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Abstract

The goal of this study is to develop a model of black, full-time undergraduate student retention. It is specifically for those students who attend public, predominantly white universities in the United States.

Essential concepts are reviewed here. Some of the key concepts are retention, attrition, persistence and dropout. The implications of the use of these particular concepts are important and is analyzed.

This project uses the naturalistic inquiry method. Naturalistic inquiry is a qualitative process that generally refers to what the researcher chooses to do in order to best obtain the desired data. Models of the retention and dropout processes and related literature were examined. Interviews also were conducted with students, staff, and faculty at a public university in California.

The history of black students at predominantly white universities is discussed. Additionally, there is an extensive review of the retention/attrition/persistence(dropout) literature.

Three models that address either retention or attrition are examined. None of these provided a
comprehensive portrayal of retention for black undergraduates who attend public predominantly white universities. An adequate model needed to be developed. A new framework—A Comprehensive Model of Black Student Retention for Predominantly White Universities—is developed here.

This model has been designed to help universities assess their retention efforts and to enable them to be more responsive to their black undergraduates. It should be noted that the model also may be used in reviewing the retention of other minority as well as non-minority students.
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The goal of this study is to develop a model of black undergraduate, full-time student retention specifically for those who attend public, predominantly white universities (PWU) in the United States. Retention has a number of meanings, but here it refers to students graduating from the school of initial entry (Lenning et al., 1980:6).

This project uses the naturalistic inquiry method. Naturalistic inquiry is a qualitative process that generally refers to what the researcher chooses to do in order to best obtain the desired data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:8). Models of the retention and dropout processes, respectively, and related literature were examined. Interviews also were conducted with students, staff, and faculty at a public university in California.

Three models of either retention or attrition are examined. The models do not provide a comprehensive portrayal of retention for black undergraduates who attend public, PWUs. In 1982, Vincent Tinto (1982:699), the author of the major model in the field, acknowledged that minorities have been dealt with insufficiently. He also stated that the existing models lack policy relevance. A framework that addresses these areas is
Several contributions to the literature are made. Essential terminology is defined and the implications of the terms is discussed. This paper also includes an extensive review of the pertinent literature in the field. In addition to assessing models, a new comprehensive model is offered.

Despite an increase in the numbers of blacks attending college from 1985 to 1989, problems remain (Schantz, 1992:7). Blacks are less likely than white students to be retained (Trippi & Cheatham, 1991:342). In the early 1980s, for instance, a study of dropouts was conducted at Indiana University Bloomington, a PWU. The dropout rate was 62 percent for blacks whereas that for whites was 30 percent (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990:33).

The importance of black student retention has been acknowledged in a number of ways. For example, _Black Issues in Higher Education_ publishes an annual special report on the retention of minority students each January. The publication also sponsored a videoconference on recruiting and retaining minority students in March of 1992. Both the National Conference on Student Retention and the National Higher Education Conference on Black Student Retention have attracted
higher education practitioners and researchers. The large body of literature reviewed here also demonstrate the relevance of the topic. These modes of communication have been geared to faculty, administrators, researchers, and policymakers.

Despite the attention given to black student retention, rates continue to be problematic. Until more PWUs both seek and enact solutions, the dilemma will not disappear. An even more basic concern is the quality of black students' educational experiences at PWUs (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990:57). It is important to recognize that, as students at PWUs, blacks, and minority students in general, have been forced to adapt to an environment conceptualized for non-minorities (Centra, 1970:336). According to Carter G. Woodson (1933:xii), the American educational system "...has been worked out in conformity to the needs of those who have enslaved and oppressed weaker peoples."

This project is divided into seven chapters. The statement of the problem is followed by a chapter that presents and discusses the definitions of the basic terms that are used in this paper. The terms, retention, attrition, persistence, and dropout will be concentrated upon in an analysis of their implications. The chapter
on methods discusses some characteristics of a naturalistic inquiry, the main methodological tools, and supplementary instruments. The fourth is the history of blacks in higher education, specifically integrated colleges and universities. Retention/attrition/persistence/dropout literature is summarized in chapter five. Chapter six describes how Emile Durkheim's theory of egoistic suicide has been used by researchers (e.g. Spady, 1970; and Tinto, 1975) to understand dropout. It also discusses three models; one of the retention process and two of the dropout process. The seventh chapter is an analysis of the information presented in previous chapters which relate to the development of a retention model for black students. The paper will be concluded in chapter eight.
CHAPTER 2
CONCEPTS

Concepts are "...abstract terms we employ to explain or make sense of our experience" (Baker, 1988:111). The first half of this chapter will provide definitions of concepts frequently used in this paper. In the second, the terms retention, attrition, persistence, and dropout will be analyzed in terms of the implications of their usage. The purpose of this is to eliminate uncertainty regarding the meanings of these words. Also, an explanation will be provided as to why this project focuses upon retention and not attrition, persistence, or dropout.

Concepts serve to remove doubt regarding the meanings of phenomena. It is intended that defining concepts will enable the reader to better understand the topic under discussion.

Eight concepts will be explained: retention; persistence; attrition; dropout; black American; full-time undergraduate student; public, four-year university; and predominantly white university. The definitions provided here will be used throughout this paper.

Retention refers to graduating from the institution of initial entry. Persistence is when students decide to stay in their particular college or university (Levin &

Attrition is when students voluntarily withdraw temporarily or permanently, transfer or are forced to leave under academic dismissal (Levin & Levin, 1991:323-324). Dropout refers to when students fail to complete their desired educational goals at a particular institution. Thus, if Student A enters a university with the aim of earning an undergraduate degree, but leaves prior to this, then she/he is considered to be a dropout (Pascarella, 1982:6).

There are two facets to the meaning of black American. First, it indicates an individual who is an American of African descent (Anderson, 1990:2). A black American also is someone who defines her/himself as being such.

A full-time undergraduate student is a person who is working toward a 2- or 4-year degree, i.e. Associate’s or Bachelor’s. She/he is a full-time student when she/he is enrolled in 9 or more semester units, or 12 or more quarter units (Schantz, 1992:13,15). A public, four-year university is one that is operated by publicly-elected officials. It primarily is maintained with public funds. It is a four-year school if it awards 4-year degrees or higher, e.g. a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree (Schantz,
1992:13-14). A predominantly white university is one with 51 percent or more white enrollment (Cross, 1985:9).

Analysis

A major problem in studying college retention is that most of the discourse does not provide concrete definitions of frequently used concepts. The most often defined terms are dropout and attrition. The other concepts often go undefined. This particularly is true for these terms: public, four-year university, predominantly white university, black American, and full-time undergraduate student. This deficiency makes it difficult for researchers to agree on what a word means implicitly and explicitly.

Another problem is the confusion that results when concepts are used interchangeably. Many investigators use retention and persistence as if they denote the same occurrence. This is not done here. Retention implies institutional responsibility, e.g. what percentage of its studentbody is a university able to retain. Persistence indicates student accountability. If a student does not persist, then it is her/his fault. This paper is concerned about an institution’s liability in retaining students, i.e. retention.
As with retention and persistence, attrition and dropout are used as if they describe the same phenomenon. Most of the research does not clarify its position as to what entity is responsible for withdrawal. If a student is academically dismissed, a study on dropout may conclude that the student was underprepared or did not study enough. An investigation on attrition may argue that the university possessed an inadequate support system.

Another facet of the retention/attrition versus persistence/dropout dichotomy is the level of attention the phenomena receive. If the problem is defined as being persistence or dropout, then it is a personal trouble, i.e. inside the realm of individual control. The implications are much more far-reaching if the focus is retention/attrition as that makes the occurrence a public issue, i.e. outside the domain of individual rule. Thus, an institution can absolve itself of much of the responsibility if it defines the difficulty as being persistence or dropout; this is a value-laden, political action (Mills, 1959:8).

The reader will notice a variety of subjects addressed in the literature. Much of the discourse focuses on attrition, dropout, or persistence. In these
three areas, the same basic problem is described. However, in terms of solutions, intervention levels differ. For instance, for a high dropout rate, efforts may converge at the student level; tutorials may be offered as a solution.

The issue of defining predominantly white university also deserves attention. Only one study out of a field of over 50 defined it. Unfortunately, it is not a satisfactory one. This study states that a predominantly white university is one where 51 percent of the student population is white. However, if it is 51 percent white, then it also must be 49 percent minority. This project is concerned with universities where blacks (and minorities in general) are dramatically outnumbered by whites. This would entail at least a 60 percent white enrollment with over 90 percent of its faculty and administrators being white.

The following chapter will describe the methodological perspective which was applied in this project. It also will detail data collection procedures.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

This chapter has three objectives. First, it describes the philosophical basis of the methods used and second, it discusses how the data was gathered. Then, it explains my own relationship to the topic of this research.

Naturalistic Inquiry

The methodological approach used here is based upon naturalistic inquiry. Lincoln and Guba (1985:8) state that it is not possible to provide a simple definition of this particular qualitative process. However, it generally refers to what the researcher chooses to do in order to best obtain the data desired.

In a naturalistic inquiry, it is important to select sources deliberately. In this way, the researcher is certain to maximize the relevant data generated on a specific subject. If sampling procedures are random, then the researcher is less likely to locate data that is useful to the purpose of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:40).

Whenever possible, the researcher should consult with informants in the field studied. The researcher should use informants to clarify dubious meanings of
data. It is their definitions of reality, not the researcher's, which are most relevant to the project (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:41). The researcher should be open to using her/his personal knowledge as well in an effort to understand the topic.

Methods and Data Collection

The primary method used for this study was an examination of theories and models of the retention and dropout processes. Two of the theories and models were selected for examination because a review of the retention/attrition/persistence/dropout (RAPD) literature revealed that they formed the foundation of at least 50 percent of the research published since 1975. The third model was selected because it is a retention framework designed specifically for black undergraduate students who attend predominantly white universities (PWU). Each of these theories and models were analyzed in terms of their applicability to black undergraduates at PWUs.

Three supplementary methods were used to make this assessment. In order of importance they were a review of RAPD literature, personal interviews with and written questionnaires completed by black undergraduates at a
PWU, and personal interviews with faculty and staff members at this same PWU.

The views of black undergraduate students and employees at a California, public university (here to be referred to by the fictional name, Creek University) were elicited. In the fall of 1992, Creek University (CU) had an undergraduate population of 7,217. Of this number, 235 were black. The institution is located in a suburban section of a southern California city. Its approximate population is 206,000 (Danbridge, 1992).

Sixteen students provided information for this study. They were selected using the snowball method. Five faculty, administrators, and staff members of CU, additionally, were chosen in a convenience sample.

Two instruments were used for the students: a personal interview and written questionnaire. The interviews were unstructured and open-ended. Questions were designed to elicit supplementary data regarding the issues that concerned informants (e.g. how responsive were CU administrators, faculty, and staff to their needs as students).²

Five university employees were selected based upon the level and type of contact they had with students. The offices and departments they represented were Student
Affirmative Action, the Learning Center, African Student Programs, and the Psychology Department. Questions were aimed at explicating and assessing an informant's role in the retention process.  

The questionnaire—the Black Student Retention Survey—initially was developed and distributed in 1982 by Walter Allen, a professor of sociology at the University of California at Los Angeles. It is composed of 72 closed and open-ended questions. The questionnaire was used to provide biographical information and responses to standardized questions.

Personal Relationship to Topic

Personal experiences have influenced my choice of subject matter. I am a black female who has attended predominantly white schools from the elementary to the graduate level. My black friends and I were plagued by feelings of social and academic isolation particularly in undergraduate school. While we adopted methods of coping with our situation, it still was difficult. Several blacks who entered in the fall of 1984 along with me were not retained after their first and second years.

The institution at which I began my undergraduate work did make efforts at integrating us into the school's social and academic fabric. For example, we were
assigned counselors and student big sisters/brothers. The big sisters/brothers were juniors and seniors at the university. We were paired according to our major discipline. The main problem with these programs was that we, the students, were responsible for initiating contact.

The methodology that I have used also has been affected by my background. I was most interested in talking to the students and their black, campus role models. A significant proportion of the literature has focused on student responsibility. However, because of my personal experience, I strongly believe that the structural environment must be the focus of analysis.

What I believe to be important, the structural environment, is not reflected in the most prominent studies in the field. Two of the theories and models, which were the focus of this analysis, zeroed in on student variables (Spady, 1970; and Tinto, 1975). The third model provided a considerably more satisfactory treatment of the structural environment (Rowser, 1990).

The following chapter provides a brief look at the history of blacks in higher education in the United States. It provides background information for the literature review.
CHAPTER 4
HISTORY OF BLACKS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This chapter discusses the entrance of black students in de jure and de facto segregated colleges and universities. It represents another stage of the educational system opening up to blacks. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a background to the literature review. Another important aim is to show the effect that the federal government has had on the experiences of black students in higher education. Although the focus here is on predominantly white universities (PWU), the significant contributions of Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the education of blacks is recognized.

The Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka decision greatly impacted the integration of segregated, white colleges and universities. In Brown, the Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated schools were unconstitutional. In the early 1940s only one in ten blacks were enrolled in PWUs. In 1978, the ratio was seven in ten (Thomas, 1981a:18).

There was a steady increase of blacks attending PWUs in the South during the 1960s. Three thousand attended them in 1960. In 1965, that figure rose eight times over to 24,000. By 1970, 98,000 blacks were matriculating at
PWUs (Thomas, 1981a:19).

In 1947, black student enrollment in northern PWUs was 61,000, which was 3 percent of their total enrollment. Significant increases of black college matriculation nationwide during the 1970s primarily was due to attendance at white colleges in the North. In 1971, blacks accounted for 8.4 percent of total college enrollment. In 1977, that figure was 10.8 percent (Thomas, 1981a:21).

Gail Thomas (1981a:22) in Black Students in Higher Education: Conditions and Experiences in the 1970s credits federal government intervention with increasing black enrollment. The government recognized the importance of financial aid to the attainment of a college education. Thus, it increased the availability of aid to blacks.

Several programs were established. The National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, founded in the 1950s, inspired blacks in predominantly black secondary schools to go on to PWUs. The Higher Education Act of 1965 also expanded aid. Additionally, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program of 1972 supplied grants to students (Thomas, 1981a:22).

Another factor that impacted black enrollment was
civil rights activism. Thomas (1981a:24) found that many PWUs heightened their recruitment of blacks after Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a civil rights leader, was assassinated.

Campus protests also put pressure on PWUs. Black students demonstrated for black studies programs, the hiring of black faculty and the recruitment of more black students. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1970:8) reported that about one in 47 of the protests were met by the administration. Demonstrations which involved "...forcible seizure, strike, or disruption as tactics..." were the most successful in capturing administrative attention. They yielded results nearly half of the time.

Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin (1963:7) in The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges shed light on retention rates during the 1950s. Clark and Plotkin studied students who received aid from the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students. The dropout rate for these students was 18.9 percent. The national rate was approximately 60 percent.

The next chapter is a review of the RAPD literature. It dates from the late 1940s to the present.
CHAPTER 5
The goal of this chapter is to provide a review of retention/attrition/persistence/dropout (RAPD) studies. Included here are those works that focus upon public and private, four-year colleges and universities; predominantly white and non-predominantly white schools; as well as majority and minority undergraduate students in the United States. Most of the studies were about white students. When minorities are studied, it will be indicated in the text.

The oldest study on retention examined here is "Causes of Student Withdrawals at De Pauw University" by Edgar C. Cumings (1949:152). De Pauw, a predominantly white school, is located in Greencastle, Indiana. Cumings cites a 50 percent dropout rate among college and university students as the reason why De Pauw enacted a withdrawal procedure.

The plan manifested itself in the form of exit interviews. Thus, school administrators were able to discover student reasons for their departure. The top five most frequently identified rationales for leaving were "low scholarship, change in curricular interests, finances, desire to be nearer home and marriage" (Cumings, 1949:153).
Cumings (1949:153) concludes that a decrease in attrition is uncertain. However, the program is beneficial for three reasons: valuable information is gathered from students, there is a possible effect of discouraging some from dropping out, and goodwill is generated between student and university during the process.

The literature will be presented here by the decade in which each study was published. This facilitates comparisons among data from different decades, particularly in terms of the amount and substance of the research that addresses black students. Thus, the reader will better understand the genesis and progression of the field. It also will help to link the literature to the particular societal events that occurred during the decades in which they were published.

1950s

From 1956 to 1959 six studies were published. Three of the projects focused on dropout, two were on persistence and one was on attrition. Attention accorded to the field was minimal.

In 1956, Charles A. Berry and Arlynne L. Jones (1956:445) wrote "Factors Involved in the Withdrawal of
Students from Grambling College at or Before the End of their Freshman Year." Grambling is an historically black institution in northern Louisiana (Wiggins, 1966:xii). Seven topics are covered in the research questions: academic status, marital status, occupation, factors influencing withdrawal, and suggestions for the improvement of the Grambling experience. The researchers use a mail survey of 71 non-returning students to gather data for the study.

Berry and Jones (1956:446) find that finances, dislike of Grambling, marriage, military enlistment, family problems, pregnancy and health troubles were the most prominent reasons for dropout. Students also suggested curricular changes as a means of improving Grambling.

Finally, a few implications are addressed. Because Grambling already is providing many of its students with financial assistance, the authors propose that the school help locate part-time employment. Berry and Jones (1956: 446-447) also advise that Grambling must accept that it is partly responsible for the fates of the students who it admits.

"A Study of the Student Drop-out Problem at Indiana University" is Charles L. Koelsche's (1956:357)
contribution to the retention literature. Koelsche focuses on the individual characteristics of withdrawing students. He finds that lack of money, poor scholarship, marriage, ill health, and disinterestedness were primary distinctions of dropouts (Koelsche, 1956:363).

In "Student Persistence in College," Paul Munger (1956:241) examines the correlation between high school class rank, standardized test scores, and grade point average (GPA) at the end of the first year and how long a student stays in college. His findings support the roles of class rank, GPA and standardized test scores in predicting retention (Munger, 1956:243).

In "Personality Factors and College Attrition," Harry A. Grace (1957:37) hypothesizes that students who drop out lack independence and responsibility. Grace (1957:40) concludes that anxiety, responsibility and independence are related to dropout. While he suggests that the characteristics may be used in the admissions process, he warns against their misuse.

Roger Yoshino (1958:43), in "College Drop-outs at the End of the Freshman Year," investigates the factors that relate to withdrawal. Yoshino summarizes his discoveries in five parts: first, persisters and non-persisters differ in terms of high school GPA and
standardized test scores; second, college students generally have above average personalities although first-year students typically are immature; third, students should have a firm understanding of a college's academic expectations; fourth, high schools should prepare students better for college academics; and fifth, even dropouts believe that they had accrued some benefit from their college experiences (Yoshino, 1958:48).

Attributes of the University of Wisconsin's first-year class of 1953 and their advancement toward graduation is presented in "The Persistence of Academically Talented Youth in University Studies" (Little, 1959:237). Little (1959:241) examines academic factors gleaned from official university records. He finds that among students of equal scholastic ability some drop out whereas others do not.

Assessment

During the 1950s, only one study of the six reviewed here was about black students. It focused on dropout and attributes it to reasons connected to the students lives. Some of the reasons were marriage, family problems, and health troubles.
1960s

Nineteen studies were published during the 1960s. This was 13 more than that which appeared in the 1950s. Nine projects investigate dropout, five are on attrition, three are on related issues such as withdrawal and graduation, and two are on persistence.

"Identifying College Dropouts with the Minnesota Counseling Inventory" by Frederick G. Brown (1960:280) describes a study of the relationship between scores from the Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI) and retention. According to Brown, "[t]he MCI is a paper-and-pencil personality inventory designed for use in high schools." Brown (1960:282) finds that males who withdraw tend to be non-conforming and irresponsible. Females commonly are withdrawn and depressed.

Eldridge E. Scales (1960:430) begins his article by citing the dearth of information on black student retention as the inspiration of his project. The results of his study—a survey of institutional members of the National Association of Collegiate Deans and Registrars—are reported in "A Study of College Student Retention and
Withdrawal." Four research questions are posed:

1. What is the rate of student retention and withdrawal at institutions attended predominantly by Negroes?
2. What curricular areas of the institutions are experiencing the greatest rate of withdrawal at the end of the first year of college attendance?
3. What reasons are given for withdrawal of students?
4. What are the implications of the college student population for selection, admission, recruitment, guidance and counseling, and other practices and policies of institutions of higher education?

Some of Scales' findings are summarized here. Combined, the schools experienced 31.9 percent dropout of students who did not return at the completion of their initial year. Twenty-nine point five percent of students dropped out of the schools between their second and fourth years. Finally, the most often specified reasons for withdrawal were money difficulties, academic problems and institutional transfer (Scales, 1960:442-443). Numerous methods of handling this problem are suggested such as re-vamped counseling and guidance, tutorial programs and deferred tuition payment (Scales, 1960:444).

Dorothy Knoell (1960:41) reviews retention studies in her "Institutional Research on Retention and Withdrawal." She emphasizes data which concentrated upon first-year student attrition. Knoell (1960:63-64) closes
her examination with several recommendations for future research: first, normative data should be collected; second, a philosophy of the field should be developed; third, dropouts should be classified as voluntary/involuntary and remedial/non-remedial; fourth, institutions should engage in self-analysis; and fifth, techniques for the prediction of withdrawal should be devised.

Stanley O. Ikenberry (1961:323) uses a multivariate analysis in "Factors in College Persistence." He hypothesizes,

> It is possible to discriminate among groups of students classified by collegiate persistence, academic achievement, and sex, on the basis of linear combinations of variations including intellectual ability, social background, attitudes, and values.

Ikenberry (1961:329) discovers three significant characteristics: intellect; culture and sex; and social background.

In "Source of Error in College Attrition Studies" Bruce K. Eckland (1964b:60) "...demonstrates the need for an inter-institutional approach which allows for the delayed graduation of the dropouts who come back and the students who transfer." Eckland (1964b:61) also shows the relevance of longitudinal studies in determining
whether or not students eventually graduate.

Eckland's (1964a:36) "Social Class and College Graduation: Some Misconceptions Corrected" was published in 1964. He states that most researchers concur that social class is a determinant of initial enrollment. Eckland's work provides some support for the finding that the higher the social class the better are the students chances to graduate.

In "Personality Factors in College Dropout," Alfred B. Heilburn (1965:1) hypothesizes that dropouts exhibit marked assertiveness and deficient task-orientation. Heilburn (1964:6) finds that, in especially intelligent students, passivity and lack of task orientation relate to dropping out.

"The Interaction of Ability Levels and Socioeconomic Variables in the Prediction of College Dropouts and Grade Achievement" reports the results of a study by Ben Barger and Everette Hall (1965:501). Barger and Hall (1965:506) summarizes that when academic ability is controlled, socioeconomic factors are not significant in attrition. However, dropping out is more likely among students with a high ability level whose parents either are separated or divorced.

Harriet Rose (1965:399) in "Prediction and
Prevention of Freshman Attrition" investigates within semester voluntary dropouts. Rose (1965:400) labels these students "defaulters" distinguishing those who typically fall under the category of "dropout." The researcher (Rose, 1965:403) concludes that defaulters differ from persisters in that they are non-conforming social introverts.

A. Gordon Nelson (1966:1046) reviews 22 variables in order to differentiate among universities in his "College Characteristics Associated with Freshman Attrition." Important institutional factors which coincide with high attrition are identified as being a high percentage of men in the student body, low selectivity in the institution's admissions process, small school and community size, and low institutional affluence (Nelson, 1966:1050).

In "The Personality Record as a Predictor of College Attrition: A Discriminant Analysis," Allen E. Ivey, Floyd E. Peterson and E. Stewart Trebbe (1966:200) consider standardized test scores and high school rank along with the Personality Record (PR) as predictors. Ivey and his colleagues (1966:202) detect that standardized test scores improve the predictive power of the PR, but the most effective factor is high school rank. When high
school rank is high, attrition is low.

Harriet A. Rose and Charles F. Elton (1966:242) examine four types of students in "Another Look at the College Dropout." They are grouped as those who withdrew during a semester, those who successfully completed one year, those who did not complete one year and those who were successful in finishing the first year, but voluntarily withdrew. Rose and Elton (1966:244) gather that personality factors distinguish the groups examined. Their findings are summarized here.

1. Students who continue their college programs but achieve less than a C average as well as those who withdraw within semester are less dependent than students who either drop out or persist with a C average.

2. Students who drop out of college are significantly more hostile than students who persist or default. In addition, dropouts tend to show the most maladjustment; to be illogical, irrational, uncritical in their approach to problem solving; and to dislike reflective and abstract thought.

3. Successful persisters in this study are conforming, as are dropouts, but they tend to repress more. They would deny or inhibit unconventional or socially undesirable behavior.

"Student Perceptions of College Persistence, and their Intellective, Personality and Performance
Correlates" details Edmond Marks' (1967) contribution to the field. Marks (1967:212) examines student persistence expectancies and how they change. Thirty-five of the 300 students Marks (1967:215) contacted state that it was likely or highly likely that they would not graduate from Pennsylvania State University. Some of the characteristics that differentiated this group from students not likely to dropout were low motivation, laziness and lack of occupational goals.

In "Student Dissatisfaction with College and the College Dropout: A Transactional Approach," Lawrence A. Pervin and Donald B. Rubin (1967:285) "...investigate how discrepancies between the student’s perception of himself and his college and probability of dropping out." Their findings support the relationship between nonacademic displeasure and attrition (Pervin & Rubin, 1967:289).

Alan E. Bayer (1968:305) in "The College Drop-out: Factors Affecting Senior College Completion" studies 38 factors, e.g. ethnicity-religion, high school characteristics and family income, and their effect on attrition. These variables account for less than 30 percent, and less than 20 percent of the variances in dropout for women and men respectively. Although information about ethnicity is requested in Bayer’s
questionnaire, he does not describe group-specific findings.

The intent of George D. Demos' (1968:681) study is to specify explanations for college dropout. His results are published in the article "Analysis of College Dropouts--Some Manifest and Covert Reasons." The most common explanation students provide for non-persistence is needing a job (Demos, 1968:682). These students also participated in in-depth interviews with counselors. The reasons that counselors perceive are very different. They list financial difficulties, poor motivation, academic problems and personal-emotional factors as the most frequent causes of dropout (Demos, 1968:684).

"Attrition Among College Students" gives the results of a national study conducted by Robert J. Panos and Alexander Astin's (1968:57). Personal and environmental factors are the focus (Panos & Astin, 1968:58). The authors determine that students are more likely to complete college if their peer relations are cohesive, cooperative and marked by independence. In regard to the classroom setting, personal involvement and familiarity with the professor are important (Panos & Astin, 1968:66-67). Significant personal characteristics that relate to retention are high grades in secondary school, desire
to pursue a graduate education and medium to high socioeconomic background (Panos & Astin, 1968:64).

In "College Students' Motivations Related to Voluntary Dropout and Under-Overachievement," Horace B. Reed (1968:412) employs psychological and sociological theories of human behavior. Reed (1968:416) finds that academic tasks that stress student effort, attention, awareness and concern improve overall performance. Another important factor in discouraging dropping out is college being relevant to a student's occupational goals.

Richard P. Vaughan (1968:685) examines the effect of lumping all withdrawals in the dropout category in "College Dropouts: Dismissed vs. Withdrew." Vaughan's subjects are 78 male undergraduates. He finds that academic dismissals and voluntary withdrawals differ in terms of cognition and personality. Dismissed individuals typically are impulsive and lack educational commitment. They also are unstable and restless. These characteristics hinder their academic performance (Vaughan, 1968:688).

Assessment

One study was published on black students out of 19 during the 1960s. Scales' (1960:430) article addressed
retention and dropout. The researcher identified student variables as reasons for dropout. The most common explanations were money difficulties, academic problems, and institutional transfer (Scales, 1960:442-443).

1970s

During the 1970s, 17 articles were published on RAPD and related areas. This represents a slight decline from the 1960s. There are five each on attrition and dropout, three on persistence, three on tangential topics such as black student collegiate experiences, and two on retention.

In "Black Students at Predominantly White Colleges: A Research Description," John A. Centra (1970:325) analyzes data from several sources to answer one research question: "How do the background characteristics, activities, goals, and perceptions of black students at predominantly white colleges differ from those of their white counterparts?" Centra (1970:336) finds many similarities and differences between these groups. For example, both participate in a variety of extracurricular activities. However, blacks are much more aware of themselves as minorities. Furthermore, they believe that their status has a direct effect on their friendships.
J. Richard Hackman and Wendell S. Dysinger (1970:311) examine educational commitment in "Research Notes: Commitment to College as a Factor in Student Attrition." The authors (Hackman & Dysinger, 1970:312) submit that both student and family commitment are significant contributors to dropout. Hackman and Dysinger's (1970:315) results confirm that low commitment has a negative effect upon persistence (Hackman & Dysinger, 1970:321).

Jack E. Rossmann and Barbara A. Kirk (1970:56) investigate the statuses of undergraduates at the University of California at Berkeley in "Factors Related to Persistence and Withdrawal among University Students." Their findings indicate that students with strong intellectual interests and a need for independence are more likely to voluntarily withdraw. This, the authors' note, is in contrast to Rose and Elton's 1966 study which describes these students as hostile and maladjusted (Rossmann & Kirk, 1970:61).

"normative congruence," the condition where students have interests and values compatible with the institution that they attend, lessens the probability of dropout. He also asserts that having a friendship support system helps prevent student dropout. The model that he devises is tested in a second study (Spady, 1970:79).

Blanchfield, (1971:1) in "College Dropout Identification: A Case Study," seeks to offer a method of predicting dropout. Among the characteristics of a persister are a concern for social issues, the possession of grants, a high secondary school class rank, and a high GPA in the first semester (Blanchfield, 1971:3).

David H. Kamens (1971:270) takes an institutional focus in his "The College 'Charter' and College Size: Effects on Occupational Choice and College Attrition." From his analysis he concludes that large-size schools (5000 or more students) retain their students at a higher rate (Kamens, 1971:293). Moreover, Kamens (1971:294) advises that institutional factors are just as important as student variables. Thus, researchers should concentrate more on university faculty, staff, and administrators.

"Dropouts from Higher Education: Toward an Empirical Model" is William G. Spady's (1971) follow-up
investigation to his 1970 work. His objective in the present endeavor is to demonstrate the value of the model created in his previous project (Spady, 1971:39). Spady (1971:57) concludes that the model is adequate.

Lucy Zaccaria and James Creaser (1971:286) in "Factors Related to Persistence in an Urban Commuter University" concentrate their analyses on social status, personality traits, and ability. The high intellectual ability of persisters distinguishes them from involuntary withdrawers. Those who withdraw voluntarily also possess intellectual ability (Zaccaria & Creaser, 1971: 290).

In "Nonintellectual Correlates of Black Student Attrition," Anthony C. Di Cesare, William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks (1972:319) attempt to discern how black returnees differ from non-returnees. Demographic and attitudinal factors are the focus of the investigation. The subjects compose nearly the entire population of black, full-time students who enrolled in the 1969 fall semester at the University of Maryland at College Park, a predominantly white institution.

Di Cesare and his colleagues (1972:323) find that the students do not substantially contrast with each other. However, those who persist are different in several ways: they are more confident, have higher
expectations, believe that the school should influence social conditions, envision more campus racism, live on campus, and use the university's facilities more frequently.

Jewelle Taylor Gibbs (1973:463) identifies "...the kinds of problems that are experienced by black students who attend a predominantly white university" in "Black Students/White University: Different Expectations."

Gibbs (1973:464) first delineates three expectations of blacks held by staff members: first, they are expected to be competitive with whites despite their inferior academic preparation; second, they are supposed to blend into the existing socio-cultural structure of the campus; and third, they are expected to be profusely thankful for their admittance to the high-quality college.

Gibbs (1973:464-465) also describes black student expectations. Four of them are listed: first, they believed that the school would flexibly meet their needs; second, they believed that college classes would both resemble and continue those in high school; third, they believed that campus social life would include and embrace their culture; and fourth, they believed that they would have closer contact with the general black community.
In conclusion, Gibbs (1973:457-458) discusses policy recommendations. First, she suggests a re-evaluation of admissions policies to reflect the school's changing applicant pool. Second, she advises that support services broaden its aims and become more culturally sensitive. Third, counselors can improve the experiences of black students by aggressively seeking them out to offer guidance. Fourth, a community liason can help put black students in touch with activities in the black community. Fifth, faculty and staff should interact more often with black students. Sixth, interracial contact should be fostered among students. Finally, black students must participate in university governance.


"Minority Enrollments in Higher Education" is the text of a speech given by researcher Alexander Astin (1975:173). The data that he relates originated with a national study on higher education. Astin asserts that
the black dropout rate is only a little higher than that for whites. He also points out that their rates are satisfactory considering their pre-collegiate academic preparation (Astin, 1975:174).

Vincent Tinto (1975:90) in "Dropout from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research" seeks to develop a theoretical model of dropout. He emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between types of dropout, i.e. voluntary withdrawal, academic failure, temporary, and permanent dropout and transfer. The basic rationale of Tinto's model is that the higher a student's academic and social integration the better their chances are for persistence (Tinto, 1975:94-95).7

In "Patterns of Student-Faculty Informal Interaction beyond the Classroom and Voluntary Freshman Attrition," Ernest T. Pascarella and Patrick T. Terenzini (1977:540) test an aspect of Tinto's theoretical model of attrition. Their data support the model. Pascarella and Terenzini (1977:449-450) also conclude that not all student-faculty interactions are equivalent. The most crucial in mitigating attrition are those that focus on intellectual matters.

Jomille Henry Braddock's (1978:4) aim in "Radicalism and Alienation Among Black College Students" is to
determine if there are attitudinal differences between black attendees who were enrolled at a predominantly white university and those at a traditional black university. Braddock hypothesizes that blacks at white institutions are more radical, educationally and politically alienated, and racially pessimistic.

Students at Florida A & M University, an historically black school, and Florida State University, a predominantly white school, are surveyed (Braddock, 1978:10). Braddock's (1978:20) hypotheses are supported by the data. He suggests that the most salient outcome of the project is the notion that there is something about the predominantly white college experience that nurtured alienation and extremism among blacks.

In "Undergraduate Black Student Retention Revisited" Sandra A. Garcia and Harriet C. Seligsohn (1978:162) assert that predominantly white universities must take responsibility for their black students' educational experiences. They also advise that the schools be more selective when it comes to admitting black students. The authors (Garcia & Seligsohn, 1978:160) reason that "[t]he success of the university in reducing the attrition rate among black students in inextricably bound to those students' skills and aspirations and to the university's
admissions policies." In addition to a more selective system, the schools should then commit needed resources to their students (Garcia & Seligsohn, 1978:162).

Andrew I. Kohen, Gilbert Nestel and Constantine Karmas (1978:233) survey male college students in "Factors Affecting Individual Persistence Rates in Undergraduate College Programs." Kohen and his co-authors (1978: 249-250) find that the salience of particular factors varies with a student’s academic year. For example, high school ability is important in the first year, but declines thereafter. The authors (Kohen, Nestel, & Karman, 1978:237) also submit that race is not an independent determinant of dropout.

Timothy Pantages and Carol F. Creedon (1978:49-50) synthesize the retention research in "Studies of College Attrition: 1950-1975." Pantages and Creedon (1978:93) found that poor college academic performance is the most important contributor to attrition. Although the influence of financial factors is equivocal, the authors conclude that its effect appears to be more one of providing psychological security to students. Pantages and Creedon (1978:94) close by suggesting that administrators should focus more on the prevention of attrition than its prediction.
In "Variables Involved in Withdrawal During the First Two Years of College: Preliminary Findings From the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972," Samuel S. Peng and William B. Fetters (1978:361) examine the manner of withdrawal in two-year and four-year schools. Among other discoveries, Peng and Fetters (1978:367) find that when socioeconomic status, aspiration and achievement are controlled, white students enrolled in four-year schools are more likely to drop out than their black cohorts. Blacks in the study have higher educational aspirations, but lower high school class rank and test scores.

In "Admission and Retention of Minority Students in Large Universities," William E. Sedlacek and Dennis W. Webster (1978:243) survey students at large, predominantly white universities in the United States. The authors gather that private schools are the most successful retainers of black students (Sedlacek & Webster, 1978:245-246).

Pascarella and Terenzini (1979:98), in "Interaction Effects in Spady's and Tinto's Conceptual Models of College Dropout," concentrate on social and academic integration. According to the authors (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1979:208-209), their research confirms the
complex, sociological nature of attrition. They also suggest that institutional policies and programs have an important impact upon dropout; specifically those that encourage faculty-student interaction and peer relations. Finally, distinctions regarding the frequency and substance of student-faculty contact add to the prediction of attrition.

Assessment

Seven articles (of 17 that were published during the 1970s) examined black students. Two of the works focused on retention and the perceptions of blacks regarding their experiences at PWUs. One project each was on attrition, dropout, and the alienation and radicalism of black students. Of those studies that addressed blacks leaving college, two provided student and institutional explanatory variables.

1980s

The 1980s produced 51 relevant studies. There are 20 on varied topics such as the alienation, adjustment, and academic performance of black students who attend PWUs. There are 11 retention-focused projects which is an increase of 9 over the 1970s. Ten studies are on
attrition, 5 are on dropout, and 3 are on persistence.

Student Retention Strategies by Oscar T. Lenning, Ken Sauer, and Philip E. Beal (1980:2-4) focuses on features of retention and types of retention programs. Numerous factors that influence retention are listed. They are:

* High academic performance in high school and first year of college.
* Familial aspirations for college.
* Advanced educational level of parents.
* High personal educational aspirations.
* Involvement of the student with the college.
* Intention to remain to graduation.
* Perception of financial capacity to pay expenses.
* Receipt of scholarships, grants, and/or part-time employment on campus.
* High prestige and cost of institution.
* Religious affiliation of institution.
* On-campus living.
* High-quality and utilization of student support services, especially learning assistance opportunities, advising, and involvement opportunities, both academic and nonacademic.
* High-quality and frequent student-faculty interaction.
* Student-institution fit, including moral and social integration, perceived responsiveness of the institution to students' needs and the congruence between expectations and opportunities for their realization.
According to Lenning and his co-authors (Lenning et al., 1980:2-4) the following are forms which retention schemes have taken:

1. Admission and recruiting.
2. Advising.
3. Counseling.
4. Early warning and prediction.
5. Exit interviews.
6. Extracurricular activities.
7. Faculty, staff, and curricular development.
9. Housing [on-campus].
10. Learning and academic support.
11. Orientation.
12. Policy change.

(Lenning et al., 1980:2-4)


Jomille Henry Braddock (1981:405-406) in "Desegregation and Black Student Attrition" applies black student behaviors to Tinto's model of attrition and compares the appropriateness of the scheme in explaining black student dropout at black and white colleges. Braddock (1981:407) gathers data at universities in Florida by means of a questionnaire. Three hundred and thirty-three individuals are targeted. Braddock's
The author concludes that Tinto's model is an apt tool for the analysis of black student dropout. In contrast to blacks who attend traditionally black colleges, those in the white institutions have a more difficult time with academic and social integration. According to Braddock (1981:416), this fact leads to higher dropout rate.


Barbara Hazard Munro (1981:133) tests Tinto's theoretical model of dropout in "Dropouts from Higher Education: Path Analysis of a National Sample." Munro's (1981:140) data support "...Tinto's notion that goal commitment has the strongest effect on persistence in higher education."

In "Social and Academic Environments of Black Students on White Campuses," Donald H. Smith (1981:300) inquires about the effects of attending a predominantly white university on black student persistence and
personal development. According to Smith (1981:304), white schools are hostile environments. He suggests that blacks need orientation programs, cultural support, counseling, contact with black faculty and administrators, white faculty-administrative leadership, and to organize with other black students (Smith, 1981: 305).

Gail E. Thomas (1981b:329) "...evaluates the influence of the types of colleges that black students attend on these students' success in completing a four-year college education on schedule...." "College Characteristics and Black Students' Four-Year College Graduation" is the product of her efforts. Thomas' (1981b:333) data is from the National Longitudinal Survey of the High School Class of 1972.

Three college variables are used: financial aid status, ("...i.e., the amount of loan and grant aid allocated to institutions per student"), college control, and racial composition (Thomas, 1981b:343). Thomas (1981b:344) concludes that financial aid status is the most important factor; i.e. the more funds that were available, the better the graduation rates. Another notable determinant is attendance at a predominantly black college. Thomas predicts that whether or not black
schools are able to retain black students depends upon the attractiveness of their financial aid packages.

Writing again in 1981, Thomas (1981c:328) studies race and sex differences in graduation rates in "Student and Institutional Characteristics as Determinants of the Prompt and Subsequent Four-Year College Graduation of Race and Sex Groups." Among those students who enter college soon after high school, blacks are slower to graduate. College grade performance is the strongest predictor of graduation for all groups studied, i.e. black and white males and females (Thomas, 1981c:342-343).

Norman D. Aitken (1982:32) presents a theoretical scheme for a particular institution in "College Student Performance, Satisfaction and Retention: Specification and Estimation of a Structural Model." Six variables are identified: GPA, residential living and academic satisfaction; concern with family--personal problems, activity involvement, and concern with financial problems. Aitken (1982:40) finds that GPA as well as degree of satisfaction with residential living and academic experiences are most effective in explaining retention.

Aitken's (1982:33) model was not chosen for further
analysis for several reasons. First, he does not
delineate the retention process; nor is it viewed as
being longitudinal. Second, while 6 percent of Aitken's
(1982:39) sample are minorities, he does not draw any
race-based conclusions. What is valuable are Aitken's
(1982:40) findings regarding factors that relate to
retention.

The article, "In Search of the Silken Purse: Factors
in Attrition Among First-Generation Students," by Janet
Mancini Billson and Margaret Brooks Terry (1982:59)
explains some of the barriers that first-generation
students confront. A few major problems are deficiencies
in social structural and affiliational integration
(Billson & Terry, 1982:73).

"From the Halls of Hough and Holsted: A Comparison
of Black Students on Predominantly White and
Predominantly Black Campuses," is Willa Mae Hemmons'
(1982:383) addition to research on black college
students. Hemmons (1982:385) compares the viewpoints of
blacks in white and black institutions. Her
questionnaire is composed of attitudinal and demographic,
closed-ended items.

Black student educational experiences are
significantly complicated by their attendance at white
colleges. Hemmons (1982:400) also states that each student must learn "...how to adjust to a totally different social environment in which he or she is at best tolerated, at worst openly ridiculed and at no time ever really wanted." Some students are better prepared than others to cope at white institutions. Hemmons concludes that black schools are an attractive alternative. However, the solution is for white institutions to improve their social and academic environments in order to make black students feel more accepted.

Studying Student Attrition is a seven chapter book edited by Ernest T. Pascarella (1982). The sections discuss the definition of dropout, models of attrition, variable selection, the designing of research studies, retention interventions, and resources for attrition projects. Pascarella (1982:90) finds that the most effective attrition investigations are longitudinal, account for variations in student background, use multiple measures of influential factors, and use a multivariate analytical design. Pascarella writes that one major problem in designing interventions is that few have been implemented. More experimentation in the field is needed.
Edwin A. Rugg (1982:232), in "A Longitudinal Comparison of Minority and Nonminority College Dropouts: Implications for Retention Improvement Programs," cites a deficit in longitudinal studies as the impetus for his project. Rugg questions students who attend the University of Mississippi, a predominantly white institution. Blacks comprise 90 percent of Rugg's (1982:233) minority subjects. Possible reasons for minority dropout are the schools' lack of commitment to affirmative action, minority student recruitment, a Black Studies Program, and black student organizations (Rugg, 1982:234-235).

"Limits of Theory and Practice in Student Attrition" by Vincent Tinto (1982:687) asks to what extent should researchers and practitioners go to decrease the dropout rate. His own attrition model, he clarifies, is not meant to explain all dropout behaviors (Tinto, 1982:688). Additionally, the model inadequately accounts for the finance variable, the difference between transfer and permanent dropout and the effects of gender, race, and social status (Tinto, 1982:682). Tinto (1982:699) goes on to write that no existing models sufficiently address minority students. Furthermore, "...our models do not permit the fine-tuning of attention and therefore are not
as policy relevant as they might otherwise be."

In "Predicting Voluntary Freshman Year Persistence/Withdrawal Behavior in a Residential University: A Path Analytical Validation of Tinto's Model," Ernest T. Pascarella and Patrick T. Terenzini (1983:215) test three specific areas: voluntary withdrawal, the interplay between social and academic integration and the interplay between institutional and goal commitment. The researchers find that the model skillfully distinguishes between persisters and dropouts. Academic and social integration have direct effects upon persistence, i.e. the better integrated students are, the better their persistence rates. These factors also indirectly affect persistence through institutional and goal commitment (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1983:224-225).

Robert A. Blanc, Larry E. DeBuhr and Deanna C. Martin (1983:80) describe an academic support program in "Breaking the Attrition Cycle: The Effects of Supplemental Instruction on Undergraduate Performance and Attrition." The scheme reaches students via their courses (Blanc et al., 1981:81). Administrators believe that the program possesses five assets: first, it is proactive; second, service is combined with particular classes; third, the program is not stigmatized as
remedial; fourth, student interaction and peer support is encouraged; and fifth, professors receive valuable feedback on student perceptions (Blanc et al., 1983:88).

In "Financial Aid and Educational Outcomes: A Review," Eric L. Jensen (1983:287) reviews the data on the financial aid variable in persistence. Two of his findings are that financial aid improves student opportunities, although it does not affect academic achievement. Additionally, grants and scholarships positively influence retention (Jensen, 1983:300).

"A Multiinstitutional, Path Analytic Validation of Tinto's Model of College Withdrawal" is Ernest T. Pascarella and David W. Chapman's (1983:100) contribution to the literature. Their analysis reveals results compatible with what Tinto anticipated. Both social and academic integration have significant impacts upon withdrawal.

Tinto's model is tested in a commuter institutional environment and the results are reported in "A Test and Reconceptualization of a Theoretical Model of College Withdrawal in a Commuter Institution Setting." Authors Ernest T. Pascarella, Paul B. Duby and Barbara K. Iverson (1983:89) seek to fill a deficit of research on commuter schools and attrition. Their
reconceptualization of Tinto's model proposes a direct line from institutional commitment to academic integration. Additionally, intent to persist is the most significant predictor of persistence through the first year of college.

Hoi K. Suen (1983:118) offers "Alienation and Attrition of Black College Students on a Predominantly White Campus." Suen's purpose is to investigate the relationship between alienation and dropout among blacks who attend a predominantly white university. White and black students from a mid-size school in the Midwest with a 97 percent white student body are surveyed.

Black students score higher on the alienation measures than whites. The black dropout rate is 48 percent whereas that for whites is 20 percent. Suen (1983:120) also finds that the students' GPAs are correlated with attrition. Therefore, "...any attempts to reduce attrition should also attempt to improve students' academic performance." Suen (1983:121) concludes that strengthened support services, e.g., orientation, tutoring and peer counseling, can decrease black estrangement and academic difficulties.

In "Two Types of Voluntary Undergraduate Attrition: Application of Tinto's Model," Shelly B. Getzlaf,
Gordon M. Sedlacek, Kathleen A. Kearney and Jane M. Blackwell (1984:258) test the model's ability to identify dropouts. Their findings confirm the utility of Tinto's model utility (Getzlaf et al., 1984:265).

"Recent Findings Concerning Relative Importance of Housing to Student Retention" by S. Herndon (1984) focuses on housing as a factor in retention. Herndon (1984:29) speculates that on-campus housing helps socialize students to the campus environment. This results in heightened satisfaction.


[t]he findings here indicate that there is something about the organization and operation of educational institutions which is differentially related to the academic achievement of black students.

William T. Trent (1984:282) focuses on educational attainment in "Equity Considerations in Higher Education: Race and Sex Differences in Degree Attainment and Major Field from 1976 through 1981." Trent also looks at
distinctions between white and black colleges in regard to black student success. He finds that, nationwide, blacks have been slow to achieve parity nationwide with whites. Trent (1984:287) concludes that black colleges continue to be important producers of degreed blacks. He also cautions that though the number of blacks completing white colleges has increased, it is due to a rise in the number of blacks attending them; not to better retention rates (Trent, 1984:303).

Walter R. Allen (1985) in "Black Student, White Campus: Structural, Interpersonal, and Psychological Correlates of Success" examines the factors that relate to black student advancement. He finds that in contrast to Tinto's subjects, black students do not need social integration as a condition for academic success (Allen, 1985:144). These students should strive to attain "interpersonal accomplishment." According to Allen (1985:145), "[t]heir expertise in interpersonal relations leads to regular participation in Black student organization activities, better relations with faculty, and more favorable views of university support services...." Allen (1985:147) closes by encouraging researchers to study variations within the black student population, instead of black-white differences.
Melvin L. Oliver, Consuelo J. Rodriguez and Roslyn A. Mickelson (1985:3), in "Brown and Black in White: The Social Adjustment and Academic Performance of Chicano and Black Students in a Predominantly White University," focus on the proportion of blacks and Chicanos in white institutions and the subsequent performance and graduation rates of these students. The exploratory study utilizes data from the University of California at Los Angeles, 1980-81 school year (Oliver et al., 1985:7).

The investigators find that among those studied, the blacks originate from higher social status backgrounds than the Chicanos (Oliver et al., 1985:10). Despite their better high school academic records, blacks do not perform as well as Chicanos in college. Additionally, middle-class Chicanos outperform middle-class blacks (Oliver et al., 1985:16). Oliver and his co-authors believe that "[m]iddle class Chicanos, in fact, often speak, dress and physically appear to be Anglo. Blacks, regardless of class, signal to the university their status as Afro-Americans." In closing, the authors argue that administrators must be more responsive to their minority students' needs (Oliver et al., 1985:19).

Richard N. Fox (1986:416), in "Application of a Conceptual Model of College Withdrawal to Disadvantaged
Students," studies special program admittees to the City University of New York. Fox (1986:416-417) sets out to discover if Tinto's theoretical model can be applied to non-traditional students, i.e. economically disadvantaged, mostly minority youths whose academic preparation is lacking. He concludes that the model does not fully address the complexity of the social and academic integration of his subjects (Fox, 1986:422).


The researchers find that ethnic minorities experience feelings of sociocultural alienation more than whites (Loo & Rolison, 1986:71). However, these students generally are satisfied with their university. Loo and Rolison (1986:72) suggest five ways of mitigating alienation: first, enroll more ethnic minorities; second, develop more supportive residential, sociopolitical and academic communities; third, strengthen support services,
e.g., financial aid and, career planning and placement; fourth, hire more minority faculty; and fifth, ensure that the faculty is accessible and helpful.

Fred R. Savitz and Adrienne Walls (1986:12) concentrate their efforts on black students in "A Study of the Relationship Between Utilization Patterns of Support Services and the Attrition and Retention Rates of Black College Students." Their purpose is to discern the effectiveness of the support services at Saint Joseph's University, a small, private PWU. Savitz and Walls (1986:18) find that a majority of their subjects are persisters. They also conclude that the support services staff is sensitive to their needs.


Allen (1987:30) reports that students at black colleges have higher GPAs than those at white colleges. Respondents from black colleges also feel more a part of campus life. White faculty are deemed more supportive at black colleges too. However, these students consider dropping out more often.
In conclusion, Allen (1987:31) says that the choice between a black and white college hinges upon the student. Finances, family background, the racial composition of schools previously attended and field of study are some important factors. Allen believes that improvements in the college experience can be made when predominantly white colleges seek to learn and adopt their counterpart's strengths.

Successful retention strategies are described in "How 4 Predominantly White Colleges Succeed in Retaining Black and Hispanic Students" by Michele Collison (1987:31). The universities featured are Boston College, the California State University at Fresno, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and Purdue University (Collison, 1987:34). Four key attributes are listed:

1. The presence of a well-defined minority-group retention policy.
2. A high level of institutional commitment.
3. Comprehensive services, such as recruitment and counseling.
4. Dedicated staff and strong faculty support.

In "Effective Institutional Practices for Improving Minority Retention in Higher Education," Beatriz Chu Clewell and Myra S. Ficklen (1987:12) also focus on successful retention programs. Eight variables are
common to the schemes that they examine:

1. The presence of a stated policy regarding retention.
2. Substantial institutional commitment.
3. A substantial degree of institutionalization of the program.
4. Comprehensiveness of services.
5. Dedicated staff.
7. Faculty support.
8. No stigma attached to participating in special programs.

Brent Mallinckrodt and William E. Sedlacek (1987) offer "Student Retention and the Use of Campus Facilities by Race" to the retention literature. According to Mallinckrodt and Sedlacek (1987:29), blacks' distinct use of campus facilities is positively related to retention. Studying in the library is common to blacks and whites. However, weekly use of the gym and participation in Black Student Union recreational trips are unique to blacks (Mallinckrodt & Sedlacek, 1987:30). The authors conclude that administrators should encourage these activities in order to improve black student retention (Mallinckrodt & Sedlacek, 1987:32).

Michael T. Nettles and Janet R. Johnson (1987:512) examine campus socialization in "Race, Sex and Other Factors as Determinants of College Students' Socialization." The investigators conclude that black
students who have regular contact with their professors are the best socialized (Nettles & Johnson, 1987:521). They also advise that administrators focus on the satisfaction and academic integration of their black students.

William E. Sedlacek (1987:484) examines the perspective of student affairs research in "Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research." Over the years, black students have consistently been concerned about campus racism. Sedlacek (1987:490) says that it may take the form of inadequate funding allotted to black Greek organizations or eliminating a black studies program. He continues that this is a type of racism with which blacks must cope. Thus, the road to success is much more bumpy for blacks who still must compete academically.

In Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition, Vincent Tinto (1987:4) focuses on two goals—organizing the literature on the subject and showing how to improve retention. Tinto (1987:127) notes that student-institutional congruence is the most salient aspect of student withdrawal. Six principles
govern successful retention schemes (Tinto, 1987:139-140):

1. Institutions should ensure that new students enter with or have the opportunity to acquire the skills needed for academic success.
2. Institutions should reach out to make personal contact with students beyond the formal domains of academic life.
3. Institutional retention actions should be systematic in character.
4. Institutions should start as early as possible to retain students.
5. The primary commitment of institutions should be to their students.
6. Education, not retention, should be the goal of institutional programs.

Kim Vaz (1987:23) examines a retention system in "Building Retention Systems for Talented Minority Students Attending White Universities." Vaz refers to students in the Honors Division at Indiana University. Among the needs of talented minorities are academic and financial counseling, culturally sensitive faculty and high academic expectations (Vaz, 1987:29).

In "Black Students in U.S. Higher Education: Toward Improved Access, Adjustment and Achievement," Walter R. Allen (1988:165) looks at black student experiences during the past 20 years. Allen charges that the quality of education for blacks has significantly decreased. Lack of financial aid and disinterested teachers are two
of the causes of this decline (Allen, 1988:184).

"Hispanic Educators Test Plan to Improve Colleges' Retention of Minority Students" is an article published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (1988:A37). The retention plan discussed in the article (*The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1988:A38*) is designed to reach 10,000 students who live in American cities near the Mexican border. Leadership development, communication workshops, study groups, and community outreach are some aspects of the programs.

Editors Marvel Lang and Clinita A. Ford (1988:3) in *Black Student Retention in Higher Education* proclaim that the American higher educational system is in crisis: "That crisis is the increase in dropout rates of black students from colleges and universities before graduation...." Lang and Ford (1988:4) review the retention literature and look at different retention strategies (e.g. an advisement program, mentoring and group work as a teaching method).

Diana Pollard McCauley (1988:48) studies the relationship between eight variables and black student persistence in "Effects of Specific Factors on Blacks' Persistence at a Predominantly White University." McCauley (1988:49) conducts her research at a
predominantly white, suburban university. Some of the data is gleaned from student files.

According to McCauley's (1988:50) findings, a significantly greater proportion of blacks drop out than whites. Family status (whether the student's family is professional or non-professional), sex, and academic performance are found to be contributing factors. Moreover, black dropouts cite the school's homogeneity as a variable.

McCauley's (1988:50) study reveals that despite a university retention program, problems remain. She concludes that commitment must come from all levels—from the federal government to the student.

Judith Stoecker, Ernest T. Pascarella, and Lee M. Wolfle (1988:196) test Tinto's theoretical model in "Persistence in Higher Education: A 9-Year Test of a Theoretical Model." The authors seek to provide a multi-institutional validation through their longitudinal investigation (1988:197). Stoecker and her co-authors' (1988:205) results support Tinto's paradigm. The research also provided strong support for the positive effects that academic integration has on persistence for black and white students.

In *From Survival to Success: Promoting Minority*
Student Retention, editors Melvin C. Terrell and Doris J. Wright (1988:v) assemble a collection of articles on retention. The authors (Terrell & Wright, 1988:101) conclude with eight postulates for retention success:

1. Racism, sexism, and other forms of bias must be controlled or managed.
2. The social climate must encourage open, flexible interactions among all members of the campus community, from maintenance personnel to administration.
3. Student enrollment must reflect and respect ethnic diversity.
4. Institutions must employ culturally skilled and technically competent professional staff/faculty.
5. Developmental/instructional support programs should exist to supplement students' classroom instruction with culture-specific learning tools.
6. Institutions' historical relationships with minority communities should be understood and, where those interactions are poor, actively enhanced.
7. Retention programs and services should be funded aggressively with emphasis placed on securing permanent institutional financial support.

David R. Williamson and Don G. Creamer (1988:210) are concerned with undergraduate education in "Student Attrition in 2- and 4-Year Colleges: Application of Theoretical Model." Williamson and Creamer replicate a 1981 study which investigated the applicability of Tinto's model to students enrolled in two and four-year programs. The researchers' findings support "...Tinto's assertion that academic and social integration play an
important role in directly influencing persistence
decisions..." (Williamson & Creamer, 1988:216).

"The Mentor-Protege Relationship: Its Impact on the
Academic and Career Development of Blacks in
Predominantly White Institutions" by Steve D. Ugbah and
Shirley Ann Williams (1989:29-31) examines the components
of mentoring. Special attention is given to blacks in
white institutions. Ugbah and Williams' findings
indicate that some black faculty do not view mentoring as
a necessity. However, because of limited contact among
blacks at white schools, mentoring is an apt way of
bringing them together. These relationships are most
productive when developed naturally (Ugbah & Williams,
1989:39). The researchers conclude that black faculty
and students must seek each other out to cultivate
mentorships (Ugbah & Williams, 1989:40).

In "Relationship of Residence to Retention of Black
and White Undergraduate Students at a Predominantly White
University," Sandra J. Galicki and Marylu K. McEwen
(1989:390) set out to discover the nature of the
relationship between residence and attrition/retention.
Galicki and McEwen's (1989:392) results indicate that
living in the dorms is beneficial to both groups of
students.
In "Increasing the Retention of Black Students: A Multimethod Approach," Helen F. Giles-Gee (1989:196) examines a three-pronged retention strategy. The scheme consists of one-on-one advising, study-skills workshops and tutoring. Giles-Gee compares students who attended the school prior to the enactment of the retention program with those who came after. Students in the test cohort notably improved their grades following one year of participation. Giles-Gee (1989:199) stresses that the complexity of black student retention necessitates a multifaceted program.

Mitchell F. Rice and Bonnie C. Alford (1989:69) in "A Preliminary Analysis of Black Undergraduate Students' Perception of Retention/Attrition Factors at a Large, Predominantly White, State Research University in the South," seek to identify the social, financial, and academic variables that affect retention. Over 175 student respondents are solicited (Rice & Alford, 1989:72).

Half of the students who dropped out state that financial and personal reasons were the causes. Few of them blame discrimination/prejudice or academic difficulties (Rice & Alford, 1989:79). In closing, Rice and Alford (1989:80) propose five components of a
university response. It should:

1. Accomplish a more organized and concerted effort to recruit and retain minority students.
2. Assist in developing more financial aid, scholarships, and work opportunities for minority students.
3. Assist academic departments and services in recruiting and retaining minority students.
4. Assist the university in providing personal support to minority students.
5. Assist the university in providing cultural heritage support activities.

Joseph Trippi and Harold E. Cheatham (1989:35) assess a special counseling program in "Effects of Special Counseling Programs for Black Freshmen on a Predominantly White Campus." The authors conclude that the scheme is beneficial. Among its most effective features are the active resolution of problems and the maintenance of a long-term counseling relationship (Trippi & Cheatham, 1989:39).

Ed Wiley (1989:8) reports on a retention strategy in "Mentor Programs Successful in Minority Retention." In the article, Wiley interviews several university officials. Napoleon Peoples, a counselor at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU), believes that black students need to have contact with successful blacks. Another VCU official contends that "...predominantly white institutions frequently deny Black students
information about the significant historical contributions of African Americans...." A good mentor, Wiley discovers, is an active listener who knows how to help students confront their stressors.

The manifestation of racism is dealt with in "Challenging Racism on Campus" by Dhyana Ziegler and Camille Hazeur (1989). Ziegler and Hazeur (1989:32) submit that blacks will not feel more a part of campus life until whites confront their attitudes toward blacks. For example, one problem is when white faculty ignore the presence of blacks in their classes. Quite often blacks are only called upon to answer black-related questions (Ziegler & Hazeur, 1989:33).

In a workshop on racism conducted in 1989, researchers played audiotaped interviews with black students to white professors. The faculty members were shocked to learn that behaviors they believed to be harmless were deemed racist by blacks (Ziegler & Hazeur, 1989:34). Ziegler and Hazeur (1989:35) note that their replication of the study using videos (instead of audiotapes) "...will not alienate those who want so desperately to help." Instead, the exercise will help faculty face and mitigate their behaviors.
Assessment

Thirty-one of the 51 articles published during the 1980s focus on blacks. This represents a significant increase in the attention accorded to the experiences of black students in PWUs. Most of the works, 16, were on a variety of topics, such as alienation, adjustment and achievement, racism, and educational attainment. Eight of the studies were on retention, four on attrition, and there was one each on dropout and persistence. Thirteen projects assigned primary responsibility to institutions for black students' campus experiences.

1990s

From January 1990 up until June 1992, 12 articles were published on RAPD and related topics. Most of them, five, are on retention. This continues the trend of the 1980s when there were more works on retention than on attrition, persistence, or dropout. Five of the articles are on a variety of related issues such as black/white student relations at a PWU. There is one study each on persistence and dropout. None has been written on attrition.

Christine Bennett and Alton M. Okinaka (1990) offer "Factors Related to Persistence Among Asian, Black,
Hispanic, and White Undergraduates at a Predominantly White University: Comparison Between First and Fourth Year Cohorts" to the retention literature. In a comparison between black persisters and non-persisters, Bennett and Okinaka (1990:42) find that the former group are less satisfied with their school than those who withdraw. These persisters feel less satisfied with their professors (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990:44). They also inform the investigators that they have minimal positive interracial contact on campus (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990:47).

Bennett and Okinaka (1990:57) conclude that "...something in the college experience is making them [i.e., blacks and Asians] less satisfied and creating more trauma, even if it does not cause them to drop out." They go on to suggest that perhaps non-persisters drop out before they develop the negative feelings expressed by persisters. Bennett and Okinaka (1990:59) recommend further investigation of their findings.

The California State University (CSU) (1990) addresses the professor's role in retention in Faculty Involvement in Student Retention and Advising: A Report of the Task Force on Retention and Advising. The CSU system suggests that faculty should interact with
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students inside and outside of the classroom. For example, during class teachers can direct students with academic problems to tutorial services. Outside of class they can involve students in their research projects and communicate with them informally as much as possible (California State University, 1990:Appendix A-1). The report also encourages faculty to develop mentoring relationships (California State University, 1990: Appendix B-9).

Jacqueline Rowser (1990) introduces a retention framework in "A Retention Model for African American Students." Rowser (1990:168) argues that a holistic approach is needed to improve the recruitment, retention, and graduation of blacks. Currently, "[s]ome needs are 'over-addressed' and others receive little, or no, attention." Rowser's conceptualization emphasizes the structural side of retention and will be further explicated in the following chapter.

In The Black Community: Diversity and Unity, James E. Blackwell (1991:186-187) includes a brief section on blacks in white colleges. In it, he describes some of the problems that plague these students. For instance, academically-achieving black, middle-class students sometimes do not receive financial aid because
institutions favor "authentic ghetto types." Blackwell (1991:187) also discusses "estrangement," a common problem for blacks reared in the middle class: "[t]o be black for many of them is to engage in behavior that is contradictory to all they learned in middle-class socialization."


Bunzel finds that more blacks than whites perceive racism at the school. Moreover, many blacks believe that there is a "...white power structure on campus..." (Bunzel, 1991:63). Racist incidents, however, are subtle. For instance, a professor may call on a lone black student in a class to provide a black perspective (Bunzel, 1991:64-65).

In "Recruitment & Retention: What Works," Jacqueline Conciatore (1991:40) provides an overview of black student retention problems and solutions. One of her sources is a report by the American Council on Education which states that the retention rate for whites is 13 percent higher than that for blacks. Some of the causes Conciatore cites are financial problems, campus racism,
academic underpreparedness, and family difficulties.

Conciatore (1991:41) highlights a few retention strategies used by universities. In an interview with a Texas A & M official, Conciatore learns that one of the best schemes is one that is institution-wide: "They must involve everyone even security officers, switchboard operators and cleaning personnel...."

At the University of California at Berkeley, Uri Treisman, a calculus professor, improves the math performance of black students (as well as that of Hispanics and whites) by putting them in an honors program. Treisman has observed that blacks, in particular, study alone. In contrast, other students, who do very well in class, work in groups. The honors program includes workshops where students work together on even more challenging problems together. Treisman's plan promotes academic advancement and multicultural cooperation (Conciatore, 1991:42).

In "A Critical Examination of Academic Retention programs for At-Risk Minority College Students," Mary E. Levin and Joel R. Levin (1991:323) investigate institutional responses to retention problems. After reviewing retention strategies, Levin and Levin (1991:331) list the most effective. They are: "...advising,
counseling, tutoring, basic skills development, first-year orientation, minority program directors, faculty involvement, study skills courses, test-taking clinics, and career advising, to name a few."

Whether "[t]he determinants to reenroll at the same institution (institutional persistence), dropout of the higher education system (dropout), or transfer to another institution (institutional withdrawal) are different..." is analyzed by Bruce I. Mallette and Alberto F. Cabrera (1991:179-180). Their findings are reported in "Determinants of Withdrawal Behavior: An Exploratory Study." They discover that the contributing factors of the behaviors are distinct. The quality of faculty interaction, academic performance, commitment to the university, and the availability of finances distinguish between dropouts andpersisters. Institutional commitment and higher goal aspirations differentiated persisters from transfers (Mallette & Cabrera, 1991:188-189).

The collegiate social experiences of two minority groups is the focus of Edward Murguia, Raymond V. Padilla, and Michael Pavel's (1991:433-434) "Ethnicity and the Concept of Social Integration in Tinto's Model of Institutional Departure." Murguia and his colleagues
interview 24 Hispanic and Native American college students. The questions are meant to reveal aspects of Tinto's social and academic integration.

Murguia and his co-authors (1991:436) identify ethnic enclaving as a means of coping with the campus' social environment. They explain, "[o]nce integrated into one or more enclaves, the rest of the campus simply becomes a backdrop that the student can explore if and when she or he desires or needs to do so." Ethnic clubs, Greek organizations, or an informal network of friends are examples of ethnic enclaves. The authors conclude that the concept of social integration is applicable. However, it must be broadened to include the dynamic of minority student integration.

In "Predicting the Adjustment of Black Students at Predominantly White Institutions," Chalmer E. Thompson and Bruce R. Fretz (1991:438) test the predictive power of what they have termed "bicultural adaptive variables." Bicultural adaptive variables are "...those strategies used by Black students to cope with the dominant culture and its institutions based on African and African American cultural styles" (Thompson & Fretz, 1991:445). The phenomena to be predicted are the degree of social and academic integration of blacks who attend a
predominantly white university. The subjects were 171 students matriculating at a large school in the mid-Atlantic United States region (Thompson & Fretz, 1991:438).

The findings point to the significance of the variables (Thompson & Fretz, 1991:445). Among them, the researchers find that higher levels of campus communalism, positive attitudes toward cooperative learning and negative attitudes toward individualistic learning related to social adjustment (Thompson & Fretz, 1991: 446). Thompson and Fretz (1991:447) believe that students' greater acceptance of different learning situations and more responsiveness to the demands of the schools may be associated with academic adjustment.

Joseph Trippi and Harold E. Cheatham (1991:343) analyzed the impact of counseling on retention in "Counseling Effects on African American College Student Graduation." Two research questions were devised:

(a) For what purposes do undergraduate African American students use special counseling services?
(b) What is the relationship between use of special counseling services and the graduation of these students?

Trippi and Cheatham (1991:345) find that first-year students often seek help for academic and legibility
concerns. Legibility refers to "...understanding the institutional culture, norms, and procedures." Issues of career and academic choice bring second-year and fourth-year students in for counseling. Most third-year students come in for assistance in locating part-time employment. Trippi and Cheatham (1991:347) also discover that more first, second, and third-year students who are counseled in the area of legibility graduated than those who did not receive such counseling. However, a major problem is that students do not often seek counseling, particularly during their first year.

Robert Rodriguez (1992:28), in "Retention Programs Seen Moving to Academic Departments," reports on future trends in retention schemes. Juan Lara, director of the affirmative action program at the University of California at Irvine, comments that the move to academic departments will facilitate the involvement of faculty members. An official at Colorado State University says that blacks, especially, are demanding change from their academic departments. At issue is the perceived Eurocentric content of many courses. Lara also believes that departments will recruit their own students and actively pursue better graduation rates (Rodriguez, 1992:29).
Assessment

Of the 12 studies published during the 1990s, eight of them focused on black students. Six of the works placed primary responsibility upon the institution.

Chapter Summary

Distinct trends may be discerned in this review regarding how researchers are perceiving the situation of blacks who attend PWUs. During the 1950s and 1960s, published research concluded that the students alone were responsible for their leaving college. This view began to change in the 1970s and has continued through to the 1990s. More work on retention has been published which proposes that institutions must accept their responsibility in retaining black students. This perspective is agreed with and is reflected in chapter seven, the analysis.
THEORY AND MODELS

This chapter will accomplish two goals. First, it will discuss the theory which underlies major studies on retention, attrition, persistence, and dropout, i.e., Emile Durkheim's (1951) theory of egoistic suicide. Theory is defined as that which "...explains why things happen and in the explanation describes some aspect of the world around us" (Pascarella, 1982:17). Second, it will describe the approaches and models of William Spady (1970) and Vincent Tinto (1975)--two major and often-cited researchers in this field. Jacqueline Rowser (1990) is included because she designs her model specifically for black students. Additionally, she focuses on the institution's role in effecting retention. These are crucial attributes which are absent in the first two frameworks.

Durkheim (1951:3), in a study originally published in the late nineteenth century, examines the social causes of suicide. He argues that there are objective social forces in society that coercively incline individuals toward suicide. Durkheim (1951:16) calls this tendency toward suicide a social fact because it possesses an objective reality that is independent of human will.
Durkheim (1951:14-15) identifies three types of suicide: egoistic, altruistic, and anomic. Spady and Tinto utilize egoistic suicide for their analyses because of its similarity to the dropout phenomenon. Durkheim believes that egoistic suicide resulted from the individual's lack of integration in society.

As a part of his examination of egoistic suicide, Durkheim (1951:152,171) studies how religious, family, and political life affected suicide rates. In looking at European countries that are "...purely Catholic...like Spain, Portugal [and] Italy...," Durkheim (1951:152) finds that suicide rates are very low. However, he concludes that Jews have the lowest incidents of suicide and Protestants have the highest. Durkheim (1951:170) explains that the level of intensity of "collective life" has an inverse relationship with suicide. He concludes, "[t]he more numerous and strong these collective states of mind are, the stronger the integration of the religious community, and also the greater its preservative value."

Durkheim (1951:208) reaches similar conclusions with respect to family and political life. They, too, have an inverse relationship with suicide. Specifically, Durkheim (1951:197-198) finds that unmarried men and
women have the highest incidence of suicide. Additionally, during periods of political upheaval there is more social integration because people "...close ranks and confront the common danger..." (Durkheim, 1951:208). Thus, the greater the social integration in family and political life, the lower the suicide rate.

In analyzing the research on dropout, Spady (1970:77) notes conceptual similarities with Durkheim's theory. He develops a model of his conceptualizations in "Dropouts from Higher Education: An Interdisciplinary Review and Synthesis." According to Spady, one important factor in preventing dropout is attaining "normative congruence." This is when the student possesses values, attitudes, and interests that are compatible with the institution she/he attends. The second one is a friendship support system. Spady theorizes that these relationships are analogous to Durkheim's assertion that social integration in religious and familial institutions is a determinant of suicide. Furthermore according to Spady (1970:78):

Although dropping out is clearly a less drastic form of rejecting social life than is suicide, we assume that the social conditions that affect the former parallel those that produce the latter; a lack of consistent, intimate interaction with others, holding
values and orientations that are dissimilar from those of the general social collectivity, and lacking a sense of compatibility with the immediate social system.

Spady (1970:77) concludes that the quality of the student's interpersonal relationships is a significant phenomenon. High quality relationships translate into high social integration. Social integration determines the degree to which a student is satisfied with school. The higher her/his social integration, the more likely the student is to remain in college.

Spady's (1970:78) model of the dropout process, "An Explanatory Sociological Model of the Dropout Process" (Figure 1), is a significant contribution to the RAPD field. He explains that a time sequence is implied in the scheme. It also represents an interplay between the student and the institution (Spady, 1970:79).

Direct and indirect relationships between variables are depicted by the arrows. For example, grade performance has a direct impact upon the dropout decision; if a student's grade point average is excessively low, then she/he may be academically dismissed. In this situation, the other factors are irrelevant (Spady, 1970:79).

In addition to grade performance, Spady (1970:78-79)
Figure 1
Spady's An Explanatory Sociological Model of the Dropout Process
argues that several other factors have an important effect on the student's dropout decision. Satisfaction refers to the student's contentment with her/his college experiences. This variable indirectly affects the dropout decision through commitment to the institution attended. The broken line from institutional commitment to normative congruence signifies that the model is cyclical. The student's normative congruence may change as time goes on.

Tinto (1975) expands upon Spady's ideas in "Dropout from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research." Tinto's (1975:90) goal in this study is to develop a theory of dropout that included student and institutional variables. He also seeks to distinguish the dynamics that lead to different types of dropout, i.e., dropout due to academic failure or voluntary withdrawal, temporary dropout, and institutional transfer.

Tinto (1975:91) cites Spady (1970) in the development of his theory. This is in terms of Spady's use of Durkheim's theory of egoistic suicide and the concept of social integration. Tinto contends that the university is a microcosm of society. As suicide results from a lack of integration in society, Tinto argues that
a lack of institutional social integration would lead to dropout.

Just as important as the social sphere is the academic sphere. Thus, Tinto (1975:92) theorizes that a student may become integrated socially and/or academically. For example, a socially integrated student may still drop out because of a lack of academic integration. A balance between the two is needed.

Tinto (1975:116-117) continues by distinguishing among types of dropout behavior. While academic dismissal is caused by poor grade performance, voluntary withdrawal is distinct. Tinto believes that its antecedent is a lack of congruence between the institution and the student. He also believes that transfer is due to low institutional commitment (Tinto, 1975:118). High goal commitment and low institutional commitment influences the student to withdraw, but continue the pursuit of her/his goals at another school.

Tinto (1975:94) revises Spady's model in his "A Conceptual Schema for Dropout from College" (Figure 2). The longitudinal process portrays the interaction among several factors.

The student enters an institution with three sources of influence--family background, individual attributes,
Figure 2
Tinto's A Conceptual Schema for Dropout from College
and pre-college schooling. These variables affect her/his goal and institutional commitments (Tinto, 1975:95).

The academic system sets the stage for one's grade performance and intellectual development. These components determine the student's integration in the academic system (Tinto, 1975:95).

The social system consists of peer-group and faculty interactions. The quality of those relationships determine the student's social integration (Tinto, 1975:95).

Combined, the student's initial commitments as well as her/his academic and social integration define subsequent commitments. The dropout decision emerges from this (Tinto, 1975:95). Ultimately, Tinto (1975:96) explains that institutional and goal commitments have the greatest impact upon whether a student drops out or not.

Rowser (1990:166) presents her interpretation of retention in "A Retention Model of African American Students" (Figure 3). She submits that a student is affected by the interplay of her/his race/ethnicity/sex; socioeconomic status/family background; self-concept/motivation/aspirations; and educational background/quality of education. Admissions criteria and
Figure 3
Rowser's A Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation Model for African American Students
recruitment messages are received by the student at this stage (Rowser, 1990:168).

From there, the student enters recruitment and admissions processes. Four categories of institutional impacts affect this part of the process. They are, university commitment to cultural diversity, university support services, university expectations for student success, and university-wide programs. Generally, numerical goals and policies/strategies influence recruitment/admissions processes and student-institution interaction (Rowser, 1990:168).

The student receives messages from the university which impresses upon student-institution interaction. Four spheres compose this interaction. Rowser (1990:168) identifies them as teacher expectations/classroom experiences/curriculum; academic advising; university resources/support services; and campus climate/environment. The student’s perceptions emerge and influence her/his self-expectations. The output is translated into student achievement/behavior.

The next chapter will analyze the models just discussed. It also will draw upon previous chapters in the development of a comprehensive model of black student retention.
ANALYSIS

The aim of this chapter is to develop a model of black student retention. The information discussed in previous chapters will be drawn upon in support of the framework.

The basic thrust of this examination is to elaborate upon the structural side of the retention equation. As Spady (1970) and then Tinto (1975) described, the Durkheimian notion of social integration is useful here. Equally as useful is Tinto’s academic integration. However, the educational institution itself possesses a key role in integrating students into its social and academic environments. The federal government also is a salient structural entity (Berry & Jones, 1956; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1979; Anderson, 1981; Rugg, 1982; Collison, 1987; Rice & Alford, 1989; and Levin & Levin, 1991).

Neither the Spady (1970) nor the Tinto (1975) models viewed the phenomenon of students leaving college as being fundamentally a structural phenomenon. Both authors stress student variables in explaining dropout, e.g. high school grade point average. However, both authors make significant additions to studies of retention/attrition/persistence/dropout (RAPD).
Spady's primary contribution is his development of a seminal model of dropout. Tinto's conceptualization shows that Spady's model possesses some inadequacies. In his criticism, Tinto (1975:92) argues that a university is composed of not just a social sphere but an academic one. Thus, a student should be integrated socially and academically.

Tinto has laid the foundation for numerous research projects on RAPD, however, there are a few notable problems with his framework. The most basic is that his focus is on dropout. This implies that the student solely is responsible for her/his educational outcome. Furthermore, institutional accountability is absent from the model. While he alludes to the social system, he does not elaborate upon it. Tinto (1975:119) does not examine the situation of black students. In fact, he acknowledges this deficit.

Rowser (1990:168) addresses areas neglected in Tinto's model. Her scheme specifically is geared toward black students. As summarized in chapter six, Rowser submits that a student is affected by the interplay of her/his race/ethnicity/sex; socioeconomic status/family background; self-concept/motivation/aspirations; and educational background/quality of education. Admissions
criteria and recruitment messages are received by the student at this stage (Rowser, 1990:168).

From there, the student enters recruitment and admissions processes. Four categories of institutional impacts affect this part of the process. They are, university commitment to cultural diversity, university support services, university expectations for student success, and university-wide programs. Generally, numerical goals and policies стратегии influence recruitment/admissions processes and student-institution interaction (Rowser, 1990:168).

The student receives messages from the university which affects the quality of student-institution interaction. Four spheres compose this interaction. Rowser (1990: 168) identifies them as teacher expectations/classroom experiences/curriculum; academic advising; university resources/support services; and campus climate/ environment. The student’s perceptions emerge and influence her/his self-expectations. The output is translated into student achievement/behavior.

In addition to Rowser’s critical support of structural variables, several components of this project support the centrality of these factors. First, the concept of retention itself is structurally defined.
Second, each qualitative method used here referred to the centrality of structural factors. For instance, chapters four and five (History of Blacks in Higher Education and Retention/Attrition/Persistence/Dropout Literature) revealed that a significant amount of research points to the importance of structural variables, i.e. the university and the federal government (e.g. Braddock, 1978 & 1981; Clark & Plotkin, 1963; Smith & Allen, 1984; Thomas, 1981; and Ziegler & Hazeur, 1989). Additionally, student, staff, and faculty informants discussed the salience of the university in improving retention.

A Comprehensive Model of Black Student Retention for Predominantly White Universities

The intent of this model is to provide a framework for public, predominantly white universities (PWU) to understand and intervene in black student retention (Figure 4). It reflects Rowser’s (1990) basic design as well as additions brought out in the literature. The factors added to the model are color-coded.

Three factors are added to Rowser’s diagram. The first is the federal government. Initially, it was the intervention of the United States Supreme Court which led to the enrollment of blacks in white institutions.
FIGURE 4
A Comprehensive Model of Black Student Retention for Predominantly White Universities
Furthermore, Thomas (1981a:22) credited the government’s financial aid with facilitating the dramatic rise in black participation in white schools during the 1960s. Clark and Plotkin (1963:7) found that recipients of federal funds experienced dropout rates that were lower than the national average.

It is believed that the federal government possesses the power to positively affect black student retention. This is so through the provision of financial aid to black students. It also relates to advancing policies, such as affirmative action, that influence PWUs to aggressively recruit blacks.

In the model, the federal government’s influence directly affects the first half of the process. This is from recruitment through admissions. That span includes individual and institutional factors. From student-institution interaction forward, the government’s influence is indirect. As public institutions, these PWUs feel governmental pressure the most in their recruitment and admission of black students.

The second variable is borrowed from Tinto’s (1975:95) model; it is institutional commitment. Rowser (1990:168) depicts a student’s perceptions as emerging from student-institutional interaction. The perceptions
directly impact student self-expectations. It is contended that these perceptions also determine the degree of a student's commitment to the university. Although the weight of the university commitment is not as great as self-expectations in determining retention, it is a noteworthy variable.

The third variable is the general area of "Student-Community Interaction." Components of it are the following:

"Community Expectations"
- preconceived notions held by community regarding an individual's status as a male/female, black student

"Community Climate/Environment"
- urban or suburban
- predominant socioeconomic status of residents
- level of crime
- racial/ethnic make-up of residents

"Community Support/Resources"
- jobs
- stores: including grocery, restaurant, drug, copying services
- also of import is whether community stores sell products unique to blacks such as black hair care merchandise
- churches

"Community Law Enforcement"
- attitude of law enforcement toward black students, i.e., helpful, neutral, hostile
- their expectations and treatment of black students, males in particular

This component was adopted because of the feedback received from personal interviews with, and written surveys of Creek University undergraduate students, as
well as my own experiences. All of the male, student subjects (n=5) emphasized community factors, specifically local law enforcement, as having been a relevant variable in their experiences.

Chapter eight will summarize the findings of this project. It also will suggest directions for future research.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION

The importance of black student retention is apparent. A great deal of research has been conducted. Conferences and workshops have been held. Magazines and journals have published special issues on retention. Despite all of this, difficulties remain.

The findings of this project point to the necessity of structural intervention in the retention dilemma. Chapters four and five (History of Blacks in Higher Education and Retention/Attrition/Persistence/Dropout Literature) revealed that a significant amount of research points to the import of structural variables, i.e. the university, the federal government, and the community (e.g. Braddock, 1978 & 1981; Clark & Plotkin, 1963; Smith & Allen, 1984; Thomas, 1981; and Ziegler & Hazeur, 1989). Additionally, student, staff, and faculty informants discussed the salience of the university in improving retention.

The model presented is geared toward university action. It is hoped that those institutions which are experiencing low black student retention will use the model to assess their efforts. They can discern which factors they have and have not handled well.

The primary thrust of the revised model is the
acknowledgment of the impact of two additional structural variables—the federal government and the community on retention. Financial need, in particular, is ongoing for a great many black students, particularly during periods of national recession. This support can come from either the government, the university, or the community in the form of scholarships, grants, jobs, and loans.

The only definitive institution in the retention equation is the university. The actions of the federal government and the community are uncertain. In some cases they may be more supportive of students than in others; e.g. financial aid may be plentiful from the federal government during healthy economic periods or certain communities may be more accepting of black students in terms of treatment by the police and employment opportunities. The university has the ability to provide earnest support of its black undergraduates. It also may use its influence to lobby the federal government for more financial aid or encourage local businesses to hire black students.

Future research on black undergraduates at predominantly white universities can move in several directions. In-depth analyses of the propositions submitted in the present model may be done. Does the
model apply as well to black students at predominantly white universities other than Creek University? Would there be any difference between public and private PWUs? It would be interesting to examine retention at historically black educational institutions. For example, how do the retention rates compare with PWUs? Also, how would a model of black student retention at black schools differ from that presented for PWUs?
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE
INSTRUCTIONS:
PLEASE ANSWER EACH QUESTION BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER OR BY WRITING IN THE REQUESTED INFORMATION.

Section I. Personal Background Information

1. Your racial/cultural identification:
   A. Black American
   B. Black Other
      B1. West Indian
      (Specify nationality)
      B2. African
      (Specify nationality)
      B3. Hispanic
      (Specify nationality)
   C. Other (Specify)

2. What is your current citizenship status?
   U.S. Citizen
   Permanent Resident
   Temporary Resident (Student Visa)
   Other (Specify)

3. Sex: Male Female

4. Date of birth: _MO_ _DY_ _YR_

5. Classification: Freshman Senior
   Sophomore Other (Please specify)
   Junior

6. Marital status: Single Separated/Divorced
   Married Widowed

7. Do you have children? Yes No
   A. (If Yes to Q. 7): How many children do you have?

8. High school senior class rank:
   Upper 5%
   Upper 10%
   Upper 20%
   Upper 30%
   Upper 50%
   Lower 50%
9. High School Cumulative Grade Point Average: 

10. Size of your high school (size range)
   - 0 to 300 students...1
   - 301 to 700 students...2
   - 701 to 1,000 students...3
   - 1,001 to 1,500 students...4
   - 1,501 to 2,500 students...5
   - 2,501 to 3,500 students...6
   - Over 3,500 students...7

11. Racial percentage of your high school (i.e., percent Black)
   - 0 to 10%...1
   - 11% to 20%...2
   - 21% to 40%...3
   - 41% to 60%...4
   - 61% to 80%...5
   - 81% to 100%...6

A. Of all your years of education through high school graduation
   (grade 12), how many have you spent attending integrated
   schools? (Please give the number.)

12. Looking back, how would you rate the overall quality of your
    educational experiences through elementary and high school?
    - Excellent...1
    - Very good...2
    - Good...3
    - Poor...4
    - Very poor...5

13. Please circle the highest number of years of school completed by
    each of the following members of your family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of School Completed</th>
<th>Brother or Sister</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. S. Graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W., M.B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., J.D., M.D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Your parents' occupation and type of business or industry.
    (If deceased, retired or unemployed, please enter previous
    occupation and industry.)

Mother: _____________________________________________
        Job Title __________________________ Major duty

Father: _____________________________________________
        Job Title __________________________ Major duty
15. Have you spent most of your life in a rural area, small town or urban community?
   Rural Area (fewer than 1,000) ..... 1
   Small Town (1,001 - 50,000) ..... 2
   Small City (50,001 - 100,000) ..... 3
   Medium-Sized City (100,001 - 300,000) ..... 4
   Large-Sized City (OVER 300,001) ..... 5

16. In which state (country) did you spend most of your life to age 18?

17. With whom did you live most of the time while you were growing up (until age 18)?
   Both natural parents ..... 1
   Mother and Stepfather ..... 2
   Father and Stepmother ..... 3
   Mother only ..... 4
   Father only ..... 5
   Grandparent(s) ..... 6
   Foster parents ..... 7
   Other (Please specify)

18. How many brothers and sisters do you have?
   Number of brothers Number of sisters
   A. What was your birth order (e.g., first child, third child, sixth child, last child)? Were you child number:
      1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

19. From the list below, please circle the number indicating your parents' combined income for the last year.
   Less than $ 8,000 ..... 1
   $ 8,001 - $ 10,000 ..... 2
   $ 10,001 - $ 12,000 ..... 3
   $ 12,001 - $ 15,000 ..... 4
   $ 15,001 - $ 18,000 ..... 5
   $ 18,001 - $ 21,000 ..... 6
   $ 21,001 - $ 25,000 ..... 7
   $ 25,001 - $ 28,000 ..... 8
   OVER $28,000 ..... 9
   $ 28,001 - $ 30,000 ..... 10
   $ 30,001 - $ 40,000 ..... 11
   $ 40,001 - $ 50,000 ..... 12
   $ 50,001 - $ 60,000 ..... 13
   $ 60,001 - $ 75,000 ..... 14
   $ 75,001 - $100,000 ..... 15
   $100,001 - $150,000 ..... 16
   OVER $150,000

110c
### Section II. Student Status at this University

20. Where are you living during this academic year?

- A university residence hall. .................. 1
- A rented apartment or condominium. ............ 2
- A rented house .................................. 3
- A rented room or apartment in a private home .... 4
- My own house or condominium. .................. 5
- The home of my parents, or other relatives, or guardian. .6
- OTHER (Please specify) ____________________________

21. Your student status this quarter/semester?

- Full-time . . . . 1
- Part-time . . . . 2

22. Your university cumulative grade point average? __________

23. How many schools did you apply to? __________

A. What led you to consider applying to this university?  
   [Please indicate the top three [3] reasons that influenced your decision. RANK these by importance: 1 (first); 2 (second); and, 3 (third).]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teachers/counselors encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program(s) offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How many schools accepted you? __________

A. Of all the schools that accepted you, why did you decide to ATTEND this university?  
   [Please indicate the top three [3] reasons that influenced your decision. RANK these by importance: 1 (first); 2 (second); and, 3 (third).]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teachers/counselors encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked school climate/setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program(s) offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted here only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Was this university your first choice?

- Yes . . . . 1
- No . . . . 2
25. Did you attend another college or university before enrolling here?
Yes. . . .1 No. . . .2
A. (If yes to Q. 25): What kind of college or university did you attend?
Community college . . .1 Vocational/technical college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .4
Liberal Arts College . . .2 Other (Please specify)
University...........3

26. Did you ever consider attending an historically black college or university?
Yes. . . .1 No. . . .2 (Go to Q. 26B)
A. (If yes to Q. 26): Why did you decide not to attend a black college? [Please indicate the top three (3) reasons that influenced your decision. RANK these by importance as 1 (first); 2 (second); and 3 (third).]
Academic reputation Financial considerations
Family members encouraged Lacked sufficient information
Location High school teachers/counselors encouraged
Program(s) offered Other (Please specify)
Friends encouraged

B. (If No to Q. 26): What are the reasons that you did not consider attending a black college? [Please indicate the top three (3) reasons that influenced your decision. RANK these by importance as 1 (first); 2 (second); and 3 (third).]
Academic reputation Financial considerations
Location Wanted integrated setting
Program(s) offered Lacked sufficient information
Family members High school teachers/counselors
Friends Other (Please specify)

27. What was your major when you first enrolled at this university?
A. Is this still your major?
Yes. . . .1 (Go to Q. 28) No. . . .2 (Go to Q. 27B & C)
B. (If No to Q. 27A): What is your major currently?
C. (If No to Q. 27A): What factor(s) led you to change your major? [Please indicate the top three (3) reasons that influenced your decision. Rank these by importance as 1 (first); 2 (second); and 3 (third).]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relations with faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future employment considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. How important is it to you to get a college degree?
   Extremely important. . . . 1
   Very important. . . . . . 2
   Somewhat important. . . . 3
   Not at all important. . . . 4

29. How important is it that you graduate from THIS university?
   Extremely important. . . . 1
   Very important. . . . . . 2
   Somewhat important. . . . 3
   Not at all important. . . . 4

30. How sure are you that you made the right choice in attending this university?
   Definitely right choice. . . . 1
   Probably right choice. . . . 2
   Not sure. . . . . . . . . . 3
   Probably wrong choice . . . . 4
   Definitely wrong choice . . . 5

31. Will you return to this university next Fall?
   Will graduate before Fall 1983. . . . 1
   Definitely will return. . . . . . 2
   Probably will return. . . . . . 3
   Not sure. . . . . . . . . . 4
   Probably will not return. . . . 5
   Definitely will not return. . . . 6
A. (If answer to Q. 31 was not sure, probably will not or definitely will not return). What are some of the reasons that you might not return to this college next fall?

32. Have you ever seriously considered leaving this university?
   Yes ... 1
   No ... 2

A. (If Yes to Q. 32): What were some of the reasons that caused you to consider leaving this University?

Section III. Student Experiences at this University

33. How much do you, as a Black student, feel part of the general campus life, insofar as student activities and government are concerned?
   Not at all ... 1
   Somewhat ... 3
   Very little ... 2
   Considerable ... 4

34. To what extent do extracurricular activities on campus reflect your interests?
   Not at all ... 1
   Somewhat ... 3
   Very little ... 2
   Considerable ... 4

35. How often do you participate in the extracurricular activities sponsored by Black student organizations (e.g. Black Student Union, fraternities/sororities, cultural groups, etc.)?
   Hardly ever ... 1
   Often ... 3
   Sometimes ... 2
   Very often ... 4
36. We are interested in what students do in an average week. Please circle the average number of hours per week that you spend on each listed activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours per WEEK spent on activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Attending class</td>
<td>None 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Studying</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sleeping or resting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Watching television</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Attending non-required lectures, seminars or workshops</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Listening to music (radio, records)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Participating in club meetings or other organized activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Working on a part-time job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Socializing with friends</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Participating in organized athletics or intramural sports</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Exercising (other than organized sports)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Interacting with family members</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. How intense would you say the academic competition is at this university?

- Extremely intense
- Somewhat intense
- Intense
- Not at all intense
- About average

38. What are your feelings about the level of academic competition here?

- Very positive
- Negative
- Positive
- Very negative
- Neutral
Section IV. Student Interactions at this University

39. Have you ever encountered racial discrimination in any form from anyone on this campus (i.e., symbols, gestures, words or behaviors)?
   Yes. . . . . 1    No. . . . . 2
   A. (If Yes to Q.39): How frequently have you experienced racial discrimination on this campus?
      Hardly ever. . . . 1       Often. . . . . 4
      Seldom. . . . . 2        Very often. . . . 5
      Sometimes. . . . . 3

40. Briefly describe the most notable incident of racial discrimination experienced by you on this campus.

41. How would you rate white STUDENTS at your university in regard to their relations with Black students? Do they:
   A. Show high regard for Black student academic abilities?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
   B. Avoid interacting with Black students socially?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
   C. Treat Black students as equals?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5

42. How would you rate your white PROFESSORS in regard to their relations with Black students? Do they:
   A. Have difficulty relating to Black students?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
   B. Avoid Black student interaction outside the classroom?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
   C. Provide encouragement to continue studies and go on for advanced degree(s)?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
   D. Seem genuinely concerned about Black student success?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
   E. Evaluate Black student academic performance fairly?
      Never. . . 1    Seldom. . . 2    Sometimes. . . 3    Often. . . 4    Always. . . 5
43. How would you rate white university STAFF people (secretaries, administrators, security police, etc.) on the following scales in regard to their relations with Black students? Do they:

A. Have difficulty relating to Black students?
   Never...1 Seldom...2 Sometimes...3 Often...4 Always...5

B. Seem genuinely concerned about the welfare of Black students?
   Never...1 Seldom...2 Sometimes...3 Often...4 Always...5

C. Treat Black students fairly and with respect?
   Never...1 Seldom...2 Sometimes...3 Often...4 Always...5

44. How would you characterize your relations with whites at this university?

A. Students:
   Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5

B. Faculty:
   Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5

C. Staff People:
   Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5

45. How often do you interact with white STUDENTS at this university in an average week?

   Several times a day...1 At least once a week...4
   At least once a day...2 Less than once a week...5
   Several times a week...3

46. How often do you interact with white FACULTY at this university in an average week?

   Several times a day...1 At least once a week...4
   At least once a day...2 Less than once a week...5
   Several times a week...3

47. How often do you interact with white STAFF at this university in an average week?

   Several times a day...1 At least once a week...4
   At least once a day...2 Less than once a week...5
   Several times a week...3

48. How would you characterize overall Black student relations with whites at this university?

A. Students:
   Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5

B. Faculty:
   Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5

C. Staff People:
   Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5
49. Do you believe that there are enough Black STUDENTS at this university?  
   Yes... .1 No... .2  
   A. How often do you interact with other Black STUDENTS at this university in an average week?  
      Several times a day... .1 At least once a week... .4  
      At least once a day... .2 Less than once a week... .5  
      Several times a week... .3  

50. Do you believe there are enough Black FACULTY at this university?  
   Yes... .1 No... .2  
   A. How often do you interact with Black FACULTY at this university in an average week?  
      Several times a day... .1 At least once a week... .4  
      At least once a day... .2 Less than once a week... .5  
      Several times a week... .3  

51. Do you believe there are enough Black STAFF people (secretaries, administrators, security police, etc.) at this university?  
   Yes... .1 No... .2  
   A. How often do you interact with Black STAFF people at this university in an average week?  
      Several times a day... .1 At least once a week... .4  
      At least once a day... .2 Less than once a week... .5  
      Several times a week... .3  

52. How would you characterize your relations with Blacks at this university?  
   A. Students:  
      Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5  
   B. Faculty:  
      Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5  
   C. Staff People:  
      Excellent...1 Good...2 Poor...3 Very poor...4 No contact...5  

53. How satisfied or dissatisfied have you been with your social life/dating at the university?  
   Very satisfied... .1 Very dissatisfied... .4  
   Satisfied... .2 I am already married... .5  
   Dissatisfied... .3  
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54. On the average, how often have you dated at the university?

I am already married. . . . .1 Once a week. . . . . . .5
Less than once a month. . . .2 Two or three times a week . . . . . .6
About once a month. . . . .3 More than three times a week . . . . . .7
Two or three times a month . . . . . .4

55. Do you receive any form of financial aid (i.e., loan, scholarship, work study)?

Yes. . . . .1 (Go to Q. 55B) No. . . . .5 (Go to Q. 55A)

A. (If No to Q. 55): Did you receive financial aid in the past?

Yes. . . . .1 (Go to Q. 56) No. . . . .2 (Go to A. 55B)

B. (If No to Q. 55A): Have you ever applied for financial aid?

Yes. . . . .1 (Go to Q. 55C) No. . . . .2 (Skip to Q. 57)

C. (If Yes to Q. 55B): Please state the reasons why you did not receive financial aid. (....then Skip to Q. 57)

D. How much financial aid do you receive from private, university, state or federal funds per year?

$1 - $499. . . . . . . .1 $3,000 - $3,999. . . . .5
$500 - $999. . . . . . .2 $4,000 - $4,999. . . . .6
$1,000 - $1,999. . . . .3 $5,000 - $6,000. . . . .7
$2,000 - $2,999. . . . .4 OVER $6,000. . . . . . .8

E. How much is the total amount of financial aid that you receive per category?

Grant $_________ Teaching Assistantship $_________
Loan $_________ Outside, non-university funding $_________
Academic Scholarship $_________ Work Study $_________
Research Assistantship $_________ OTHER (Please specify source and amount)
56. How adequate have financial aid services been to your needs?
   Inadequate. . . . .1
   Somewhat adequate . . . .2
   Adequate. . . . .3
   Very adequate. . . . .4
   Do not receive aid. . . . .5

57. How satisfied have you been with academic advising?
   Do not receive academic advising. . . . .1
   Very dissatisfied. . . . .2
   Dissatisfied. . . . .3
   Satisfied. . . . .4
   Very satisfied. . . . .5

58. How helpful are campus tutorial and remedial academic services to your needs?
   Do not use. . . . .1
   Not helpful. . . . .2
   Somewhat helpful. . . . .3
   Helpful. . . . .4
   Very helpful. . . . .5

59. How adequate is the student health service to your needs?
   Do not use student health services. . . . .1
   Inadequate. . . . .2
   Somewhat adequate. . . . .3
   Adequate. . . . .4
   Very adequate. . . . .5

60. What are some of the more serious difficulties or problems (academic or personal) you have had to cope with since entering this university?

A. How do you handle your problems (academic and personal)?

B. What sources or people do you seek help from in coping with these problems?
Section VI. Student Attitudes and Opinions

61. Considering your ability, financial situation, societal attitudes, etc., how far do you actually expect to go in school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. or B.S. degree</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S. degree</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W., M.P.H., or M.B.A. degree</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D., D.D.S. or J.D. degree</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. What are some factors that might prevent you from going this far in school?

62. Considering your abilities, personal contacts, the job market, etc., what occupation do you actually expect to go into once your education is completed? Please provide the following information on the occupation you expect to go into once your education is completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation (e.g., engineer)</th>
<th>Specialization (e.g., computer engineering)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of business or institution</td>
<td>(e.g., I.B.M., Johnson Publishing Company)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. What are some factors that might prevent you from going into this occupation?
63. After you are in the profession which will be your life's work, when do you think you will be able to consider yourself successful enough so that you can relax and stop trying so hard to get ahead? When you are:

"Doing well enough to stay in the profession". ....... 1
"Doing as well as the average person in the profession". ........ 2
"Doing a little better than the average person in the profession" ....... 3
"Doing much better than the average person in the profession". ... 4
"Recognized as one of the top persons in the profession" ....... 5

64. What is your religious identification?

Christian/Protestant. .... 1
( Specify denomination: e.g.,
Methodist, Baptist) .... 1
Other (Please specify). .... 4

Christian/Catholic. .... 2
Islam/Muslim. .... 3
None. .... 5

A. How religious are you?

Very religious. .... 1
Religious .... 2
Not at all religious. .... 4

65. Below is a list of statements grouped by two's about Black people. Please read the statements and check the one in each group you most agree with.

A. (1) The attempt to "fit in" and do what's proper hasn't paid off for Blacks. It doesn't matter how "proper" you are, you'll still meet serious discrimination if you are Black.
    (2) Any Black who is educated and does what is considered "proper" will be accepted and eventually get ahead.

B. (1) Many Blacks have only themselves to blame for not doing better in life. If they tried harder, they would do better.
    (2) When two qualified people, one Black and one white, are considered for the same job, the Black won't get the job no matter how hard s/he tries.

C. (1) The recent upsurge in conservatism shows once again that whites are so opposed to Blacks getting their rights that it is practically impossible to end discrimination in America.
    (2) The recent upsurge in conservatism has been exaggerated. Certainly enough whites support the goals of the Black cause for Americans to see considerable progress in wiping out discrimination.

D. (1) The best way to overcome discrimination is through pressure and social action.
    (2) The best way to overcome discrimination is for each individual Black to be even better trained and more qualified than the most qualified white person.
E. (1) People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just don't come their way.

(2) Some people just don't use the breaks that come their way. If they don't do well, it is their own fault.

66. We are interested in your opinions on several topics and issues. Please read the following statements and indicate the strength of your agreement or disagreement. Do you: 1 = Strongly Agree (SA); 2 = Agree (A); 3 = Disagree (D); or, 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD) with the statement. (Please circle the number indicating your answer below.)

A. There is a need for a national Black political party.

B. Interracial dating and marriage are equally as acceptable as within race dating and marriage.

C. Schools with majority Black student populations should have a majority of Black teachers and administrators.

D. In general, the church has helped the conditions of Black people in this country.

E. There is a great deal of unity and sharing among Black students at this university.

F. The future looks very promising for educated Black Americans.

G. Black men and women students on this campus really don't get along very well together.

H. Middle-class Blacks have more in common with middle-class whites than they do with lower-class Blacks.

I. Participation in organized sports or athletics is usually more harmful than helpful for Black college students.

J. Black students have the same problems as white students do at this university.
67. If you were compared to most other students at this university, how would you be rated on the following points by an unbiased observer? Please indicate whether you think you would be rated among the: 1 = Highest (H); 2 = Above average (Ab Avg); 3 = Average (A); or, 4 = Below average (B Avg) on each point. (Please circle the number indicating your answer below.) How would you be rated in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ab Avg</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>B Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Your popularity with members of the opposite sex?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Your professors' evaluations of you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Your closeness to your family?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Your undergraduate teachers' evaluations of you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The number of friends that you have?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Your current physical well-being and health?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Your current emotional or psychological well-being and health?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Your self-confidence?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Your leadership abilities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. The kind of person that people in the neighborhood or community where you grew up think you are?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. The kind of person that you are, all things considered?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section VII. Improving Black Student Experiences

68. What would you say are some of the most serious barriers to more Black students being ACCEPTED to attend this university?

A. What are some of the most serious barriers to more Black students DECIDING TO ATTEND this university?
69. What would you say are some of the most serious problems and difficulties that Black students who attend this university must face?

70. If you know of any Black student(s) who recently left the university for reasons other than graduation, what were some of the reasons?

71. Suppose for a moment, that you were Chancellor or President of this university. What programs or policies would you adopt in order to deal with the kinds of problems Black students experience here?

72. Please mention below any important aspects of Black student experiences at your university that this questionnaire overlooks. How have these factors influenced you?
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
APPENDIX B

Four sample questions and several sample responses are included here. They represent the most helpful items contained in the questionnaires.

SAMPLE QUESTION (SQ) 1:

"What would you say are some of the most serious problems and difficulties that Black students who attend this university must face?"

Sample Student Response (SSR) 1a:

"-Not enough black peers to help guide one another.  
-Not enough black professors to provide as role models."

SSR 1b:

"1.) prejudices & biased attitudes  
2.) lack of support"

SSR 1c:

"White professors & students that control everything.  
Fees are increasing and affecting minorities the most.  
Many black students don’t have the money to maintain themselves."

SSR 1d:

"The stereotypes that other students perceive of them.  
Trying to get a job on campus.  Dealing with the financial problems.  Getting enough recognition."

SSR 1e:

"Negative comments by leaders of different organizations.  
Professors ‘no care’ attitude about teaching.  Lack of motivation because you’re the only person of color in class and no one speaks to you.  They’re [sic] only 3 black professors on campus."
SSR 1f:

"Socialization, study skills, & networking. Also the underlying fact that you know systemically you aren't wanted in higher education."

SAMPLE QUESTION 2:

"If you know of any Black student(s) who recently left the university for reasons other than graduation, what were some of the reasons?"

SSR 2a:

"Racial climate, and unhappy with overall campus life"

SSR 2b:

"financial problems, apathy, and general dissatisfaction with the social environment."

SSR 2c:

"Not enough blacks or benefits for blacks."

SSR 2d:

"1) financial setbacks"

SSR 2e:

"- one student transferred to UC Irvine to participate in a Black Engineering programs, something [Creek University] does not have
- one student left for financial reasons
- one student felt she couldn't reach her full potential at [CU]."

SAMPLE QUESTION 3:

"Suppose for a moment, that you were Chancellor or President of this university. What programs or policies would you adopt in order to deal with the kinds of
problems Black students experience here?"

SSR 3a:
"Better recruitment programs of blacks as well as other minorities. Allow or create a program to have more black functions on the campus."

SSR 3b:
"More black professors and counselors who can relate to the students."

SSR 3c:
"-Bring more blacks student [sic] in (increase recruitment)
-give them more financial aid
-more black professors"

SSR 3d:
"1) more financial aid 2) more structured black forums etc. 3) diversify schedule of black related classes"

SSR 3e:
"Increase African student population. Increase number of African staff, and faculty."

SSR 3f:
"political, social, advancement of Black Greek organizations, employment programs."

SSR 3g:
"Higher more black faculty & staff in more areas than Ethnic Studies & Sociology like English, History & Sciences. And increase overall campus percentage of blacks from 3% to...8, 9, 10%"
SAMPLE QUESTION 4:
"Briefly describe the most notable incident of racial discrimination experiences by you on this campus."

SSR 4a:
"Police harassment because of the type of car I drive ('gang related')"

SSR 4b:
"Not being served food right. Not being acknowledged in class. Grades being different than others with same percentages. People acting as though you don’t exist."

SSR 4c:
"Interaction with campus police."

SSR 4d:
"In my english [sic] class, my teacher often overlooked me and also another friend (black). Our answers & opinions were always 'incorrect, unclear' etc."

SSR 4e:
"I applied to a club & I was definitely qualified and I didn’t get in. They have no black members. But [when] they were taking pictures for a brochure [they] asked me to be apart [sic] (They’re crazy!) They think I’m @ [CU] because of quotas! I feel as though I have to prove myself in order to get respect."

SSR 4f:
"Associated Students Programming Board wanted to have a debate on apartheid in which one of the speakers would give his side of the advantages of apartheid. This was very offensive to me and many other students as well."

SSR 4g:
"I was walking back from class and a couple of caucasian [sic] males walked by me. One spit very close to me as I passed by, and the other guy says, 'You almost got her."
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Too bad you didn't.' Meaning he almost spit on me but missed. As they walked off, one of them said 'She's black anyway. She's used to it.' I just walked away.
APPENDIX C

FACULTY INTERVIEW EXCERPT
APPENDIX C

Informant: Black, female, Psychology Professor

Question: "What do you believe is the general attitude of professors toward black students in their classes?"

Response: "I think there is a number of faculty members who give African American students higher grades than they deserve and they call themselves being liberal when they're really being extremely racist because what they're communicating is that African Americans don't have the ability or can't cut the mustard. Then, I think there are faculty members who give them lower grades than they deserve because they feel threatened. They don't evaluate their work the same just like the ones who give them higher grades than they deserve as they would a white student. You have to prove yourself and be so outstanding so that there's no question and then they take you and separate you from the group after you've jumped through all of these hoops. They might say 'Oh, you're not like them.' They say 'Oh, it's because he's mixed.' I've heard them say things like that."

"Did you want to know what I personally do in my classes? For African American students?"

"Sometimes courses are too large, but in the smaller courses when I am able to identify them and I know that they're doing poorly, I have a policy for students in general. That policy is that I am very open and receptive. If I find out that they're not doing well for whatever reason I'll give them pointers like quizzesing them, telling them how to get tutors, use different support services. I suggest to them that they do study groups."
Endnotes

1. See chapter two for a detailed discussion of the different meanings of retention.

2. Examples of student responses to several open-ended questions are in Appendix B.

3. An excerpt from an interview with a faculty member is transcribed in Appendix C.

4. Professor Allen's assistance in this project is very much appreciated.

5. A sample of the questionnaire is in Appendix A.

6. Spady's model is examined further in chapter six.

7. Tinto's model is analyzed in chapter six.

8. In his 1987 work Tinto uses the term "retention" instead of "dropout" which was the focus of his 1975 article. The reason behind this significant change of perspective is unknown.
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