context.

1. Provide faculty with professional development opportunities that are sensitive to students needs by ethnicity, gender and age. This study included African American male students' and their perceptions of the community college environment; of which, several significant element were significant. A study on the perceptions' of faculty, and their level of preparation within the community

college context could provide faculty with insightful instructional techniques and motivational strategies.

2. Explore resources provided by the institution (curriculum, student activities, and student support, etc.); and its function by age. In this study, traditional and non-traditional differed significantly on various aspects of the college environment. For instance, non-traditional students and how they valued their interactions with faculty and student acquaintances proved significant in this study. A more focused approach to the amount and quality of interaction with faculty and student acquaintances can contribute to a higher level of satisfaction that may translate into greater student success.
3. Create a qualitative study at the community college level by age. Case studies on African American male student experience would provide rich data about how institutional initiatives actually being received. This information would be useful in program design.
4. Examine participation of African American male community college students by age that could help students in other ways (socially, adjusting to the college), which may result in greater academic success in later years. Perhaps cohorts by age or affinity organizations by interest may inspire greater involvement and effort.
5. Design programs that include persistence item considerations within its design. Informational session on time management, parenting, budgeting, financial assistance procedures, and studying technique may prove beneficial to students and their tendency to persist.

The implementation of at least some of these recommendations would lead to an even greater understanding of African American male community college students and their motivations towards persistence. The research would also examine the motivations behind institutional strategies to create persistence in more depth to determine what these students are drawing from the community college environment. These recommendations would support the analysis of other effects and consequences of African American male community college involvement, such as a potential increase in their perceptions, motivations, and understanding of what it means to be a successful student.

Community college administrators should carefully plan the design of African American male community college students with clearly defined goals and learning objectives. If improved persistence is a goal for community college success, then motivations for continued enrollment should be researched and the design and implementation of the community college program should address student motivations and needs. In this way, administrators of community colleges looking to increase persistence may realize academic effectiveness.

Conclusion

The data gained from this research project indicates that persistence of African American male community college students was not significantly mediated by age. However, in regards to these students and their tendency to persist, multiple comparisons revealed that job responsibilities, family responsibilities, a student's generational status, and how much time a student spends studying or preparing for class are significant. The results for traditional student persistence were more favorable when considering a students' job and family responsibilities, and generational status; however, not for time

devoted to studying or preparation. This may be an indication that African American males enroll at the community college for reasons other than academics; perhaps for interactive factors (e.g., caring faculty, and close personal connections). Thus, discovering the reasons and motivations for persistence at community colleges among African American males may provide a wealth of potential research beneficial to many institutions.

References

- Adelman, C. (2003). A growing plurality: The “traditional age community college dominant” student. *Community College Journal*, 73(5), 26-30.
- Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 26-46.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2014a). *Manchester Community College: Brother-2-Brother program* [AACC: Minority male student success database]. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/diversity/MinMaleStuSuccessProgs/Pages/SearchResults.aspx?criteria=criteria>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2014b). *Baltimore City Community College - The QUEST: African American male learning cohort* [AACC: Minority male student success database]. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/diversity/MinMaleStuSuccessProgs/Pages/SearchResults.aspx?criteria=criteria>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2014c). *Winchester Community College: Black & Hispanic male initiative program* [AACC: Minority male student success database]. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/diversity/MinMaleStuSuccessProgs/Pages/SearchResults.aspx?criteria=criteria>

- Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1985). Involvement: The cornerstone of excellence. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 17(4), 34-39.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education*, 79(4), 4-12.
- Astin, A. W., & Oseguera, L. (2004). The declining “equity” of American higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(3), 321-341.
- Bean, J. P. (1980). Dropouts and turnover: the synthesis and test of a causal model of student attrition. *Research in Higher Education*, 12(2), 155-187.
- Bean, J. P., & Metzner, B. S. (1985). A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 485-540.
- Berger, J.B., & Lyons, S. (2005). Past to present: A historical look at retention. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp.1-30). San Francisco: Praeger.
- Bogue, J. P. (1948). The community college. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, 34(2), 285-295.
- Brown, T. D. (2007). *Keeping the brothers focused: A study of the impact of male mentoring on the community college level* (Doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved from:
<http://gradworks.umi.com/32/74/3274692.html>
- Brown, II, M. C. (2001). Editorial. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(1), 1-4.
- Brown, II, M. C., & Davis, J. E. (2001). The historically Black college as social contract, social capital, and social equalizer. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(1), 31-49

- Burke, C. B. (1982). *American collegiate populations: A test of the traditional view*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Burnett, S. T. (2013). *An examination of retention at a private liberal arts Historically Black College* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Memphis). Retrieved from <http://www.etd.memphis.edu>
- Bush, E. C. (2004). *Dying on the vine: A look at African American student achievement in California community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA.
- Bush, E. C., & Bush, L. (2010). Calling out the elephant: An examination of African American male achievement in community colleges. *Journal of African American Males in Education, 1*(1), 40-62.
- Carnevale, A. P., & Fry, R. A. (2000). *Crossing the great divide*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, Communication Services.
- Cejda, B. D., & Kaylor, A. J. (2001). Early transfer: A case study of traditional aged community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(8), 621-638.
- Cheyney University of Pennsylvania. (2010). *About CU* [Special Section]. *Welcome to Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: A National Treasure for Over 175 Years*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cheyney.edu/about-cheyney-university/>
- Cohen, A. M. (1995). *Projecting the future of community colleges* (Dialog, ERIC, ED, 388351). Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Complete College America (2012, August). Remediation: higher education's bridge to nowhere (2012 Remediation Report). Retrieved from Complete College America website: <http://www.completecollege.org/docs/CCA-Remediation-final.pdf>
- Chang, J. C. (2005). Faculty-student interaction at the community college: A focus on students of color. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7), 769-802.
- Choi, B. K., & Rhee, B. S. (2014). The influences of student engagement, institutional mission, and cooperative learning climate on the generic competency development of Korean undergraduate students. *Higher Education*, 67(1), 1-18.
- Cuyjet, M. J. (2006). *Helping African American men succeed in college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- D'Amico, M. M., Friedel, J. N., Katsinas, S. G., & Thorton, Z. M. (2013). Current developments in community college performance funding. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(2-3), 231-241.
- DeRemer, M. A. (2002). *The adult student attrition decision process (ASADP) model* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin). Retrieved from <http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/540/deremerma029.pdf>
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide*. Gencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Eells, W. C. (1931). *The Junior College*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Elkins, S. A., Braxton, J. M., & James, G. W. (2000). Tinto's separation stage and its influence on first-semester college student persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 41*(2), 251-68.
- Ethington, C.A., Guthrie, A.M., & Lehman, P. W. (2001). CCSEQ: Test manual and comparative data. Center for the Study of Higher Education; The University of Memphis.
- Fenske, R. H., & Boyd, J. D. (1981). *State need-based college scholarship and grant programs: A study of their development, 1960-1980* (College Board Report No. 81-7). Retrieved from College Entrance Examination Board (Collegeboard) website:
<http://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012/7/researchreport-1981-7-state-need-based-college-scholarships-grants.pdf>
- Flowers, L. A. (2004). Examining the effects of student involvement on African American college student development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(6), 633-654.
- Flowers, L. A. (2006). Effects of attending a 2-year institution on African American males' academic and social integration in the first year of college. *Teachers College Record, 108*(2), 267-286.
- Fortson, S. B. (1994). An evaluation of a program to influence academic self-concept among African American male college students. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 34*(3), 104-107.
- Friedlander, J., & MacDougall, P. R. (1992). Achieving student success through student involvement. *Community College Review 20*(1), 20-28.

- Friedlander, J., Murrell, P. H., & MacDougall, P. R. (1993). The Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire. In T. W. Banta & Associates (Eds.), *Making a Difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Friedlander, J., Pace, C.R., Murrell, P. H., & Lehman, P. H. (1990, 1999, revised 2011). *The community college student experiences questionnaire*. Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.
- Gerlach, K. L. (2008). *African American student involvement in campus affinity organizations: An exploration study of impact* (Doctoral dissertation, American University). Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com>
- Gladieux, L. E., King, J. E., & Corrigan, M. E. (2005). The federal government and higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges (2nd Ed.)*, (pp.163-197). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Glover, J., & Murrell, P. H. (1996). The community college experience: Assessing process and progress. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 20, 199-200.
- Glover, J., & Murrell, P. H. (1998). Campus environment and student involvement as predictors of outcomes of the community college experience. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College* 6(1), 5-13.
- Gonzalez, J. (2011). \$10-Million grant program will support state efforts to boost college-completion rates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

http://chronicle.com/search/?search_siteId=5&contextId=&action=rem&searchQueryString=complete+college+america

- Greene, T. G., Marti, C. N., & McClenney, K. (2008). The effort-outcome gap: Differences for African American and Hispanic community college students in student engagement and academic achievement. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(5), 513-539.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2005). How to define retention: A new look at an old problem. In A. Seldman (Ed), *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success* (pp.81-98). Landham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hagedorn, L. S., Maxwell, W., & Hampton, P. (2001). Correlates of retention for African-American males in community colleges. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 3*(3), 243-263.
- Hakim, C. (1982). Secondary analysis and the relationship between official and academic social research. In J. Goodwin (Ed.), *SAGE Secondary Data Analysis* (pp. 27-45). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hanna, S. B. (1996). The Higher Education Act of 1992: Skills, constraints, and the politics of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(5), 498-527.
- Hansen, W. L., & Stampen, J. O. (1981). Economics and financing of higher education: The tension between quality and equity. In P. G. Altbach & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *Higher Education in American Society* (pp.107-128). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Haplain, R. L. (1990). An application of the Tinto model to the analysis of freshman persistence in a community college. *Community College Review, 17*(1), 22-32.

- Harper, S. R. (2012). *Black male student success in higher education: A report from the National Black Male College Achievement Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education.
- Harper, S. R., & Kuykendall, J. A. (2012). Institutional efforts to improve Black male student achievement: A standards-based approach. *Change*, 44(2), 23-29.
- Harvard University Archives. (2014). Historical Facts. In the Harvard University Library System, Cambridge, MA Retrieved from: <http://www.harvard.edu/historical-facts>
- Hausmann, L. R. M., Ye, F., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2009). Sense of belonging and persistence in White and African American first-year students. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(7), 649-669.
- Herndon, M. K., & Hirt, J. B. (2004). Black students and their families: What leads to success in college. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(4), 489-513.
- Higher Education Act of 1965 § 42 U.S.C. § Public Law 89-3329 (1965).
- Horn, L., Peter, K., & Rooney, K. (2002). Profiles of undergraduates in US postsecondary educational institutions: 1999-2000. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 4(3), 79-86.
- Hoyt, J. E. (1999). Remedial education and student attrition. *Community College Review*, 27(2), 51-72.
- Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, 70(4), 324-345.
- Jordan, P. G. (2008). *African American male students' success in an urban community college: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Pennsylvania,

Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved from:

<http://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI3311541/>

- Kember, D., Lee, K., & Li, N. (2001). Cultivating a sense of belonging in part-time students. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(4), 326-341.
- Kiester, E. (1994). The G.I. Bill may be the best deal ever made by Uncle Sam. *Smithsonian*, 25(8), 128-132.
- Kim, J., Kirby, C., & Bragg, D. D. (2006). Dual credit: Then and now. Retrieved from <http://ocrl.illinois.edu/files/inbrief/brief-spring-06.pdf>
- Klingaman, W. K. (2001). *Abraham Lincoln and the road to emancipation, 1861-1865*. New York, NY: Viking Penguin Group Publishers.
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 540-563.
- Lombardi, J. (1978). *Resurgence of occupational education* (Topical Paper No. 65). ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, CA. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED148418.pdf>
- Mason, H. P. (1998). A persistence model for African American male urban community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28(8), 751-760.
- McCabe, W. G. (1922). The first university in America (1619-1622). *The Virginia Magazine of History*, 30 (1), 133-156.
- Morrison, T., Maciejewski, B., Giffi, C., DeRocco, E. D., McNelly, J., & Carrick, G. (2011). *The 2011 skills gap report*. Retrieved from The Manufacturing Institute's

website:

<http://www.themanufacturinginstitute.org/~media/A07730B2A798437D98501E798C2E13AA.ashx>

Meredith, B. W. (2004). *Assessing Hispanic students' perceptions of gains within the community college environment* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.

Meseus, S. D., & Quaye, S. J. (2009). Toward an intercultural perspective of racial and ethnic minority college student persistence. *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(1), 67-94.

Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 119-148.

Norman, O., Ault, Jr., C. R., Bentz, B., & Meskimen, L. (2001). The Black-White "achievement gap" as a perennial challenge of urban science education: A sociocultural and historical overview with implications for research and practice. *Journal of Research In Science Teaching*, 38(10), 1101-1114.

Olson, K. W. (1973). The G.I. bill and higher education: Success and surprise. *American Quarterly*, 25(5), 596-610.

Ory, J. C., & Branskamp, L. A. (1988). Involvement and growth of students in three academic programs. *Research in Higher Education* 28(2), 116-129.

Pace, C. R. (1979). *Achievement and the quality of student effort* (Contract No. NIE-P-82-0037). National Commission on Excellence in Education (ED) (Publication No. 143). Washington, DC.

- Pace, C. R. (1984). *Measuring the Quality of College Student Experiences: An account of the development and use of the college student experience questionnaire* (ERIC Document No. ED 255 099). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED255099.pdf>
- Pace, C.R. (1987). *CSEQ Test manual and norms*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Pace, C. R. (1998). Recollections and reflections. In J. C. Smart & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher Education: Theory and Research: Vol. XVII* (p. 1-34). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Pagliaro, P., & Bingham, F. K. (1990, 2010). Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Exploring a national treasure. In C. Conyers (Ed.) *A Living Legend: The History of Cheyney University (1837-1991)* (pp. 1-15). Cheyney, PA: Cheyney University Press.
- Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(4), 545-595.
- Pascarella, E. T. (2006). How college affects students: Ten directions for future research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(5), 508-520.
- Pearson, F.C., Gould, P.D., Ethington, C.A., & Murrell, P.H. (2009). *Community college student experiences questionnaire: Test manual and comparative data* (4th ed.), Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for the Study of Higher Education.

- Phillippe, K. A., & Patton, M. (2000). National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends and Statistics (4th Ed.). *American Association of Community Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.
- Pigg, T. L. (2000). *Student effort: The impact on community college transfer and vocational students' academic achievement* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.
- Pincus, F. L. (1980). False promises of community colleges. *Harvard Educational Review*, 50(3), 332-361.
- Pope, M. L. (2006). Meeting the challenges to African American men at community colleges. In M. J. Cuyjet (Ed.), *African American men in college* (pp. 210-236). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Powell, P. R. (2009). Retention and writing instruction: Implications for access and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, 60(4), 664-682.
- Quincy, J. (1860). *The history of Harvard University (Vol. II)*. Boston, MA: Crosby, Nichols, Lee, & Company.
- Rayfield, W. W. (2012). *Determining the relationship between participation in the arts and the academic, personal, and social growth of community college students* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Memphis). Retrieved from <https://umwa.memphis.edu/etd//index.php>
- Rovai A.P. (2003). In search of higher persistence in distance education online programs. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 6(1), 1-16.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: A history*. New York, NY: Knopf.

- Santibáñez, L., Gonzalez, G., Morrison, P. A., & Carroll, S. J. (2007). Methods for gauging the target populations that community colleges serve. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 26(1), 51-67.
- Schneider, M., & Yin, L. M. (2011). The hidden cost of community colleges. eWashington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Shaffer, D. F. (2013). Workforce development at community colleges. In J.E. Lane & D. B. Johnstone (Eds.), *Higher Education Systems 3.0: Harnessing Systemness, Delivering Performance* (pp. 237-254). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Shannon, H. D., & Smith, R. C. (2006). A case for the community college's open access mission. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 136, 15-21
- Siedman, A. (2004). Minority student retention: Resources for practitioners. In G. H. Gaither (Ed.), *Minority retention: What works?* (pp. 7-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Skolnik, M. L. (2005). The community college baccalaureate. In D. L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik, & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The Community College Baccalaureate: Emerging Trends & Policy Issues* (pp. 49-72). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Sorey, K. C., & Duggan, M. H. (2008). Differential predictors of persistence between community college adult and traditional aged students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32(2), 75-100.
- Spady, W. (1970). Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review of synthesis. *Interchange*, 1(1), 64-85.
- St. John, E. P., Paulsen, M. B., & Carter, D. F. (2005). Diversity, college costs, and postsecondary opportunity: An examination of the financial nexus between

- college choice and persistence for African Americans and Whites. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 545-569.
- Stoecker, J., Pascarella, E. T., & Wolfe, L. M. (1988). Persistence in higher education: A 9-year test of a theoretical model. *Journal of College Student Development*, 23(3), 196-209.
- Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). Satisfaction and retention among African American men at two-year community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(5), 358-375.
- Strayhorn, T. L., Williams, M. S., Tillman-Kelly, D. L., & Dorimé-Williams, M. (2013). Stemming the tide: Psychological factors influencing racial and ethnic minority students' success in STEM at community colleges. In R.T. Palmer & J. L. Wood (Eds.), *Community Colleges and STEM: Examining Underrepresented Racial and Ethnic Minorities* (pp. 91-100). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Summers, M. D. (2003). ERIC review: Attrition research at community colleges. *Community College Review*, 30(4), 64-84.
- Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Yaeger, P. M., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1996). First-generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education* 37(1), 1-22.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the cause and cures of student attrition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving College: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd Ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1998). Colleges as communities: Taking research on student persistence seriously. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(2), 167-177.
- Theelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education* (2nd Ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thornton, J. W., Jr. (1972). *The community junior college* (3rd Ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Trow, M. (1993). Federalism in American higher education. In A. Levine (Ed.), *Higher Learning in America: 1980-2000* (pp. 39-66). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Turner, S., & Bound, J. (2003). Closing the gap or widening the divide: The effects of the G. I. Bill and World War II on the educational outcome of Black Americans. *The Journal of Economic History*, 63(1), 145-177.
- Turner, V. (1994). Betwix and between: The Liminal Period in rites of passage (4th Ed.). In L. C. Mahdi, S. Foster, & M. Little (Eds.), *Betwixt & Between: Patterns of Masculine and Feminine Initiation* (pp. 3-22). Peru, IL: Open Court Publishing Company.
- Vacik, S. M. & Miller, M. T. (1995). Development and planning perspectives on Virginia's Henrico College. Retrieved from: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED396612>
- Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wood, J. L., & Ireland, S. M. (2014). Supporting Black male community college success: Determinants of faculty-student engagement. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38, 154-165.

- Wood, J. L., & Turner, C. S. (2010). Black males and the community college: Student perspectives on faculty and academic success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35(1-2), 135-151.
- Williams, H. A. (2005). *Self-taught: African American education in slavery and freedom*. Chapel, Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Williams, P. (1935, January 13). Henricopolis, America's first college. *Then and Now*.
- U. S. Department of Education (2014). *Federal work-study program*. Retrieved from: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/fws/index.html>
- U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (2008). *Descriptive summary of 2004-04 beginning postsecondary students: Three years later* (NCES 2008-174). National Center for Educational Statistics, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *Beginning postsecondary students longitudinal study, first follow (BPS)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

APPENDIX A

From: Beverly Jacobik (bjacobik)
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 12:02 PM
To: William Melvin Johnson Sr (wmjhnsn1)
Cc: Mitsunori Misawa (mmisawa)
Subject: IRB Approval 3069

Hello,

The University of Memphis Institutional Review Board, FWA00006815, has reviewed and approved your submission in accordance with all applicable statuses and regulations as well as ethical principles.

PI NAME: William Johnson

CO-PI:

PROJECT TITLE: Quality of Effort: The Impact on African American Male Student Persistence at Community Colleges

FACULTY ADVISOR NAME (if applicable): Mitsunori Misawa

IRB ID: #3069

APPROVAL DATE: 1/06/2014

EXPIRATION DATE: 1/05/2015

LEVEL OF REVIEW: Exempt

RISK LEVEL DETERMINATION: No more than minimal

Please Note: Modifications do not extend the expiration of the original approval

Approval of this project is given with the following obligations:

1. If this IRB approval has an expiration date, an approved renewal must be in effect to continue the project prior to that date. If approval is not obtained, the human consent form(s) and recruiting material(s) are no longer valid and any research activities involving human subjects must stop.
2. When the project is finished or terminated, a completion form must be completed and sent to the board.
3. No change may be made in the approved protocol without prior board approval, whether the approved protocol was reviewed at the Exempt, Exedited or Full Board level.
4. Exempt approval are considered to have no expiration date and no further review is necessary unless the protocol needs modification.

Approval of this project is given with the following special obligations:

Thank you,

Ronnie Priest, PhD

Institutional Review Board Chair

The University of Memphis.

Note: Review outcomes will be communicated to the email address on file. This email should be considered an official communication from the UM IRB. Consent Forms are no longer being stamped as well. Please contact the IRB at IRB@memphis.edu if a letter on IRB letterhead is required.

Community College Student Experiences Questionnaire

Survey Name:

Organization:

State:

Today's Date:

The main purpose of asking you to complete this questionnaire is to learn more about how community college students spend their time. The information obtained from you and from other community college students from all over the country will help administrators and faculty members provide programs which will benefit student learning and development within the college experience.

At first glance, you may think it will take a long time to fill out this questionnaire, but you can actually complete it in 20 to 30 minutes. You will find when you have finished it, that your answers provide a kind of self-portrait of what you have been giving and getting in your college experience.

The ultimate benefit from this or any other survey depends on the thoughtful responses and willing participation of those who are asked to help. Your willingness to participate is important and very much appreciated.

We do not ask you to enter your name on the questionnaire. On the last page there is space for a student identification number if it is requested by your college.

©Copyright 1990 by C. Robert Pace, Patricia H. Murrell, Jack Friedlander and Penny W. Lehman

DIRECTIONS: Indicate your responses by filling in the appropriate space under each question.

BACKGROUND, WORK, FAMILY

1. Age

- 18-19 or younger
- 20-22
- 23-27
- 28-39
- 40-55
- Over 55

2. Gender

- Male
- Female

3. What is your racial or ethnic identification?

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- White
- Other/Multiracial

4. Is English your native language?

Yes
 No

5. During the time college is in session, about how many hours a week do you usually spend working on a job for pay?

None, I don't have a job
 1-10 hours
 11-20 hours
 21-30 hours
 31-40 hours
 More than 40 hours

6. If you have a job, how does it affect your college work?

I don't have a job
 My job does not interfere with my college work
 My job takes some time from my college work
 My job takes a lot of time from my college work

7. If you have family responsibilities, how does this affect your college work?

I don't have family responsibilities
 Those responsibilities do not interfere with my college work
 Those responsibilities take some time from my college work
 Those responsibilities take a lot of time from my college work

8. Are you in a work-study program?

Yes
 No

9. Do you consider yourself a first generation college student (neither parent attended college)?

Yes
 No

Comment ?

1. You chose "Other/Multiracial" as your ethnic identification. Please describe here.

COLLEGE PROGRAM ?

1. How many credits are you taking THIS term?

Less than 6
 6 to 8
 9 to 11
 12 to 15
 More than 15

2. Including the credits you are now taking, what is the total number of course credits you have taken at this college?

1-15 credits
 16-30 credits
 31-45 credits
 46 or more credits

3. When do the classes you are now taking meet?

Day only
 Evening only
 Some day and some evening

4. Up to now, what have most of your grades been at this college?
- A
 - A-, B+
 - B
 - B-, C+
 - C, C-
 - lower than C-
 - No grades, this is my first term
5. About how many hours a week do you usually spend studying or preparing for your classes?
- 1 to 5 hours
 - 6 to 10 hours
 - 11 to 15 hours
 - 16 to 20 hours
 - more than 20 hours
6. About how many hours a week do you usually spend on the college campus, not counting time attending classes?
- none
 - 1 to 3 hours
 - 4 to 6 hours
 - 7 to 9 hours
 - 10 to 12 hours
 - more than 12 hours
7. What is the most important reason you are attending THIS COLLEGE at this time? (Mark ONLY ONE answer.)
- To prepare for transfer to four-year college or university.
 - To gain skills necessary to enter a new job or occupation.
 - To gain skills necessary to retrain, remain current, or advance in a current job or occupation.
 - To satisfy a personal interest(cultural, social).
 - To improve my English, reading, or math skills.
8. Including this term, I have taken classes in the following format(s):
- In-person (face-to-face) only
 - Online only
 - Hybrid (some face-to-face and some online elements) only
 - In-person and online
 - In-person and hybrid
 - Online and hybrid
 - In-person, online, and hybrid

COLLEGE COURSES

DIRECTIONS: Indicate whether you have taken (or are now taking) any courses in the following areas:	More than 1	One	None
1. College Math (not remedial math)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Computer/Technology Literacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. English Class or Classes (to prepare you to take a college level English composition course)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. English Composition (not remedial English)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Fine Arts (such as music, theater, dance)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Foreign Languages	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Humanities (such as history, literature, philosophy, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Math Class or Classes (to prepare you to take a college level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

math course)			
9. Physical or Health Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Sciences (such as astronomy, biology, physics, chemistry, geology, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Social Sciences (such as psychology, political science, sociology, economics, ethnic studies, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Speech, Communications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

DIRECTIONS: Answer each of the following questions:	Yes	No
1. Are you working for an AA degree?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Are you working for an AS degree?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Are you working for a diploma?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Are you working for a certificate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Do you plan to transfer to a four year college or university?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Are you currently enrolled in an occupational/vocational program?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

DIRECTIONS: Answer the following question:
1. If you are enrolled in a vocational program, which of the following categories best describes your occupational/technical program? (MARK ONE)
<input type="radio"/> I am not enrolled in an occupational/technical program. <input type="radio"/> Agriculture (such as agricultural business, management, mechanics, or production; animal science; horticulture; landscaping; conservation; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Business (such as accounting; bookkeeping; data processing; office supervision; personnel and training; secretarial programs; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Management and Distribution (such as real estate; fashion merchandising; small business management; financial services marketing; food marketing; marketing management; institutional management; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Health (such as dental services; diagnostic and treatment services; medical laboratory technologies; mental health & human services; nursing services; rehabilitation services; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Home Economics (such as interior design; clothing and textiles; food and nutrition; food production; child care; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Technical and Communications (such as computer programming; educational media technology; radio and television technology; architectural technology; civil technology; electrical and electronic technology; environmental control technology; industrial technology; engineering technology and robotics; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Trade and Industrial (such as cosmetology; law enforcement; construction trades; heating and air conditioning; industrial equipment maintenance; aircraft mechanics; auto body repair; automotive mechanics; architectural, civil, or mechanical drafting; commercial art; commercial photography; truck and bus driving; tool and dye making; welding; etc.) <input type="radio"/> Other occupational/technical programs not listed above.

LEARNING AND STUDY SKILLS

How much OUT-OF-CLASS instruction have you received at the college in each of the following learning and study skills areas?	A lot	Some	None
1. Memory skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Note taking skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Listening skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Speaking skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Writing skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Reading skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Test taking skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Time management skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Problem solving skills

DIRECTIONS: In your experience at this college DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, about how often have you done each of the following? Indicate your responses by filling in one of the circles to the right of each activity.

COURSE ACTIVITIES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Participated in class discussions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Worked on a paper or project which combined ideas from different sources of information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Summarized major points and information from readings or notes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Tried to explain the material to another student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Did additional readings on topics that were introduced and discussed in class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Asked questions about points made in class discussions or readings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Studied course materials with other students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Applied principles and concepts learned in class to understand other problems or situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Compared and contrasted different points of view presented in a course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Considered the accuracy and credibility of information from different sources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

LIBRARY ACTIVITIES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Used the library as a quiet place to read or study material you brought with you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Read newspapers, magazines, or journals located in the library or on-line.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Checked out books and other materials to read at home.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Used the computer to find materials the library had on a topic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Prepared a bibliography or set of references for a term paper or report.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Asked the librarian for help in finding materials on some topic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Found some interesting material to read just by browsing in the stacks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

FACULTY	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Asked an instructor for information about grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Talked briefly with an instructor after class about course content.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Made an appointment to meet with an instructor in his/her office.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Discussed ideas for a term paper or other class project with an instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Discussed your career and/or educational plans, interests, and ambitions with an instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Discussed comments an instructor made on a test or paper you	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

wrote.

7. Talked informally with an instructor about current events, campus activities, or other common interests.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Discussed your school performance, difficulties or personal problems with an instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Used e-mail to communicate with your instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

STUDENT ACQUAINTANCES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Had serious discussions with students who were much older or much younger than you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Had serious discussions with students whose ethnic or cultural background was different from yours.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Had serious discussions with students whose philosophy of life or personal values were very different from yours.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Had serious discussions with students whose political opinions were very different from yours.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Had serious discussions with students whose religious beliefs were very different from yours.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Had serious discussions with students from a country different from yours.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

COLLEGE ACTIVITIES

DIRECTIONS: In your experience at this college DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, about how often have you done each of the following? Indicate your responses by filling in one of the circles to the right of each activity.

ART, MUSIC, THEATRE ACTIVITIES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Talked about art (painting, sculpture, architecture, artists, etc.) with other students at the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Talked about music (classical, popular, musicians, etc.) with other students at the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Talked about theatre (plays, musicals, dance, etc.) with other students at the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Attended an art exhibit on the campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Attended a concert or other musical event at the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Attended a play, dance, concert, or other theatre performance at the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Participated in an art exhibit, musical event, or theatre performance at the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Attended an OFF-CAMPUS art exhibit, musical event, or theatre performance <u>for course credit</u> .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Participated in an OFF-CAMPUS art exhibit, musical event, or theatre performance <u>for course credit</u> .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

WRITING ACTIVITIES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Used a dictionary [or computer spell-check/thesaurus] to look up the proper meaning, definition, and/or spelling of words.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Prepared an outline to organize the sequence of ideas and points in a paper you were writing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Thought about grammar, sentence structure, paragraphs and word choice as you were writing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Wrote a rough draft of a paper or essay and revised it before handing it in.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Used a computer to write a paper.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Asked other people to read something you wrote to see if it was clear to them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Spent at least 5 hours or more writing a paper.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Asked an instructor for advice and help to improve your writing or about a comment he/she made on a paper you wrote.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SCIENCE ACTIVITIES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Memorized formulas, definitions, technical terms.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Practiced to improve your skills in using laboratory equipment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Showed a classmate how to use a piece of scientific equipment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Attempted to explain an experimental procedure to a classmate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Tested your understanding of some scientific principle by seeing if you could explain it to another student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Completed an experiment/project using scientific methods.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Talked about social and ethical issues related to science and technology such as energy, pollution, chemicals, genetics, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Used information you learned in a science class to understand some aspect of the world around you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Tried to explain to someone the scientific basis for environmental concerns about pollution, recycling, alternative forms of energy, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Did paid or volunteer work OFF-CAMPUS to help the environment after learning about environmental issues in class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Applied information or skills you learned in a science class to work (either volunteer or paid) outside of class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Followed a regular exercise program on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Sought athletic instruction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Attended an athletic event on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Coached or assisted with youth athletic programs on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Coached or assisted with OFF-CAMPUS youth athletic programs for course credit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Participated in a sport on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

COLLEGE ACTIVITIES

DIRECTIONS: In your experience at this college DURING THE CURRENT SCHOOL YEAR, about how often have you done each of the following? Indicate your responses by filling in one of the circles to the right of each activity.

CAREER/OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS

DIRECTIONS: If you are enrolled in a career/occupational program or a course in which you learn occupational skills, answer the following items.	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Read about how to perform a procedure (occupational task, vocational skill).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Listened to an instructor explain how to do a procedure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Watched an instructor demonstrate how to do a procedure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Practiced a procedure while being monitored by an instructor or other student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Practiced a procedure without supervision.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Identified that there was a problem and located information from an instructor or other resource about what to do.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Diagnosed a problem and carried out the appropriate procedure without having to consult any resource.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Applied occupational skills learned in class to a job situation outside of class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Participated in an internship, cooperative, practicum, etc. with a local business, facility, or organization for course credit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Used E-mail to communicate with an instructor or other students about a course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Used the Internet (or other computer network) to get information for a class project or paper.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Used a computer tutorial to learn material for a course or remedial program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Used computers in a group (cooperative) learning situation in class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Used a computer for some type of database management.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Used a computer to analyze data for a class project.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Used a computer to create graphs or charts for a class paper or project.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Wrote an application using existing software or programming languages.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Used social media (e.g., Facebook) to communicate with other students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10.Used computer technology (e.g., Facebook or Wikis) as part of a course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Looked for notices about campus events and student organizations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Read or asked about a student club or organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Attended a meeting of a student club or organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Assumed a leadership role (held an office, headed a committee, etc.) in a student organization or club.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Participated in a campus project or event sponsored by a student organization or club.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Participated in a project or event OFF-CAMPUS which was sponsored by a student organization or club.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Participated in a project or event OFF-CAMPUS which was not	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

sponsored by a student organization or club.

COUNSELING AND CAREER PLANNING	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Never
1. Talked with a counselor/advisor about courses to take, requirements, educational plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Discussed your vocational interests, abilities and ambitions with a counselor/advisor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Read information about a particular 4-year college or university that you were interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Read materials about career opportunities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Made an appointment with a counselor or an advisor to discuss your plans for transferring to a 4-year college or university.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Identified courses needed to meet the general education requirements of a 4-year college or university you are interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Talked with a counselor/advisor about personal matters related to your college performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Have taken interest inventories or surveys (e.g., Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, etc.) to help you direct your career goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ESTIMATE OF GAINS

DIRECTIONS: In thinking over your experiences in this college up to now, to what extent do you think you have gained or made progress in each of the following areas? (Please mark one response for each item.)

I have gained or made progress in:	Very Much	Quite a bit	Some	Very Little
1. Acquiring knowledge and skills applicable to a specific job or type of work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Gaining information about career opportunities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Developing clearer career goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Becoming acquainted with different fields of knowledge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and theatre.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing an understanding and enjoyment of literature (novels, stories, essays, poetry, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Writing clearly and effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Presenting ideas and information effectively in speaking to others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Acquiring skills needed to use computers to access information from the library or the Internet.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Acquiring skills needed to use computers to produce papers, reports, graphs, charts, tables, or data analysis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Becoming clearer about my own values and ethical standards.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Understanding myself-my abilities and interests.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Understanding mathematical concepts such as probabilities, proportions, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Understanding the role of science and technology in society.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. Putting ideas together to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Developing the ability to learn on my own, pursue ideas, and find information I need.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Developing the ability to speak and understand another language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Interpreting information in graphs and charts I see in newspapers, textbooks, on TV, or on the Internet.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Developing an interest in political and economic events.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Seeing the importance of history for understanding the present as well as the past.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Learning more about other parts of the world and other people (Asia, Africa, South America, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Developing good health habits and physical fitness.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Developing the ability to get along with others in different kinds of situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

- If you could start over again would you go to this college?
 - yes
 - maybe
 - no
- How many of the students you know are friendly and supportive of one another?
 - all
 - most
 - some
 - few or none
- How many of your instructors at this college do you feel are approachable, helpful, and supportive?
 - all
 - most
 - some
 - few or none
- How many of the college counselors, advisors, and department staff you have had contact with would you describe as helpful, considerate, knowledgeable?
 - all
 - most
 - some
 - few or none
- How many of your courses at this college would you describe as challenging, stimulating, and worthwhile?
 - all
 - most
 - some
 - few or none
- Do you feel that this college is a stimulating and often exciting place to be?
 - all of the time
 - most of the time
 - some of the time
 - rarely or never
- Are there places on the campus for you to meet and study with other students?

yes, ample
 places
 yes, a few
 places
 no

8. Are there places on the campus for you to use computers and technology?

yes, ample
 places
 yes, a few
 places
 no

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

	A	B	C	D
1. 1.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. 2.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. 3.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. 4.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. 5.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. 6.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. 7.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. 8.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. 9.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10.10.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11.11.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12.12.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13.13.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14.14.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15.15.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16.16.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17.17.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18.18.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19.19.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20.20.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

©

Student Identification Number .. \#. # ?)

Thank you for your participation in this survey. _____ ID

C=:J

Note: Click on the Preview button to confirm your responses. Then you can submit the responses.

APPENDIX C




William Akey, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Leadership
Director, Dual Enrollment
Programs
300 Browning Hall
Memphis, TN 38152-3340
Office: 901-678-3993
Fax: 901-678-4291

May 27, 2014

Memorandum

To: William M. Johnson, Doctoral Candidate Department of Leadership
The University of Memphis

From: Dr. William Akey, Interim Director
Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) 

Subject: Request to use CCSEQ archived data for doctoral research at the University of
Memphis

Contingent upon receipt of a copy of your approved dissertation prospectus and University of Memphis IRB approval notification, the CSHE approves your use of the CCSEQ electronic data pool under the following conditions:

- Use of the CCSEQ data will be for the purpose of your approved doctoral research only and any further use of this data is strictly prohibited.
- Your access to the data will be under the supervision of Dr. Louis Franceschini who is a staff member in the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) where the CCSEQ data is retained.
- You are not allowed to copy or remove this database from the premises of the University of Memphis (physically or electronically).
- You may not share the CCSEQ database with anyone else.
- All data remains the property of the CSHE.
- No CCSEQ participant or participating institution may be identified in your research.
- You must acknowledge the CSHE and the CCSEQ in your dissertation.