

Copyright
by
Gerald F. Napoles
2009

The Dissertation Committee for Gerald F. Napoles Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ENGAGEMENT LEVELS AMONG ENTERING AND RETURNING HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS

Committee:

John E. Roueche, Supervisor

Ronald Angel

Walter G. Bumphus

Kay McClenney

Norvell Northcutt

**FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ENGAGEMENT LEVELS AMONG
ENTERING AND RETURNING HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS**

by

Gerald F. Napoles, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2009

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family and Donna. Thank you for all of your love and support during this journey. I am very blessed and humbled to have you all in my life.

Acknowledgements

This was a great journey thanks to many people I had the opportunity to meet along the way.

I give many thanks to my committee members for supporting me through the dissertation process. Dr. John Roueche is a great person, professor, mentor, model, and advisor. I am forever grateful for the opportunity he has given me to learn from the best practitioners in the country. I considered a few other programs in the country, and the Community College Leadership Program was the best fit for me. Dr. Walter Bumphus always dresses like a million dollars, and he made everyone feel like they were worth a million dollars. I thank him for his energy and support. Dr. Norvell Northcutt has tremendous talents in music and teaching. I am very appreciative of the many times he helped me figure out the fun data analysis and interpretations. Dr. Kay McClenney is an outstanding educator and person. Her sense of humor and extensive knowledge of matters pertaining to student engagement are incredible. I appreciate her for allowing me to use the pilot study of SENSE. Dr. Ronald Angel inspired me to participate in the local community and learn more about the global community. Thank you for your inspiration and encouragement in the world of nonprofits.

I also give thanks to Dr. Lasher, Dr. Moore, and the other wonderful faculty in the College of Education and the LBJ School of Public Affairs. I appreciate the support and encouragement from Beverly Hurbace, Reid Watson, and Ruth Thompson. My experience at The University of Texas at Austin was much easier thanks to their guidance, encouragement, and positive energy.

I have been fortunate to have a great set of classmates. I did not realize that May 2006 would be one of the best summers of my life. I am forever indebted to each and every one of my classmates, colleagues, and friends: Phil Neal, Maggie Schmid-Shelton, Grant Wilson, Rosemary Reynolds-Sundet, Melissa Richardson Curtiss, Val Dabney, Maryellen Mills, Lisa Alcorta, Ryan Carstens, Rick Batemen, Wendi Prater, Oralia de los Reyes, Esmeralda Garcia, and Rosemary Ramirez. We aimed high and raced fast. Though we reached the finish line at different times, we all were part of a great race to the chase.

I thank Sarah Johnson for her enthusiasm and passion. She was very instrumental and influential in my decision to enroll in a Ph.D. program in educational administration. I thank my best friend Josh for his support from the first day of high school wrestling and even until today. I give many thanks to Jasmine, Reea, Connie, and Roshni for being wonderful and generous people during our time together in Austin. Many thanks also to my family in California: Auntie Babie, Uncle Nathan, Auntie Nardette, Boogie, Jerome, Jake, and Jannah. Thank you for the food on the table and the roof over my head during my Los Angeles internship.

I appreciate the many opportunities I had to learn during my internship with the Los Angeles Community College District Office. I give many thanks to Dr. Drummond, Dr. Barrera, LACCD board of trustee members, Gary, Deborah, David, Ed, Lupe, Bob, Yasmin, Sue, the ALPineers, and all the rest of my LACCD colleagues and friends. I appreciate how you all welcomed me and accepted me in to your community.

I would especially like to thank the wonderful Thunderducks at Richland College. Thank you for encouraging and inspiring me to succeed in school and in life. Richland College is indeed a wonderful place to teach, learn, and build local and global communities. Many thanks to Dr. Mittelstet, Tony Summers, Janet James, Kay Coder, Bert Becerra, David Canine, Bobbie Harrison, Janice Jones-Bell, Jay Woolridge, and the countless other friends and colleagues at Richland College and within the Dallas County Community College District.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ENGAGEMENT LEVELS AMONG ENTERING AND RETURNING HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS

Publication No. _____

Gerald F. Napoles, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2009

Supervisor: John E. Roueche

The purpose of this study was to explore the engagement levels among entering and returning Hispanic community college students. This study provides needed data focused specifically on Hispanic student engagement. Limited data exist on the persistence of community college students in general, and Hispanic students in particular. The data were collected using the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). SENSE was administered as a pilot test to students at volunteer community colleges during the fourth and fifth weeks of the fall 2007 semester. These 22 colleges are located in eight states.

This study consisted of two research questions: Are there significant differences in the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students? Are there significant differences in engagement levels of entering Hispanic students when analyzed in terms of the following breakout variables: enrollment status (full-time and part-time); age (traditional and nontraditional; 18-19 years old and 20 years old and older); first-generation and non-first-generation status; developmental education status

(enrollment in developmental writing course; developmental reading course; developmental math course); sex (male and female); academic goal aspiration (degree seeking and non-degree seeking).

The results show that when there are significant differences in levels of engagement between entering and returning Hispanic students, returning students are consistently more engaged. This study also identifies the importance of collaborative learning in Hispanic student engagement. Full-time students reported higher engagement levels than part-time students. Nontraditional age students reported higher engagement levels than traditional age students. Students 20 years and older reported higher engagement levels than students 18-19 years old. First-generation students reported higher engagement levels than non-first-generation. Students enrolled in developmental reading reported higher engagement levels than students not enrolled in developmental reading. Students enrolled in developmental writing reported higher engagement levels than students not enrolled in developmental writing. Students enrolled in developmental math reported higher engagement levels than students not enrolled in developmental math in regards to use of skill labs. Females were more likely to report that they would prepare at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in. Degree-seeking students reported higher engagement levels than non-degree seeking students.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xv
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Student Success	3
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	5
Significance of the Study	6
Definitions of Terms	8
Delimitations of the Study	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Assumptions	10
Chapter II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Overview	12
Theoretical Models	12
Explanatory Sociological Model of the Dropout Process	12
Tinto's Theory of Student Departure	12
Conceptual Model of Nontraditional Student Attrition	13
Theory of Student Development	14
Other Theoretical Perspectives	12
Limitations of the Models	15
The Community College Student	16
First-generation Students	17
Nontraditional Students	18
Enrollment Status	19
Institutional Culture	19
The Hispanic Population	19
Factors that Influence Student Dropout	21
Student Engagement	23
Factors that Influence Student Persistence	27

Areas of Improvement	31
Chapter Summary	32
Chapter III: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	33
Introduction	33
Purpose of the Study	33
Research Questions	33
Methodology	34
Research Design	34
Description of Sample	34
Procedures and Data Collection	35
Instrument Development	35
Instrument Validity	36
Procedure for Obtaining Informed Consent for Agenda	36
SENSE Research Protocol	36
Data Analysis	37
Chapter Summary	38
Chapter IV: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	39
Introduction	39
Analysis	39
Research Question 1	39
Sample Characteristics	39
Sex	40
Age	40
First-generation Status	41
International Students	43
Marriage Status	44
Live with Children	45
Work	46
High School Grades	47
Four Years of Math	48
College Goals	49
Engagement Variables	51

Active and Collaborative Learning	53
Student Effort	53
Student-Faculty Interaction	55
Support for Learners	56
Research Question 2	57
Enrollment Status	58
Active and Collaborative Learning	58
Student Effort	59
Student-Faculty Interaction	60
Support for Learners	61
Traditional Age	62
Active and Collaborative Learning	63
Student Effort	64
Student-Faculty Interaction	66
Support for Learners	67
18-19 Years Old Versus 20 Years Old and Older	68
Active and Collaborative Learning	69
Student Effort	69
Student-Faculty Interaction	70
Support for Learners	71
First-generation Versus Non-First-generation	72
Active and Collaborative Learning	73
Student Effort	73
Student-Faculty Interaction	74
Support for Learners	75
Developmental Reading	76
Active and Collaborative Learning	77
Student Effort	78
Student-Faculty Interaction	80
Support for Learners	82
Developmental Writing	83
Active and Collaborative Learning	84
Student Effort	85

Student-Faculty Interaction	87
Support for Learners	89
Developmental Math.....	90
Active and Collaborative Learning	91
Student Effort	91
Student-Faculty Interaction	93
Support for Learners	95
Sex	95
Active and Collaborative Learning	96
Student Effort	96
Student-Faculty Interaction	97
Support for Learners	98
College Goal	99
Active and Collaborative Learning	100
Student Effort	100
Student-Faculty Interaction	102
Support for Learners	103
Chapter Summary	104
Chapter V: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	105
Introduction	105
Summary of Major Findings	105
Research Question One	107
Entering Versus Returning Students' Engagement Major Findings	107
Active and Collaborative Learning	107
Student Effort	107
Student-Faculty Interaction	108
Support for Learners	108
Research Question Two	108
Full-Time Enrollment Versus Part-Time Enrollment	109
Active and Collaborative Learning	109
Student Effort	109
Student-Faculty Interaction	109

Support for Learners	110
Traditional Age Versus Nontraditional Age	110
Active and Collaborative Learning	110
Student Effort	110
Student-Faculty Interaction	111
Support for Learners	111
18-19 Years Old Versus 20 Years and Older	111
First-generation Versus Non-First-generation	113
Active and Collaborative Learning	113
Student Effort	113
Student-Faculty Interaction	113
Support for Learners	113
Developmental Reading Versus Non-Developmental Reading	114
Active and Collaborative Learning	114
Student Effort	114
Student-Faculty Interaction	114
Support for Learners	115
Developmental Writing Versus Non-Developmental Writing	115
Active and Collaborative Learning	115
Student Effort	116
Student-Faculty Interaction	116
Support for Learners	117
Developmental Math Versus Non-Developmental Math	117
Active and Collaborative Learning	117
Student Effort	117
Student-Faculty Interaction	117
Support for Learners	118
Male Versus Female	118
Active and Collaborative Learning	118
Student Effort	118
Student-Faculty Interaction	118
Support for Learners	119
Degree Seeking Versus Non-Degree Seeking	119

Active and Collaborative Learning	119
Student Effort	119
Student-Faculty Interaction	120
Support for Learners	120
Implications	120
Recommendations for Educational Leaders	124
Group Activities	125
Training Regarding Online Resources	125
Dedicate More Time to Discussing the Syllabus	126
Establish Office Visits or Other Required Interactions With Faculty	126
Develop Faculty-Student Mentorship Programs.....	126
Encourage Students to Visit and Learn About	
Available Student Services	126
Limitations of the Study	127
Recommendations for Further Study	128
Longitudinal Study	128
Adjunct and Part-Time Faculty	129
Use of Computer Technology	129
Online Students	129
Day and Evening Students	129
Regression Analysis	130
Chapter Summary	130
References.....	131
Vita	143

List of Tables

Table 1. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics:	
Sex.....	40
Table 2. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics:	
Age.....	41
Table 3. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics:	
Generation Status.....	42
Table 5. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics:	
Immigration Status.....	44
Table 6. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:	
Marital Status.....	45
Table 7. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:	
Children.....	46
Table 8. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:	
Hours Worked.....	47
Table 9. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:	
High School GPA.....	48
Table 10. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:	
Four Years Math.....	49
Table 11. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:	
Goals.....	50
Table 12. Engagement Variables.....	52
Table 13. Active and Collaborative Learning.....	53
Table 14. Student Effort.....	54
Table 15. Student-Faculty Interaction.....	56
Table 16. Support for Learners.....	57

Table 17. Less than Full-time versus Full-time	58
Table 18. Active and Collaborative Learning	59
Table 19. Student Effort	60
Table 20. Student-Faculty Interaction	61
Table 21. Support for Learners	62
Table 22. Traditional Age versus Nontraditional Age	63
Table 23. Active and Collaborative Learning	64
Table 24. Student Effort	65
Table 25. Student-Faculty Interaction	67
Table 26. Support for Learners	68
Table 27. 18-19 years old versus 20 years old and older	68
Table 28. Active and Collaborative Learning	69
Table 29. Student Effort	70
Table 30. Student-Faculty Interaction	71
Table 31. Support for Learners	72
Table 32. First-Generation versus Non-first-generation	73
Table 33. Active and Collaborative Learning	73
Table 34. Student Effort	74
Table 35. Student-Faculty Interaction	75
Table 36. Support for Learners	76
Table 37. Developmental Reading versus Non-Developmental Reading	77
Table 38. Active and Collaborative Learning	77
Table 39. Student Effort	79
Table 40. Student-Faculty Interaction	81
Table 41. Support for Learners	83
Table 42. Developmental Writing versus Non-Developmental Writing	84
Table 43. Active and Collaborative Learning	84

Table 44. Student Effort	86
Table 45. Student-Faculty Interaction	88
Table 46. Support for Learners	90
Table 47. Developmental Math versus Non-Developmental Math	91
Table 48. Active and Collaborative Learning	91
Table 49. Student Effort	92
Table 50. Student-Faculty Interaction	94
Table 51. Support for Learners	95
Table 52. Male versus Female	96
Table 53. Active and Collaborative Learning	96
Table 54. Student Effort	97
Table 55. Student-Faculty Interaction	98
Table 56. Support for Learners	99
Table 57. Degree Seeking versus Non-Degree Seeking	100
Table 58. Active and Collaborative Learning	100
Table 59. Student Effort	102
Table 60. Student-Faculty Interaction	103
Table 61. Support for Learners	104
Table 62. Statistical Significance	105

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Numerous studies have focused on the socioeconomic benefits of higher education. These benefits include: higher earnings; lower levels of unemployment and poverty; lower smoking rates; better perception of health; lower incarceration rates; and higher levels of civil participation such as volunteer work and voting (Baum and Payea, 2005). College enrollment and college completion are important in creating a better quality of life.

Today, more individuals have access to higher education. Even though access to public and private universities may be challenging for some, Tinto (2002) believes that everyone can gain access somewhere in the U.S. educational system. Community colleges are the point of entry for many individuals. “Community colleges now enroll almost half of the students in U.S. undergraduate education, and they also serve disproportionately high numbers of low-income, first-generation, and minority students” (McClenney, 2006, p. 47). Community colleges were created, at least in part, to provide opportunity for individuals who could not afford or could not attend four-year colleges and universities (Borlum and Kubala, 2000).

Vaughan (2006) highlights the advantages of community colleges, including the following: commitment to open access, comprehensive course offerings, and community building. Open-door admission at community colleges in most states was created through

legislation that supported the entrance of all high school graduates and adults (Roueche and Hurlburt, 1968).

Several other factors make the community college a desirable choice for many individuals. Tuition costs at community colleges are lower than tuition at public universities and private universities. The admission requirements are more flexible at community colleges, allowing students who may have some academic challenges to access educational opportunities similar to those afforded to students who possess stronger academic skills.

Though open access to higher education is a great concept, access does not always lead to success. There are challenges and opportunities associated with the open door policy of the community college. Students who walk through the doors of the community colleges may walk out without ever reaching their goals. Regrettably, the open door of the community college has also become a revolving door (McClenney and Green, 2005).

The data on student persistence are alarming. Schuetz (2005) reports approximately half of all first-year community college students leave higher education before the beginning of their second year.

Roueche and Baker (1987) state:

Open access increases the demand that community colleges respond to the many special needs of the students they admit. Too often, institutions have welcomed new populations of students while failing to serve these students' unique needs. More specifically, a major problem accompanying an open-access policy is the generally low college aptitude found among an unselected student population... Understandably, an unselected student body is characterized by large turnover. (p. 6)

The four primary missions of the comprehensive community college include: academic preparation for transfer to four-year institutions, vocational education, general

education, and noncredit community outreach (Dowd, 2003). Student success is most commonly measured in terms of enrollment, retention rates, transfer rates, and mean scores on standardized tests (Astin, 1997; Dowd, 2003). Herzog (2005) explains, “Student retention has been the focus of research on higher education for some time, not least due to efforts to establish a benchmark indicator of institutional performance and to gain a better understanding of enrollment-driven revenue streams” (p. 883).

McGrath and Braunstein (1997) also acknowledge the increased focus on retention because of decreases in the pool of available students and the level of funding for institutions of higher education. Institutional funding has been associated with student enrollment. Common indicators for community college funding are data on enrollment, graduation rates, transfer rates to 4-year institutions, and persistence rates (Sorey and Duggan, 2008).

Student Success

The issue of student dropout rate is significant because of the financial costs to the individual and the institution. Colleges seem to focus more on recruitment efforts and less so on retention efforts. Levitz, Noel, and Richter (1999) found that reducing the number of dropouts by a single student at four-year colleges would save a college between \$15,000 to \$25,000 in gross revenue in a span of four to five years. Though the cost of a four-year education is more expensive than the cost of a two-year education, colleges should realize the savings to both the institution and students if they focused more on retention efforts. Colleges can also positively benefit from word of mouth and testimonials from satisfied students who share the story of their college experiences with their families and other people in their community.

Students at community colleges may have intentions to take courses for pleasure or as prerequisites for transfer to another institution. Once they achieve their goals at the community college, these students no longer need to continue in the community college. Viewed from the perspective of the individual, the community college is successful in helping these students reach their goals. Yet, from an accountability standpoint, the community college fails because these students are viewed as not persisting.

“Community colleges were intended to be responsive institutions from the earliest beginnings; providing students and taxpayers proof that they are accomplishing their missions is simply an expression of that responsiveness—and the right thing to do” (Roueche et al., 1997, pp. 18-19). Community colleges can create win-win opportunities for students and the community; they can also function without always providing the best services to their students. “While recent research shows the public’s opinion of community colleges is improving, at the same time there is a growing mistrust and exasperation with higher education in general—its cost, its focus, and—in particular—its quality” (Roueche et al., 2001, p. 1).

Tinto and Russo (1994) state, “Like larger tuition-driven four-year colleges and universities, two-year institutions are painfully aware of the need to increase their rates of program completion, which nationally are barely a third of all beginning full-time students” (para. 1). Student success is often measured using first-year retention and six-year graduation rates (Gansemer-Topf and Schuh, 2006). This measure does not accurately represent student success at the community colleges because the goals of community college students vary from earning certificates, associate degrees, courses leading to transfer, and personal enrichment courses. Therefore, they may be enrolled for

shorter periods of time or until they reach their goals. Community and technical colleges need assessment tools appropriate to their unique missions and the characteristics of their diverse student populations (CCSSE, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

The community college is the first choice, and for some, the only choice for higher education. Community colleges serve a diverse and underserved student body (Sorey and Duggan, 2008). Though colleges have increased their efforts to focus on the success of traditionally underrepresented groups, graduation rates for African American, Hispanic American, and Native American students still fall behind those of majority students (Tinto, 2002). A disproportionate number of nonwhite, working-class, and lower-middle-class students who attend community colleges are led away from the path to a bachelor's degree (Pascarella et al., 2003). More than 50 percent of the Latino students who select postsecondary education choose the community college (Davies et al., 2003). However, the main challenge of community colleges is its ability to keep students enrolled (Borglum and Kubala, 2000). More research is needed to identify factors that influence engagement among Hispanic community college students during their first semester of college.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if there are significant differences in the engagement levels among entering and returning Hispanic community college students. The study will also examine if there are significant differences in the engagement levels of entering Hispanic community college students based on enrollment, age, generation status, and developmental education status. Community colleges can increase the success

of their students if they dedicate more research and resources to retention efforts (Borglum and Kubala, 2000).

Research Questions

1. Are there significant differences in the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students?
2. Are there significant differences in engagement levels of entering Hispanic students when analyzed in terms of the following breakout variables:
 - Enrollment status (full-time and part-time)
 - Age (traditional and nontraditional; 18-19 years old and 20 years old and older)
 - First-generation and non-first-generation status
 - Developmental education status (enrollment in developmental writing course; developmental reading course; developmental math course)
 - Sex (male and female)
 - Academic goal aspiration (degree seeking and non-degree seeking)

Significance of the Study

Capturing the data for the first year of college is important. Tinto (1988) stresses the significance of early data that deal with the first year experiences of college students.

He states:

First and foremost, we need studies that consciously attempt to discern whether the process of departure varies over time. For instance, we should ascertain whether the process of leaving which characterizes departure during the first semester is similar to that which describes departure after the first year and whether the widely studied process of departure at the end of the first year looks like that which marks departure afterwards. (p. 450)

Reason, Terenzini, and Domingo (2006) and Herzog (2005) identify the first year of college as a critical time for students to develop a foundation for academic success. Levitz, Noel, and Richter (1999) identify the importance of collecting information on students' goals at the beginning of each term and measuring whether the student has reached their educational goals. Noel, Levitz, and Saluri (1985) and Upcraft and Gardner (1989) stress "the initial weeks of college are the most critical for first-year students in terms of developing attitudes and impressions about campus life, including their overall adjustment to college" (as cited in Jalomo, 2001, p. 261). Sorey and Duggan (2008) and Bean and Metzner (1985) note the limited research on variables that influence persistence of older adult students. As a result, it is difficult to compare what factors influence persistence of nontraditional students. Institutional stakeholders will be better able to provide preventive and remedial assistance to curb student withdrawal when they use information such as age to make their decisions (Sorey and Duggan, 2008). Bean and Metzner (1985) suggest that further research on nontraditional students are based on theoretical framework that applies to a two-year college setting; examines factors other than social integration due to the fact that community colleges tend to serve a commuter population; includes variables from students' external environments such as family and work; and uses multivariate analysis to examine how more than one variable such (e.g. nontraditional age and minority status) influence engagement..

The Hispanic population continues to increase in the United States. In order to better serve the needs of Hispanic students, colleges should gather data to identify factors associated with student engagement. There is limited research that is focused on the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students during

the first few weeks of the semester. Research specific to Hispanic community college students will provide much needed data to the literature as well as community college practitioners and policy makers.

Definition of Terms

Engagement

Engagement refers to the amount of time and energy that students invest in educationally meaningful activities (McClenney, 2006).

First-generation students

Refers to students whose parents never attended college (Ishitani, 2006).

Persistence

“Persistence measures indicate the percentage of students who re-enroll in the institution from one term to the next and from year to year” (K. McClenney, personal email, April 23, 2009).

Retention

“Retention is a measure of student re-enrollment term-to-term” (K. McClenney, personal email, April 23, 2009).

Nontraditional Age Students

Nontraditional age students are students defined as 25 years and older. Traditional age students are defined as 24 years and younger. In addition, this study further reviews age into two additional categories: 18-19 years old and 20 years and older. This allows the researcher to identify if there are differences in engagement levels among students that graduated from college within the past few years versus students who may have delayed their enrollment from high school to college.

Dropouts

Dropouts are defined as students who enroll in college but do not re-enroll or do not complete their intended degree program or set of courses (Hoyt and Winn, 2004).

Stop-outs

Stop-outs are defined as students who do not complete their plan of study within the normal time schedule which includes not enrolling in consecutive semesters (Hoyt and Winn, 2004).

Opt-outs

Opt-outs are defined as students who leave college because they accomplished their goals, which may not have included the desire to complete a degree or certificates (Hoyt and Winn, 2004).

Transfer-outs

Transfer-outs are defined as students who begin their college career at one college and then transfer to another institution (Hoyt and Winn, 2004).

Enrollment Status

Full-time students are enrolled in 12 or more credit hours in a two-semester cycle. Part-time students are enrolled in 11 or fewer credit hours in a two-semester cycle. In this study, students self identified as to whether they were enrolled full-time or part-time. Part-time students may have additional responsibilities such as marriage, family, and jobs that may make it difficult for them to participate in school activities (Voorhees, 1987).

Delimitations of the Study

Delimitations of the study include the following:

1. This study will focus on the engagement levels of Hispanic community college students.
2. The colleges that were part of the survey were the pilot colleges for the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE, 2007d).

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study include the following:

1. The structure of the survey limits the number of questions and the length for students to respond.
2. Returning students answered retrospectively in regard to their experiences during the first three weeks of school during their first semester of enrollment.

Assumptions

The assumptions included the following:

1. Students responded to the survey accurately.
2. The courses randomly selected for this survey are drawn from those most likely to enroll students.
3. Returning students may also be enrolled in the course randomly selected for this survey.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

Community colleges were created with the concept of open-door admission. All individuals regardless of academic experience or factors such as race, gender, and age have the opportunity to access higher education via the community college (Crews and Aragon, 2007). The community colleges are an attractive pathway to higher education because they are not academically or socially select institutions (Lee and Frank, 1990). Despite the commitment to providing access, community college officials understand that they must do a better job helping students succeed. Colleges are beginning to realize the importance of stable enrollments while maintaining academic quality by reexamining attrition rates so that they can capitalize on the investment they have already made in recruitment and orientation services (Grimes and Antworth, 1996). A review of the literature will help identify the types of students who attend community colleges as well as the theoretical models that help explain student persistence.

Though new literature on Hispanic students is emerging, there has traditionally been limited research focused primarily on Hispanic students. The literature review will include literature research on community colleges and four-year institutions. Much of the research on Hispanic student persistence is presented collectively with other students of color. Bensimon (2005) states that an obvious factor for the disparity of educational outcomes for underrepresented minorities is that “the disaggregation of student outcome data by race and ethnicity is not an institutionalized practice” (p. 100).

Theoretical Models

Explanatory Sociological Model of the Dropout Process

Spady (1970) found that the “dropout process is best explained by an interdisciplinary approach involving an interaction between the individual student and his particular college environment in which his attributes are exposed to influences, expectations, and demands from a variety of sources” (p. 77). The results of the interactions between students with their courses, faculty members, administrators, and peers can lead to greater integration into the academic and social systems of the college (1970). Challenges with grade performance and institutional commitment increase the student’s decision to drop out. Satisfactory grade performance, intellectual development, and friendship support lead to social integration. The students who are socially integrated are more likely to be satisfied and therefore, committed to the institution.

Tinto’s Theory of Student Departure

Tinto (1975) is often cited for his academic and social integration model used to explain student persistence. The model states that it is the individual’s integration into the academic and social systems of the college that most directly relates to his continuance in that college. Tinto’s model incorporates much of the concepts of Durkheim’s theory of suicide as well as other concepts from the economics and education fields. The research and model helps develop a foundation for understanding the early stages of student departure (Tinto, 1975). Tinto (1975) identifies three stages of institutional departure: separation, transition to college, and incorporation to college.

In the separation stage, students “disassociate themselves, in varying degrees, from membership in the past communities, most typically those associated with the local

high school and place of residence” (p. 443). Students who stay at home may be impacted by external factors that make it difficult to become more engaged in their college environment.

In the transition stage, students begin the process of merging their previous pre-academic life with their academic life. This is an extremely crucial time for students, and students who do not receive enough support may withdraw from college very early in the semester (1975). Past life experiences are very influential, and students who come from families with no college education may find the transition stage more difficult. Most affected by the lack of experience are poor families, older adults, and persons from small, rural communities (1975). In the incorporation stage, students are faced with integration or incorporation in the college community (1975). Students should establish relationships with other students, faculty, and staff at the college. If the student is unsuccessful in developing these relationships, they may feel isolated from the academic community. Students may decide to transfer or quit college permanently.

Conceptual Model of Nontraditional Student Attrition

The conceptual model of nontraditional student attrition identifies dropout based on four primary sets of variables (Bean and Metzger, 1985). These include:

- Students that performed poorly in academics in the past are more likely to drop out than students who have performed well.
- Intent to leave (influenced primarily by psychological outcomes as well as academic variables).
- Primarily high school performance and educational goals.
- Environmental variables.

Cabrera, Castaneda, Nora, and Hengstler (1992) note, “Bean has argued that student attrition is analogous to turnover in work organizations and stresses the importance of behavioral intentions (to stay or leave) as predictors of persistence behavior” (p. 145).

Theory of Student Involvement

The Student involvement theory developed by Astin (1999) is another model that can be used to explain student persistence. He explains that student involvement includes the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experiences. Students, therefore, increase their own learning and personal development through participation in student organizations, extracurricular activities, frequent faculty interactions, and amount of time spent studying. Students who have high levels of involvement in the college are more likely to persist than students who have no or low levels of involvement.

Other Theoretical Perspectives

Okun, Ruehlman, and Karoly (1991) explain student persistence using investment theory. Whereas Tinto’s (1975) theory focuses on the role of sociological constructs pertaining to integration into the college environment, Okun et al. (1991) focus on the psychological constructs that relate to the departure decision process. Commitment, investment, satisfaction, and alternative value influence persistence at or departure from an organization. Okun (1991) states, “When intent was excluded from the model, students were more likely to persist at the same college as investment and college satisfaction increased” (p. 218). Three possible routes that nontraditional college students may take in departing from college involve:

- Low satisfaction with college elicits thoughts of leaving;

- Transfer to a four-year college; and
- Unexpected life events i.e. career change (1991).

Limitations of the Models

The models previously reviewed can be used to help understand the persistence of students in higher education. Yet, Voorhees (1987) argues, “No conceptual models of student persistence behavior have been advanced, designed specifically for the two-year college setting, which adequately account for student background characteristics and how students interact within the community college environment” (p. 115). Marti (2009) suggests a critical examination of the research conducted at four-year institutions to determine the applicability on two-year institutions. He finds that the existence of social opportunities (i.e. clubs, fraternities, sororities) available at four-year institutions may not exist at two-year institutions because the numerous differences in the structure of the two environments (2009). Bailey and Alfonso (2005) identify four additional problems:

- Most of the research is based on studies conducted at four-year colleges.
- Available national data do not have good measures of institutional practices designed to promote retention and completion.
- Flawed methodology often thwarts efforts to properly assess institutional practice.
- The dissemination and discussion of research reports on community colleges are inadequate. (p. 7)

Pascarella, Smart, and Ethington (1986) identify the lack of longitudinal studies of two-year college students available to “determine the various individual and institutional influences on their persistence/withdrawal behavior with reasonable

accuracy are essentially absent from the attrition literature” (p. 49). Voorhees and Zhou (2000) observe the need for additional research to link goals and intentions of community college students. “A fairer measurement strategy, and a considerable challenge for most community colleges, calls for identification of those students intending to earn degrees and complete courses for transfer and subsequent analysis of their behavior” (p. 232). Summers (2003) identifies the need of additional research focused on the behaviors of community college students to understand causes of student attrition. Furthermore, a theoretical model should focus on the persistence of minority students.

The Community College Student

The American Association of Community Colleges (2007) reports the following facts about community college students: 46 percent of all U.S. undergraduates attend the community college; 45 percent of all first time freshmen attend community college; and 57 percent of Native Americans, 47 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders, 47 percent of all Black, and 55 percent of Hispanic students are enrolled at the community college. Many students of color enroll in two-year colleges for a variety of reasons such as proximity, cost, and open access (Opp, 2002). Community college students may have other academic goals besides earning a degree or transferring to a university (Voorhees and Zhou, 2000; Summers, 2003). Community college students do not follow traditional attendance patterns and this affects their persistence to earn a degree (Ryken, 2006). They are more likely to delay college enrollment, attend college part-time, or have gaps in college enrollment.

Crews and Aragon (2007) find students of community colleges have many complicated life issues that make it more difficult for them to succeed in school. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement's (CCSSE) 2006 data show:

- 61 percent of students are enrolled part-time;
- 57 percent of students work more than 20 hours per week;
- 34 percent of students spend 11 or more hours per week caring for dependents; and
- 21 percent of students spend six to 20 hours per week commuting to and from class.

In addition, 60 percent of students enter community colleges underprepared and need at least one remedial course (McClenney, 2009; MDRC, 2009). Community colleges should be able to assist the under-prepared students in reaching their academic goals (Crews and Aragon, 2007). Grimes (1997) finds that underprepared students demonstrated a more external locus of control which indicates a perception of less control over their environment and less responsibility for taking action. Students who did not persist demonstrated a lower course completion rate, lower GPA, and higher general self-esteem, and underprepared students who did not persist obtained a lower passing rate in remedial courses.

First-generation Students

First-generation college students face additional factors that increase their risk of departure more than students who are not first-generation (Ishitani, 2006). Specifically, he discusses "how varying effects of high school academic attributes along with other factors, such as family income, affect the college persistence rate for first-generation

students longitudinally” (p. 880). In addition, first-generation college students are more likely to take longer periods of time to complete their degree programs than non-first-generation students (2006).

Nontraditional Students

The enrollment of older adult students has increased as a result of institutional commitment to recruit older adult students. Colleges created programs that expanded their course offerings and mission to create more vocational certificate and degree programs (Bean and Metzner, 1985). Courses offered during the evenings and weekends were more convenient for working adults or students with families. Older adult students may benefit from orientation that provides education regarding the personal and monetary benefits of a community college education (Sorey and Duggan, 2008). Grimes (1997) found that nontraditional students scored higher in cognitive and noncognitive areas such as interest, motivation, time management, concentration, reasoning, and test review.

Older adult students also face additional challenges that affect their persistence. Marriage of many nontraditional students adversely affects persistence (Leppel, 2002). Leppel (2002) found that “women may feel that their education is less critical since their husbands serve a primary breadwinner. Married men may be more inclined to drop out of college because they feel pressured to earn a living and cannot meet the demands of employment and schooling simultaneously” (p. 446). He suggests that the persistence of older adult students may be impacted by part-time enrollment status. Students enrolled part-time may do so because they work full-time.

Enrollment Status

The percentage of students enrolled at community colleges part-time continues to increase. Sorey and Duggan (2008) report that part-time enrollment in public two-year colleges increased 222 percent between 1970 and 1995, but full-time enrollment increased only 63 percent. Part-time enrollment in addition to career responsibilities creates additional challenges for community college students because they must balance several responsibilities such as family and work with school.

Institutional Culture

In addition to student characteristics, campus culture can have a great influence on student success. Tinto and Russo (1994) suggest that colleges should consider creating educational settings that encourage student involvement. “Minority community college students are more likely to succeed at colleges where they are made to feel welcome and where there are support services and programs specifically designed for them” (Jenkins, 2007, p. 954). Fresno City College in California identified several ways that the institution can create a culture of student success. These actions were guided by the following: finding a catalyst for change; creating change from the bottom up; reaching a common definition of student success; continual communication; involving large numbers of people; providing early feedback; expecting that problems can and will occur; and maintaining focus (Harris, 1998).

The Hispanic Population

A study of the Hispanic population will provide a glimpse of the impact and relationship of Hispanic students with society and higher education. Demographic data on the Hispanic population can be used to better understand the growth in population and

trends. Much of the data on the Hispanic population have been collected through the U.S. Census and the U.S. Department of Education's National Center on Educational Statistics (Santiago, 2007).

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that the Hispanic population has become the largest and fastest-growing minority group in the United States (Kohler and Lazarin, 2007). The Hispanic population in 2000 was 35.3 million and is projected to increase to 102.6 million by 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). The states that have the largest Hispanic populations are California, Texas, Florida, New York, and Illinois. In 2006, the median age of Hispanic males was 27.0 and the median age of Hispanic females was 27.6. Sixty percent of the Hispanic population was native-born while 40 percent was foreign born. The median age at first marriage by males was 27.1 and the median age for first marriage by females was 24.7. In regard to educational attainment, 24.5 percent of Hispanic males had less than a 9th grade education; 58.7 percent had a high school education or more; and 11.5 percent had a bachelor's degree or more. These figures were much lower than the total male population in which 6.7 percent of the population had less than a 9th grade education, 83.5 percent had a high school education or more; and 27.9 percent had a bachelor's degree or more.

Santiago (2007) identified several other college patterns for Hispanic students:

1. The enrollment of Hispanics who enrolled immediately after graduation was 54 percent, compared to 74 percent for White students.
2. Approximately half of Hispanic undergraduate students are enrolled in Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

3. Fifty-two percent of Hispanic undergraduate students are enrolled in two-year institutions. Thirty-four percent of Whites, 40 percent of African Americans, and 38 percent of Asian students are enrolled in two-year institutions.
4. In 2003-2004, most undergraduate students lived off-campus and one-third of all Latinos lived with their parents compared to only one-quarter of all undergraduates.

Factors that Influence Student Dropout

Lee and Frank (1990) and Sorey and Duggan (2008) identify that community college students have the following characteristics: more likely to be minority; less academic preparation and lower achievement levels; come from families of considerable lower social class; and be first-generation college students. These characteristics have been associated with lower rates of persistence and attainment (Lee and Frank, 1990). In addition, “More than 80% of community college students are employed, and 30% of community college students who work full-time also attend school full-time” (p. 77).

Financial factors also negatively affect student persistence. Community colleges generally have an open-door policy that allows students from various academic levels access to higher education. Gansemer-Topf and Schuh (2006) note, “Since low selectivity institutions are more likely to enroll low-income students than their high selectivity peers and low-income families are in more need of financial assistance, financial aid would play a more critical role in the retention and graduation at low selectivity institutions than high selectivity institutions” (p. 635). Cofer and Somers (2000) find that increased funding in loans has a positive effect on persistence for highly motivated two-year

college students while creating a negative effect on persistence for not-so-motivated two-year college students.

Grimes and Antworth (1996) identify the relationships of gender, age, ethnicity, academic success and persistence, reenrollment and activity to student persistence:

- Women reported withdrawals associated more with external or personal factors including health problems, family responsibilities, emotional problems, and marital changes.
- Men reported withdrawals associated more with non-challenging coursework.
- Nontraditional student persistence and dropout rates are often similar to those for younger students though nontraditional students may demonstrate stronger motivational factors, stronger goal orientation, less sociability, and less time.
- Ethnicity is related to difficulties with full integration into the social and academic life of the college.
- Less academically prepared and non-returning students had lower course completion rates and lower GPAs.

Additional factors that have a strong influence on student departure are first in the family to attend college, family income, lower educational expectations, lower high school class rank quintile, lower high school academic intensity, enrollment in a public institution, and non-selectivity of admission (Ishitani, 2006). Attewell et al., (2006) find low family socioeconomic status, poor high school preparation, and being African American were factors that reduced student persistence at two-year colleges. Stovall (2000) adds, “Students’ diverse backgrounds, varying levels of commitment to earning a

college degree, and numerous pressures from the external environment all influence their persistence in college” (p. 45).

Student Engagement

The open admissions concept of the community college is effective if “students are able to succeed in their educational objectives” (Roueche and Hurlburt, 1968, p. 454). “In recent years, there has been a growing scientific and social recognition that students play an active role in their own learning, and that any attempt to characterize the learning that takes place in higher education must consider the individual student’s role in this process” (Dwyer et al., 2006, p. 14). Kuh (2003) defines student engagement as the “time and energy students devote to educationally sound activities inside and outside of the classroom” (p. 25). The level of student engagement influences the level of performance (Schreiber and Shinn, 2003). Chaves (2006) finds a positive association with academic success in college with classroom engagement. Handelsman et al. (2005) find that students are engaged in four dimensions: skills engagement (e.g. coming to class everyday); emotional engagement (e.g. applying course material to life); participation/interaction engagement (e.g. asking instructors questions); and performance engagement (doing well on tests). Carini et al. (2003) identify other factors such as residence, age, race, and undergraduate enrollment influence student engagement

Dwyer, Millet, and Payne (2006) find that student engagement is considered a valuable aspect of postsecondary education for the individual and the institution. Furthermore, student engagement is an indicator of motivation and habits that carry over into other current and future settings. Some students may need additional assistance to succeed in school. Marti (2008) identifies two groups of students as students who need

immediate intervention to integrate them into an academic environment and students who would benefit from ongoing intervention.

Research shows that the more actively engaged students are in all of the various aspects of college life, the more likely they are to learn and also to stay in college (DiMaria, 2006). A critical factor in student development is participation in one or more activities (Astin, 1993). These activities range from group projects, tutoring other students, and participation in campus sports or student clubs. Schmidt et al. (2004) find that students who participate in service learning enhance their classroom knowledge as well as develop civic responsibility, personal growth, and enhance their understanding of social problems. Learning communities also serve as another opportunity to increase student engagement.

Though it would create more benefits for students to participate in activities inside and outside of the classroom, it is very difficult for many community college students to become engaged on campus because many community college students only stay on campus long enough to attend classes. In fact, students in general will do the things required of them in the courses (McClenney, 2004). Therefore, it is very important to make the best use of the time in the classroom (Boylan, 1999). Borglum and Kubala (2000) find that more than half of the students in their study chose not to be involved with campus activities and student organizations. Also, half of the students in their study responded that they did not want to spend more time on campus for a variety of reasons most notably work and lack of interest. Many community college students juggle additional responsibilities such as work and family that limit the opportunities for them to interact outside of the classroom (McClenney and Greene, 2005). Kuh (2009)

acknowledges the diversity in engagement and types of students makes it important to understand what forms of engagement work best under various situations for different groups of. He finds that “engagement tends to have conditional effects, with students with certain characteristics benefiting from some type of activities more so than other students” (p. 15).

Chickering and Gamson (1987) identify seven principles to improve the education experiences for students and faculty. These include:

1. Encourage contact between students and faculty.
2. Develop reciprocity and cooperation among students
3. Encourage active learning.
4. Give prompt feedback.
5. Emphasize time on task.
6. Communicate high expectations.
7. Respect diverse talents and ways of learning.

As a follow-up to Chickering and Gamson’s (1987) seven principles, Kolhatic and Kuh (2001) conducted a study to determine whether student engagement in three good educational practices (cooperation with peers, active learning, faculty-student interaction) increased between 1983 and 1997. The results of their study suggest that student engagement in good educational practice has not changed significantly between those time frames. Cruce et al. (2006) find that Chickering and Gamson’s (1987) principles for good practices in undergraduate education have a “significant positive impact on the cognitive development, learning orientations, and educational aspiration of students, at least during the first year of college” (p. 378).

Kuh (2008) finds students who participate in high-impact activities increase student engagement for the following reasons:

1. High-impact activities demand students to devote their time and effort to a purposeful task.
2. High-impact activities require students to interact with faculty and peers about substantive matters over extended periods of time.
3. High-impact activities create opportunities for students to experience diversity through interactions with people different from themselves.
4. High-impact activities allow students receive frequent feedback.
5. High-impact activities allow students to realize that what they are learning is adaptable to different settings, on and off campus.
6. Participating in a study abroad, service learning, internship or research project can be life changing.

Chavez (2006) identifies the benefit for learners to connect abstract learning objectives with real-world contexts. Students are likely to become more engaged in their learning process when they realize that the subject matter and topics they learn and discuss in the classroom have applications outside of the classrooms as well.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

Colleges should partner with organizations to help them identify strategies and develop programs that encourage student success. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) was established as part the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin in 2001 (McClenney, 2006). CCSSE helps advance education through research on educational practices in community

colleges with the goal of enhancing student learning and persistence. CCSSE has identified five research-based national benchmarks that focus on important aspects of the student experience. The CCSSE national benchmarks include: active and collaborative learning; student effort; academic challenge; student-faculty interaction; and support for learners. College leaders, faculty, and staff can use the benchmarks to explore survey results, paint the big picture, identify key findings, make institutional comparisons, and pursue further inquiry (McClenney, 2006).

Factors that Influence Student Persistence

Wild and Ebbers (2002) state, “Community college leaders need to develop appropriate indicators of student retention” (p. 511). More importantly, community college leaders need to develop new ways of thinking and new methods to identify and solve challenges. This new perspective or attitude involves more than the president, vice president or dean. It includes the faculty, staff members, and most importantly, students. Kuh et al., (1997) identify the benefits of using indicators in education. “They can help institutions identify whether activities and opportunities for learning are in ample supply and whether students are taking advantage of the institution’s learning resources. They can also help focus faculty, staff, and students on those tasks and activities that are associated with higher yields in terms of desired student outcomes” (p. 436).

The Lumina Foundation describes such a comprehensive approach as developing “culture of evidence.” *Path to Persistence: An Analysis of Research on Program Effectiveness at Community Colleges*, includes six suggestions for developing a culture of evidence:

- Colleges must devote more resources and skills to research.

- Colleges must recognize that assessing the effectiveness of practices is difficult and involves a continuum of activities and analyses that range from simple descriptive comparisons to more time-consuming and expensive controlled analyses and experiments.
- Projects should combine quantitative research on student outcomes with qualitative research to elicit insights from students above those outcomes.
- Colleges, states and college associations must provide more opportunities for faculty and administrators to discuss evidence about student outcomes.
- Colleges and states must develop more systematic methods to publicize and disseminate useful research findings from state and institutional research offices.
- Collaboration among academic, institutional and state-level researchers should be promoted. (Bailey and Alfonso, 2005, 27 – 28)

The ACT's policy report, *The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Factors in Improving College Retention*, also highlights the necessity of including all members of the college community to address the issue of student persistence (Lotkowski et al., 2004) and offers the following suggestions:

- Acknowledgement by the institution that improved retention is desirable.
- Assembling comprehensive information about students, derived from multiple sources including ACT student records as well as other institutional student records, surveys, questionnaires, etc., to determine the academic and non-academic needs of individual students.

- Assessing the availability of retention resources with respect to the needs to be addressed.
- Reviewing and evaluating the efficacy of potential retention programs.
- Putting areas of retention need in priority order (e.g., first-year orientation, summer transition programs, tutorials, skills-related workshops, mentoring).
- Planning program execution.
- Designing and implementing a retention program evaluation process.
- Implementing the program.
- Widely disseminating results from the program evaluation.
- Modifying the program as warranted. (p. 21)

Jenkins (2007) states that students can succeed when student support services such as orientations, advising, early and warning systems are aligned and coordinated throughout the campus. This is effective because the students will benefit from improved services created when faculty and staff communicate and support each other. Maxwell (1998) finds substantial evidence exists that demonstrate that community colleges can offer supplemental instruction that encourages students to work collaboratively with other students outside of the classroom without faculty supervision. Students are influenced by the micro-level interpersonal environments that exist on college campuses (Antonio 2004).

Tinto (2003) identifies five conditions known to promote student persistence in higher education:

- Students are more likely to persist and graduate in settings that expect them to succeed.

- Students are more likely to persist and graduate in settings that provide academic, social, and personal support.
- Students are more likely to persist and graduate in settings that provide frequent and early feedback about their performance as they are trying to learn and persist.
- Students are more likely to persist and graduate in settings that involve them as valued members of the institution (Astin, 1984; Tinto, 1993; Tinto, 2003).
- Students are more likely to persist and graduate in settings that foster learning. (Tinto, 2003)

McGrath and Braunstein (1997) find that students who had better academic preparation from high school were more likely to persist in college. High school grades, SAT scores, and first semester grade point averages of the students that persisted from the first semester to the second semester were higher than the students who did not return after the first semester. Also, students who persisted after the first semester came from higher socioeconomic backgrounds or were enrolled in financial aid programs. This demonstrates that students are more likely to persist if finances were not a main concern (1997).

Sorey and Duggan (2008) found that students are more likely to persist if faculty members incorporate teaching strategies that consider the diversity of the community college population. Faculty members should also “have high expectations for their students and provide a challenging, albeit supportive, learning classroom” (p. 95). Colleges can encourage student development and social integration through mandatory orientation programs that occurs during the first semester or first year (2008). The

interactions with fellow students and faculty and staff help promote a closer sense of community. The benefits of a community college education should be stressed during orientation so that students have a better understanding of the personal and financial benefits of a community college education (2008). Counselors can help encourage student persistence by providing clear and consistent information about curriculum and institutional requirements and institutional policies and procedures.

Areas of Improvement

The classroom is one of the most important settings to help address issues in persistence. For some students, the college experience is associated with time in the classroom. This is especially true for students at community colleges who are typically commuters and have other responsibilities outside of the classroom. McClenney and Greene (2005) identify that more colleges are intentionally designing educational experiences to make the most of students' available time. "Centrally important are efforts that focus on enhancing classroom experiences through curricular approaches such as cooperative learning, service learning, and project-based learning" (p. 7). Strauss and Vokwein (2004) state:

First-year students at two-year institutions have slightly higher institutional-commitment scores than those at four-year institutions, and the classroom experience appears to be more critical for two-year students...This study finds the strongest influence on institutional commitment coming not from organizational characteristics, but from student level variables; and not from student-entry characteristics, but from subsequent campus experiences" (220-221).

The classroom may be the only place where students interact with the campus community (Tinto, 1997). Therefore, it is in the classroom that the student will have the opportunity to integrate with the college. Academic and social involvement or integration must occur in the classroom. In addition, Berger and Braxton (1998) found it was important that

faculty members provide well-articulated, consistent, and clear expectations for assignments and grading.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided review of the literature related to persistence. Much of the current research was based on studies of four-year college students with a relatively homogenous population. The population of college students has become more heterogeneous and additional research on the students of color will be valuable in providing information on student persistence.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter describes the research methodology that was used to carry out this study. This chapter includes the purpose of the study, research questions, methodology, research design, description of sample, procedures and data collection, instrument development, instrument validity, procedure for obtaining informed consent for agenda, SENSE research protocol, data analysis, and summary.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in the engagement levels among entering and returning Hispanic community college students. The study also examined if there existed significant differences in the engagement levels of entering Hispanic community college students based on enrollment, age, first-generation status, enrollment in developmental courses, sex, and academic goal aspiration.

Research Questions

1. Are there significant differences in the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students?
2. Are there significant differences in engagement levels of entering Hispanic students when analyzed in terms of the following breakout variables:
 - Enrollment status (full-time and part-time)
 - Age (traditional and nontraditional; 18-19 years old and 20 years old and older)

- First-generation versus not-first-generation
- Developmental education status (enrollment in developmental writing course; development reading course; developmental math course)
- Sex (male and female)
- Academic goal aspiration (degree seeking and non-degree seeking)

Methodology

Survey research was used to collect and identify the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students.

Research Design

This study used a quantitative research design to determine if there were significant differences in the engagement levels among entering and returning Hispanic community college students. “A quantitative approach is one in which the investigator primarily used postpositivist claims for developing knowledge, employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data” (Creswell, 2003, p. 18). Data were collected from the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). The primary independent variable, type of enrollment, was categorical, and included two levels of entering and returning. The dependent variable, student engagement, was continuous.

Description of Sample

The Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) was administered to students at volunteer community colleges during the fourth and fifth weeks of the fall 2007 semester (SENSE, 2007a). The member colleges included 22 colleges located in eight states. These colleges include: Alvin Community College (TX), Brazosport College

(TX), Broward Community College (FL), Butler Community College (KS), College of the Mainland (TX), Durham Technical Community College (NC), El Paso Community College (TX), Houston Community College (TX), Kingsborough Community College (NY), Lee College (TX), Lone Star College System (TX), Northeast Lakeview College (TX), Northwest Vista College (TX), Palo Alto College (TX), Paul D. Camp Community College (VA), Richland College (TX), San Antonio College (TX), Sinclair Community College (OH), St. Philip's College (TX), Wharton County Junior College (TX), and Zane State College (OH) (SENSE, 2007b).

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) obtained the fall term Course Schedule File (CSF) from member colleges to create a random sample of course sections drawn from the following courses:

- All developmental reading, writing, and math courses at all levels (excluding ESL);
- First college-level English course(s); and
- First college-level math course(s) (SENSE, 2007a).

Procedures and Data Collection

The Survey of Entering Student Engagement was collected through the use of paper surveys administered in-class during the 4th and 5th weeks of the fall academic term by survey administrators (SENSE, 2007a).

Instrument Development

The staff of the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) created the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) along with consultations

with “national experts in the field of community and technical college research and practice.” (SENSE, 2007d, para. I).

Instrument Validity

This study is secondary research using data from the Survey of Entering Student Engagement created by the Center for Community College Student Engagement, which is associated with The University of Texas at Austin.

Procedure for Obtaining Informed Consent for Agenda

The presidents of participating community colleges signed a membership and agreement form. The classes were randomly selected from a specified universe of classes, and the students in these classes were provided the following: oral description of the study, assurance that participation was completely voluntary, and explanation of why student identification numbers were requested. In addition, students had the opportunity to ask questions regarding the study (SENSE, 2007).

SENSE Research Protocol

The registration of colleges to participate in the SENSE survey was conducted online. Participation in SENSE required the signature of the college president/CEO and the submission of the Institutional Membership and Agreement Form. Procedure guides were sent to the designated college contact. A review of the survey administration process was conducted via conference calls during the middle to latter part of April 2007. The participating colleges submitted to SENSE by the end of the spring 2007 academic term a list of all credit courses meeting predefined sampling parameters for the upcoming fall academic term. Data analysts for SENSE performed the random sampling

and staff created survey packets along with accompanying materials. These were all prepared and shipped to the designated college contacts (SENSE, 2007c).

The survey administrator, once the random sample had been approved or when the survey packets arrived at the college, obtained permission from the course instructor to administer SENSE during class time (approximately 35-45 minutes). Before the surveys were administered to the class, the survey administrator read the Survey Administration Script to inform participants that participation was voluntary and to solicit their participation. After the administration of the surveys was completed, the survey administrator collected all surveys and returned them to the class envelope provided by SENSE. The completed survey packets were shipped back to SENSE for scanning, analysis, and reporting (SENSE, 2007c).

Data Analysis

A variety of statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. The researcher used an independent sample t-test to compare the means of the responses of entering and returning Hispanic community college students to answer research question one and research question two. Descriptive statistics were used to compare entering and returning students with control variables. The researcher used SPSS to analyze the data. Consistent with the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) guidelines, statistical significance was defined with a p-value of 0.01 and an effect size of 0.20 or more. Though not statistically significant at the pre-established level, this researcher highlighted data with a p-value of 0.05 or less.

Chapter Summary

The use of survey research detailed in this chapter was appropriate for use with this quantitative study.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the differences in engagement levels between entering and returning Hispanic community college students using the pilot data from the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). SENSE was administered during the third and fifth weeks of the fall 2007 semester.

Analysis

This researcher conducted independent sample t-tests to analyze the data. The results reflect how entering and returning Hispanic community college students respond to questions that involve a single variable (e.g. entering students and enrollment status). It is important to note that this study did not examine how the interactions of multiple variables influenced student engagement.

Research Question 1

Are there significant differences in the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students? To answer research question one, this researcher used cross-tabulations to provide a descriptive analysis of the variables. The data were further analyzed using an independent sample t-test and the effect size was calculated for the variables. Consistent with the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) guidelines, statistical significance was defined with a p-value of 0.01 and an effect size of 0.20 or more. Though not statistically significant at the pre-established level, this researcher highlighted data with a p-value of 0.05 or less.

Sample Characteristics

This study focused on entering and returning Hispanic college students. A total of 4,890 respondents identified themselves as Hispanic. Descriptive statistics were used for this research to provide basic features of the data.

Sex

As reported in Table 1, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 40% were male and 60% were female. Among entering Hispanic students, 43% percent were male and 57% were female. Among returning Hispanic students, 37% were male and 63% were female.

Table 1. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics: Sex

		Sex		
		Male	Female	Total
Entering	Count	1092	1425	2517
	% within return	43.4%	56.6%	100.0%
	% within sex	56.7%	49.5%	52.4%
	% of Total	22.7%	29.7%	52.4%
Returning	Count	834	1452	2286
	% within return	36.5%	63.5%	100.0%
	% within sex	43.3%	50.5%	47.6%
	% of Total	17.4%	30.2%	47.6%
Total	Count	1926	2877	4803
	% within return	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%
	% within sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%

Age

As reported in Table 2, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 80% were traditional age students and 20% were nontraditional age students. Among entering Hispanic students, 88% were traditional age students and 12% were nontraditional age students. Among returning students, 70% were traditional age students and 30% were nontraditional age students.

Table 2. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics: Age

		Traditional Age vs. Nontraditional Age		
		Traditional-Age	Nontraditional-Age	Total
Entering	Count	2220	296	2516
	% within return	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
	% within Traditional Age vs. Nontraditional Age	58.1%	30.2%	52.4%
	% of Total	46.2%	6.2%	52.4%
Returning	Count	1603	684	2287
	% within return	70.1%	29.9%	100.0%
	% within Traditional Age vs. Nontraditional Age	41.9%	69.8%	47.6%
	% of Total	33.4%	14.2%	47.6%
Total	Count	3823	980	4803
	% within return	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
	% within Traditional Age vs. Nontraditional Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%

First-generation Status

As reported in Table 3, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 58% were first-generation students and 42% were non-first-generation students. Among entering Hispanic students, 57% were first-generation students and 43% were non-first-generation students. Among returning Hispanic students, 58% were first-generation students and 42% were non-first-generation students.

Table 3. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics: Generation Status

		First-generation vs. Not First-generation		
		First-Generation	Not First-Generation	Total
Entering	Count	1457	1114	2571
	% within return	56.7%	43.3%	100.0%
	% within First-generation vs. Not First-generation	51.9%	53.6%	52.6%
	% of Total	29.8%	22.8%	52.6%
Returning	Count	1353	966	2319
	% within return	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within First-generation vs. Not First-generation	48.1%	46.4%	47.4%
	% of Total	27.7%	19.8%	47.4%
Total	Count	2810	2080	4890
	% within return	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%
	% within First-generation vs. Not First-generation	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%

Native Language English

As reported in table 4, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 59% reported that English was their native (first) language and 41% reported that English was not their native (first) language. Among entering Hispanic students, 61% reported that English was their native language and 39% reported that English was not their native language. Among returning Hispanic students, 59% reported that English was their native language and 41% reported that English was not their native language.

Table 4. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics: Native Language

		Is English your native (first) language?		
		Yes	No	Total
Entering	Count	1555	1002	2557
	% within return	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
	% within Is English your native (first) language?	54.0%	50.5%	52.6%
	% of Total	32.0%	20.6%	52.6%
Returning	Count	1324	983	2307
	% within return	57.4%	42.6%	100.0%
	% within Is English your native (first) language?	46.0%	49.5%	47.4%
	% of Total	27.2%	20.2%	47.4%
Total	Count	2879	1985	4864
	% within return	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
	% within Is English your native (first) language?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%

International Student

As reported in Table 5, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 8% were international students or foreign nationals and 92% were not international students or foreign nationals. Among entering Hispanic students, 7% were international students or foreign nationals and 93% were not international students or foreign nationals. Among returning Hispanic students, 8% were international students or foreign nationals and 92% were not international students or foreign nationals.

Table 5. Entering and Returning Students' Characteristics: Immigration Status

		Are you an international student or foreign national?		
		Yes	No	Total
Entering	Count	180	2361	2541
	% within return	7.1%	92.9%	100.0%
	% within Are you an international student or foreign national?	49.2%	52.8%	52.5%
	% of Total	3.7%	48.8%	52.5%
Returning	Count	186	2114	2300
	% within return	8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
	% within Are you an international student or foreign national?	50.8%	47.2%	47.5%
	% of Total	3.8%	43.7%	47.5%
Total	Count	366	4475	4841
	% within return	7.6%	92.4%	100.0%
	% within Are you an international student or foreign national?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	7.6%	92.4%	100.0%

Marriage Status

As reported in Table 6, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 14% were married and 86% were not married. Among entering Hispanic students, 9% were married and 91% were not married. Among returning Hispanic students, 20% were married and 80% were not married.

Table 6. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics: Marital Status

		Marital Status		
		Yes	No	Total
Entering	Count	233	2328	2561
	% within return	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	33.8%	55.6%	52.5%
	% of Total	4.8%	47.8%	52.5%
Returning	Count	457	1856	2313
	% within return	19.8%	80.2%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	66.2%	44.4%	47.5%
	% of Total	9.4%	38.1%	47.5%
Total	Count	690	4184	4874
	% within return	14.2%	85.8%	100.0%
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	14.2%	85.8%	100.0%

Live with Children

As reported in Table 7, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 27% reported that they have children living with them and 73% reported that they did not have children living with them. Among entering Hispanic students, 23% reported that they have children living with them and 77% reported that they did not have children living with them. Among returning Hispanic students, 32% reported that they have children living with them and 68% reported that they did not have children living with them.

Table 7. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics: Children

		Do you have children who live with you?		
		Yes	No	Total
Entering	Count	590	1962	2552
	% within return	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
	% within Do you have children who live with you?	44.8%	55.4%	52.5%
	% of Total	12.1%	40.4%	52.5%
Returning	Count	728	1580	2308
	% within return	31.5%	68.5%	100.0%
	% within Do you have children who live with you?	55.2%	44.6%	47.5%
	% of Total	15.0%	32.5%	47.5%
Total	Count	1318	3542	4860
	% within return	27.1%	72.9%	100.0%
	% within Do you have children who live with you?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	27.1%	72.9%	100.0%

Work

As reported in Table 8, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic college students, 43% reported that they worked 10 hours or less and 57% reported that they worked 11 hours or more. Specifically within this group, 15% reported that they worked 21 – 30 hours and 32% reported that they worked more than 30 hours. Among entering Hispanic students, 48% reported that they worked 10 hours or less and 52% reported that they worked 11 hours or more. Specifically within this group, 15% of entering Hispanic students worked 21 – 30 hours and 26% worked more than 30 hours. Among returning Hispanic students, 38% reported that they worked 10 hours or less and 62% reported that they worked 11 hours or more. Specifically within this group, 15% of returning Hispanic students reported they worked 21 – 30 hours and 39% reported that they worked more than 30 hours.

Table 8. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:

Hours Worked

		During the first three weeks of your first academic term at this college, hours spent in a typical 7-day week working f						
		None	1-5 hours	6-10 hours	11-20 hours	21-30 hours	More than 30 hours	Total
Entering	Count	891	124	142	282	364	632	2435
	% within return	36.6%	5.1%	5.8%	11.6%	14.9%	26.0%	100.0%
	% within During the first three weeks of your first academic term at this college, hours spent in a typical 7-day week working	59.1%	57.4%	54.2%	60.1%	51.8%	42.8%	52.5%
	% of Total	19.2%	2.7%	3.1%	6.1%	7.9%	13.6%	52.5%
Returning	Count	616	92	120	187	339	846	2200
	% within return	28.0%	4.2%	5.5%	8.5%	15.4%	38.5%	100.0%
	% within During the first three weeks of your first academic term at this college, hours spent in a typical 7-day week working	40.9%	42.6%	45.8%	39.9%	48.2%	57.2%	47.5%
	% of Total	13.3%	2.0%	2.6%	4.0%	7.3%	18.3%	47.5%
Total	Count	1507	216	262	469	703	1478	4635
	% within return	32.5%	4.7%	5.7%	10.1%	15.2%	31.9%	100.0%
	% within During the first three weeks of your first academic term at this college, hours spent in a typical 7-day week working	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	32.5%	4.7%	5.7%	10.1%	15.2%	31.9%	100.0%

High School Grades

As reported in Table 9, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 98% reported that they had a C or better grade or average and 2% reported that they had a C- or lower grade or average. Among entering Hispanic students, 98% reported that they had a C or better grade or average and 2% reported that they had a C- or lower grade or average. Among returning Hispanic students, 98% reported that they had a C or better grade or average and 2% reported that they had a C- or lower grade or average.

Table 9. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:

High School GPA

		Range of overall high school grade or average						Total
		A	A- to B+	B	B- to C+	C	C- or lower	
Entering	Count	126	735	700	648	182	57	2448
	% within return	5.1%	30.0%	28.6%	26.5%	7.4%	2.3%	100.0%
	% within Range of overall high school grade or average	54.5%	53.4%	54.6%	50.6%	48.1%	52.8%	52.6%
	% of Total	2.7%	15.8%	15.0%	13.9%	3.9%	1.2%	52.6%
Returning	Count	105	641	582	632	196	51	2207
	% within return	4.8%	29.0%	26.4%	28.6%	8.9%	2.3%	100.0%
	% within Range of overall high school grade or average	45.5%	46.6%	45.4%	49.4%	51.9%	47.2%	47.4%
	% of Total	2.3%	13.8%	12.5%	13.6%	4.2%	1.1%	47.4%
Total	Count	231	1376	1282	1280	378	108	4655
	% within return	5.0%	29.6%	27.5%	27.5%	8.1%	2.3%	100.0%
	% within Range of overall high school grade or average	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	5.0%	29.6%	27.5%	27.5%	8.1%	2.3%	100.0%

Four Years of Math

As reported in Table 10, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 63% of the students reported that they had four years of high school math and 37% reported that they did not have four years of high school math. Among entering Hispanic students, 63% reported that they had four years of high school math and 37% reported that they did not have four years of high school math. Among returning Hispanic students, 62% reported that they had four years of high school math and 38% reported that they did not have four years of high school math.

Table 10. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics:

Four Years Math

		While in high school, did you take math all four years?		
		Yes	No	Total
Entering	Count	1558	910	2468
	% within return	63.1%	36.9%	100.0%
	% within While in high school, did you take math all four years?	53.6%	52.7%	53.3%
	% of Total	33.6%	19.6%	53.3%
Returning	Count	1350	816	2166
	% within return	62.3%	37.7%	100.0%
	% within While in high school, did you take math all four years?	46.4%	47.3%	46.7%
	% of Total	29.1%	17.6%	46.7%
Total	Count	2908	1726	4634
	% within return	62.8%	37.2%	100.0%
	% within While in high school, did you take math all four years?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	62.8%	37.2%	100.0%

College Goal

As reported in Table 11, among the sample of entering and returning Hispanic students, 92% reported that their goals were to complete a certificate, obtain an associate degree or transfer to a 4-year university and 8% reported that their goals were to obtain or update job-related skills, self-improvement/personal enjoyment, and update their skills for career changes. Among entering Hispanic students, 92% reported that their goals were to complete a certificate, obtain an associate degree or transfer to a 4-year university and 8% reported that their goals were to obtain or update job-related skills, self-improvement/personal enjoyment, and update their skills for career changes. Among returning Hispanic students, 93% reported that their goals were to complete a certificate, obtain an associate degree or transfer to a 4-year university and 7% reported that their

goals were to obtain or update job-related skills, self-improvement/personal enjoyment, and update their skills for career changes.

Table 11. Entering and Returning Hispanic Students' Characteristics: Goals

		Mark the primary reason for attending this college						
		Complete a certificate	Obtain an Associate degree	Transfer to a 4 year college/university	Obtain or update job-related skills	Self-improvement/personal enjoyment	Change careers	Total
Entering	Count	113	685	1536	49	112	49	2544
	% within return	4.4%	26.9%	60.4%	1.9%	4.4%	1.9%	100.0%
	% within Mark the primary reason for attending this college	54.1%	50.1%	53.2%	56.3%	59.3%	52.7%	52.7%
	% of Total	2.3%	14.2%	31.8%	1.0%	2.3%	1.0%	52.7%
Returning	Count	96	681	1350	38	77	44	2286
	% within return	4.2%	29.8%	59.1%	1.7%	3.4%	1.9%	100.0%
	% within Mark the primary reason for attending this college	45.9%	49.9%	46.8%	43.7%	40.7%	47.3%	47.3%
	% of Total	2.0%	14.1%	28.0%	.8%	1.6%	.9%	47.3%
Total	Count	209	1366	2886	87	189	93	4830
	% within return	4.3%	28.3%	59.8%	1.8%	3.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	% within Mark the primary reason for attending this college	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	4.3%	28.3%	59.8%	1.8%	3.9%	1.9%	100.0%

Engagement Variables

The engagement variables used for this study were found in the 2007 SENSE pilot study. Since the data came from the pilot administration of the SENSE data, there were no established SENSE benchmarks. This researcher chose to use the national benchmarks created for the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. Table 12 shows the four constructs and the variable questions for each of the constructs. The dependent variables were categorized into four constructs: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student Effort, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Support for Learners. The 29 dependent variables include: *askques*, *pinclass*, *prepoutc*, *ocideas*, *acocstud*, *prepdraft*, *turninas*, *notcompl*, *useintmg*, *skipcl*, *acintro*, *resource*, *gradepol*, *syllabi*, *dacmeet*, *emailfac*, *facassn*, *facidoc*, *feedback*, *acadpuse*, *carcuse*, *jobpluse*, *tutoruse*, *sklabuse*, *fause*, *comlbuse*, *storguse*, *trnfcras*, and *disvsuse*.

Table 12. Engagement Variables

<p>Active and Collaborative Learning</p> <p><i>Askques</i>: Ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions (17a) <i>Pinclass</i>: Work with other students on a project during class (17e) <i>Prepoutc</i>: Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f) <i>Ocideas</i>: Discuss ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)</p>
<p>Student Effort</p> <p><i>Acocstud</i>: During the first three weeks of your first academic term at this college, how many hours per week (total) did you actually spend studying outside of class (10) <i>Prepdraft</i>: Prepare at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in (17b) <i>Turninas</i>: Complete and turn in at least one assignment (17c) <i>Notcompl</i>: Come to class without completing reading or assignments (17d) <i>Useintmg</i>: Use the Internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment (17g) <i>Skipcl</i>: Skip class (17m)</p>
<p>Student-Faculty Interaction</p> <p><i>Actintro</i>: Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g) <i>Resource</i>: Instructors clearly explained academic resources and services available at this college (16h) <i>Gradepol</i>: Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i) <i>Syllabi</i>: Instructors clearly explained syllabi (16j) <i>Facmeet</i>: I knew how to get in touch with/contact my instructors outside of class (16k) <i>Emailfac</i>: Use e-mail to communicate with instructor (17h) <i>Facasn</i>: Discuss an assignment or grade with an instructor (17i) <i>Facidoc</i>: Discuss ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class (17j) <i>Feedback</i>: Receive prompt feedback (written or oral) from instructors on performance (17k)</p>
<p>Support for Learners</p> <p><i>Acadpuse</i>: Academic advising/planning (18a-2) <i>Carcuse</i>: Career counseling (18b-2) <i>Jobpluse</i>: Job placement assistance (18c-2) <i>Tutoruse</i>: Peer or other tutoring (18d-2) <i>Sklabuse</i>: Skill labs (writing, math, etc) (18e-2) <i>Fause</i>: Financial aid advising (18f-2) <i>Comlbuse</i>: Computer lab (18g-2) <i>Storguse</i>: Student Organizations (18h-2) <i>Trnfcras</i>: Transfer credit assistance (18i-2) <i>Disvuse</i>: Service to students with disabilities (18j-2)</p>

Active and Collaborative Learning

Two statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 13, returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher frequency than entering Hispanic students in the variables *Worked with other students on a project during class* (mean difference = -0.2649; effect size = -0.30) and *Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments* (mean difference = -0.3487; effect size = -0.40). Though not statistically significant, returning students also reported higher mean differences than entering students in the variables *Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions* (-0.1128) and *Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class* (mean difference = -0.1685).

Table 13. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Entering Mean	Returning Mean	Mean Difference	Entering Standard Deviation	Returning Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6403	2.7531	-0.1128	0.8280	0.7931	0.000	-0.14
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.2966	2.5615	-0.2649	0.9455	0.8409	0.000	-0.30
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5150	1.8637	-0.3487	0.8333	0.9257	0.000	-0.40
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2697	2.4382	-0.1685	0.9880	0.9537	0.000	-0.17

Student Effort

Four statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 14, returning Hispanic students showed statistically significant higher frequency than entering Hispanic students in the variables *Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your*

first academic term (mean difference = -0.2124; effect size -0.25), *Came to class without complete reading or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1789; effect size = -0.21), *Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2588; effect size = -0.27), and *Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2630; effect size = -0.53). Though not statistically significant, returning students had higher mean differences than entering students in the variable *Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (-0.0627).

Table 14. Student Effort

	Entering Mean	Returning Mean	Mean Difference	Entering Standard Deviation	Returning Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5711	2.6198	-0.0487	0.8961	0.9140	0.062	-0.05
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4380	2.6504	-0.2124	0.8602	0.8113	0.000	-0.25
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1147	3.1774	-0.0627	0.6116	0.6005	0.000	-0.10
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7642	1.9431	-0.1789	0.8222	0.8484	0.000	-0.21
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1519	2.4107	-0.2588	0.9992	0.9489	0.000	-0.27
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3361	1.6991	-0.3630	0.5933	0.7664	0.000	-0.53

Student-Faculty Interaction

Four statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 15, returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher frequency than entering Hispanic students in the variables *Used email to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.4742; effect size = -0.53), *Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term* (mean difference = -0.4664; effect size = -0.54), *Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = -0.2654; effect size = -0.32), and *Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = -0.3458; effect size = -0.38). Also though not statistically significant, entering students reported higher levels of engagement than returning students in the variable *Instructor clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college* (mean difference = -0.0848).

Table 15. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Entering Mean	Returning Mean	Mean Difference	Entering Standard Deviation	Returning Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.2992	2.2375	0.0617	1.1183	1.0792	0.054	0.06
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9576	2.0424	-0.0848	0.8776	0.9053	0.001	-0.10
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6790	1.6805	-0.0015	0.7097	0.6735	0.943	0.00
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6158	1.6232	-0.0074	0.6959	0.6707	0.708	-0.01
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6456	1.6691	-0.0235	0.7326	0.7011	0.255	-0.03
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.7369	2.2111	-0.4742	0.8886	0.9080	0.000	-0.53
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8414	2.3078	-0.4664	0.8793	0.8552	0.000	-0.54
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.4066	1.6720	-0.2654	0.7439	0.8845	0.000	-0.32
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.2096	2.5554	-0.3458	0.9404	0.8683	0.000	-0.38

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

Five statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 16, returning Hispanic students showed statistically significant higher frequency than entering Hispanic students in the variables *Used academic advising* (mean difference = -0.2665; effect size = -0.32), *Used career counseling* (mean difference = -0.1877; effect size = -0.26), *Used peer or other tutoring* (mean difference = -0.3908; effect size = -0.44), *Used skill labs* (mean difference = -0.3176; effect size = -0.30), and *Used computer labs* (mean difference = -0.4503; effect size = -0.44).

Though not statistically significant, returning Hispanic students showed higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students in the variables *Used job placement*

assistance (mean difference = -0.0459), *Used financial aid advising* (mean difference = -0.1233), and *Used transfer credit assistance* (mean difference = -0.0801).

Table 16. Support for Learners

	Entering Mean	Returning Mean	Mean Difference	Entering Standard Deviation	Returning Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7519	2.0184	-0.2665	0.8096	0.8317	0.000	-0.32
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.3936	1.5813	-0.1877	0.6651	0.7720	0.000	-0.26
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1117	1.1576	-0.0459	0.4128	0.4650	0.001	-0.10
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4094	1.8002	-0.3908	0.7694	0.9801	0.000	-0.44
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.8866	2.2042	-0.3176	1.0521	1.0757	0.000	-0.30
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7654	1.8887	-0.1233	0.8593	0.9009	0.000	-0.14
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1462	2.5965	-0.4503	1.0240	1.0159	0.000	-0.44
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1874	1.2105	-0.0231	0.5562	0.5887	0.181	-0.04
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1378	1.2179	-0.0801	0.4392	0.5413	0.000	-0.16
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0823	1.0894	-0.0071	0.3841	0.4004	0.547	-0.02

Research Question Two

Are there significant differences in engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic students when analyzed in the terms of the following breakout variables: enrollment status, age (traditional versus nontraditional; 18 – 19 year old versus 20 years and older), first-generation status, developmental education status (developmental reading; developmental writing; developmental math), sex, and academic goal aspiration. To answer research question two, this researcher used descriptive statistics to provide details of the variables. The data were further analyzed using an independent sample t-test and the effect size was calculated for the variables. Consistent with CCSSE guidelines, statistical significance was defined with a p-value of 0.01 and an effect size of

0.20 or more. Though not statistically significant at the pre-determined level, this researcher highlighted data with a p-value of 0.05 or less.

Enrollment Status

Full-time students were defined as students enrolled in four courses or more with at least 12 hours. Less than full-time students were defined as students enrolled less than 12 hours in the semester. As reported in Table 17, 34% of the students reported to be enrolled less than full-time and 66% reported to be enrolled full-time.

Table 17. Less than Full-time versus Full-time

	Frequency	Percent
Less than Full-time	871	33.9%
Full-time	1700	66.1%
Total	2571	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 18, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time showed statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variable *Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments* (mean difference = -0.1653; effect size = 0.20). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time showed higher mean differences than entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variables *Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions* (mean difference = -0.0692), *Worked with other students on a project during class* (mean difference = -0.1600), and *Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.)* (mean difference = -0.1364).

Table 18. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Less than Full-time Mean	Full-time Mean	Mean Difference	Less than Full-time Standard Deviation	Full-time Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.5942	2.6634	-0.0692	0.8341	0.8242	0.050	-0.08
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.1908	2.3508	-0.1600	0.9548	0.9364	0.000	-0.17
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.4057	1.5710	-0.1653	0.7702	0.8586	0.000	-0.20
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.1794	2.3158	-0.1364	0.9989	0.9795	0.001	-0.14

Student Effort

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 19, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time showed statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variable *Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2267; effect size = -0.26). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported higher mean differences than entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variables *Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0977) and *Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0711). Though the data show that entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time were likely to have prepared for class, the data also show that Hispanic students enrolled full-time frequently came to class not prepared more than entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time. Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time had higher mean differences than entering

Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variable *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0942). Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported higher frequency compared to entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variable *Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2822).

Table 19. Student Effort

	Less than Full-time Mean	Full-time Mean	Mean Difference	Less than Full-time Standard Deviation	Full-time Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.4213	2.6480	-0.2267	0.8002	0.9325	0.000	-0.26
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.3730	2.4707	-0.0977	0.8802	0.8483	0.008	-0.11
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.0675	3.1386	-0.0711	0.6211	0.6056	0.006	-0.12
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7017	1.7959	-0.0942	0.8263	0.8186	0.007	-0.11
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.0270	2.2161	-0.1891	1.0154	0.9850	0.000	-0.19
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3175	1.3457	-0.2822	0.5878	0.5960	0.262	-0.05

Student-Faculty Interaction

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 20, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time showed statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled less than full-time in the variable *Used e-mail to communicate with an*

instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (mean difference = -0.2142; effect size = -0.25). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time showed higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled full-time in the variables *Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another* (mean difference = 0.1400), *Instructors clearly explained course grading policies* (mean difference = 0.0585), and *Instructors clearly explained course syllabi* (mean difference = 0.0696).

Table 20. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Less than Full-time Mean	Full-time Mean	Mean Difference	Less than Full-time Standard Deviation	Full-time Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.3921	2.2521	0.1400	1.1499	1.0994	0.003	0.12
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9965	1.9380	0.0585	0.8858	0.8731	0.114	0.07
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.7178	1.6593	0.0585	0.7320	0.6975	0.050	0.08
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6620	1.5924	0.0696	0.7254	0.6794	0.017	0.10
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6779	1.6291	0.0488	0.7427	0.7271	0.112	0.07
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.5948	1.8090	-0.2142	0.8204	0.9131	0.000	-0.25
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.7964	1.8643	-0.0679	0.8701	0.8834	0.069	-0.08
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.3788	1.4207	-0.0419	0.7199	0.7556	0.186	-0.06
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.1856	2.2219	-0.0363	0.9574	0.9317	0.369	-0.04

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 21, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported

higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled full-time in the variable *Used financial aid advising* (mean difference = -0.2028; effect size = -0.24). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled full-time in the variables *Used academic advising/planning* (mean difference = -0.0968), *Used job placement assistance* (mean difference = -0.0420), *Used peer or other tutoring* (mean difference = -0.0685), *Used skill labs* (mean difference = -0.0878), *Used computer lab* (mean difference = -0.1478), *Used student organizations* (mean difference = -0.0578), and *Used transfer credit assistance* (mean difference = -0.0545).

Table 21. Support for Learners

	Less than Full-time Mean	Full-time Mean	Mean Difference	Less than Full-time Standard Deviation	Full-time Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.6873	1.7841	-0.0968	0.7933	0.8159	0.006	-0.12
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.3589	1.4111	-0.0522	0.6320	0.6808	0.072	-0.08
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.0837	1.1257	-0.0420	0.3688	0.4324	0.020	-0.10
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.3639	1.4324	-0.0685	0.7393	0.7834	0.039	-0.09
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.8280	1.9158	-0.0878	1.0437	1.0553	0.053	-0.08
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.6311	1.8339	-0.2028	0.8079	0.8767	0.000	-0.24
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.0484	2.1962	-0.1478	1.0287	1.0182	0.001	-0.14
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1492	1.2070	-0.0578	0.4961	0.5839	0.017	-0.11
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1021	1.1556	-0.0535	0.3505	0.4765	0.006	-0.13
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0968	1.0749	0.0219	0.4113	0.3695	0.193	0.06

Traditional Age

Traditional age students were defined as students 24 years and younger.

Nontraditional age students were defined as students 25 years and older. As reported in

Table 22, 88% of the students reported to be in the traditional age category and 12% of the students reported to be in the nontraditional age category.

Table 22. Traditional Age versus Nontraditional Age

	Frequency	Percent
Traditional-Age	2220	88.2%
Nontraditional-Age	296	11.8%
Total	2516	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 23, nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students showed statistically significant higher engagement levels than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion* (mean difference = -0.1953; effect size = -0.24). Though not statistically significant, traditional age, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Worked with other classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments* (mean difference = 0.1536).

Table 23. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Traditional Age Mean	Nontraditional Age Mean	Mean Difference	Traditional Age Standard Deviation	Nontraditional Age Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6129	2.8082	-0.1953	0.8295	0.7979	0.000	-0.24
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.2851	2.3720	-0.0869	0.9414	0.9588	0.139	-0.09
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5273	1.3737	0.1536	0.8365	0.7398	0.003	0.19
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2595	2.3699	-0.1104	0.9833	1.0121	0.073	-0.11

Student Effort

Three statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 24, nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students showed statistically significant higher engagement levels than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2254; effect size = -0.25). Traditional age, entering Hispanic students responded with statistical significance in the variables *Came to class without completing readings or*

assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (mean difference = 0.2549; effect size = 0.32) and *Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.2013; effect size = 0.40). Though not statistically significant, nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1356)

Table 24. Student Effort

	Traditional Age Mean	Nontraditional Age Mean	Mean Difference	Traditional Age Standard Deviation	Nontraditional Age Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5425	2.7679	-0.2254	0.8856	0.9512	0.000	-0.25
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4207	2.5563	-0.1356	0.8616	0.8534	0.013	-0.16
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1214	3.0584	0.0630	0.6112	0.6215	0.100	0.10
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7896	1.5347	0.2549	0.8174	0.8000	0.000	0.32
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1529	2.1267	0.0262	0.9969	1.0360	0.675	0.03
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3538	1.1525	0.2013	0.6060	0.3794	0.000	0.40

Student-Faculty Interaction

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 25, nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = -0.2773; effect size = -0.29). Though not statistically significant, nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students showed higher levels of engagement than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in the variables *Instructors clearly explained course grading policies* (mean difference = 0.1182) and *Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class* (mean difference = 0.1356).

Table 25. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Traditional Age Mean	Nontraditional Age Mean	Mean Difference	Traditional Age Standard Deviation	Nontraditional Age Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.2985	2.2862	0.0123	1.1214	1.0945	0.862	0.01
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9633	1.9386	0.0247	0.8798	0.8776	0.652	0.03
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6916	1.5734	0.1182	0.7196	0.6294	0.007	0.17
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6215	1.5597	0.0618	0.6980	0.6929	0.154	0.09
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6592	1.5236	0.1356	0.7402	0.6531	0.003	0.19
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.7285	1.7698	-0.0413	0.8831	0.9089	0.456	-0.05
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8260	1.9255	-0.0995	0.8774	0.8756	0.073	-0.11
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.3910	1.4724	-0.0814	0.7291	0.8029	0.078	-0.11
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.1759	2.4532	-0.2773	0.9296	0.9593	0.000	-0.29

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 26, though not statistically significant, entering, nontraditional age Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering, traditional age Hispanic students in the variables *Used career counseling* (mean difference = -0.1306) and *Used peer or other tutoring* (mean difference = -0.0942). Also though not statistically significant, entering, traditional age Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering, nontraditional age Hispanic students in the variable *Used student organizations* (mean difference = 0.0690).

Table 26. Support for Learners

	Traditional Age Mean	Nontraditional Age Mean	Mean Difference	Traditional Age Standard Deviation	Nontraditional Age Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7414	1.8327	-0.0913	0.8141	0.7665	0.082	-0.12
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.3730	1.5036	-0.1306	0.6538	0.7225	0.002	-0.19
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1152	1.0787	0.0365	0.4186	0.3541	0.172	0.09
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.3966	1.4908	-0.0942	0.7563	0.8537	0.057	-0.12
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.8736	1.9388	-0.0652	1.0497	1.0748	0.332	-0.06
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7745	1.6957	0.0788	0.8640	0.8234	0.152	0.09
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1557	2.0569	0.0988	1.0198	1.0608	0.129	0.09
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1931	1.1241	0.0690	0.5642	0.4715	0.056	0.13
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1317	1.1815	-0.0498	0.4333	0.4679	0.085	-0.11
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0800	1.0722	0.0078	0.3779	0.3790	0.754	0.02

18-19 Years Old Versus 20 Years Old and Older

Students who identified themselves as 18 or 19 years of age comprised the category 18-19 Years Old. Students who identified themselves as 20 years or older comprised the category 20 Years Old and Older. As reported in Table 27, 70% of the students were part of the 18-19 year old category and 30% were part of the 20 years or older category

Table 27. 18-19 years old versus 20 years old and older

	Frequency	Percent
18-19 Years	1753	69.7%
20 Years-Older	763	30.3%
Total	2516	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 28, though not statistically significant, older, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than 18-19 year old, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Asked questions in class or contribute to class discussion* (mean difference = -0.0947). Also, though not statistically significant, 18-19 year old, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than older, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments* (mean difference = 0.1186).

Table 28. Active and Collaborative Learning

	18-19 Ages Mean	Older Ages Mean	Mean Difference	18-19 Ages Standard Deviation	Older Ages Standard Deviation	Sig. (2- tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6073	2.7020	-0.0947	0.8438	0.7879	0.009	-0.12
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.2784	2.3347	-0.0563	0.9417	0.9480	0.174	-0.06
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5449	1.4263	0.1186	0.8443	0.7798	0.001	0.15
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2623	2.2970	-0.0347	0.9793	1.0056	0.426	-0.03

Student Effort

One statistically significant difference was found within the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in table 29, entering Hispanic students 20 years and older reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than 18-19 year old, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2427; effect size = -0.27). Though not statistically significant, 18-19 year old,

entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students 20 years and older in the variables *Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.0766) and *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.1438).

Table 29. Student Effort

	18-19 Ages Mean	Older Ages Mean	Mean Difference	18-19 Ages Standard Deviation	Older Ages Standard Deviation	Sig. (2- tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.4957	2.7384	-0.2427	0.8624	0.9492	0.000	-0.27
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4239	2.4663	-0.0424	0.8601	0.8648	0.269	-0.05
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1371	3.0605	0.0766	0.6087	0.6186	0.004	0.12
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.8033	1.6595	0.1438	0.8118	0.8281	0.000	0.18
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1439	2.1633	-0.0194	0.9984	1.0089	0.660	-0.02
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3413	1.3051	0.0362	0.5941	0.5722	0.163	0.06

Student-Faculty Interaction

No significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 30, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students 20 years of age and older showed higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students 18 and 19 years of age in the variable *Instructors clearly explained course grading policies* (mean difference = 0.0932). Also, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students 20 years of age and older reported higher

frequency than entering Hispanic students 18 and 19 years of age in the variables *Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term* (mean difference = -0.1301), *Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = -0.0947), and *Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = -0.1407).

Table 30. Student-Faculty Interaction

	18-19 Ages Mean	Older Ages Mean	Mean Difference	18-19 Ages Standard Deviation	Older Ages Standard Deviation	Sig. (2- tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.2953	2.3012	-0.0059	1.1103	1.1368	0.904	-0.01
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9587	1.9641	-0.0054	0.8739	0.8924	0.888	-0.01
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.7061	1.6129	0.0932	0.7209	0.6820	0.003	0.13
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6193	1.6026	0.0167	0.6868	0.7218	0.584	0.02
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6609	1.6026	0.0583	0.7445	0.7001	0.067	0.08
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.7144	1.7778	-0.0634	0.8741	0.9124	0.104	-0.07
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.7985	1.9286	-0.1301	0.8701	0.8888	0.001	-0.15
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.3720	1.4667	-0.0947	0.7147	0.7873	0.004	-0.13
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.1663	2.3070	-0.1407	0.9179	0.9743	0.001	-0.15

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 31, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students 20 years and older reported higher frequency than 18-19 year old, entering

Hispanic students in the variables *Used career counseling* (mean difference = -0.0576) and *Used transfer credit assistance* (mean difference = -0.0448). Also though not statistically significant, 18-19 year old, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students 20 years and older in the variable *Used student organizations* (mean difference = -0.0568).

Table 31. Support for Learners

	18-19 Ages Mean	Older Ages Mean	Mean Difference	18-19 Ages Standard Deviation	Older Ages Standard Deviation	Sig. (2- tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7486	1.7597	-0.0111	0.8263	0.7676	0.762	-0.01
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.3712	1.4288	-0.0576	0.6551	0.6814	0.056	-0.09
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1188	1.0925	0.0263	0.4236	0.3819	0.163	0.07
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4006	1.4237	-0.0231	0.7609	0.7866	0.505	-0.03
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.8980	1.8418	0.0562	1.0579	1.0397	0.234	0.05
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7866	1.7155	0.0711	0.8685	0.8369	0.065	0.08
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1672	2.0910	0.0762	1.0216	1.0313	0.095	0.07
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.2020	1.1452	0.0568	0.5818	0.4826	0.025	0.11
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1241	1.1689	-0.0448	0.4197	0.4761	0.026	-0.10
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0806	1.0754	0.0052	0.3807	0.3715	0.764	0.01

First-Generation Versus Non-First-generation

First-generation students were defined as students who did not have either of their parents attend college. Non-first-generation students were defined as students who had at least one parent attend college. As reported in Table 32, 57% of the students reported they were first-generation and 43% reported they were not first-generation.

Table 32. First-Generation versus Non-first-generation

	Frequency	Percent
First-Generation	1457	56.7%
Not First-Generation	1114	43.3%
Total	2571	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 33, though not statistically significant, non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than first-generation, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.)* (mean difference = -0.0809).

Table 33. Active and Collaborative Learning

	First-Generation Mean	Non-first-generation Mean	Mean Difference	First-Generation Standard Deviation	Not First-Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6151	2.6735	-0.0584	0.8412	0.8095	0.082	-0.07
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.2803	2.3180	-0.0377	0.9573	0.9299	0.323	-0.04
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5014	1.5325	-0.0311	0.8201	0.8500	0.354	-0.04
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2347	2.3156	-0.0809	0.9765	1.0016	0.044	-0.08

Student Effort

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 34, though not statistically significant, non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than first-generation, entering Hispanic

students in the variables *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1036) and *Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1020).

Table 34. Student Effort

	First-Generation Mean	Not First-Generation Mean	Mean Difference	First-Generation Standard Deviation	Not First-Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5558	2.5911	-0.0353	0.8931	0.9000	0.324	-0.04
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4569	2.4133	0.0436	0.8541	0.8678	0.215	0.05
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1029	3.1302	-0.0273	0.6024	0.6235	0.269	-0.04
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7194	1.8230	-0.1036	0.8056	0.8403	0.002	-0.13
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1450	2.1610	-0.0160	1.0085	0.9874	0.691	-0.02
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.2919	1.3939	-0.1020	0.5561	0.6342	0.000	-0.17

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 35, though not statistically significant, not first-generation, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than first-generation, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Used e-mail to communicate with*

an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (mean difference = -0.0965).

Table 35. Student-Faculty Interaction

	First-Generation Mean	Non-first-generation Mean	Mean Difference	First-Generation Standard Deviation	Not First-Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.2837	2.3192	-0.0355	1.1025	1.1387	0.431	-0.03
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9631	1.9503	0.0128	0.8807	0.8739	0.717	0.01
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6671	1.6947	-0.0276	0.6971	0.7260	0.333	-0.04
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6181	1.6129	0.0052	0.6954	0.6967	0.854	0.01
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6540	1.6345	0.0195	0.7369	0.7272	0.507	0.03
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.6952	1.7917	-0.0965	0.8662	0.9147	0.007	-0.11
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8168	1.8734	-0.0566	0.8759	0.8831	0.113	-0.06
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.4034	1.4108	-0.0074	0.7397	0.7496	0.807	-0.01
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.1906	2.2347	-0.0441	0.9425	0.9375	0.252	-0.05

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 36, first-generation, entering Hispanic students showed statistically significant higher frequency than non-first-generation, entering Hispanic

students in the variable *Used financial aid advising* (mean difference = 0.2084; effect size = 0.25). Though not statistically significant, first-generation, entering Hispanic students showed higher frequency than non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Used career counseling* (mean difference = 0.0777).

Table 36. Support for Learners

	First-Generation Mean	Non-first-generation Mean	Mean Difference	First-Generation Standard Deviation	Not First-Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7476	1.7574	-0.0098	0.7965	0.8264	0.768	-0.01
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.4273	1.3496	0.0777	0.6759	0.6485	0.005	0.12
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1061	1.1191	-0.0130	0.3963	0.4333	0.449	-0.03
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4028	1.4179	-0.0151	0.7633	0.7775	0.632	-0.02
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.9080	1.8588	0.0492	1.0584	1.0436	0.254	0.05
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.8556	1.6472	0.2084	0.8702	0.8305	0.000	0.25
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1730	2.1112	0.0618	1.0251	1.0219	0.139	0.06
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1788	1.1986	-0.0198	0.5324	0.5859	0.394	-0.04
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1395	1.1355	0.0040	0.4500	0.4250	0.829	0.01
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0843	1.0796	0.0047	0.3776	0.3925	0.773	0.01

Developmental Reading

Developmental reading students were defined as students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses. Non-developmental reading students were defined as students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses. As reported in Table 37, 50% of the students were enrolled in developmental reading courses and 50% of the students were not enrolled in developmental reading courses.

Table 37. Developmental Reading versus Non-Developmental Reading

	Frequency	Percent
Enrolled	1025	50.0%
Not enrolled	1023	50.0%
Total	2048	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 38, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variable *Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion* (mean difference = -0.0849).

Table 38. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Developmental Reading Mean	Not Developmental Reading Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6134	2.6983	-0.0849	0.8255	0.8408	0.023	-0.10
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.3236	2.3151	0.0085	0.9290	0.9469	0.838	0.01
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5488	1.4861	0.0627	0.8605	0.8141	0.093	0.07
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2706	2.3455	-0.0749	0.9606	1.0036	0.090	-0.08

Student Effort

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 39, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variable *Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.0805). Also, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variables *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your academic term* (mean difference = -0.1283) and *Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0552).

Table 39. Student Effort

	Developmental Reading Mean	Not Developmental Reading Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5655	2.5962	-0.0307	0.8801	0.9012	0.437	-0.03
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4903	2.4098	0.0805	0.8293	0.8794	0.038	0.09
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1212	3.1630	-0.0418	0.5686	0.6094	0.111	-0.07
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7012	1.8295	-0.1283	0.7990	0.8345	0.000	-0.16
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1914	2.1419	0.0495	0.9825	1.0246	0.269	0.05
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.2919	1.3471	-0.0552	0.5669	0.5848	0.033	-0.10

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in table 40, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses showed higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variables *Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another* (mean difference = -0.1348) and *Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term* (mean difference = 0.0844). Also though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variables *Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0785) and *Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = -0.1262).

Table 40. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Developmental Reading Mean	Not Developmental Reading Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.1982	2.3330	-0.1348	1.0644	1.1394	0.006	-0.12
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9064	1.9742	-0.0678	0.8415	0.8858	0.078	-0.08
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6729	1.6382	0.0347	0.7074	0.6894	0.262	0.05
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6069	1.5674	0.0395	0.6958	0.6653	0.190	0.06
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6285	1.6075	0.0210	0.7194	0.7099	0.505	0.03
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.6969	1.7754	-0.0785	0.8605	0.9020	0.046	-0.09
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8729	1.7885	0.0844	0.9068	0.8498	0.033	0.10
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.4154	1.3599	0.0555	0.7398	0.7149	0.090	0.08
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.1608	2.2870	-0.1262	0.9316	0.9427	0.003	-0.13

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

Four statistically significant differences were found in the construct *Support for Learners*. As reported in Table 41, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variables *Used career counseling* (mean difference = 0.1461; effect size = 0.23), *Used skill labs* (mean difference = 0.4781; effect size = 0.46), *Used computer lab* (mean difference = 0.3512; effect size = 0.35), and *Used student organizations* (mean difference = 0.1125; effect size = 0.21). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in the variables *Used job placement assistance* (mean difference = 0.0454), *Used peer or other tutoring* (mean difference = 0.0789), *Used financial aid advising* (mean difference = 0.1107), and *Used services to students with disabilities* (mean difference = 0.0506).

Table 41. Support for Learners

	Developmental Reading Mean	Not Developmental Reading Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Reading Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7605	1.7675	-0.0070	0.8276	0.7923	0.850	-0.01
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.4589	1.3128	0.1461	0.7007	0.5906	0.000	0.23
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1274	1.0820	0.0454	0.4292	0.3488	0.012	0.12
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4427	1.3638	0.0789	0.7854	0.7434	0.023	0.10
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	2.1314	1.6533	0.4781	1.0820	0.9714	0.000	0.46
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.8171	1.7064	0.1107	0.8669	0.8433	0.004	0.13
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.3228	1.9716	0.3512	0.9906	1.0316	0.000	0.35
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.2347	1.1222	0.1125	0.6184	0.4522	0.000	0.21
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1276	1.1250	0.0026	0.4251	0.4026	0.893	0.01
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0893	1.0387	0.0506	0.3906	0.2622	0.001	0.15

Developmental Writing

Developmental writing students were defined as students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses. Non-developmental reading students were defined as students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses. As reported in Table 42, 43% of the students were enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses and 57% of the students were not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses.

Table 42. Developmental Writing versus Non-Developmental Writing

	Frequency	Percent
Enrolled	840	42.6%
Not enrolled	1131	57.4%
Total	1971	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 43, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses in the variable *Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignment* (mean difference = 0.0901).

Table 43. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Developmental Writing Mean	Not Developmental Writing Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6809	2.6523	0.0286	0.8128	0.8503	0.456	0.03
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.3370	2.3261	0.0109	0.9257	0.9505	0.802	0.01
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5695	1.4794	0.0901	0.8792	0.7987	0.019	0.11
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2855	2.3242	-0.0387	0.9654	0.9998	0.397	-0.04

Student Effort

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 44, Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses reported statistically significant higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses in the variable *Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.1860; effect size = 0.22). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses in the variable *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0724).

Table 44. Student Effort

	Developmental Writing Mean	Not Developmental Writing Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.6053	2.5789	0.0264	0.9407	0.8677	0.522	0.03
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.5519	2.3659	0.1860	0.8188	0.8748	0.000	0.22
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1286	3.1532	-0.0246	0.5776	0.6005	0.365	-0.04
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7242	1.7966	-0.0724	0.7972	0.8264	0.053	-0.09
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.2119	2.1317	0.0802	0.9872	1.0147	0.082	0.08
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3107	1.3467	-0.0360	0.5749	0.5936	0.185	-0.06

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 45, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses showed higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses in the variables *Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another* (mean difference = -0.1614) and *Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college* (mean difference = -0.1382). In addition, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental writing courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental writing courses in the variables *Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term* (mean difference = 0.0822) and *Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks* (mean difference = 0.1262).

Table 45. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Developmental Writing Mean	Not Developmental Writing Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.1803	2.3417	-0.1614	1.0872	1.1207	0.002	-0.15
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.8510	1.9892	-0.1382	0.8206	0.8901	0.000	-0.16
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6462	1.6593	-0.0131	0.7214	0.6945	0.686	-0.02
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.5754	1.5924	-0.0170	0.6924	0.6732	0.585	-0.02
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6022	1.6300	-0.0278	0.7259	0.7132	0.396	-0.04
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.7089	1.7667	-0.0578	0.8521	0.8971	0.153	-0.07
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8831	1.8009	0.0822	0.9004	0.8656	0.044	0.09
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.4723	1.3461	0.1262	0.7951	0.6915	0.000	0.17
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.2563	2.2163	0.0400	0.9151	0.9711	0.367	0.04

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

Two statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 46, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses reported statistically significant higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses in the variables *Used skill labs* (mean difference = 0.3401; effect size = 0.32) and *Used computer lab* (mean difference = 0.2480; effect size = 0.24). Though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep writing courses in the variables *Used career counseling* (mean difference = 0.1078), *Used peer or other tutoring* (mean difference = 0.0885), *Used student organizations* (mean difference = 0.1041), and *Used services to students with disabilities* (mean difference = 0.0392).

Table 46. Support for Learners

	Developmental Writing Mean	Not Developmental Writing Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Writing Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7684	1.7724	-0.0040	0.8247	0.8053	0.918	0.00
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.4530	1.3452	0.1078	0.6947	0.6178	0.000	0.16
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1120	1.0987	0.0133	0.4027	0.3919	0.479	0.03
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4419	1.3534	0.0885	0.7945	0.7297	0.013	0.12
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	2.0894	1.7493	0.3401	1.0751	1.0234	0.000	0.32
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7868	1.7470	0.0398	0.8571	0.8548	0.321	0.05
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.2818	2.0338	0.2480	1.0058	1.0327	0.000	0.24
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.2392	1.1351	0.1041	0.6267	0.4829	0.000	0.19
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1308	1.1261	0.0047	0.4395	0.4089	0.815	0.01
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0865	1.0473	0.0392	0.3873	0.2814	0.012	0.12

Developmental Math

Developmental math students were defined as students enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses. Non-developmental reading students were defined as students not enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses. As reported in Table 47, 69% of the students were enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses and 31% of the students were not enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses.

Table 47. Developmental Math versus Non-Developmental Math

	Frequency	Percent
Enrolled	1422	68.7%
Not enrolled	648	31.3%
Total	2070	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

As reported in Table 48, no statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct.

Table 48. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Developmental Math Mean	Not Developmental Math Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6492	2.6667	-0.0175	0.8319	0.8230	0.660	-0.02
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.3072	2.3418	-0.0346	0.9448	0.9388	0.445	-0.04
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5180	1.5079	0.0101	0.8378	0.8257	0.800	0.01
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.3004	2.3248	-0.0244	0.9827	0.9796	0.605	-0.02

Student Effort

As reported in Table 49, no statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct.

Table 49. Student Effort

	Developmental Math Mean	Not Developmental Math Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5817	2.5913	-0.0096	0.9004	0.8704	0.821	-0.01
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4409	2.4405	0.0004	0.8501	0.8656	0.992	0.00
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1476	3.1339	0.0137	0.5868	0.6148	0.629	0.02
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7475	1.7899	-0.0424	0.8044	0.8448	0.279	-0.05
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1523	2.1765	-0.0242	0.9865	1.0386	0.615	-0.02
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3302	1.3312	-0.0010	0.5772	0.5884	0.971	0.00

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 50, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses in the variable *Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0931).

Table 50. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Developmental Math Mean	Not Developmental Math Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.2798	2.3333	-0.0535	1.1082	1.1501	0.320	-0.05
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9203	2.0000	-0.0797	0.8558	0.9021	0.055	-0.09
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6586	1.6450	0.0136	0.6888	0.7241	0.681	0.02
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.5934	1.5776	0.0158	0.6768	0.6911	0.628	0.02
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6145	1.6233	-0.0088	0.7195	0.7260	0.799	-0.01
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.7069	1.8000	-0.0931	0.8607	0.9208	0.027	-0.10
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8303	1.8328	-0.0025	0.8679	0.8853	0.953	0.00
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.3913	1.3847	0.0066	0.7267	0.7389	0.853	0.01
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.2350	2.1941	0.0409	0.9403	0.9496	0.373	0.04

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 51, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep math courses reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental math courses in the variable *Used skill labs* (mean difference = 0.2155; effect size = 0.21).

Table 51. Support for Learners

	Developmental Math Mean	Not Developmental Math Mean	Mean Difference	Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Not Developmental Math Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7592	1.7805	-0.0213	0.7969	0.8350	0.590	-0.03
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.4006	1.3516	0.0490	0.6501	0.6360	0.122	0.08
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1009	1.1106	-0.0097	0.3820	0.4191	0.621	-0.02
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4143	1.3586	0.0557	0.7723	0.7245	0.131	0.07
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.9573	1.7418	0.2155	1.0592	1.0324	0.000	0.21
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7752	1.7329	0.0423	0.8547	0.8513	0.308	0.05
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1672	2.0978	0.0694	1.0285	1.0332	0.163	0.07
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1744	1.1765	-0.0021	0.5396	0.5420	0.940	0.00
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1192	1.1538	-0.0346	0.4102	0.4518	0.098	-0.08
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0760	1.0530	0.0230	0.3713	0.2830	0.177	0.07

Sex

Students self identified as being either male or female. As reported in Table 52, 43% of the students were male and 57% of the students were female.

Table 52. Male versus Female

	Frequency	Percent
Male	1092	43.4%
Female	1425	56.6%
Total	2517	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. As reported in Table 53, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic female students reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic male students enrolled in the variable *Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class* (mean difference = -0.1638).

Table 53. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Male Mean	Female Mean	Mean Difference	Male Standard Deviation	Female Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6108	2.6568	-0.0460	0.8279	0.8303	0.175	-0.06
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.2580	2.3261	-0.0681	0.9369	0.9479	0.076	-0.07
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5042	1.5169	-0.0127	0.8175	0.8385	0.708	-0.02
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.1817	2.3455	-0.1638	0.9848	0.9821	0.000	-0.17

Student Effort

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 54, entering Hispanic female students reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic male students in the variable *Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.2043; effect size = -0.24). Though not statistically significant,

entering Hispanic female students reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic male students in the variables *Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0816) and *Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.0893). Also though statistically significant, entering Hispanic male students reported higher frequency than entering Hispanic female students in the variables *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.1347) and *Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.0491).

Table 54. Student Effort

	Male Mean	Female Mean	Mean Difference	Male Standard Deviation	Female Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5222	2.6038	-0.0816	0.8635	0.9216	0.024	-0.09
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.3200	2.5243	-0.2043	0.8724	0.8427	0.000	-0.24
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.0960	3.1268	-0.0308	0.6046	0.6179	0.216	-0.05
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.8371	1.7024	0.1347	0.8507	0.7915	0.000	0.16
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.0990	2.1883	-0.0893	0.9851	1.0112	0.028	-0.09
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3585	1.3094	0.0491	0.6190	0.5618	0.041	0.08

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 55, though not statistically significant, entering Hispanic

female students showed higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic male students in the variables *Instructors clearly explained course syllabi* (mean difference = 0.0645) and *Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class* (mean difference = 0.1361). Entering female Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering male Hispanic students in the variable *Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1675).

Table 55. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Male Mean	Female Mean	Mean Difference	Male Standard Deviation	Female Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.3065	2.2884	0.0181	1.1021	1.1271	0.691	0.02
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9413	1.9757	-0.0344	0.8345	0.9109	0.336	-0.04
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.7102	1.6553	0.0549	0.7103	0.7101	0.057	0.08
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6506	1.5861	0.0645	0.7012	0.6915	0.022	0.09
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.7201	1.5840	0.1361	0.7470	0.7113	0.000	0.19
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.6384	1.8059	-0.1675	0.8514	0.9057	0.000	-0.19
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8311	1.8436	-0.0125	0.8846	0.8716	0.729	-0.01
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.4348	1.3760	0.0588	0.7624	0.7203	0.052	0.08
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.1948	2.2165	-0.0217	0.9269	0.9445	0.575	-0.02

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 56, though not statistically significant, entering female Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering male Hispanic students in the

variables *Used academic advising/planning* (mean difference = -0.1221), *Used peer or other tutoring* (mean difference = -0.11), *Used skill labs* (mean difference = -0.1053), and *Used financial aid advising* (mean difference = -0.1022). Also though not statistically significant, entering male students reported higher frequency than entering female students in the variable *Used job placement assistance* (mean difference = 0.0365).

Table 56. Support for Learners

	Male Mean	Female Mean	Mean Difference	Male Standard Deviation	Female Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.6821	1.8042	-0.1221	0.7792	0.8280	0.000	-0.15
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.3632	1.4089	-0.0457	0.6441	0.6785	0.101	-0.07
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1321	1.0956	0.0365	0.4444	0.3870	0.036	0.09
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.3573	1.4446	-0.0873	0.7194	0.8018	0.006	-0.11
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.8233	1.9286	-0.1053	1.0254	1.0722	0.016	-0.10
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7068	1.8090	-0.1022	0.8466	0.8673	0.004	-0.12
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1027	2.1801	-0.0774	1.0072	1.0375	0.066	-0.08
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1964	1.1757	0.0207	0.5512	0.5567	0.377	0.04
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1410	1.1373	0.0037	0.4385	0.4425	0.846	0.01
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0919	1.0738	0.0181	0.3929	0.3772	0.263	0.05

College Goal

Degree seeking students were defined as students seeking completion of a certificate, obtaining an associate degree or planning to transfer to a 4-year college/university. Non-degree seeking students were defined as students enrolled in college to obtain or update job-related skills, self-improvement/personal enjoyment or change careers. As reported in Table 57, 92% of the students were degree seeking and 8% were non-degree seeking.

Table 57. Degree Seeking versus Non-Degree Seeking

	Frequency	Percent
Degree Seeking	2334	91.7%
Nondegree Seeking	210	8.3%
Total	2544	100.0%

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found among entering, degree seeking Hispanic college students and entering, non-degree seeking Hispanic college students in the construct Active and Collaborative Learning. As reported in Table 58, though not statistically significant, entering, degree seeking Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering, non-degree Hispanic students enrolled in the variable *Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignment* (mean difference = 0.1185).

Table 58. Active and Collaborative Learning

	Degree Seeking Mean	Non-degree Seeking Mean	Mean Difference	Degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Non-degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	2.6493	2.5528	0.0965	0.8221	0.8910	0.115	0.11
Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	2.3066	2.1942	0.1124	0.9460	0.9480	0.102	0.12
Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (17f)	1.5244	1.4059	0.1185	0.8366	0.7877	0.053	0.15
Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family, co-workers, etc.) (17l)	2.2781	2.2059	0.0722	0.9855	1.0058	0.317	0.07

Student Effort

Three statistically significant differences found in the *Student Effort* construct. As reported in Table 59, entering, degree seeking Hispanic students showed statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering, non-degree seeking Hispanic students

in the variable *Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.2122; effect size = 0.24). Entering, degree seeking Hispanic students reported higher engagement levels than entering, non-degree seeking Hispanic students in the variable *Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.2122; effect size = 0.24). Entering, non-degree seeking Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering, degree seeking Hispanic students in the variables *Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1820; effect size = -0.21) and *Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = -0.1517; effect size = -0.23). Though not statistically significant, entering, degree seeking Hispanic students reported higher frequency than entering, non-degree seeking Hispanic students in the variable *Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.1550).

Table 59. Student Effort

	Degree Seeking Mean	Non-degree Seeking Mean	Mean Difference	Degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Non-degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (10)	2.5872	2.3750	0.2122	0.8964	0.8590	0.001	0.24
Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in during your first three weeks of your first academic term (17b)	2.4420	2.4051	0.0369	0.8600	0.8585	0.566	0.04
Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17c)	3.1220	3.0396	0.0824	0.6110	0.6055	0.066	0.14
Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17d)	1.7483	1.9303	-0.1820	0.8076	0.9461	0.003	-0.21
Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17g)	2.1649	2.0099	0.1550	0.9989	0.9874	0.034	0.16
Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17m)	1.3235	1.4752	-0.1517	0.5795	0.7137	0.000	-0.23

Student-Faculty Interaction

One statistically significant difference was found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. As reported in Table 60, degree seeking, entering Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher frequency than non-degree seeking, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term* (mean difference = 0.2290). Although not statistically significant, degree seeking, entering Hispanic students showed higher engagement levels than non-degree seeking, entering Hispanic students in the variable *Instructors clearly explained course syllabi* (mean difference = -0.1332).

Table 60. Student-Faculty Interaction

	Degree Seeking Mean	Non-degree Seeking Mean	Mean Difference	Degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Non-degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	2.2964	2.3005	-0.0041	1.1185	1.0915	0.960	0.00
*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at this college (16h)	1.9515	2.0193	-0.0678	0.8751	0.8920	0.287	-0.08
*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	1.6730	1.7440	-0.0710	0.7083	0.7154	0.168	-0.10
*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	1.6047	1.7379	-0.1332	0.6930	0.7186	0.008	-0.19
*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	1.6419	1.6957	-0.0538	0.7397	0.6530	0.312	-0.08
Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first three weeks of your first academic term (17h)	1.7535	1.5245	0.2290	0.8911	0.8151	0.000	0.27
Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first three weeks of your academic term (17i)	1.8379	1.8812	-0.0433	0.8783	0.8842	0.502	-0.05
Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17j)	1.4007	1.4680	-0.0673	0.7356	0.8161	0.217	-0.09
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during the first three weeks (17k)	2.2177	2.1414	0.0763	0.9366	0.9666	0.274	0.08

*(Reverse scale: 1 = Strongly Agree; 5 = Strongly Disagree)

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. As reported in Table 61, though not statistically significant, degree seeking, entering Hispanic students reported higher frequency than non-degree seeking, entering Hispanic students in the variables *Used financial aid advising* (mean difference = 0.1398) and *Used transfer credit assistance* (mean difference = 0.0666).

Table 61. Support for Learners

	Degree Seeking Mean	Non-degree Seeking Mean	Mean Difference	Degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Non-degree Seeking Standard Deviation	Sig. (2-tails)	Effect Size
Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	1.7571	1.7062	0.0509	0.8071	0.8340	0.401	0.06
Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	1.3913	1.4124	-0.0211	0.6634	0.6791	0.672	-0.03
Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	1.1116	1.1164	-0.0048	0.4144	0.4089	0.878	-0.01
Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	1.4114	1.4093	0.0021	0.7701	0.7795	0.971	0.00
Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	1.8801	1.9400	-0.0599	1.0536	1.0449	0.441	-0.06
Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	1.7785	1.6387	0.1398	0.8646	0.8016	0.031	0.17
Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	2.1413	2.2030	-0.0617	1.0204	1.0759	0.413	-0.06
Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	1.1842	1.2176	-0.0334	0.5509	0.6075	0.424	-0.06
Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	1.1431	1.0765	0.0666	0.4453	0.3549	0.049	0.17
Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	1.0792	1.1105	-0.0313	0.3791	0.4284	0.281	-0.08

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was determine the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic community college students and identify factors associated with student engagement and thus with higher likelihood of student persistence and attainment.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the differences in engagement levels among entering and returning Hispanic community college students using the pilot data from the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). The pilot study of SENSE was administered during the third and fifth week of the fall 2007 semester. Twenty-two community colleges located in eight states participated in the pilot study. This chapter will consist of the summary of major findings, recommendations for educational leaders, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Major Findings

This section will highlight the findings from the two research questions of this study. Table 62 highlights the constructs and the variables in which entering and returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant levels of engagement. Statistical significance was defined with a p value of 0.01 and an effect size of 0.20.

Table 62: Statistical Significance		RQ#1	RQ#2																
		Entering Returni	Part- Time	Non- Traditio	18-19	20	Years	First	Non- Generah	Develop	Non- Develo	Develop	Non- Develo	Develop	Non- Develo	Female	Non- Degree- Seeking		
Construct	Question	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	Eff Size	# of Sig I	Commuc
Active and Collaborative Learning	Frequency: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions (17a)	-0.14	-0.08	-0.24	-0.12	-0.07	-0.10	0.03	-0.02	-0.06	0.11							1	
	Frequency: Worked with other students on a project during class (17e)	-0.30	-0.17	-0.09	-0.06	-0.04	0.01	0.01	-0.04	-0.07	0.12							1	
	Frequency: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	-0.40	-0.20	0.19	0.15	-0.04	0.07	0.11	0.01	-0.02	0.15							2	
	Frequency: Discussed ideas from your readings with others outside of class (stu	-0.17	-0.14	-0.11	-0.03	-0.08	-0.08	-0.04	-0.02	-0.17	0.07							0	4
Student Effort	Number of hours per week (total) you actually spent studying outside of class	-0.05	-0.26	-0.25	-0.27	-0.04	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	-0.09	0.24							4	
	Frequency: Prepared at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in dur	-0.25	-0.11	-0.16	-0.05	0.05	0.09	0.22	0.00	-0.24	0.04							3	
	Frequency: Completed and turned in at least one assignment during the first th	-0.10	-0.12	0.10	0.12	-0.04	-0.07	-0.04	0.02	-0.05	0.14							0	
	Frequency: Came to class without completing readings or assignments during th	-0.21	-0.11	0.32	0.18	-0.13	-0.16	-0.09	-0.05	0.16	-0.21							3	
	Frequency: Used internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment durin	-0.27	-0.19	0.03	-0.02	-0.02	0.05	0.08	-0.02	-0.09	0.16							1	
	Frequency: Skipped class during the first three weeks of your first academic ter	-0.53	-0.05	0.40	0.06	-0.17	-0.10	-0.06	0.00	0.08	-0.23							3	14
Student-Faculty Interaction	*Instructors had activities to introduce students to one another (16g)	0.06	0.12	0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.12	-0.15	-0.05	0.02	0.00							0	
	*Instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at	-0.10	0.07	0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.08	-0.16	-0.09	-0.04	-0.08							0	
	*Instructors clearly explained course grading policies (16i)	0.00	0.08	0.17	0.13	-0.04	0.05	-0.02	0.02	0.08	-0.10							0	
	*Instructors clearly explained course syllabi (16j)	-0.01	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.06	-0.02	0.02	0.09	-0.19							0	
	*Knew how to contact my instructors outside of class (16k)	-0.03	0.07	0.19	0.08	0.03	0.03	-0.04	-0.01	0.19	-0.08							0	
	Frequency: Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor during the first thre	-0.53	-0.25	-0.05	-0.07	-0.11	-0.09	-0.07	-0.10	-0.19	0.27							3	
	Frequency: Discussed an assignment or grade with an instructor during the first	-0.54	-0.08	-0.11	-0.15	-0.06	0.10	0.09	0.00	-0.01	-0.05							1	
	Frequency: Discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of	-0.32	-0.06	-0.11	-0.13	-0.01	0.08	0.17	0.01	0.08	-0.09							1	
Frequency: Received prompt feedback from instructors outside of class during	-0.38	-0.04	-0.29	-0.15	-0.05	-0.13	0.04	0.04	-0.02	0.08							2	7	
Support for Learners	Frequency: Used academic advising/planning (18a-2)	-0.32	-0.12	-0.12	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.03	-0.15	0.06							1	
	Frequency: Used career counseling (18b-2)	-0.26	-0.08	-0.19	-0.09	0.12	0.23	0.16	0.08	-0.07	-0.03							2	
	Frequency: Used job placement assistance (18c-2)	-0.10	-0.10	0.09	0.07	-0.03	0.12	0.03	-0.02	0.09	-0.01							0	
	Frequency: Used peer or other tutoring (18d-2)	-0.44	-0.09	-0.12	-0.03	-0.02	0.10	0.12	0.07	-0.11	0.00							1	
	Frequency: Used skill labs (writing, math, etc.) (18e-2)	-0.30	-0.08	-0.06	0.05	0.05	0.46	0.32	0.21	-0.10	-0.06							4	
	Frequency: Used financial aid advising (18f-2)	-0.14	-0.24	0.09	0.08	0.25	0.13	0.05	0.05	-0.12	0.17							2	
	Frequency: Used computer lab (18g-2)	-0.44	-0.14	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.35	0.24	0.07	-0.08	-0.06							3	
	Frequency: Used student organizations (18h-2)	-0.04	-0.11	0.13	0.11	-0.04	0.21	0.19	0.00	0.04	-0.06							1	
	Frequency: Used transfer credit assistance (18i-2)	-0.16	-0.13	-0.11	-0.10	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.08	0.01	0.17							0	
	Frequency: Used services to students with disabilities (18j-2)	-0.02	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.12	0.07	0.05	-0.08							0	14
Total Number of Significant Differences		15	4	5	1	1	4	3	1	1	4	3	1	1	4	39		39	39

Research Question One

Are there significant differences in the engagement levels among entering and returning Hispanic community college students?

Entering Versus Returning Students' Engagement Major Findings by Construct

The major findings of the study are identified in their respective constructs: *Active and Collaborative Learning*, *Student Effort*, *Student-Faculty Interaction*, and *Support for Learners*.

Active and Collaborative Learning

Returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement in regards to *working with other students on a project during class* and *working with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments*. Returning Hispanic students also *asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions* and *discussed ideas from readings with others outside of class* significantly more than entering Hispanic students.

Student Effort

Returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students in regard to *preparing at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in* and *using the Internet or instant messaging to work on assignments*. Even though returning Hispanic students responded that they would prepare at least one draft of an assignment, returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher levels of *coming to class without completing readings or assignments* and *skipping class* more than entering Hispanic students. Returning Hispanic students

were significantly more likely than entering Hispanic students to *complete and turn in at least one assignment*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

Returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students in regard to *using email to communicate with an instructor, discussing an assignment or grade with an instructor, discussing ideas from readings or classes with an instructor, and receiving prompt feedback from instructors*. Returning Hispanic students responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students that they felt their *instructors clearly explained the academic resources and services available at the college*.

Support for Learners

Returning Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students in regards to *using academic advising, using career counseling, using peer or other tutoring, using skills labs, and using computer labs*. Returning Hispanic students responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students in regard to *using job placement assistance and using financial aid advising*.

Research Question Two

Are there significant differences in engagement levels of entering Hispanic students when analyzed in the terms of the following breakout variables: enrollment status (full-time and part-time), age (traditional and nontraditional; 18 – 19 years old and 20 years and older), first-generation status, developmental education status (enrollment in developmental reading, enrollment in developmental writing, enrollment in

developmental math), sex (male and female), and academic goal aspiration (degree seeking and non-degree seeking).

Full-Time Enrollment Versus Part-Time Enrollment

Active and Collaborative Learning

Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regards to *working with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments*. Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regards to *asking questions in class or contributing to class discussions, working with other students on a project during class, and discussing ideas from your readings with others outside of class*.

Student Effort

Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regards to *the number of hours per week they actually spent studying outside of class*. Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regard to *using the Internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regard to *using email to communicate with an instructor*. Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time that

the *instructors had activities to introduce students to one another, instructors clearly explained the course grading policies, and instructors clearly explained course syllabi.*

Support for Learners

Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regards to *using financial aid advising*. Entering Hispanic students enrolled full-time responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled part-time in regards to *using job placement assistance, using peer or other tutoring, using computer lab, and using student organizations.*

Traditional Age Versus Nontraditional Age

Active and Collaborative Learning

Nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *asking questions in class or contributing to class discussion*. Traditional age, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *working with other classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments.*

Student Effort

Nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *the number of hours they actually spent studying outside of class*. Traditional age, entering Hispanic students reported statistically significant more than nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *coming to class without completing readings or*

assignments and *skipping class*. Nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *preparing at least one draft of an assignment*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

Nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *receiving prompt feedback from instructors outside of class*. Nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to their perception that *instructors clearly explained course grading policies* and their *knowledge of contacting their instructors outside of class*.

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. Nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than traditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *using career counseling* and *using peer or other tutoring*. Traditional age, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than nontraditional age, entering Hispanic students in regards to *using student organizations*.

18-19 Years Old Versus 20 Years and Older

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. Entering Hispanic students 20 years and older responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students 18-19 years old in regards to *asking questions in class or contributing to class discussion*. Entering Hispanic students 18-19

years old responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students 20 years and older in regards to *working with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments*.

Student Effort

Entering Hispanic students 20 years and older reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students 18-19 years old in regard to the *number of hours per week they actually studied outside of class*. Also, entering Hispanic students 18-19 years old were significantly more likely than entering Hispanic students 20 years and older in regard to *completing and turning in at least one assignment* and *coming to class without completing readings or assignments*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. Entering Hispanic students 18-19 years old responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students 20 years and older in regard to believing that their *instructors clearly explained course grading policies*. On the other hand, entering Hispanic students 20 years and older responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students 18-19 years of age in regard to *discussing an assignment or grade with an instructor, discussing ideas from readings or classes, and receiving prompt feedback from instructors*.

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. Entering Hispanic students 20 years and older responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students 18-19 years old in regards to *using career counseling and using transfer credit assistance*. Entering Hispanic students 18-19 years old responded

significantly more than entering Hispanic students 20 years and older in regards to *using student organizations*.

First-generation Versus Non-First-generation

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. Non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than first-generation, entering Hispanic students in *discussing ideas from reading with others outside of class*.

Student Effort

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct. Non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than first-generation, entering Hispanic students in regards to *coming to class without completing readings or assignments and skipping class*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Instruction* construct. Non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students responded significantly more than first-generation, entering Hispanic students in regards to *using e-mail to communicate with an instructor*.

Support for Learners

First-generation, entering Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students in regards to *using financial aid advising*. First-generation, entering Hispanic students

responded significantly more than non-first-generation, entering Hispanic students in regards to *using career counseling*.

Developmental Reading Versus Non-Developmental Reading

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct. Entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in regards to *asking questions in class or contributing to class discussion*.

Student Effort

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student Effort* construct. Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in regards to *preparing at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in*. Also, entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in regards to *coming to class without completing readings or assignments and skipping class*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses in regards to

believing that their *instructors had activities to introduce students to one another and discussing an assignment or grade with an instructor*. Entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses in regards to *using email to communicate with an instructor and receiving prompt feedback from instructors outside of class*.

Support for Learners

Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses reported significantly higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental reading courses in regards to *using career counseling, using skill labs, using computer labs, and using student organizations*. Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses in regards to *using job placement assistance, using peer or other tutoring, using financial aid advising, and using services to students with disabilities*.

Developmental Writing Versus Non-Developmental Writing

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative* construct. Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental writing courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in

developmental writing courses in regards to *working with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignment*.

Student Effort

Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental writing courses reported significantly higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental writing courses in regards to *preparing at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in*. Entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental writing courses responded more significantly than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental writing courses in regards to *coming to class without completing readings or assignments*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental writing courses responded more significantly than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental writing courses in regards to believing that their *instructors had activities to introduce students to one another* and believing that their *instructors had clearly explained the academic resources available*. Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental writing courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental writing courses in regards to *discussing an assignment or grade with an instructor* and *discussing ideas from readings or classes with instructors*.

Support for Learners

Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental/college prep reading courses in regards to using skill labs and using computer labs. Also, entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental reading/college prep reading courses in regards to *using career counseling, using peer or other tutoring, using student organizations, and using services to students with disabilities.*

Developmental Math Versus Non-Development Math

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct.

Student Effort

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative Learning* construct.

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. Entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental math courses responded significantly more than entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental math courses in regards to *using email to communicate with an instructor.*

Support for Learners

Entering Hispanic students enrolled in developmental math courses reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic students not enrolled in developmental math courses in regards to *using skill labs*.

Male Versus Female

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative* construct. Entering Hispanic female students responded significantly more than entering female Hispanic in regards to *discussing ideas from their readings with others outside of class*.

Student Effort

Entering Hispanic female students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement than entering Hispanic male students in regards to *preparing at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in*. Entering Hispanic female students responded significantly more than entering Hispanic male students in regards to *the number of hours per week they actually spent studying outside of class and using Internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment*. Entering Hispanic male students responded significantly more than entering Hispanic female students in regards to *coming to class without completing readings or assignments and skipping class*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Student-Faculty Interaction* construct. Entering Hispanic female students responded significantly more than entering Hispanic male students in regards to believing that their *instructors clearly*

explained course syllabi and knew how to contact their instructors outside of class. They also responded significantly more than entering Hispanic male students to using email to communicate with an instructor.

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. Entering Hispanic female students seeking degrees responded significantly more than entering Hispanic male students in regards to *using peer or other tutoring, using skill labs, and using financial aid advising.*

Degree Seeking Versus Non-Degree Seeking

Active and Collaborative Learning

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Active and Collaborative* construct. Entering degree seeking Hispanic students responded significantly more than entering non-degree seeking Hispanic students in regards to *working with classmates outside of class.*

Student Effort

Entering degree seeking Hispanic students reported statistically significantly higher levels of engagement than entering non-degree seeking Hispanic students in regards to the *number of hours per week they actually spent studying outside of class.* Entering non-degree seeking Hispanic students reported statistically significant lower levels of engagement than entering degree seeking Hispanic students in regards to *coming to class without completing readings or assignments and skipping class.* Entering degree seeking Hispanic students responded significantly more than entering non-degree seeking

Hispanic students in regards to *using Internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment*.

Student-Faculty Interaction

Entering degree seeking Hispanic students reported statistically significant higher engagement levels than entering non-degree seeking Hispanic students in regards to *using email to communicate with an instructor*. Entering degree seeking Hispanic students responded significantly more than entering non-degree seeking Hispanic students in believing that *instructors clearly explained course syllabi*.

Support for Learners

No statistically significant differences were found in the *Support for Learners* construct. Entering degree seeking Hispanic students responded significantly more than entering non-degree seeking Hispanic students in regards to *using financial aid advising* and *using transfer credit assistance*.

Implications

The community college will continue to represent the door of opportunity for many individuals in pursuit of higher education. As community college enrollments continue to soar due to population growth and economic conditions, community college leaders must be able to serve their diverse student body. One of the largest and fastest growing segments comprises Hispanic students. The results of this survey will help community colleges practitioners identify the factors that influence student engagement among Hispanic students.

One of the significances of this study is it captures student data during the early weeks of the school year. This period is usually the most critical time of adjustment and

enculturation into the college environment by the college student (Noel, Levitz, and Salluri, 1975; Upcraft and Gardner, 1989). When there are significant differences in levels of engagement between entering and returning Hispanic students, returning students are consistently more engaged. This is consistent with Greene, Marti, and McClenney's (2008) research that suggests "higher levels of engagement reported by minority students may reflect a survivor effect whereby only the highly engaged students survive long enough to be measured" (p. 530). Overall, returning Hispanic students responded with higher levels of student engagement.

This study identifies the importance of collaborative learning in Hispanic student engagement. Kuh (2009) finds that collaboration encourages students to work with others to solve problems or master difficult material that will prepare them to handle any unexpected problems they may face during and after college. Through collaborative learning, students learn "to do research, theorize, read, write, reason quantitatively, and listen respectfully" (Lardner and Malnarich, 2008, p. 35). Returning Hispanic students were more likely to work with other students inside and outside of class and share their reading experiences with others outside of class. This is consistent with Spady's (1970) Explanatory Sociological Model of the Dropout Process which states that the interactions between students with their courses, faculty members, administrators, and peers can lead to greater integration into the academic and social systems of the college. It is also consistent with Tinto's (1975) Theory of Student Departure which states that it is the individual's integration into the academic and social systems of the college that most directly relates to his continuance in that college. In addition to the interactions with other students, it is important to encourage Hispanic students to prepare at least one draft of an

assignment before submitting the assignment. Returning Hispanic students responded that they prepared at least one draft of the assignment before submitting the assignment. Returning Hispanic students were more likely to communicate with their instructors via email, discuss their assignments or grade with their instructors, discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class, and receive prompt feedback from instructors outside of class. By preparing the assignments in advance, students have the opportunity to review their own work. They may feel more comfortable speaking with their instructors because they can receive feedback related to the assignments. They also can seek assistance from their peers or other tutoring services to discuss specific issues related to the assignment.

Astin's (1999) Theory of Student Involvement posits that students with high levels of involvement in the college are more likely to persist than students who have no or low levels of involvement. One of the variables of this theory is the amount of time spent studying. Entering Hispanic students reported that they actually spent more time studying outside of class more than they expected. These included entering Hispanic students in the breakout variables: full-time, nontraditional, 20 years and older, and degree-seeking. The underestimation of entering Hispanic students in regards to time spent studying may indicate that they are not aware of the recommended amount of hours students should spend studying for each hour credit hours for which they are enrolled in.

Ishitani (2006) finds that first-generation students face additional factors that increase their risk of departure more than non-first-generation students. First-generation, entering Hispanic students showed engagement with the use of financial aid. Yet, they reported no other statistically significant differences in the defined engagement variables.

Additional outside factors such as family and work responsibilities or the limited understanding of college expectations may cause these students to delay their academic goals, stop-out, or drop-out of school. Pascarella et al. (2004) find that activities such as volunteer work, employment, and participation in intercollegiate athletics were related to a more negative experience among first-generation students. They suggest that participation in these activities reduce their involvement with academic and nonacademic activities.

Students enrolled in development reading, writing, and math courses responded with statistical significance on their use of skill labs. One possible explanation of this occurrence could be that students enrolled in developmental courses are required to use the skill labs to complete their assignments. This reasoning is also consistent to justify why students enrolled in developmental writing courses responded that they prepared at least one draft before turning in an assignment. The use of computer lab use was identified with statistical significance among students enrolled in developmental reading and developmental writing courses. Students enrolled in developmental reading courses also responded with statistical significance that they were involved in student organizations. A startling finding from this study is that students enrolled in any developmental courses did not respond with statistically significant differences to any of the other engagement variables. Students enrolled in these courses may focus their time and energy to prepare for these courses or other responsibilities related to work or family. As a result, they do not have time to engage in other activities. Yet, these students may feel more connected to the college if they developed relationships with their peers and instructors. If students prepared at least one draft of an assignment, they would create

opportunities to have their peers or instructors review the assignment which may result in better scores. The better scores will result in better sense of academic accomplishment.

In general, female students are more engaged than male students (CCSSE, 2008). Consistent with this fact, entering female students responded that they were likely to prepare at least one draft of an assignment before turning it in. A bigger issue to understand is why there were no more statistically significant differences among entering female and male Hispanic students.

This study also examined the engagement levels of degree-seeking and non-degree seeking students and found that having an academic goal is a major reason for engagement. The findings from this study reveal that entering, non-degree-seeking students came to class without reading or completing assignments and skipping classes more than entering, degree-seeking students. Non-degree-seeking students may not feel as though they have to complete assignments because they will not receive a derogatory grade. The instructor also may have lower expectations of the students' commitment. Regardless of the reason for enrollment in the course, instructors should emphasize that students may have a more positive college experience by attending class and gaining information from completing assignments.

Administrators will be able to use this information to develop and improve policies that will help improve student engagement among Hispanic students. Faculty will be able to use this information to include information in the syllabus and encourage student and faculty communications during class and outside of class. Student services personnel can use the information to identify the student support services that students

utilize most. They can also develop programs that help students learn about the student support services available on campus.

Recommendations for Educational Leaders

Group Activities

The development of relationships is very important. Students are more engaged when they work with classmates on projects during class and outside of the classroom. Students benefit from working with other students because it results in a stronger connection with other students as well as a better understanding of their own significance. Rather than view school as a simple transaction between the student and the faculty, more engaged students realize that other students can serve as resources of academic and emotional support. They also realize that they are part of a group. Schuetz (2008) suggests that the development of positive relationships help students develop a sense of belonging allowing them to “developing a stronger sense of autonomy, which, in turn, supports competence and achievement” (p. 27).

One of the best resources for students to succeed is the words and wisdom from other students. Peer support is very important to student success. Entering Hispanic students can learn and benefit from the challenges and opportunities experienced by other students. Understanding these challenges and opportunities will help them understand the realities of college.

Training Regarding Online Resources

Students are more computer savvy utilizing the Internet and online forms of communications such as instant messaging and social network sites such as Facebook and MySpace. Faculty will benefit from learning how to use these resources to better able to

communicate with their students. Students will benefit from learning the best ways to communicate with their professors. Faculty, student support employees, and students can benefit in training focused on how to use these social networking sites to enhance the teaching and learning experience.

Dedicate More Time to Discussing the Syllabus

It is important that students begin on the correct track. Students benefit from better understanding of the course syllabus. They will gain a better understanding of the expectations and requirements of the courses. It is very important to gain this understanding especially for students who have not prior knowledge or awareness of the college experience. Students must understand that the syllabus will serve as an outline for them to follow to help them track of their academic requirements.

Establish Office Visits or Other Required Interactions with Faculty

Students who communicated with their professors before or during class reported higher levels of engagement than students who did not. This indicates the importance and the need of the relationship between the student and faculty member. Rather than view education as a transaction limited to the classroom, students can understand that education is a continual process. During this time, faculty can explain to the student class expectations or answer questions students may have in a more personal approach minus the distractions of the classroom.

Develop Faculty-Student Mentorship Programs

Students view faculty as experts in the faculty member's respective discipline. This perception also extends beyond the classroom. Students will benefit positively from a faculty-student mentorship program. The formal and informal relationships developed

outside of the classroom can help strengthen the relationship in the classroom. The students can benefit from the faculty member's knowledge of the education process which may appear overwhelming to students that belong to a minority group.

Encourage Students to Visit and Learn About Available Student Services

Most of the time spent on campus is usually dedicated in the classroom. Therefore students may not know or understand the student support services available to them. Pike and Kuh (2005) suggest that students will benefit from involvement inside and outside the classroom. For example, students can engage in activities such as tutoring services or writing centers that support classroom learning. Students will feel more integrated with the college because these activities may result in better grades and improved interactions with other people, Faculty can include descriptions of student services such as computer labs, study skills, counseling, financial aid, student organizations, and athletics in their syllabus. Faculty can also invite representatives from the various student support services to come to class to discuss their programs and services. Faculty can use class time to allow their students to participate in college service fairs or other co-curricular activities that relate to the courses subject matter.

Limitations of the Study

This study focused on entering and returning Hispanic students enrolled at the volunteer colleges for the 2007 pilot study of the Survey on Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). The 22 volunteer colleges were located in eight states. The courses were randomly selected from the following course:

- All developmental reading, writing, and math courses at all levels (excluding ESL);

- First college-level English courses; and
- First college-level math courses.

This researcher examined the engagement levels of Hispanic students using independent sample t-tests. The study was limited to observing the engagement levels independent of other factors (e.g. nontraditional age, part-time students employed full-time who are head of the household) when community college students may belong to one or more of the breakout variables defined in this study. Ouimet (2003) describes some community colleges students as commuter students who are enrolled part-time that juggle college with work and family duties.

Recommendations for Further Study

Future studies should include more colleges located in several states. It would be interesting also to examine if there were differences in levels of student engagement by school setting (i.e. rural, suburban, and urban). Additional recommendations include examining these students over time, adjunct and part-time faculty, the use of technology, distance education, and day and evening students. Future studies should incorporate regression analysis to describe the relationship of multiple factors on student engagement.

Longitudinal Study

This study examined returning and entering Hispanic students. Additional information can be gathered based on the academic progress of the students at the community college and subsequent transfer to another institution. It would be interesting to discover how many students reach their academic goals, and if they academic goals changed over time.

Adjunct and Part-Time Faculty

Future studies can examine the engagement levels of Hispanic students enrolled in courses taught by adjunct and part-time faculty. Because adjunct and part-time faculty may teach at other schools or work with other companies, they may not be as engaged with the college as a full-time faculty member. Students may also have less access to visiting their faculty before or after class due to the adjunct and part-time faculty's schedule or lack of office space.

Use of Computer Technology

Future studies can examine the influence of online resources. With the availability of email and social networking sites such as MySpace and Facebook, students can have more access to their instructors and other students outside of the classroom. It would be interesting to see the results of a study focused on these other forms of communications.

Online Students

This study was administered in the traditional classroom setting. Therefore, students who are enrolled online but do not take classes on campus were excluded from this study. It would be interesting to examine the levels of engagement for online students. Online enrollment continues to increase for a variety of reasons. For-profit colleges benefit from the online delivery of education. Community colleges will be able to use these findings to improve teaching and student support services.

Day and Evening Students

Future studies can examine the engagement levels of day and evening students. This would be extremely useful in understanding the success of evening students because evening students' time is primarily dedicated in the classroom. They arrive at school

immediately after work or after providing care for their family. Also, many of the student support services available to them may already be closed once they arrive.

Regression Analysis

Regression analysis will provide additional insight on the engagement levels of students who belong to more than one of the breakout variables. The use of regression analysis will allow future studies to identify the influences of multiple factors (e.g. part-time enrollment and first-generation status) on student engagement. Researchers will also have the ability to predict how certain variables influence engagement levels.

Chapter Summary

This study provides insight on the engagement levels of entering and returning Hispanic students. The findings presented in this study demonstrate that returning Hispanic students were more positively engaged than entering Hispanic students. In addition, entering Hispanic students were more likely to be engaged if they belonged to one of the breakout variables: enrolled full-time, nontraditional age, enrolled in developmental reading, enrolled in development writing.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2007). *Trends and statistics*. Retrieved October 1, 2007, from <http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/research/index.htm>
- Antonio, A.L. (2004). The influence of friendship groups on intellectual self-confidence and educational aspirations in college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(4), 446-471.
- Astin, A. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education*, 79(4).
- Astin, A.W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Astin, A.W. (1997). How “good” is your institution’s retention rate? *Research in Higher Education*, 38(6), 647-658.
- Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T., & Levey, T. New evidence on college remediation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 886-924.
- Bailey, T.R., & Alfonso, M. (2005). Paths to persistence: An analysis of research and program effectiveness at community colleges. *Lumina Foundation for Education*, 6(1), 1-38.
- Baum, S., & Payea, K. (2005). *Education Pays 2004: The Benefits of Higher Education for Individuals and Society*. College Board.
- Bean, J.P., & Metzner, B.S. (1985). A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 485-540.
- Bensimon, E.M. (2005). Closing the achievement gap in higher education: An organizational learning perspective. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 131, 99-111.

- Berger, J.B., & Braxton, J.M. (1998). Revising Tinto's interactionist theory of student departure through theory elaboration: Examining the role of organizational attributes in the persistence process. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(2), 103-119.
- Borglum, K., & Kubala, T. (2000). Academic and social integration of community college students: A case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*, 567-576.
- Boylan, H. (1999). Exploring alternatives to remediation. *Journal of Developmental Education, 22*(3).
- Cabrera, A.F., Castaneda, M.B., Nora, A., & Hengstler, D. (1992). The convergence between two theories of college persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*(2), 143-164.
- Chaves, C. (2006). Involvement, development, and retention. Theoretical foundations and potential extensions for adult community college students. *Community College Review, 34*(2), 139-152.
- Carini, R., Hayek, J., Kuh, G., Kennedy, J., Ouimet, J. (2003). College student responses to web and paper surveys: Does mode matter. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(1), 1-19.
- Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39*(7), 3-7.
- Cofer, J., & Somers, P. (2000). Within-year persistence of students at two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*(10), 785-807.

- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). (2008). *Essential elements of engagement: High expectations high support*. Austin, TX.
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). (2007). Overview.
Retrieved November, 1, 2007, from,
<http://www.ccsse.org/aboutccsse/aboutccsse.cfm>
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). (2006). *Act on fact: Using data to improve student success*. Austin, TX.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crews, D.M., & Aragon, S.R. (2007). Developmental education writing: Persistence and goal attainment among community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 673-652.
- Cruce, T. M., Wolniak, G. C., Seifert, T. A., & Pascarella, E. T. (2006). Impacts of good practices on cognitive development, learning orientations, and graduate degree plans during the first year of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(4), 365–382.
- Davies, T.G., Safarik, L., & Banning, J.H. (2003). The deficit portrayal of underrepresented populations on community college campuses: A cross cases analysis. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 843-858.
- Dimaria, F. (2006). Keeping our engaged, at-risk kids in college. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 72(2), 52-57.

- Dowd, A.C. (2003). From access to outcome equity: Revitalizing the democratic mission of the community college. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 586, 92-119.
- Dwyer, C.A., Millett, C.M., & Payne, D.G. (2006). A culture of evidence: Postsecondary assessment and learning outcomes. ETS.
- Gansemer-Topf, A.M., & Schuh, J.H. (2006). Institutional selectivity and institutional expenditures: Examining organizational factors that contribute to retention and graduation. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(6), 613-641.
- Greene, T., Marti, C., & McClenney, K. (2008). The effort-outcome gap: Differences for african american and Hispanic community college students in student engagement and academic achievement. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 531-539.
- Grimes, S.K. (1997). Underprepared community college students: Characteristics, persistence, and academic success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 21, 47-56.
- Grimes, S.K., & Antworth, T. (1996). Community college withdrawal decisions: Student characteristics and subsequent reenrollment patterns. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 20, 345-361.
- Handelsman, M., Biggs, W., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A measure of college student course engagement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 98(3), 184-191.
- Harris, B.W. (1998). Looking inward: Building a culture for student success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(4), 401-418.

- Herzog, S. (2005). Measuring determinants of student return vs. dropout/stopout vs. transfer: A first-to-second year analysis of new freshmen. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(8), 883-928.
- Hoyt, J.E., & Winn, B.A. (2004). Understanding retention and college student bodies: Differences between drop-outs, stop-outs, opt-outs, and transfer-outs. *NASPA, 41*(3), 395-417.
- Ishitani, T.T. (2006). Studying attrition and degree completion behavior among first-generation college students in the United States. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5), 861-885.
- Jalomo, R. (2001). Institutional policies that promote persistence among first-year community college students. In B.K. Townsend and S.B. Twombly (Eds.), *Community colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 261-281). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Jenkins, D. (2007). Institutional effectiveness and student success: A study of high-and-low-impact community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 31*, 945-962.
- Kolkatic, M., & Kuh, G.D. (2001). A longitudinal assessment of college student engagement in good practices in undergraduate education. *Higher Education, 42*(3), 351-371.
- Kohler, A.D., & Lizarin, M. (2007). Hispanic education in the United States. *NCLR Statistical Brief, 8*.
- Kuh, G.D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement. Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 141*, 5-20.

- Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE. *Change*, 35(2), 24–32.
- Kuh, G.D. (2008). Why integration and engagement are essential to effective educational practice in the twenty-first century. *Peer Review*, 27-28.
- Kuh, G.D., Pace, C.R., & Vesper, N. (1997). The development of process indicators to estimate student gains associated with good practices in undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(4), 435-454.
- Lardner, E., & Malnarich, G. (2008). A new era in learning-community work: Why the pedagogy of intentional integration matters. *Change*, 50(4), 30-37.
- Lee, V.E., & Frank K.A. (1990). Students' characteristics that facilitate the transfer from two-year to four-year colleges. *Sociology of Education*, 63(3), 18-193.
- Leppel, K. (2002). Similarities and differences in the college persistence of men and women. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(4), 433-450.
- Levitz, R.S., Noel, L., & Richter, B.J. (1999). Strategic moves for retention success. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 108, 31-49.
- Lotkowski, V., Robbins, S.B., & Noeth, R.J. (2004). *The role of academic and non-academic factors in improving college retention: ACT Policy Report*.
- Manning, T.M., & Bostian, B. (2006). Using benchmark and assessment data to facilitate institutional change. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 134, 73-81.
- Marti, C.N. (2008). Latent postsecondary persistence pathways: Educational pathways in american two-year colleges. *Res High Educ*, 49, 317-336.

- Marti, C.N. (2009). Dimensions of student engagement in american community colleges: Using the community college student report in research and practice. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33, 1-24.
- Maxwell, W. (1998). Supplemental instruction, learning communities, and students studying together. *Community College Review*, 26(2), 1-18.
- McClenney, K.M. (2006). Benchmarking effective educational practice. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 134, 47-55.
- McClenney, K.M. (2009). Helping community-college students succeed: A moral imperative. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(33), p. A60. Retrieved April 26, 2009, from <http://chronicle.com/free/v55/i33/33a06001.htm>
- McClenney, K.M. (2004). Redefining quality in community colleges. *Change*, 36(6), 16-21.
- McClenney, K.M., & Greene, T. (2005). A tale of two students: Building a culture of engagement in the community college. *About Campus*, 2-7.
- McGrath, M., & Braunstein, A. (1997, September). The prediction of freshmen attrition: An examination of the importance of certain demographic, academic, financial, and social factors. *College Student Journal*, 31(3), 396. Retrieved September 28, 2007, from MasterFILE Premier database.
- MDRC. (2009). *Combating poverty by growing the proportion of adults with college degrees*. Retrieved April 26, 2009, from http://www.mdrc.org/area_issue_31.html

- Okun, M.A., Ruehlman, L., and Karoly, P. (1991). Application of investment theory to predicting part-time community college student intent and institutional persistence/departure behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(2), 212-220.
- Ouimet, J.A. (2003). Assessment measures: Community college strategies: A glimpse of community & technical college students' perception of student engagement. *Assessment Update*, 15(1), 8-10, 16.
- Opp, R.D. (2002). Enhancing program completion rates among two-year college students of color. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(2), 147-163.
- Pascarella, E.T., Pierson, C.T., Wolniak, G.C., Terenzini, P.T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experience and outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(3), 249-284.
- Pascarella, E.T., Smart, J.C., & Corinna, A.E. (1986). *Long-term persistence of two-year college students. Research in Higher Education*, 24(1), 47-71.
- Pascarella, E.T., Wolniak, G.C., & Pierson, C.T. (2003). Influences on community college students' educational plans. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 301-314.
- Pike, G.R., & Kuh, G.D. (2005). First-and second-generation college students: A comparison of their engagement and intellectual development. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(3), 276-300.
- Reason, R.D., Terenzini, P.T., & Domingo, R.J. (2006). First things first: Developing academic competence in the first year of college. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(2), 149-175.

- Roueche, J.E., & Baker III, G.A. (1987). *Access and excellence: The open-door college*. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.
- Roueche, J.E., & Hurlburt, A.S. (1968). The open-door college: The problem of the low achiever. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 39(8), 453-456.
- Roueche, J.E., Roueche, S.D., & Ely, E. (2001). *In pursuit of excellence: The Community College of Denver*. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.
- Roueche, J.E., Johnson, L.F., & Roueche, S.D. (1997). *Embracing the tiger: The effectiveness debate in the community college*. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.
- Ryken, A.E. (2006). Multiple choices, multiple chances: Fostering re-entry pathways for first generation college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 593-607.
- Santiago, D.A. (2007). VOCES: A profile of today's latino college students. *Excelencia in Education*, 1-12.
- Schmidt, M., Marks, J., & Derrico, L. (2004). What a difference mentoring makes: service learning and engagement for college students. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 12(2), 205-217.
- Schuetz, P. (2005, Spring). UCLA community college review: Campus environment: A missing link in studies of community college attrition. *Community College Review*, 32(4). Retrieved September 28, 2007, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Schuetz, P. (2008). Developing a theory-driven model of community college student engagement. *New Direction for Community Colleges*, 144, 17-28.

- Schreiber, J.B., & Shinn, D. (2003). Epistemological beliefs of community college students and their learning processes. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 699-709.
- 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, 75-100.
- Spady, W.G. (1970). Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. *Interchange*, 1, 109-121.
- Strauss, L.C., & Vokwein, J.F. (2004). Predictors of student commitment at two-year and four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2), 203-227.
- Stoval, M. (2000). Using success courses for promoting persistence and completion. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 112, 45-54.
- Summers, M. (2003, Spring). *ERIC review: Attrition research at community colleges. Community College Review*, 30(4), 64. Retrieved September 28, 2007, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) (2007a). About. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from, <http://www.ccsse.org/sense/aboutSENSE/index.cfm>
- Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) (2007b). Sense Colleges. Retrieved October 14, 2007, from, <http://www.ccsse.org/sense/aboutSENSE/colleges.cfm>
- Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) (2007c). Research Proposal.
- Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). (2007d). *About the survey*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from, <http://www.ccsse.org/sense/aboutsurvey/index.cfm>

- Tinto, V. (2003, November). *Promoting student retention through classroom practice*. Paper presented at the International Conference of the European Access Network and the Institute for Access Studies at Staffordshire University, Amsterdam.
- Tinto, V. (2002, June). *Establishing conditions for student success*. Paper presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the European Access Network at Monash University, Italy.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student Persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(6), 599-623.
- Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure: Reflections of the longitudinal character of student leaving. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(4), 438-455.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V., & Goodsell-Love, A. (1993). Building community. *Liberal Education*, 79(4), 16-22.
- Tinto, V., & Russo, P. (1994). Coordinated studies programs: Their effect on student involvement at a community college. *Community College Review*, 22(2), 16-26.
- U.S. Census Bureau, *Hispanics in the United States*. Retrieved on March 8, 2009, from http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic/files/Internet_Hispanic_in_US_2006.pdf
- Vaughan, G.B. (2006). *The community college story* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.
- Voorhees, R.A. (1987). Toward building models of community college persistence: A logit analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 26(2), 115-129.

- Voorhees, R.A., & Zhou, D. (2000). Intentions and goals at the community college:
Associating student perceptions and demographics. *Community College Journal
of Research and Practice*, 24, 219-232.
- Wild, L., & Ebbers, L. (2002). Rethinking student retention in community colleges.
Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26, 503-519.

Vita

Gerald F. Napoles was born in the Philippines. The Napoles family moved to Dallas, TX in the early 1980's because of job opportunities and educational opportunities. Gerald attended schools in the Dallas Independent School District and the Richardson Independent School District. He attended Richland College of the Dallas County Community College District for one year. He then transferred and earned his bachelor's degree in sociology from Sam Houston State University. He returned to Dallas and worked at Eastfield College of the Dallas County Community College District.

During this time, he realized the need to pursue a graduate education. He enrolled in the gerontology program at the University of North Texas where he earned his master's degree in gerontology. He was offered and accepted an assistant director – visiting scholar position with Richland College. While at Richland College, Gerald participated in many community programs He volunteered with the Greater Dallas Asian American Chamber of Commerce, the Organization of Chinese Americans – DFW Chapter, and the Multi-ethnic and Educational Development Center. He is a graduate of the Leadership Tomorrow Program sponsored by the Greater Dallas Asian American Chamber of Commerce and a graduate of the Leadership Richardson Program sponsored by the Richardson Chamber of Commerce.

He pursued his doctoral studies at The University of Texas at Austin. He graduated with his Ph.D. in educational administration with an emphasis in community college leadership in May 2009. He is committed to the mission of the community college and plans to teach as well as serve in various levels of administration.

Permanent address: 6211 Alpha Road, Dallas, Texas 75240

This dissertation was typed by the author.