

2004

A Study of Factors Influencing Retention Rates at Wright State University: Differences in the Reported Degree of Importance and Satisfaction Rates of Caucasian and African-American Students in University College (UVC) Classes

Claudia Valentina Espinoza
Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Espinoza, Claudia Valentina, "A Study of Factors Influencing Retention Rates at Wright State University: Differences in the Reported Degree of Importance and Satisfaction Rates of Caucasian and African-American Students in University College (UVC) Classes" (2004). *Browse all Theses and Dissertations*. 15.

https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all/15

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Browse all Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

*A Study of Factors Influencing Retention Rates at Wright State University:
Differences in the Reported Degree of Importance and Satisfaction Rates
of Caucasian and African American Students in UVC Classes.*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

By

Claudia V. Espinoza
B.A., Universidad de Concepción, Chile, 1992

2004
Wright State University
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education and Human Services
Dayton, Ohio

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

December 16, 2004

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY Claudia V. Espinoza ENTITLED A Study of Factors Influencing Retention Rates at Wright State University: Differences in the Reported Degrees of Importance and Satisfaction Rates of Caucasian and African American Students in UVC Classes BE OF THE REQUIREMENT ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Master of Arts.

June Ovington, Ph.D.
Chair Educational Leadership Department

Committee on
Final Examination

Charles W. Ryan, Ph.D.
Chair Thesis Committee

Dan Abrahamowicz, Ph.D.

Glenn Graham, Ed.D.

Joanne Risacher, Ph.D.

Joseph F. Thomas, Jr., Ph.D.
Dean, School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

Espinoza, Claudia Valentina. M.A., Department of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, 2004. A Study of Factors Influencing Retention Rates at Wright State University: Differences in the Reported Degrees of Importance and Satisfaction Rates of Caucasian and African American Students in UVC Classes.

This study examined the importance first year students enrolled in UVC classes at Wright State University assigned to factors considered by scholars to influence student retention. Espinoza expected to find significant differences in the importance that African American and Caucasian students assign to those factors, as well as to identify potential attrition rate in the two groups. The analysis of the data confirmed that the two groups assign different degrees of importance to certain factors, and consistent with research literature, the potential attrition rate for African American students (10.03%) was slightly higher than that for Caucasian students (9.8%).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Abstract</u>	iii
<u>List of Tables</u>	vii
<u>Acknowledgements</u>	viii
<u>Dedication</u>	ix
<u>Preface</u>	x
Chapter I INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
<u>General Background</u>	1
<u>Significance of the Study</u>	1
<u>Statement of the Problem</u>	2
<u>Independent and Dependent Variables</u>	3
<u>Definition of Terms</u>	4
<u>Research Questions</u>	5
<u>Assumptions</u>	6
<u>Scope and Limitations</u>	6
<u>Summary</u>	7
Chapter II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
<u>Key points in Student Retention History</u>	8
<u>Theories of Student Retention</u>	10
<u>Minority Student Retention</u>	13

<u>Efforts to Curb Student Attrition</u>	14
<u>Summary</u>	15
Chapter III METHODS AND DESIGN	16
<u>Target Population</u>	16
<u>Sample</u>	16
<u>Instrument</u>	17
<u>Data Collection</u>	17
<u>Data Analysis</u>	18
<u>Summary</u>	18
Chapter IV <u>RESULTS</u>	19
<u>Institutional Demographics</u>	19
<u>Diversity</u>	20
<u>Research Question 1</u>	20
<u>Research Question 2</u>	21
<u>Research Question 3</u>	22
<u>Summary</u>	31
Chapter V SUMMARY, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS ..	32
<u>Introduction</u>	32
<u>Conclusions</u>	32
<u>Limitations</u>	33
<u>Recommendations</u>	33
<u>Summary</u>	34
<u>Appendices</u>	36

A. <u>Student Retention Survey</u>	36
B. <u>Survey Cover Letter</u>	38
C. <u>Frequency Distribution – Race subgroups</u>	39
D. <u>Frequency Distribution – Race/gender subgroups</u>	40
E. <u>Chi Square Printouts – Importance</u>	41
F. <u>Chi Square Printouts – Satisfaction</u>	64
<u>References</u>	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. <u>Summary of Significant Differences in Importance</u>	
<u>Assigned to Factors by African American and Caucasian Students</u>	27
2. <u>Summary of Significant Differences in Levels of Satisfaction</u>	
<u>Assigned to Factors by African American and Caucasian Students</u>	30
3. <u>Probabilities Indicating Differences in the Responses</u>	
<u>of African American and Caucasian Students</u>	31

Appendices

<u>Frequency Distribution – Race subgroups</u>	39
<u>Frequency Distribution – Race/Gender subgroups</u>	40

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A sincere thanks to all those who assisted and supported me with this project:

- My thesis committee, for their expert input throughout the development of this project as well as their encouragement throughout the program.
- UVC 101 and SM 198 instructors, for allowing me to request their students' participation during class time.
- UVC 101 and SM 198 students, for their willingness to participate in this study.
- My husband, for his love, encouragement, patience, support, and assistance.

The hours invested in this project would have been worthless without your help.

DEDICATION

Through the years, my life has been shaped by one and many.

Mother, Father, Grandmother, Sisters, friends, childhood teachers, and my beloved husband have all contributed to making my life an endless journey of self-discovery and fulfillment. However, none has been more influential in my love of learning, perseverance, and determination than he who unselfishly devoted years of his life to raising me and my sisters, and who taught me to always believe in myself and develop my full potential as a creature of God: My Grandfather Miguel, the beacon of my life.

PREFACE

Student retention, especially African American student retention, as an on-going issue in institutions of higher education was the focus of this study. Chapter one presents a brief description of the problem including the significance of the study; the independent and dependent variables; a definition of terms as used in this study; assumptions the researcher made; and an abbreviated description of the scope and limitations of the findings. The three research questions that determined the collection of data are also included. Chapter two summarizes landmark models of college student retention; initiatives undertaken in colleges and universities throughout the United States to curb African American student attrition rates; and general literature dealing with African American student retention. Chapter three reviews the methods and design of the study, including a description of the instrument and how the data were collected and analyzed. In chapter four, the three research questions are answered following a thorough analysis of the data. Finally, chapter five summarizes the study, and offers conclusions and recommendations for future practice within the student affairs division.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

General Background

*“The success of an institution and the success of its students
are inseparable” (Levitz and Noel, 2000)*

For the past fifteen years colleges and universities nationwide have reviewed their recruitment tactics in order to attract and enroll African American students in larger numbers (Eimers, and Pike, 1997). That success, however, as evidenced by figures provided by U.S. Department of Education (2003), has not been reflected in retention rates.

Within the context of higher education as a right not a privilege, and in an America where minority populations grow at accelerated rates (U.S. Department of Education, 2003), institutions of higher education nation-wide have implemented recruiting strategies aimed at attracting and enrolling a more diverse student body. Institutional figures reported to the U.S. Department of Education, or to State Boards of Education, indicated that although African American students are enrolling at record numbers they are ‘dropping out’ at larger numbers than their Caucasian counterparts (Eimers & Pike, 1997).

Significance of the study

Several researchers and scholars have asserted that African American students

face a number of unique challenges that often hinder their possibility of completing their college studies (Lee, 1999; Bourne-Bowie, 2000; Education Access Report, 2004). The findings of this study demonstrated that standard approaches to dealing with attrition rates may be effective for only part of the student body, and that due to intrinsic cultural differences “equal” is not always fair. Student attrition is an ongoing problem that affects the institution, the student that is not persisting, and the community at large. The findings of this study will provide officials at this four-year public institution with important information that can be used to effect needed changes before at-risk students make the decision to drop out of college. For example, University College could redefine their retention initiatives to better serve at-risk students. In addition, the Division of Student Affairs could use the findings and determine whether to rethink and/or redefine some existing programs in their different departments or implement new ones in order to accommodate specific target populations.

Statement of the Problem

According to data published by the Division of Institutional Research at Wright State University, between 1995 and 2001, the mean retention rate for African American students returning after their freshman year was 68.8 percent (Student Fact Book 2003) as compared to 71 percent for Caucasian students. Although this figure is higher than the mean retention rate (60%) of other four-year public institutions in the state of Ohio (Ohio board of Regents, 2003), and the retention rates for African American students for the period 2003-2004 improved in 1.8%, for WSU officials retention of minority students continues to be an ongoing issue that requires special attention. However, in spite of the different strategies the institution has undertaken- from financial aid to intrusive

advising- to assist students succeed in college, retention rates for direct from high school African American students (70.6%) continue to be lower than that for Caucasian students(71.9). (Fraker, December 2, 2004, Personal communication).

This study had two main purposes. First, to identify which of a number of factors associated with student retention could hinder first year African American and Caucasian students enrolled in freshman seminars at WSU from returning the next quarter and/or year. Second, to determine if African American and Caucasian students reported significantly different degrees of importance and/or satisfaction to factors associated with student retention (affective, emotional, academic support, institutional characteristics).

Independent and Dependent Variables

Due to time constraints and in order to obtain a meaningful number of respondents from both groups– African American and Caucasian students- the design of this study was a purposeful sampling.

The dependant variables in this study were degree of importance, satisfaction rate, and retention rate of African American and Caucasian students attending a freshman seminar at this institution during the Fall Quarter 2004.

The independent variables were:

- Sense of self-efficacy (self-esteem, assertiveness)
- Support (support from family and friends)
- Institutional characteristics (institutional mission, institutional size, campus safety, campus environment, housing, one-stop service, student body characteristics)
- Academics (class offerings, class size)

- Support services (mentors, advisor availability)
- Financial constraints (financial support/aid)
- Involvement (Student/faculty interaction in class, availability of faculty outside the classroom, approachable faculty, peer group relationship)
- Student activities (co-curricular activities within area of interest, co-curricular activities they can fit in their schedule)
- Ethnicity of faculty.

In addition, for reference purposes, the students provided demographic information regarding their parents education, their place of residence, their marital status, age group, employment, high school G.P.A., and area where they grew up.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the terms below are understood as herewith stated:

- *Attrition rate*: percentage of students that do not return to the institution of higher education after their first year.
- *Retention rate*: percentage of students that return to the institution of higher education after their freshman year.
- *Perception of self-efficacy*: student's belief that he/she has the capabilities required to succeed in college as indicated by their self-reported degree of satisfaction with their self-esteem and assertiveness.
- *Familial support*: (1) parents, legal guardians, or relatives encourage the student to attend and graduate from college; (2) parent(s), attended college as reported by the student.

- Peer support: friends understand and respect the student's decision to attend college as reported by the student.
- Involvement: the student participates of campus activities, has a support group among classmates, talks to professors/instructors inside and outside the classroom. The student's involvement is evidenced in his/her responses to various questions in the survey.
- One-stop service: students' questions, concerns, and/or needs are answered quickly and without being referred from office to office.
- Synthetic model: Combination of elements from the models of student retention presented by Spady (1970), Tinto (1975), Pascarella (1980), Bean (1981), and Fishbein & Ajzen (1975), according to Pascarella (1982). The purpose of this model is to identify a student's probability of dropping out and some of the reasons why. This model identifies four types of variables: background, organizational, environmental, and attitudinal variables. Variables can be selected to suit a particular institution's needs (Pascarella, 1982).
- Freshman seminar: interactive class intended to assist students in their transition from high school. The students, instructor, and guest speakers discuss issues related to student life, academic success, academic requirements and information, support services, as well as career development.

Research Questions

Variables considered in the models of student attrition developed by Bean (1970), Tinto (1975), Fishbein & Ajzen (1975), and Pascarella (1980), and summarized in Bean's (1982) Synthetic Model (in Pascarella, 1982) provided the framework for this study. The

selection of the variables considered to answer the following three research questions was determined by institutional characteristics.

Research question 1 – What factors do first-year students (direct from high school African American and Caucasian) enrolled in freshman seminars identify as very important or important for their success as students at Wright State University?

Research question 2 – What is the level of satisfaction that first-year students (direct from high school African American and Caucasian) enrolled in a freshman seminar report regarding the factors that influence student retention after eight weeks attending Wright State University?

Research question 3 – What differences are there between African American and Caucasian students in their self-reported rating of importance and satisfaction of the factors under study?

Assumptions

The analysis of the data was based on the following assumptions:

1. Surveyed students followed the directions of the instrument.
2. Surveyed students answered truthfully to the questions in the survey.
3. It is assumed that those students who participated in the study are similar to students who did not participate.

Scope and Limitations

The study was limited to selected first-year African American and Caucasian students attending a four-year public university in south west Ohio. Only students enrolled in a freshman seminar were invited to participate. Also, the tendencies of each group may be affected by the predominance of one gender over the other in one or both

groups. Thus, the results cannot be generalized to all direct from high school freshman students attending a four-year public university, nor to all minority student populations. Furthermore, since freshman seminars are one of the many strategies implemented by the institution to improve student success, the findings cannot be generalized to all first-year students attending this institution.

The investigator also used Chi Square to look for trends using gender/race subgroups. Although the analysis is not included in this report, data are available upon request (cer2000@emal.com).

Summary

Ever since students from minority groups began to attend predominantly white colleges and universities retention strategies had to be implemented. This chapter presented the problem and introduced this study developed to identify potential dropout rate as well as to discover differences between African American and Caucasian students that could assist student affairs professionals develop more effective programs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Key points in Student Retention History

As early as 1776, the signers of the U.S. Declaration of Independence talked about the equality of men and their rights, however, decades would go by before Blacks were granted the same educational rights as their Caucasian counterparts. Since that day in 1956 when James Meredith, the first African American to enroll at the University of Mississippi, was escorted to school on his first day of class by U.S. Marshals (www.infoplease.com) huge strides have been made.

Throughout history, the U.S. government has intervened several times with the purpose of further opening access to higher education for underrepresented populations. Examples are the Morrill Act of 1862, that granted land for the establishment of colleges in rural areas; the Morrill Act II (1890), which specified that states using land-grant funds either had to make their schools open to both African Americans and Caucasians or allocate money for segregated schools that Blacks could attend. In addition, bills like the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Higher Education Act of 1965 expanded the role the government in higher education by offering new financial aid and academic support programs (Sweil, 2003; College View, 2004).

A controversial initiative first introduced in 1961 by President John F. Kennedy, to remove racial bias of employment practices funded by federal funds is Affirmative

Action. Later expanded by President Lyndon B. Johnson to include African Americans and other racial minorities in opportunities such as school admissions, scholarships, and financial aid (Swail, 2003), “Affirmative Action” has been surrounded by controversy since the beginning. Although there has been no consensus regarding what strategies colleges and universities were to use to diversify the student body institutions nationwide have redefined their recruitment programs in order to attract and matriculate students from minority populations, specifically African Americans (Amos, 2002). When President George W. Bush denounced overtly race-conscious practices such as the ones followed at the University of Michigan at the time under scrutiny, educational traditionalists praised his words (Iannone, 2002-2003). However, shortly thereafter, Supreme Court rulings such as *Grutter v. Bollinger*, and *Gratz v. Bollinger* allowed selective institutions to use Affirmative Action plans provided admissions officers review applicants’ characteristics and academic records individually (Sweil, 2003).

Year after year, strides continue to be made towards embracing ‘diversity’ on campuses nation-wide, and although much has been accomplished, and institutions of higher education are welcoming African American students in record numbers, completion rates for African American students continue to lag behind when compared to those of their Caucasian counterparts (Eimers & Pike, 1997; Evelyn, 2000; Swail, 2003). Degree attainment rates of one African American student for every two or three Caucasian students illustrate that fact (Swail, 2003). This issue becomes particularly important in states where racial-ethnic minorities grow rapidly (Anderson, 2003), and particularly in states like California, Florida, and Texas where minority groups are becoming a majority (Swail, 2003).

Corrigan (2003) asserted that more than fifteen million students from different backgrounds enrolled in institutions of higher education and that demographic projections predict an increase for the coming years. According to the U.S. Department of Education, by 2015 there will be a 1.6 million increase in college enrollment, 80 percent of those students are expected to be non-White (in Roach, 2001). With the projected changes in the national and campus demographics, the present perceived inability to retain minority students, particularly African American males, poses new challenges upon institutional officials (Anderson, 2003).

Post-secondary institutions have faced the issue of student retention for the past 100 years with mean graduation rates of fifty percent. Presently, in order to curb student attrition, Academic Departments and Divisions of Student Affairs on campuses around the country are constantly reviewing their policies and programs. From freshman seminars, intended to assist students through their transition from high school, to intrusive advising, implemented to provide at-risk students with a 'last chance', efforts are as varied as the populations institutions seek to serve. If student success concerns so many parties, student service personnel, faculty, parents and students, a sound plan should include a discussion of what seem to be the roadblocks to graduation (Evelyn, 2000).

Theories of Student Retention

Theories and models of student retention/attrition abound. The sociologists Spady (1970), and Tinto (1975) presented models that have been widely used and built upon (in Bean & Eaton, 2000). Fishbein & Ajzen (1975), Bandurra (1986, 1998), and Weiner (1986) have offered psychological theories to explain student attrition (in Bean & Eaton,

2000). Attinasi (1992, 1999), and Tierney (1992) have proposed discourse analysis models to generate college departure theories (in Johnson, Jr., 2000; Stage & Hossler, 2000). To provide a framework for this study, five leading models were briefly reviewed:

Spady - Model of Student Retention (1970)

Adapting elements of Durkheim's (1961) theory of suicide, Spady (1970) developed the first theoretical model of student departure. His model explained how shared values, grade performance, normative congruence, and friendship support lead to social integration, which in turn was expected to promote satisfaction that translated into institutional commitment, thus, reducing the likelihood of a student from dropping out (Bean, in Pascarella, 1982).

Tinto - Students Integration Model (1975)

Adapting Spady's model, Tinto, in an attempt to clarify the effects of multifaceted interactions within the system on student persistence, proposed a model which comprised six dimensions: background characteristics; goals and commitments derived from those characteristics; institutional experiences; integration; goal commitment; and outcome (Tinto, 1993a; Pascarella, 1982; ASHE-ERIC, 2003). Tinto's integration model restated that students' persistence results from the students' interaction with characteristics of the campus environment (in ASHE-ERIC, 2003).

Pascarella - Student-Faculty Informal Contact Model (1980)

In his model, Pascarella (1980) stressed the importance of informal student/faculty interaction in student decisions to stay in an institution. The interaction of background characteristics, and institutional characteristics is expected to lead to informal contact with faculty members, and to promote other college experiences such as

peer culture, co-curricular activities, and academics, thus influencing educational outcomes and persistence (Bean, in Pascarella, 2003).

Bean and Eaton's Psychological Model (2000)

Many researchers have revised and enhanced Tinto's model. Bean and Eaton (2000) used elements of Tinto's academic and social integration theory to develop a psychological model of student persistence. Their model incorporated elements such as students' past behavior, personality, initial self-efficacy, initial attributions, normative beliefs, coping strategies, motivation to attend, and skills and abilities (ASHE-ERIC, 2003).

Although theorists have analyzed and averted shortcomings in these and many other theories, all have contributed with valuable elements that may be utilized to create a model applicable to institutional and student body characteristics (Bean, in Pascarella, 1982).

Bean - The Synthetic Model (1981)

The purpose of Bean's model is not to explain the dynamics of student attrition across institutions but to help an institution identify potential dropouts and the reasons that could lead to that outcome. Institutions can then use the information to affect changes needed to promote student persistence. The model organizes elements associated with student attrition into four groups: background variables, organizational variables, environmental variables, and attitudinal and outcome variables.

The selection of the variables can be selected based on what an institution needs to know to understand dropout patterns within a group of students (Bean, in Pascarella, 1982).

Minority Student Retention

Studies on minority student retention abound, and findings indicate that academic success and persistence of students of African-heritage rely heavily on factors such as social interaction and social adjustment to campus, socio-economic background, and academic preparedness (Bourne-Bowie, 2000). At a glance, those factors would seem to coincide with those affecting non-minority students, but if so, why are retention strategies not yielding similar results for minority and no-minority students? As Bourne-Bowie suggested (2000), part of the answer may lie on the fact that the student development models that guide student affairs professionals were developed at a time when African American students did not attend predominantly White institutions (Bourne-Bowie, 2000).

Efforts undertaken over the last few decades by professionals to implement generalized techniques and strategies to retain students often overlook specific needs of students of color. Factors such as upbringing, and centuries of history contribute to making Black students and White students lives and outlook on life undeniably different (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). In addition, studies demonstrate that many African American students are first generation college students. Thus, they have few positive role-models regarding college (Bourne-Bowie, 2000). Heath (in Lee, 1999) asserted that African American students at predominantly White universities are prone to experience a clash between their culture and that of the institution, thus making it harder for them to cope with all other transition issues, and that the presence of Black faculty may provide positive role-models to Black students. Accordingly, issues that may contribute to Black student attrition rates may not be an issue for White students. Presently, institutions are

presenting underrepresented students with a myriad of programs and activities aimed at assisting students from minority groups persist in college (Swail, 2003). Due to the myriad of factors considered to influence minority, as well as non-minority student retention, a joined effort between student affairs professionals and academic affairs could result in new, more culturally-inclusive student-learning and student-development models (Bourne-Bowie, 2000).

Efforts to Curb Student Attrition

Efforts to curb student attrition are many. Institutions across the nation are permanently striving to develop and implement programs to assist in easing their students' road to success (Sweil, 2003). Some successful initiatives exercised at different institutions nation-wide may provide ideas for practice.

North Carolina State University – University Transition Program

This long running program (10 years) evolved from affirmative action efforts. From a pool of candidates that have been rejected by one or more university colleges, and who are near the floor criteria for admissions, are granted conditional admission through the University Transition Program (UTP). The program is predominantly for African American students but it also includes Native American students. UTP offers an array of special courses and counseling services tailored to assist the students in the program through their first year in college (Lee, 1999).

Student Success Program – Saint Xavier University

Counselors, advisors, and academic instructors team up to offer students enrolled in their SSP program with advising, counseling (academic, career planning, and personal), freshman orientation, advocacy, peer mentoring cultural programming, and service learning.

Freshman Seminar - Wright State University

With over 10 years of success, freshman seminars offer direct from high school, first-year students with a quarter-long course designed to inform students about college life, to help them with studying techniques, and guide them through institutional rules and regulations.

HAWK – University of Kansas

This program was awarded the Noel-Levitz Retention Excellence Award in 2000. Launched in 1998 the program employs a combination of orientation, mentoring and tutoring programs, along with sessions that provide the students with information regarding career counseling, financial aid, and academic advising (Fields, 2002).

Summary

Literature on student attrition is abundant and provides a wealth of information as to what is being done and what remains to be done to assist students, particularly African American students, on their effort to attain a college degree. While models may assist institutional officials to understand, in part, the behavior of student attrition, student and institutional characteristics may provide a better framework to identify problem areas that could potentially lead to student attrition.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND DESIGN

Target Population

The purpose of this study was to determine potential student drop-out rate among direct from high school first-year African American and Caucasian students enrolled in a freshman seminar at Wright State University; and to detect differences in their self-reported degrees of importance and satisfaction with a number of factors listed in student retention models. The sample consisted of 363 first-year students enrolled in 18 different sections of the freshman seminar. Fifteen surveys could not be used. Of the remaining 348, 121 (34.7%) were completed by African American students (87 [71%] females, and 34 [28.09%] males), and 227 (65.2%) by Caucasian students (137 [60.3%] females, and 90 [39.6%] males). Sixty four percent of the respondents were females, and 36% were males.

Sample

In order to determine particular characteristics of the African American, and Caucasian students subgroups as well as to facilitate a comparison among the groups, a stratified purposeful sampling procedure was used. Paton (in Fridah, 2004), defined a purposeful sampling procedure as that which allowed researchers to employ samples that would yield the most insightful data to answer the research questions.

Instrument

The design of the survey instrument used the gap analysis format of the Noel-Levitz 'Student Satisfaction Survey' (Low, 2000) and the questions were selected from elements presented in Bean's (in Pascarella, 1982) Synthetic Model. It consisted of two sections. Section I required the students to answer ten demographic questions. The students' ethnicity, was used to create the subgroups whereas nine other questions were asked for general reference (sex, age group, parents education attainment, place of residence, marital status, involvement in student groups, place where they grew up, how they are paying for their education, and their high school G.P.A.). Section II listed 23 factors included in the Synthetic Model proposed by Bean (in Pascarella, 1982), and compiled from the works presented by theorists such as Spady (1970), Tinto (1975, 1981), Pascarella (1980), Bean (1983) as important for student retention (in Pascarella, 1982). Using a 5-point Likert scale (1- not important at all; 2- not very important; 3- neutral; 4- important; 5- very important), the students were asked to indicate the importance they assigned to those factors in their success as college students. Then, the students had to select their level of satisfaction (1- not satisfied at all; 2- not very satisfied; 3- neutral; 4- satisfied; 5- very satisfied) with the factors at that particular point in time. Prior to being administered, the researcher asked ten students to answer the survey to test it for face validity.

Data Collection

During the eighth week of the Fall Quarter 2004 the investigator distributed the survey instrument to freshman seminar instructors, and asked them to invite the students in their classes to participate in the study. Additionally, the investigator attended eight

freshman seminar classes, and personally invited those students to participate. In both cases, the invitation was issued during the last 10 minutes of the session so that those students who chose not to participate could leave. The instructors' cooperation, and students' participation were voluntary.

Data Analysis

The data collected were summarized in one tally sheet that recorded the students' responses under two subgroups: African American students, and Caucasian students. For the purpose of using "Chi Square", the frequencies obtained for 'not important at all', 'not very important', and 'neutral' were grouped under a new column labeled 'unimportant'. As for satisfaction, the responses for 'not satisfied at all', and 'not very satisfied' were recorded in a 'not satisfied' column.

Summary of Method and Design

A total of 18 freshman seminar sections, four of which were exclusively for African American students, were invited to participate in the study. The data sets obtained from 363 surveys were regrouped and analyzed using Chi Square tests from the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) on the WSU main frame in November, 2004. The printouts obtained were reviewed for trends and implications.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to detect potential dropout rate among first-year direct from high school African American and Caucasian students enrolled in a freshman seminar, and to determine differences between the levels of importance and satisfaction the subgroups African American students and Caucasian students assigned to the factors selected for this study. The results of this study will be thoroughly discussed in this chapter.

Institutional Demographics

The study was conducted at Wright State University. The target population was African American and Caucasian first-year students enrolled in a freshman seminar. The mean undergraduate population for the years 2000–2004 was 15,482 students, and approximately 13.8% (2,148) of those are direct from high school, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen. During the fall quarter of the academic year 2004-2005, of 2,148 freshmen, 1,665 students were enrolled in a freshman seminar (77.5%).

Diversity

Data contained in the WSU Student Fact Book (2003) indicate that the mean percentage for African American students attending the institution was 14% for the period 2000-2003. As for retention rates, 68.8 percent of freshmen returned the second

year during the period 1999-2001. The mean retention rate for African American students for the same period was 67.2 percent.

Research Question 1

What factors do first-year students (African American and Caucasian) enrolled in freshman seminars identify as very important or important for their success as students at Wright State University?

The data collected for this study indicated that of the 23 factors listed in the survey, both, African American (AA) and Caucasian (C) students regard only self-esteem (AA-71.67%, C-52.63%), support from family (AA-76.47%, C-68.72%), financial support/aid (AA-74.59, C-52.4), and class offerings (AA-58.62, C-57.27) as important for their success as students. African American students also placed importance on factors such as campus safety (58.82%), approachable faculty (56.30%), advisor availability (49.57%), and housing (56.41%) (see Appendix C).

A large number of students from both groups reported a neutral position with regards to the importance of assertiveness (AA-43.70%, C-48.67%), support from friends (AA-36.445, C-37.89%), campus environment (AA-44.17%, C-44.69%), and co-curricular activities within their area of interest (AA-36.13%, C-42.54%). Many Caucasian students indicated that the availability(46.22%) and approachability of faculty (49.34%); advisor availability (45.13%); and student faculty interaction (47.14%) are neither important nor unimportant for their success as students.

As for factors believed to bear no importance or little importance on their success, students identified the institutional mission (AA-44.07%, C-61.40%), co-curricular activities students can fit in their schedule (AA-41.53%, C-41.96%), ethnicity of faculty

(AA-48.74%, C-75.33%), one-stop service (AA-38.26%, C-56.25%), and student body characteristics (AA-38.66%, C-46.70%). Caucasian students considered institutional size (55.51%), mentors (58.15%), and housing (38.33%) as unimportant for their success as students. And a high percentage of African American students (42.86%) rated peer group relationship either as not important at all or not very important.

Finally, African American students had mixed opinions as to whether mentors are important (35.29%), unimportant (30.25%), or if they have a neutral (34.45%) position to that respect.

Research Question 2

What is the level of satisfaction that first-year students (direct from high school African American and Caucasian) enrolled in a freshman seminar report regarding the factors of that influence student retention after eight weeks attending Wright State University?

Overall, 56.84% of African American students and 52.67% of Caucasian students indicated being either satisfied or very satisfied with most of the factors listed in the survey instrument. Over 50% of the students from both groups also reported a neutral position regarding institutional mission, and co-curricular activities within their area of interest or that fit their schedule. Also, the majority of Caucasian students (58.67%) had a neutral position with regards to mentors.

In order to determine the potential dropout rate, the investigator used the mean percentage of dissatisfaction for each group. Consistent with national, state, and institutional reports, the mean percentage of dissatisfaction for African American

students was slightly higher (10.03%) than the mean obtained for the group of Caucasian students (9.8). For a more detailed frequency distribution refer to Appendix F

Research Question 3

What differences are there between African American and Caucasian students in their self-reported rating of importance and satisfaction of the factors under study?

Research Hypothesis - $f_R: f_{\text{African American}} \neq f_{\text{Caucasian}}$

Null Hypothesis - $f_o: f_{\text{African American}} = f_{\text{Caucasian}}$

In order to determine statistically significant differences between the groups, the data obtained were compared using “Chi-Square” with level of significance being ≤ 0.05 .

Importance of the Factors for Students’ Success

The research hypothesis was accepted for 19 of the 23 factors included in the study. The statistically significant differences detected between the responses of African American students and Caucasian students were as follows:

- ***Self-esteem***: more African American (71.67%) than Caucasian students (52.63%) indicated that self-esteem is important for their success as students. In addition, more Caucasian (35.09%) than African American students (22.50%) were neutral as to the importance of self-esteem.
- ***Financial Support***: the percentage of African American (11.48%, 13.93%) students that selected the answers neutral or not important for this factor was considerably lower than the percentage of Caucasian students (23.56%, 24%) who did so. Accordingly, a considerably higher percentage of African American students (74.59%) rated this factor as important or very important.

- ***Institutional Mission:*** although the majority of the students rated the institutional mission as unimportant, the responses of African American students were more evenly distributed among ‘not important’ (44.07%), ‘neutral’ (32.20%), and ‘important’ (23.73%) than the responses of Caucasian students that were skewed towards ‘not important’ (61.40%).
- ***Campus Safety:*** there were significant differences between the two subgroups for all the answers. However, a higher percentage of African American students (58.82%) identified campus safety as an important factor for their success as students. Accordingly, there were considerably less African American students who answered ‘neutral’ (24.37%), or ‘not important’ (16.81%).
- ***Institutional size:*** A considerably higher percentage of Caucasian students (55.51%) as compared to 37.82% of African American students considered this factor as having no bearing in their success. The students’ responses for ‘neutral’ or ‘important’ did not differ significantly.
- ***Co-curricular Activities within my Area of Interest and Co-curricular Activities that fit my Schedule:*** only a small percentage of students from either group indicated that they thought co-curricular activities within their area of interest or that fit their schedule were important factors for them to succeed. A significant difference between the groups was evidenced in the ‘neutral’ and ‘important’ responses. Although low, a higher percentage of African American students (30.25%) than Caucasian students (15.35%) said that activities co-curricular within their areas of interest were important for

them to succeed in their role as college students. Likewise, a larger number of African American students (31.36%) considered that co-curricular activities they can fit in their schedule are important for their success as students. Only almost eighteen percent of Caucasian students shared their opinion.

- ***Class Size:*** the majority of the students from both groups assigned little or no importance to the size of the classes at this institution. Significant differences, however, were observed for the ‘not important’ and ‘important’ answers. Forty four percent of the Caucasian students’ selected the ‘not important’ option, as compared to 35% of African American students. As for ‘important’, a considerably higher percentage of African American students (31.93%) suggested that class size is an important factor in their success as students. Only 19% of the Caucasian shared their views.
- ***Student/faculty Interaction:*** almost the same percentage of African American and Caucasian students (24.37%, and 24.23% respectively) coincided in that this factor was not important. They presented an opposite perspective as to whether they had a neutral position or they thought that student/faculty interaction was important. While 30.25% of African American students indicated having a neutral position and 45.38% said it was important, 47.14% Caucasian students selected the neutral option and 28.63% thought it was important for their success as students.
- ***Availability of Faculty outside the Classroom:*** a clear difference was detected between the two groups. While a high percentage of African American students (47.6%) found this factor to be important, only 25% of Caucasian

students shared their opinion. On the other hand, 46.22% of Caucasian students were 'neutral' as to the weight of this factor on their success, a opposed to 27.35% of African American students.

- ***Approachable Faculty:*** although almost the same small percentage (14%) of the students from each group admitted to finding this factor unimportant, the responses of the two groups differed considerably for 'neutral' and 'important'. A considerably higher percentage of Caucasian students (49.34%) than African American students (29.41%) said they had a 'neutral' position, whereas a higher percentage of African American students (56.30%) than Caucasian students (36.12%) assigned high importance to this factor.
- ***Ethnicity of Faculty and Staff:*** although a significant difference in the importance given to this factor by the two groups was expected, the differences were not as suggested by literature. Contrary to belief, the majority of African American and Caucasian students regarded this factor as irrelevant to their success as students. Considerably more Caucasian students (75.33%) than African American students (48.74%) admitted not to place any importance on this factor. On the other hand, a higher proportion of African American students selected 'neutral' (27.73%) or 'important' (22.53%) as opposed to 13.66% (neutral) and 11.01% (important) in the case of Caucasians.
- ***Mentors:*** although almost one third of African American students selected the 'not important', another third 'neutral', and the last third 'important, significant differences were found between the subgroups in their responses

for 'not important' and 'important'. Nearly 60% of the Caucasian students stated that mentors do not influence their success. Accordingly, a small percentage of Caucasian students (10.57%) assigned importance to this factor.

- **Advisor Availability:** nearly 50% of African American students thought that this factor was important, as opposed to only 28% of Caucasians. Another significant difference occurred for 'neutral'. A considerably higher percentage of Caucasian students (45.13%) than African American students (33.33%) considered this factor to be neither important nor unimportant.
- **One-stop Service:** the opinions of both subgroups also varied significantly for this factor. While a clear majority of Caucasian students (56.25%) said it was not important, and few regarded it as important (15.63%), African American students were evenly divided among the possible answers ('not important'- 38.26%, 'neutral'-27.83%, and 'important'-33.91%). The significant differences were for the answers 'not important' and 'important'.
- **Housing:** African American and Caucasian students had opposite views as to the importance of this factor. While over 50% of the African American students that participated in this study indicated that this is an important factor for their success, almost 40% of Caucasian students regarded this factor as 'not important'.
- **Student Body Characteristics:** albeit the fact that most of the students from either group considered this factor to be of no importance or had a neutral position, a considerably greater proportion of African American students (27.7%) found it to be important, as opposed to 14.9% of Caucasian students.

Both African American and Caucasian students coincided in that support from family and class offerings are important for their success; peer group relationships is not important; they are neutral as to the importance of assertiveness, and campus environment; and are evenly divided regarding the importance of ‘support from friends’.

For a summary of significant differences and the direction of those differences see table 1.

TABLE 1
Summary of Significant Differences in Importance Assigned to Factors by African American and Caucasian Students

Factor	Not important		Neutral		Important	
	AA	C	AA	C	AA	C
Self-esteem			-	+	+	-
Financial support/aid	-	+	-	+	+	-
Institutional mission	-	+			+	-
Campus safety	-	+	+	-	+	-
Institutional size	-	+	+	-		
Co-curricular activities within area of interest					+	-
Co-curricular activities that fit schedule			-	+	+	-
Class size					+	-
Student/faculty interaction			-	+	+	-
Availability of faculty outside the classroom			-	+	+	-
Approachable faculty			+	-	+	-
Ethnicity of faculty and staff	-	+	+	-	+	-
Mentors	-	+			+	-
Advisor availability			-	+	+	-
One-stop service	-	+			+	-
Housing	-	+			+	-
Student body					+	-

Note: + indicates higher percentage, - indicates lower percentage

Satisfaction with the Factors at WSU

Regarding the students’ level of satisfaction, there were significant differences in the ratings they assigned to eleven of the 23 factors:

- ***Self-esteem***: much as African American and Caucasian students reported to be ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with their self-esteem at that point in their lives as students at this institution, a significant difference was detected. While more Caucasian students (42.92%) than African American students (32.20%)

indicated being 'satisfied' with this factor, a higher percentage of African American students (37.29%) than Caucasians (20.35%) reported being 'very satisfied'.

- ***Support from Family:*** although close to 78% of the students from either group said to be either 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with 'support from family', a vast majority of African American students (61.90%) reported being 'very satisfied' while only 48% of the Caucasian students selected that option.
- ***Co-curricular Activities within my Area of Interest, and Co-curricular Activities I can fit in my Schedule:*** a significant difference between the two groups was detected for these two factors. A significantly higher percentage of Caucasian students (34.42%) selected 'satisfied' than African American students (23.08%) regarding co-curricular activities within their area of interest. As for co-curricular activities they can fit in their schedule, more African American students (17.24%) indicated that they were very satisfied. Only eight percent of the Caucasian selected that option. The higher percentage of respondents from each group had a 'neutral' position.
- ***Availability of Faculty outside the Classroom:*** few students from either group indicated dissatisfaction with this factor. The difference between these two groups was detected at the 'very satisfied' level. A much higher percentage of African American students (27.19%) than Caucasian students (13.90%) reported being 'very satisfied'.

- ***Approachable Faculty:*** both subgroups, African American and Caucasian students were mostly ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the approachability of faculty at this institution. Within those two options, a considerably higher percentage of Caucasian students (42.48%) were ‘satisfied’, whereas a higher percentage of African American students (27.59%) than Caucasian students (17.26%) selected ‘very satisfied’.
- ***Ethnicity of Faculty and Staff:*** as expected from their response to the level of importance they assigned to this factors, the majority of the students decided that they were either ‘neutral’ or ‘satisfied’ with this aspect of the institution. While, more Caucasian students (54.26%) than African American students (37.61%) reported having a ‘neutral’ position, more African American students (34.19%) than Caucasian students (21.97) reported being ‘satisfied’.
- ***Mentors:*** although a high percentage of African American students(41.38%) stated that they had a ‘neutral’ position as to their level of satisfaction with this factor, a considerably higher percentage of Caucasian students (58.68%) selected that answer.
- ***One-stop Service:*** although a large proportion of each group (44.6% -African American students, 58.6% - Caucasian students) had a ‘neutral’ position regarding their level of satisfaction with this factor, a significantly higher percentage of Caucasian students selected “neutral’. Also, however small, the proportion of students who indicated that they were ‘very satisfied’ differed for African American (17.86%) and Caucasian (8%) students.

- **Housing:** the groups demonstrated a significant difference between them evidenced at two of the responses. A much higher percentage of Caucasian students (40.1%), as opposed to African American students (22.6%), had a ‘neutral’ position. Also the groups diverged from each other at the ‘satisfied’ level with a higher percentage of African American (34.78%) than Caucasian (26.34%) students expressing satisfaction.
- **Student Body Characteristics:** differences between the groups were detected for the answers ‘neutral’, and ‘very satisfied’. While a significantly higher proportion of Caucasian students (50.88%) than African American students (36.75%) had a ‘neutral’ position, proportionally more African American (22.22%) than Caucasian (12.72%) students indicated to be ‘very satisfied’ with the characteristics of the student body at this institution.

The responses for the remaining factors are mostly evenly distributed among ‘neutral’, ‘satisfied’, and ‘very satisfied’. Few students indicated dissatisfaction with any of the factors. In addition, there were clear tendencies for ‘neutral’ regarding institutional mission, and ‘satisfied’ for class offerings.

For a summary of significant differences in the responses of African American and Caucasian students regarding their level of satisfaction with the factors selected for this study and the direction of those differences see table 2.

TABLE 2
Summary of Significant Differences In Levels of Satisfaction Assigned to Factors by African American and Caucasian Students

Factor	Not Satisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
	AA	C	AA	C	AA	C	AA	C
Self-esteem					-	+	-	+
Co-curricular activities within area of interest					-	+	+	-
Co-curricular activities that fit schedule							+	-
Approachable faculty					-	+	+	-
Ethnicity of faculty and staff			-	+	+	-		
Housing			-	+			+	-
Student body			-	+				

Note: + indicates higher percentage, - indicates lower percentage

The table below (Table 3) summarizes the frequencies and the probabilities obtained for each one of the factors included in this study.

TABLE 3
Probabilities Indicating Differences in the Responses of African American and Caucasian Students

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Importance</i>		<i>Satisfaction</i>	
	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>x² probability</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>x² probability</i>
Self-esteem	348	0.0023*	344	0.0039*
Assertiveness	345	0.2350	335	0.1391
Support from family	346	0.2437	351	0.0329*
Support from friends	345	0.1576	338	0.3618
Financial support/aid	347	0.0003*	341	0.4396
Institutional mission	346	0.0032*	334	0.1622
Campus environment	346	0.1582	342	0.2367
Campus safety	344	0.0063*	339	0.2999
Institutional size	346	0.0059*	342	0.8889
Co-curricular activities within area of interest	347	0.0047*	332	0.0123*
Co-curricular activities that fit schedule	342	0.0069*	340	0.0348*
Class size	345	0.0248*	342	0.1301
Student/faculty interaction	346	0.0028*	339	0.7634
Availability of faculty outside the classroom	342	<.0001*	337	0.0276*
Approachable faculty	346	0.0006*	342	0.0469*
Ethnicity of faculty and staff	346	<.0001*	340	0.0208*
Mentors	346	<.0001*	341	0.0190*
Advisor availability	343	0.0007*	340	0.2660
One-stop service	339	0.0003*	337	0.0094*
Housing	344	<.0001*	339	0.0131*
Class offerings	343	0.5259	340	0.7578
Peer group relationships	347	0.6515	342	0.9418
Student body	346	0.0168*	345	0.0426*

Level of significance: $p \leq 0.05$

Note: *indicates significant differences between the groups.

Summary of Findings

As suggested by literature (Bourne-Bowie, 2000), the findings of this study reflected differences between direct from high school first-year students enrolled in a freshman seminar at this four-year, public institution in south west Ohio. Contrary to belief, however, African American students did not regard the ethnicity of faculty members or the characteristics of the student body as important for their success as students.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Much has been said and done regarding student retention. Based on degree attainment figures, no effort is too much, particularly considering the value of higher education for the individual, the institution, and the community.

Models of student retention provide the framework for institutions to assess their programs and deal with this issue. Regrettably, efforts have not been able to eliminate the inequity between African American and Caucasian students with respect to degree attainment. Bourne-Bowie (2000) suggested that special attention need to be paid to differences between African American and Caucasian students.

This study reviewed 23 factors associated with student retention, and analyzed the data to establish trends for both groups. Also, based on students' rates of satisfaction with the factors, a potential attrition rate was obtained for each group.

Conclusions

The findings of this study, congruent with literature research, indicated that African American and Caucasian students do differ in the levels of importance and degrees of satisfaction they assigned to several of the factors included in the survey. Reportedly, regarding the importance of the factors in their success as students, there

were significant differences in seventeen of the twenty three factors. As for their degree of satisfaction, the two groups differed on eleven of the factors listed in the survey.

Also, consistent with national, state, and institutional figures, the potential retention rate calculated for direct from high school, first-year African American students (10.03%) was slightly higher than the figure obtained for their Caucasian (9.8%) counterparts.

Limitations

The findings of this study are only relevant for Wright State University, a South West Ohio, 4-year, public institution. These findings may not be used to describe differences or potential attrition rates at other 4-year institutions since the survey was specially tailored to include factors relevant to this institution and to this particular group of students. Trends may not be used to describe differences between all African American and Caucasian freshmen attending this institution because the survey was given to students enrolled in a freshman seminar, which is tailored to assist students with their transition from high school to college.

Recommendations

While analyzing the data the researcher noticed some differences determined by gender. Although the sample was representative of the gender breakdown for the 2004 cohort (371 African American students, 69.2% females and 30.72% males; and 1,569 Caucasian students, 55.8% females and 44.1% males) a thorough analysis of gender trends would provide interesting information. Also, considering the importance that African American and Caucasian students placed on factors such as financial support/aid, housing, faculty availability and approachability, and campus safety, the researcher

developed the following recommendations for student affairs professional staff members in Residence Services, Academic Advising, and Student Life.

Recommendation 1: Assess gender/racial differences to decide whether the differences reported are somehow determined by gender trends.

Recommendation 2: Display a variety of ethnic elements in common halls and resting areas in residence halls to create a more home-like environment for students.

Recommendation 3: Provide easily accessible information regarding scholarships, financial aid, and career services opportunities. Perhaps an e-mail with the direct link to that information would be helpful.

Recommendation 4: Invite faculty members to participate in retention seminars and initiatives usually planned for student affairs professionals.

Recommendation 5: Include in the campus recreation activities a non-credit class of self-defense for both men and women separately to boost students' feeling of security.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify differences in rates of importance and satisfaction that direct from college, first-year African American and Caucasian students assigned to selected factors associated to student attrition. In addition, a potential attrition rate based on the students reported levels of dissatisfaction was determined for both subgroups. Congruent with literature, findings indicated that there are significant differences between the two groups. Additionally, also reflecting present data, the potential attrition rate for African American students was slightly higher than the attrition rate obtained for Caucasian students.

Finally, the investigator hopes that this investigation will be helpful for Student affairs professionals in their continuous effort to provide students with a holistic development and thus, curb student attrition.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT RETENTION SURVEY

To ensure confidentiality, please DO NOT write your name or any other identifier on this page. Please, answer each question as honestly as possible.

SECTION I: Select the answer that applies to you.

Sex: Male Female
 Race: African American Caucasian Asian Hispanic Native American

Age: 17 – 22 Older than 22
 Family Education: Parents did not attend college
 Parents attended college but did not graduate
 Parents graduated from college

Living Arrangements: I live on Campus
 I live off campus
 Integration: I have joined a student club/organization
 I have not joined any student club/organization

Marital Status: I am single
 I am married

I grew up in: a rural area
 a sub-urban area
 an urban area

High School G.P.A. 3.01 or higher
 between 3.0 and 2.0
 lower than 2.0

Please, continue on reverse side 

SECTION II: Each question (factor) requires TWO answers:

- On the left, select the number that better describes the importance you give to that factor
- On the right, select the number that better defines your level of satisfaction with that factor.

Importance to me... 1 = not important at all 2 = not very important 3 = neutral 4 = important 5 = very important	Influence of the following factors in my success as a college studentMy level of satisfaction 1 = not satisfied at all 2 = not very satisfied 3 = neutral 4 = satisfied 5 = very satisfied
	Self-esteem	
	Assertiveness	
	Support from my family	
	Support from my friends	
	Financial support/aid	
	Institutional mission	
	Campus environment	
	Campus safety	
	Institutional size	
	Co-curricular activities within my areas of interest	
	Co-curricular activities that I can fit in my schedule	
	Class size	
	Student-faculty interaction in class	
	Availability of faculty outside of the classroom	
	Approachable faculty	
	Ethnicity of faculty and staff	
	Mentors	
	Advisor availability	
	One stop service	
	Housing	
	Class offerings	
	Peer group relationship	
	Student body characteristics	

APPENDIX B**SURVEY COVER LETTER**

October, 2004

Dear Wright State Student,

My name is Claudia Espinoza and I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Leadership here at Wright State University. Presently I am working on my thesis entitled: *A Study of Factors Influencing Retention Rates at Wright State University: Differences in the Reported Degree of Importance and Satisfaction Rates of Caucasian and African American Students in UVC Classes.*

Your participation in this study is voluntary and would be of great importance in determining the factors that you consider important to your success as a student at Wright State University as well as how you feel about those factors at present. If you choose to complete this survey, please do not write your name on it. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes. Please, be as honest and open as you can when answering the questions.

To learn about the results of this survey, you can contact me at cer2000@email.com. To be sure I read your e-mail write “*Retention Survey Results*” in the reference window.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Claudia Espinoza
Principal Researcher

Charles W Ryan, Ph.D.
Thesis Advisor

APPENDIX C**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION – RACE SUBGROUPS**

APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION – RACE/GENDER SUBGROUPS

APPENDIX E

CHI SQUARE PRINTOUTS – IMPORTANCE

Self-Esteem

The SAS System

23:53 Thursday, November 18, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	7
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	28
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	27
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	80
5	Important	Blckstdnt	86
6	Important	Whtstdnts	120

The FREQ Procedure

Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	7	28	35
	2.01	8.05	10.06
	20.00	80.00	
	5.83	12.28	
Neutral	27	80	107
	7.76	22.99	30.75
	25.23	74.77	
	22.50	35.09	
Important	86	120	206
	24.71	34.48	59.20
	41.75	58.25	
	71.67	52.63	
Total	120	228	348
	34.48	65.52	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	12.1134	0.0023
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	12.5000	0.0019
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	11.2855	0.0008
Phi Coefficient		0.1866	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1834	
Cramer's V		0.1866	

Sample Size = 348

Assertiveness

The SAS System

23:55 Thursday, November 18, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	29
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	63
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	52
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	110
5	Important	Blckstdnt	38
6	Important	Whtstdnts	53

The FREQ Procedure

Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	29	63	92
	8.41	18.26	26.67
	31.52	68.48	
	24.37	27.88	
Neutral	52	110	162
	15.07	31.88	46.96
	32.10	67.90	
	43.70	48.67	
Important	38	53	91
	11.01	15.36	26.38
	41.76	58.24	
	31.93	23.45	
Total	119	226	345
	34.49	65.51	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	2.8963	0.2350
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	2.8463	0.2409
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	2.1059	0.1467
Phi Coefficient		0.0916	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0912	
Cramer's V		0.0916	

Sample Size = 345

Support from Family

The SAS System

23:57 Thursday, November 18, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	13
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	27
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	15
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	44
5	Important	Blckstdnt	91
6	Important	Whtstdnts	156

The FREQ Procedure

Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	13	27	40
	3.76	7.80	11.56
	32.50	67.50	
	10.92	11.89	
Neutral	15	44	59
	4.34	12.72	17.05
	25.42	74.58	
	12.61	19.38	
Important	91	156	247
	26.30	45.09	71.39
	36.84	63.16	
	76.47	68.72	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	2.8236	0.2437
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	2.9249	0.2317
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	1.2547	0.2627
Phi Coefficient		0.0903	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0900	
Cramer's V		0.0903	

Sample Size = 346

Support from Friends

The SAS System
00:00 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	36
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	49
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	43
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	86
5	Important	Blckstdnt	39
6	Important	Whtstdnts	92

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	36	49	85
	10.43	14.20	24.64
	42.35	57.65	
	30.51	21.59	
Neutral	43	86	129
	12.46	24.93	37.39
	33.33	66.67	
	36.44	37.89	
Important	39	92	131
	11.30	26.67	37.97
	29.77	70.23	
	33.05	40.53	
Total	118	227	345
	34.20	65.80	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	3.6955	0.1576
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	3.6424	0.1618
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	3.4230	0.0643
Phi Coefficient		0.1035	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1029	
Cramer's V		0.1035	

Sample Size = 345

Financial Support/Aid

The SAS System
01:25 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	14
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	53
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	17
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	54
5	Important	Blckstdnt	91
6	Important	Whtstdnts	118

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	14	53	67
	4.03	15.27	19.31
	20.90	79.10	
	11.48	23.56	
Neutral	17	54	71
	4.90	15.56	20.46
	23.94	76.06	
	13.93	24.00	
Important	91	118	209
	26.22	34.01	60.23
	43.54	56.46	
	74.59	52.44	
Total	122	225	347
	35.16	64.84	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	16.3372	0.0003
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	16.9221	0.0002
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	14.7150	0.0001
Phi Coefficient		0.2170	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2120	
Cramer's V		0.2170	

Sample Size = 347

Institutional Mission

The SAS System
00:04 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	52
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	140
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	38
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	60
5	Important	Blckstdnt	28
6	Important	Whtstdnts	28

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	52	140	192
	15.03	40.46	55.49
	27.08	72.92	
	44.07	61.40	
Neutral	38	60	98
	10.98	17.34	28.32
	38.78	61.22	
	32.20	26.32	
Important	28	28	56
	8.09	8.09	16.18
	50.00	50.00	
	23.73	12.28	
Total	118	228	346
	34.10	65.90	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	11.4592	0.0032
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	11.2752	0.0036
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	11.4246	0.0007
Phi Coefficient		0.1820	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1790	
Cramer's V		0.1820	

Sample Size = 346

Campus Environment

The SAS System
00:06 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	20
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	55
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	53
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	101
5	Important	Blckstdnt	47
6	Important	Whtstdnts	70

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	20	55	75
	5.78	15.90	21.68
	26.67	73.33	
	16.67	24.34	
Neutral	53	101	154
	15.32	29.19	44.51
	34.42	65.58	
	44.17	44.69	
Important	47	70	117
	13.58	20.23	33.82
	40.17	59.83	
	39.17	30.97	
Total	120	226	346
	34.68	65.32	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	3.6879	0.1582
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	3.7469	0.1536
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	3.6407	0.0564
Phi Coefficient		0.1032	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1027	
Cramer's V		0.1032	

Sample Size = 346

Campus Safety

The SAS System
00:07 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	20
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	58
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	29
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	75
5	Important	Blckstdnt	70
6	Important	Whtstdnts	92

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	20	58	78
	5.81	16.86	22.67
	25.64	74.36	
	16.81	25.78	
Neutral	29	75	104
	8.43	21.80	30.23
	27.88	72.12	
	24.37	33.33	
Important	70	92	162
	20.35	26.74	47.09
	43.21	56.79	
	58.82	40.89	
Total	119	225	344
	34.59	65.41	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	10.1473	0.0063
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	10.1893	0.0061
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	8.8053	0.0030
Phi Coefficient		0.1717	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1693	
Cramer's V		0.1717	

Sample Size = 344

Institutional size

The SAS System
00:10 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	45
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	126
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	47
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	69
5	Important	Blckstdnt	27
6	Important	Whtstdnts	32

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	45	126	171
	13.01	36.42	49.42
	26.32	73.68	
	37.82	55.51	
Neutral	47	69	116
	13.58	19.94	33.53
	40.52	59.48	
	39.50	30.40	
Important	27	32	59
	7.80	9.25	17.05
	45.76	54.24	
	22.69	14.10	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	10.2525	0.0059
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	10.2912	0.0058
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	9.6041	0.0019
Phi Coefficient		0.1721	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1696	
Cramer's V		0.1721	

Sample Size = 346

Co-curricular within area of interest

The SAS System
00:10 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	40
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	96
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	43
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	97
5	Important	Blckstdnt	36
6	Important	Whtstdnts	35

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
	t	s	
Notimportant	40	96	136
	11.53	27.67	39.19
	29.41	70.59	
	33.61	42.11	
Neutral	43	97	140
	12.39	27.95	40.35
	30.71	69.29	
	36.13	42.54	
Important	36	35	71
	10.37	10.09	20.46
	50.70	49.30	
	30.25	15.35	
Total	119	228	347
	34.29	65.71	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	10.7201	0.0047
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	10.3259	0.0057
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	7.5990	0.0058
Phi Coefficient		0.1758	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1731	
Cramer's V		0.1758	

Sample Size = 347

Co-curricular activities that fit my schedule

The SAS System
00:11 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	49
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	94
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	32
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	90
5	Important	Blckstdnt	37
6	Important	Whtstdnts	40

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Notimportant	49	94	143
	14.33	27.49	41.81
	34.27	65.73	
	41.53	41.96	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Neutral	32	90	122
	9.36	26.32	35.67
	26.23	73.77	
	27.12	40.18	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Important	37	40	77
	10.82	11.70	22.51
	48.05	51.95	
	31.36	17.86	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Total	118	224	342
	34.50	65.50	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	9.9539	0.0069
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	9.8397	0.0073
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	2.4701	0.1160
Phi Coefficient		0.1706	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1682	
Cramer's V		0.1706	

Sample Size = 342

Class size

The SAS System
00:13 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	42
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	100
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	39
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	83
5	Important	Blckstdnt	38
6	Important	Whtstdnts	43

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	42	100	142
	12.17	28.99	41.16
	29.58	70.42	
	35.29	44.25	
Neutral	39	83	122
	11.30	24.06	35.36
	31.97	68.03	
	32.77	36.73	
Important	38	43	81
	11.01	12.46	23.48
	46.91	53.09	
	31.93	19.03	
Total	119	226	345
	34.49	65.51	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	7.3933	0.0248
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	7.1990	0.0273
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	6.0383	0.0140
Phi Coefficient		0.1464	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1448	
Cramer's V		0.1464	

Sample Size = 345

Student/faculty Interaction

The SAS System
00:15 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	29
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	55
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	36
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	107
5	Important	Blckstdnt	54
6	Important	Whtstdnts	65

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	29	55	84
	8.38	15.90	24.28
	34.52	65.48	
	24.37	24.23	
Neutral	36	107	143
	10.40	30.92	41.33
	25.17	74.83	
	30.25	47.14	
Important	54	65	119
	15.61	18.79	34.39
	45.38	54.62	
	45.38	28.63	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	11.7500	0.0028
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	11.7839	0.0028
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	3.7225	0.0537
Phi Coefficient		0.1843	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1812	
Cramer's V		0.1843	

Sample Size = 346

Availability of Faculty

The SAS System
00:17 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	29
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	63
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	32
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	104
5	Important	Blckstdnt	56
6	Important	Whtstdnts	58

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	29	63	92
	8.48	18.42	26.90
	31.52	68.48	
	24.79	28.00	
Neutral	32	104	136
	9.36	30.41	39.77
	23.53	76.47	
	27.35	46.22	
Important	56	58	114
	16.37	16.96	33.33
	49.12	50.88	
	47.86	25.78	
Total	117	225	342
	34.21	65.79	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	18.4529	<.0001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	18.3415	0.0001
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	8.2117	0.0042
Phi Coefficient		0.2323	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2263	
Cramer's V		0.2323	

Sample Size = 342

Approachable Faculty

The SAS System
00:18 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	17
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	33
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	35
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	112
5	Important	Blckstdnt	67
6	Important	Whtstdnts	82

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	17	33	50
	4.91	9.54	14.45
	34.00	66.00	
	14.29	14.54	
Neutral	35	112	147
	10.12	32.37	42.49
	23.81	76.19	
	29.41	49.34	
Important	67	82	149
	19.36	23.70	43.06
	44.97	55.03	
	56.30	36.12	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	14.6830	0.0006
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	14.8591	0.0006
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	6.5876	0.0103
Phi Coefficient		0.2060	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2018	
Cramer's V		0.2060	

Sample Size = 346

Ethnicity of Faculty

The SAS System
00:19 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	58
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	171
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	33
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	31
5	Important	Blckstdnt	28
6	Important	Whtstdnts	25

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	58	171	229
	16.76	49.42	66.18
	25.33	74.67	
	48.74	75.33	
Neutral	33	31	64
	9.54	8.96	18.50
	51.56	48.44	
	27.73	13.66	
Important	28	25	53
	8.09	7.23	15.32
	52.83	47.17	
	23.53	11.01	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	24.6864	<.0001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	24.2286	<.0001
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	21.4020	<.0001
Phi Coefficient		0.2671	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2581	
Cramer's V		0.2671	

Sample Size = 346

Mentors

The SAS System
00:20 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	36
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	132
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	41
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	71
5	Important	Blckstdnt	42
6	Important	Whtstdnts	24

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	36	132	168
	10.40	38.15	48.55
	21.43	78.57	
	30.25	58.15	
Neutral	41	71	112
	11.85	20.52	32.37
	36.61	63.39	
	34.45	31.28	
Important	42	24	66
	12.14	6.94	19.08
	63.64	36.36	
	35.29	10.57	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	37.7710	<.0001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	37.1442	<.0001
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	36.5696	<.0001
Phi Coefficient		0.3304	
Contingency Coefficient		0.3137	
Cramer's V		0.3304	

Sample Size = 346

Advisor Availability

The SAS System
00:21 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	20
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	59
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	39
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	102
5	Important	Blckstdnt	58
6	Important	Whtstdnts	65

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	20 5.83 25.32 17.09	59 17.20 74.68 26.11	79 23.03
Neutral	39 11.37 27.66 33.33	102 29.74 72.34 45.13	141 41.11
Important	58 16.91 47.15 49.57	65 18.95 52.85 28.76	123 35.86
Total	117 34.11	226 65.89	343 100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	14.6405	0.0007
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	14.4449	0.0007
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	11.9428	0.0005
Phi Coefficient		0.2066	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2023	
Cramer's V		0.2066	

Sample Size = 343

One Stop Service

The SAS System
00:23 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	44
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	126
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	32
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	63
5	Important	Blckstdnt	39
6	Important	Whtstdnts	35

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	44	126	170
	12.98	37.17	50.15
	25.88	74.12	
	38.26	56.25	
Neutral	32	63	95
	9.44	18.58	28.02
	33.68	66.32	
	27.83	28.13	
Important	39	35	74
	11.50	10.32	21.83
	52.70	47.30	
	33.91	15.63	
Total	115	224	339
	33.92	66.08	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	16.5486	0.0003
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	16.0925	0.0003
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	15.5899	<.0001
Phi Coefficient		0.2209	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2157	
Cramer's V		0.2209	

Sample Size = 339

Housing

The SAS System
00:24 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	17
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	87
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	34
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	66
5	Important	Blckstdnt	66
6	Important	Whtstdnts	74

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	17	87	104
	4.94	25.29	30.23
	16.35	83.65	
	14.53	38.33	
Neutral	34	66	100
	9.88	19.19	29.07
	34.00	66.00	
	29.06	29.07	
Important	66	74	140
	19.19	21.51	40.70
	47.14	52.86	
	56.41	32.60	
Total	117	227	344
	34.01	65.99	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	25.2165	<.0001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	26.6185	<.0001
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	24.9839	<.0001
Phi Coefficient		0.2707	
Contingency Coefficient		0.2613	
Cramer's V		0.2707	

Sample Size = 344

Class Offerings

The SAS System
00:25 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	15
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	22
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	33
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	75
5	Important	Blckstdnt	68
6	Important	Whtstdnts	130

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Notimportant	15	22	37
	4.37	6.41	10.79
	40.54	59.46	
	12.93	9.69	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Neutral	33	75	108
	9.62	21.87	31.49
	30.56	69.44	
	28.45	33.04	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Important	68	130	198
	19.83	37.90	57.73
	34.34	65.66	
	58.62	57.27	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Total	116	227	343
	33.82	66.18	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	1.2851	0.5259
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	1.2729	0.5292
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.0587	0.8086
Phi Coefficient		0.0612	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0611	
Cramer's V		0.0612	

Sample Size = 343

Peer Group Relationship

The SAS System
00:27 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	51
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	89
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	38
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	84
5	Important	Blckstdnt	30
6	Important	Whtstdnts	55

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdn t	Whtstdnt s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	51	89	140
	14.70	25.65	40.35
	36.43	63.57	
	42.86	39.04	
Neutral	38	84	122
	10.95	24.21	35.16
	31.15	68.85	
	31.93	36.84	
Important	30	55	85
	8.65	15.85	24.50
	35.29	64.71	
	25.21	24.12	
Total	119	228	347
	34.29	65.71	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	0.8568	0.6515
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	0.8624	0.6497
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.0936	0.7597
Phi Coefficient		0.0497	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0496	
Cramer's V		0.0497	

Sample Size = 347

Student Body Characteristics

The SAS System
00:28 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notimportant	Blckstdnt	46
2	Notimportant	Whtstdnts	106
3	Neutral	Blckstdnt	40
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	87
5	Important	Blckstdnt	33
6	Important	Whtstdnts	34

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnt	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notimportant	46	106	152
	13.29	30.64	43.93
	30.26	69.74	
	38.66	46.70	
Neutral	40	87	127
	11.56	25.14	36.71
	31.50	68.50	
	33.61	38.33	
Important	33	34	67
	9.54	9.83	19.36
	49.25	50.75	
	27.73	14.98	
Total	119	227	346
	34.39	65.61	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	2	8.1787	0.0168
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	2	7.8894	0.0194
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	5.8783	0.0153
Phi Coefficient		0.1537	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1520	
Cramer's V		0.1537	

Sample Size = 346

APPENDIX F

CHI SQUARE PRINTOUTS – SATISFACTION

Self-Esteem

The SAS System
00:32 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	15
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	24
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	21
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	59
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	38
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	97
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	44
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	46

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn ts	Whtstdnt s	Total
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	15	24	39
	4.36	6.98	11.34
	38.46	61.54	
	12.71	10.62	
Neutral	21	59	80
	6.10	17.15	23.26
	26.25	73.75	
	17.80	26.11	
Satisfied	38	97	135
	11.05	28.20	39.24
	28.15	71.85	
	32.20	42.92	
Verysatis	44	46	90
	12.79	13.37	26.16
	48.89	51.11	
	37.29	20.35	
Total	118	226	344
	34.30	65.70	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	13.3671	0.0039
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	13.1277	0.0044
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	3.7728	0.0521
Phi Coefficient		0.1971	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1934	
Cramer's V		0.1971	

Sample Size = 344

Assertiveness

The SAS System
00:34 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	10
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	26
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	43
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	89
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	39
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	81
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	23
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	24

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	10	26	36
	2.99	7.76	10.75
	27.78	72.22	
	8.70	11.82	
Neutral	43	89	132
	12.84	26.57	39.40
	32.58	67.42	
	37.39	40.45	
Satisfied	39	81	120
	11.64	24.18	35.82
	32.50	67.50	
	33.91	36.82	
Verysatis	23	24	47
	6.87	7.16	14.03
	48.94	51.06	
	20.00	10.91	
Total	115	220	335
	34.33	65.67	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	5.4918	0.1391
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	5.3031	0.1509
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	3.4236	0.0643
Phi Coefficient		0.1280	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1270	
Cramer's V		0.1280	

Sample Size = 335

Support from Family

The SAS System
00:35 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	11
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	16
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	16
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	36
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	21
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	65
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	78
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	108

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	11	16	27
	3.13	4.56	7.69
	40.74	59.26	
	8.73	7.11	
Neutral	16	36	52
	4.56	10.26	14.81
	30.77	69.23	
	12.70	16.00	
Satisfied	21	65	86
	5.98	18.52	24.50
	24.42	75.58	
	16.67	28.89	
Verysatis	78	108	186
	22.22	30.77	52.99
	41.94	58.06	
	61.90	48.00	
Total	126	225	351
	35.90	64.10	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	8.7409	0.0329
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	8.9936	0.0294
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	1.6828	0.1946
Phi Coefficient		0.1578	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1559	
Cramer's V		0.1578	

Sample Size = 351

Support from Friends

The SAS System
00:36 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	7
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	17
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	32
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	46
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	35
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	85
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	39
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	77

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
	ts	s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	7	17	24
	2.07	5.03	7.10
	29.17	70.83	
	6.19	7.56	
Neutral	32	46	78
	9.47	13.61	23.08
	41.03	58.97	
	28.32	20.44	
Satisfied	35	85	120
	10.36	25.15	35.50
	29.17	70.83	
	30.97	37.78	
Verysatis	39	77	116
	11.54	22.78	34.32
	33.62	66.38	
	34.51	34.22	
Total	113	225	338
	33.43	66.57	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	3.2000	0.3618
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	3.1631	0.3672
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.2068	0.6493
Phi Coefficient		0.0973	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0968	
Cramer's V		0.0973	

Sample Size = 338

Financial Support/Aid

The SAS System
00:38 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	17
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	46
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	34
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	72
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	35
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	64
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	29
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	44

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
	ts	s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	17	46	63
	4.99	13.49	18.48
	26.98	73.02	
	14.78	20.35	
Neutral	34	72	106
	9.97	21.11	31.09
	32.08	67.92	
	29.57	31.86	
Satisfied	35	64	99
	10.26	18.77	29.03
	35.35	64.65	
	30.43	28.32	
Verysatis	29	44	73
	8.50	12.90	21.41
	39.73	60.27	
	25.22	19.47	
Total	115	226	341
	33.72	66.28	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	2.7035	0.4396
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	2.7227	0.4364
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	2.6725	0.1021
Phi Coefficient		0.0890	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0887	
Cramer's V		0.0890	

Sample Size = 341

Campus Environment

The SAS System

00:41 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	10
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	19
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	36
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	54
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	38
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	99
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	32
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	54

The FREQ Procedure

Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	10	19	29
	2.92	5.56	8.48
	34.48	65.52	
	8.62	8.41	
Neutral	36	54	90
	10.53	15.79	26.32
	40.00	60.00	
	31.03	23.89	
Satisfied	38	99	137
	11.11	28.95	40.06
	27.74	72.26	
	32.76	43.81	
Verysatis	32	54	86
	9.36	15.79	25.15
	37.21	62.79	
	27.59	23.89	
Total	116	226	342
	33.92	66.08	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	4.2401	0.2367
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	4.2761	0.2332
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.1398	0.7084
Phi Coefficient		0.1113	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1107	
Cramer's V		0.1113	

Sample Size = 342

Campus Safety

The SAS System
00:42 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	10
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	16
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	35
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	52
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	34
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	87
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	37
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	68

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Notsatisf	10	16	26
	2.95	4.72	7.67
	38.46	61.54	
	8.62	7.17	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Neutral	35	52	87
	10.32	15.34	25.66
	40.23	59.77	
	30.17	23.32	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Satisfied	34	87	121
	10.03	25.66	35.69
	28.10	71.90	
	29.31	39.01	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Verysatis	37	68	105
	10.91	20.06	30.97
	35.24	64.76	
	31.90	30.49	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Total	116	223	339
	34.22	65.78	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob

Chi-Square	3	3.6661	0.2999
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	3.6943	0.2964
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.6135	0.4335
Phi Coefficient		0.1040	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1034	
Cramer's V		0.1040	

Sample Size = 339

Institutional size

The SAS System
00:44 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	7
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	14
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	40
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	86
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	43
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	75
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	27
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	50

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	7	14	21
	2.05	4.09	6.14
	33.33	66.67	
	5.98	6.22	
Neutral	40	86	126
	11.70	25.15	36.84
	31.75	68.25	
	34.19	38.22	
Satisfied	43	75	118
	12.57	21.93	34.50
	36.44	63.56	
	36.75	33.33	
Verysatis	27	50	77
	7.89	14.62	22.51
	35.06	64.94	
	23.08	22.22	
Total	117	225	342
	34.21	65.79	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	0.6329	0.8889
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	0.6344	0.8885
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.2878	0.5917
Phi Coefficient		0.0430	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0430	
Cramer's V		0.0430	

Sample Size = 342

Co-curricular within Area of Interest

The SAS System
00:45 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	17
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	16
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	49
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	99
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	27
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	74
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	24
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	26

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
	ts	s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	17	16	33
	5.12	4.82	9.94
	51.52	48.48	
	14.53	7.44	
Neutral	49	99	148
	14.76	29.82	44.58
	33.11	66.89	
	41.88	46.05	
Satisfied	27	74	101
	8.13	22.29	30.42
	26.73	73.27	
	23.08	34.42	
Verysatis	24	26	50
	7.23	7.83	15.06
	48.00	52.00	
	20.51	12.09	
Total	117	215	332
	35.24	64.76	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	10.8951	0.0123
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	10.7142	0.0134
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.0255	0.8732
Phi Coefficient		0.1812	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1783	
Cramer's V		0.1812	

Sample Size = 332

Co-curricular activities that Fit my Schedule

The SAS System
00:47 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	9
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	31
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	52
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	111
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	35
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	64
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	20
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	18

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
Frequency	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	
Percent	ts	s	
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	9	31	40
	2.65	9.12	11.76
	22.50	77.50	
	7.76	13.84	
Neutral	52	111	163
	15.29	32.65	47.94
	31.90	68.10	
	44.83	49.55	
Satisfied	35	64	99
	10.29	18.82	29.12
	35.35	64.65	
	30.17	28.57	
Verysatis	20	18	38
	5.88	5.29	11.18
	52.63	47.37	
	17.24	8.04	
Total	116	224	340
	34.12	65.88	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	8.6199	0.0348
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	8.4658	0.0373
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	7.4302	0.0064
Phi Coefficient		0.1592	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1572	
Cramer's V		0.1592	

Sample Size = 340

Class Size

The SAS System
00:48 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	12
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	13
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	38
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	78
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	41
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	99
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	26
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	35

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
Frequency	Blckstdnts	Whtstdnts	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	12	13	25
	3.51	3.80	7.31
	48.00	52.00	
	10.26	5.78	
Neutral	38	78	116
	11.11	22.81	33.92
	32.76	67.24	
	32.48	34.67	
Satisfied	41	99	140
	11.99	28.95	40.94
	29.29	70.71	
	35.04	44.00	
Verysatis	26	35	61
	7.60	10.23	17.84
	42.62	57.38	
	22.22	15.56	
Total	117	225	342
	34.21	65.79	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	5.6475	0.1301
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	5.5250	0.1371
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.0001	0.9915
Phi Coefficient		0.1285	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1275	
Cramer's V		0.1285	

Sample Size = 342

Student/faculty Interaction

The SAS System
00:49 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	14
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	24
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	35
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	74
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	43
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	88
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	24
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	37

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Notsatisf	14	24	38
	4.13	7.08	11.21
	36.84	63.16	
	12.07	10.76	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Neutral	35	74	109
	10.32	21.83	32.15
	32.11	67.89	
	30.17	33.18	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Satisfied	43	88	131
	12.68	25.96	38.64
	32.82	67.18	
	37.07	39.46	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Verysatis	24	37	61
	7.08	10.91	17.99
	39.34	60.66	
	20.69	16.59	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Total	116	223	339
	34.22	65.78	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob

Chi-Square	3	1.1566	0.7634
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	1.1430	0.7667
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.1884	0.6642
Phi Coefficient		0.0584	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0583	
Cramer's V		0.0584	

Sample Size = 339

Availability of Faculty

The SAS System
00:50 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	11
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	22
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	34
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	84
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	38
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	86
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	31
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	31

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	11	22	33
	3.26	6.53	9.79
	33.33	66.67	
	9.65	9.87	
Neutral	34	84	118
	10.09	24.93	35.01
	28.81	71.19	
	29.82	37.67	
Satisfied	38	86	124
	11.28	25.52	36.80
	30.65	69.35	
	33.33	38.57	
Verysatis	31	31	62
	9.20	9.20	18.40
	50.00	50.00	
	27.19	13.90	
Total	114	223	337
	33.83	66.17	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	9.1341	0.0276
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	8.7865	0.0323
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	4.4022	0.0359
Phi Coefficient		0.1646	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1624	
Cramer's V		0.1646	

Sample Size = 337

Ethnicity of Faculty

The SAS System
00:53 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	14
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	19
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	44
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	121
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	40
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	49
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	19
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	34

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
	ts	s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	14	19	33
	4.12	5.59	9.71
	42.42	57.58	
	11.97	8.52	
Neutral	44	121	165
	12.94	35.59	48.53
	26.67	73.33	
	37.61	54.26	
Satisfied	40	49	89
	11.76	14.41	26.18
	44.94	55.06	
	34.19	21.97	
Verysatis	19	34	53
	5.59	10.00	15.59
	35.85	64.15	
	16.24	15.25	
Total	117	223	340
	34.41	65.59	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	9.7466	0.0208
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	9.7382	0.0209
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	1.1716	0.2791
Phi Coefficient		0.1693	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1669	
Cramer's V		0.1693	

Sample Size = 340

Mentors

The SAS System
00:54 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	14
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	17
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	48
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	132
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	32
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	50
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	22
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	26

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	14	17	31
	4.11	4.99	9.09
	45.16	54.84	
	12.07	7.56	
Neutral	48	132	180
	14.08	38.71	52.79
	26.67	73.33	
	41.38	58.67	
Satisfied	32	50	82
	9.38	14.66	24.05
	39.02	60.98	
	27.59	22.22	
Verysatis	22	26	48
	6.45	7.62	14.08
	45.83	54.17	
	18.97	11.56	
Total	116	225	341
	34.02	65.98	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	9.9499	0.0190
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	9.9110	0.0193
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	2.6447	0.1039
Phi Coefficient		0.1708	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1684	
Cramer's V		0.1708	

Sample Size = 341

Advisor Availability

The SAS System
00:56 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	13
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	20
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	38
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	75
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	39
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	91
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	28
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	36

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	13	20	33
	3.82	5.88	9.71
	39.39	60.61	
	11.02	9.01	
Neutral	38	75	113
	11.18	22.06	33.24
	33.63	66.37	
	32.20	33.78	
Satisfied	39	91	130
	11.47	26.76	38.24
	30.00	70.00	
	33.05	40.99	
Verysatis	28	36	64
	8.24	10.59	18.82
	43.75	56.25	
	23.73	16.22	
Total	118	222	340
	34.71	65.29	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	3.9585	0.2660
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	3.9063	0.2718
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.2493	0.6176
Phi Coefficient		0.1079	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1073	
Cramer's V		0.1079	

Sample Size = 340

One Stop Service

The SAS System
00:57 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	11
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	29
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	50
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	132
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	31
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	46
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	20
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	18

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
Frequency	Blckstdnts	Whtstdnts	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	11	29	40
	3.26	8.61	11.87
	27.50	72.50	
	9.82	12.89	
Neutral	50	132	182
	14.84	39.17	54.01
	27.47	72.53	
	44.64	58.67	
Satisfied	31	46	77
	9.20	13.65	22.85
	40.26	59.74	
	27.68	20.44	
Verysatis	20	18	38
	5.93	5.34	11.28
	52.63	47.37	
	17.86	8.00	
Total	112	225	337
	33.23	66.77	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	11.4720	0.0094
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	11.1193	0.0111
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	9.7948	0.0018
Phi Coefficient		0.1845	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1814	
Cramer's V		0.1845	

Sample Size = 337

Housing

The SAS System
00:58 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	18
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	24
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	26
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	90
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	40
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	59
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	31
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	51

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		Total
	Blckstdnts	Whtstdnts	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	18 5.31 42.86 15.65	24 7.08 57.14 10.71	42 12.39
Neutral	26 7.67 22.41 22.61	90 26.55 77.59 40.18	116 34.22
Satisfied	40 11.80 40.40 34.78	59 17.40 59.60 26.34	99 29.20
Verysatis	31 9.14 37.80 26.96	51 15.04 62.20 22.77	82 24.19
Total	115 33.92	224 66.08	339 100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	10.7569	0.0131
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	11.1433	0.0110
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	1.1161	0.2908
Phi Coefficient		0.1781	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1754	
Cramer's V		0.1781	

Sample Size = 339

Class Offerings

The SAS System
00:59 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	12
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	16
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	29
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	56
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	50
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	104
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	24
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	49

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
Frequency	ts	s	
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Notsatisf	12	16	28
	3.53	4.71	8.24
	42.86	57.14	
	10.43	7.11	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Neutral	29	56	85
	8.53	16.47	25.00
	34.12	65.88	
	25.22	24.89	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Satisfied	50	104	154
	14.71	30.59	45.29
	32.47	67.53	
	43.48	46.22	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Verysatis	24	49	73
	7.06	14.41	21.47
	32.88	67.12	
	20.87	21.78	
-----+-----+-----+-----			
Total	115	225	340
	33.82	66.18	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob

Chi-Square	3	1.1799	0.7578
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	1.1445	0.7663
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.6254	0.4290
Phi Coefficient		0.0589	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0588	
Cramer's V		0.0589	

Sample Size = 340

Peer Group Relationship

The SAS System
01:34 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	9
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	20
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	46
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	90
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	40
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	78
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	22
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	37

The FREQ Procedure
Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdn	Whtstdnt	Total
	ts	s	
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	9	20	29
	2.63	5.85	8.48
	31.03	68.97	
	7.69	8.89	
Neutral	46	90	136
	13.45	26.32	39.77
	33.82	66.18	
	39.32	40.00	
Satisfied	40	78	118
	11.70	22.81	34.50
	33.90	66.10	
	34.19	34.67	
Verysatis	22	37	59
	6.43	10.82	17.25
	37.29	62.71	
	18.80	16.44	
Total	117	225	342
	34.21	65.79	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	0.3924	0.9418
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	0.3912	0.9421
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	0.3010	0.5833
Phi Coefficient		0.0339	
Contingency Coefficient		0.0339	
Cramer's V		0.0339	

Sample Size = 342

Student Body Characteristics

The SAS System

01:02 Friday, November 19, 2004

Obs	PREFER	GROUP	FREQ
1	Notsatisf	Blckstdnts	9
2	Notsatisf	Whtstdnts	15
3	Neutral	Blckstdnts	43
4	Neutral	Whtstdnts	116
5	Satisfied	Blckstdnts	39
6	Satisfied	Whtstdnts	68
7	Verysatis	Blckstdnts	26
8	Verysatis	Whtstdnts	29

The FREQ Procedure

Table of PREFER by GROUP

PREFER	GROUP		
	Blckstdnts	Whtstdnts	Total
Frequency			
Percent			
Row Pct			
Col Pct			
Notsatisf	9	15	24
	2.61	4.35	6.96
	37.50	62.50	
	7.69	6.58	
Neutral	43	116	159
	12.46	33.62	46.09
	27.04	72.96	
	36.75	50.88	
Satisfied	39	68	107
	11.30	19.71	31.01
	36.45	63.55	
	33.33	29.82	
Verysatis	26	29	55
	7.54	8.41	15.94
	47.27	52.73	
	22.22	12.72	
Total	117	228	345
	33.91	66.09	100.00

Statistics for Table of PREFER by GROUP

Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
Chi-Square	3	8.1721	0.0426
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	3	8.0879	0.0442
Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square	1	5.0127	0.0252
Phi Coefficient		0.1539	
Contingency Coefficient		0.1521	
Cramer's V		0.1539	

Sample Size = 345

REFERENCES

- Amos, A. (2002). Affirmative action during the 1970s. *History of education: Selected moments of the 20th century*. Retrieved September 6, 2004, from <http://fcis.oise.utoronto.ca/>.
- American Council on Education. (2001). Investing in people: Developing all of America's talent on campus and the workplace. *Business-Higher Education Forum Report*.
- Anderson, E. L. (2003). Changing U.S. demographics and American higher education. In King, J. E., Anderson, E. L., & Corrigan, M. E., Changing student attendance patterns: Challenges for policy. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 121, 3-12. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- ASHE-ERIC, (2003). Why students leave college. [Electronic Version]. *Higher Education Report*, 30(2), 43 – 70.
- Bean, J. P. (2000). A psychological model of college student retention. In Braxton, J. M. (Ed.), *Rethinking the student departure puzzle* (1st ed., pp.48-61). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Bean, J. P. & Eaton, B. E., (2000). A psychological model of college student retention. In J. Braxton (Ed.), *Reworking the student departure puzzle* (pp. 48-61). Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press

Bourne-Bowie, K. (2000). Retention depends on new models of student development.

[Electronic version]. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 17(3), 36.

College View, (2004). *A history in three acts*. Retrieved on November 20, 2004 from

<http://www.collegeview.com>.

Corrigan, M. E. (2003). Beyond access: Persistence challenges and the diversity of low

income students. In King, J. E., Anderson, E. L., & Corrigan, M. E., Changing

student attendance patterns: Challenges for policy. *New Directions for Higher*

Education, 121(Spring). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Education Access Report, (2004). *African American student retention involves unique*

challenges. Retrieved on April 2, 2004 from

<http://www.usafunds.org/news/dmp/dmp012704a.html>.

Eimers, M.T., Pike, G.R., (1997). Minority and non-minority adjustment to college:

Differences or similarities? *Research in Higher Education*, 38(1), 77-97.

Evelyn, J. (2000). Retention: Graduation's critical component. [Electronic version].

Black Issues in Higher Education. 17(3), 6.

Fridah, M. W. (2004). Sampling in research. Retrieved November 22, 2004, from

http://www.indiana.edu/~educy520/sec5982/week_2/mugo02sampling.pdf

Fields, C. D. (2002). Taking a holistic approach to retention. *Black Issues in Higher*

Education, 19(18), 28.

Gaither, G. H. (1999). What the future holds. [Electronic version]. *New Directions for*

Higher Education. 108(Winter), 115 -118.

- Hurd, H., (2000). Staying power: Colleges work to improve retention rates. [Electronic version]. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 17(18), 42-47.
- Iannone, C. (2002-2003). Diversity and the abolition of learning. *Academic Questions*, Winter, 39-49.
- Johnson Jr., R. M. (2000). Investigating the processes of persistence: Refining discourse analysis as a tool for generating new departure theory. In Braxton, M. J. (Ed.), *Rethinking the student departure puzzle* (1st Ed., 157-169). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Johnson, L. J., (2000 – 2001). Learning communities and special efforts in the retention of university students: What works and what doesn't, and is it worth the investment. *Journal of College Student Retention: research, theory & practice*, 2(3), 219-238.
- Kuh, G. D., & Love, P.G., (2000). A cultural perspective in student departure. In Braxton, J. M., *Rethinking the student departure puzzle*, (1st ed.,196-212). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Lee, W. Y., (1999). Striving toward effective retention: The effect of race on mentoring African American students. [Electronic version]. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(2), 27 - 44.
- Levitz, R. & Noel, L., (2000). The earth shaking but quiet revolution in retention management. Retrieved April 16, 2004 from <http://www.noellevitz.com>.
- Low, L., (2000). Successful retention planning: A step-by-step approach. Retrieved on April 2, 2004 from www.noellevitz.com.

Nora, A. (2001). How minority students finance their higher education. ERIC Digest.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Retrieved April 16, from

<http://ericdigest.org>.

Pascarella, E. T. (1982). Studying student attrition. *New Directions for Institutional*

Research. IX(4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pearson Education, (2000-2004). Milestones in African American education. Retrieved

September 6, 2004 from <http://printinfolease.com/ipa/A0872844.html>.

Potts, G., Schultz, B. & Foust, J., (2003-2004). The effect of freshman cohort groups on

academic performance and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention:*

research, theory & practice 5(4), 385-396.

Ohio Board of Regents, (2004). *The performance report for Ohio's Colleges &*

universities – 2003. Retrieved on April 2, 2004 from

<http://www.regents.state.oh.us/perfrpt/>.

Roach, R., (2001). Is higher education ready for minority America? [Electronic version].

Black Issues in Higher Education, 18(8).

Redón, L. I.; Jalomo, R. E.; & Nora, A. (2000) *Theoretical considerations in the study of*

minority student retention in higher education. In Braxton, J. M., *Rethinking the*

student departure puzzle, (1st ed., 127-156). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University

Press

Stage, F. K., & Hossler, D., (2000). Where is the student? Linking student behaviors,

college choice, and college persistence. In Braxton, J. M., *Rethinking the student*

departure puzzle, (1st ed., 170-195). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press

- Swail, W. S. (with Redd, K. E. & Perna, L. W. (2003). Retaining minority students in higher education: A framework for success. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tinto, V., (1993). *Leaving college*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Ill.
- Tinto, V., (2003a). The assessment of student retention programs. Paper presented at *Student Success and Retention Conference*, Dayton, OH.
- Tinto, V., (2003b). Student success and the building of involving education communities. Paper presented at *Student Success and Retention Conference*, Dayton, OH.
- U.S. Department of Education, (2003). *Education performance & accountability: Results Agenda*. Retrieved on April 4, 2004 from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/results2004/index.html>.
- Walton, M. Joseph, (1979). Retention, role modeling, and academic readiness: A perspective on the ethnic minority student in higher education.[Electronic version]. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, October, 124 – 127.
- Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, Division of Institutional Research, (Fall, 2003). *Student fact book*. Retrieved April, 9, 2004, from http://www.wright.edu/admin/bpra/pubs/f03_factbook.pdf

