Perceptions of African-American Males Regarding Factors Supporting Doctoral Completion in Colleges of Education

William Respress
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://dc.etsu.edu/etd

Part of the Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons, African American Studies Commons, Higher Education Commons, and the Higher Education Administration Commons

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact dcadmin@etsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6” x 9” black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
PERCEPTIONS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN MALES REGARDING
FACTORS SUPPORTING DOCTORAL COMPLETION
IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the
Doctorate of Education

by
William Respress
May 1997
Approval

This is to certify that the Graduate Committee of

William Respress

met on the

21st day of March, 1997.

The committee read and examined his dissertation, supervised his defense of it in an oral examination, and decided to recommend that his study be submitted to the Graduate Council, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.

Chair, Graduate Committee

Signed on behalf of the Graduate Council

Interim Dean, School of Graduate Studies
ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN MALES REGARDING FACTORS SUPPORTING DOCTORAL COMPLETION IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

by

William Respress

The primary purpose of the study was to examine what institutional factors most influenced the decision of African-American male doctoral scholars to persist unto graduation. The literature review showed mentoring, institutional climate, race relations, and social adjustment as key factors in persistence of minorities in graduate studies. An objective specific to the study was to explore the cumulative outcomes that mentoring, social adjustment, institutional climate, and race relations have upon persistence.

The population included scholars at both Predominantly White Colleges (PWIs) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) throughout the United States in Colleges of Education. One hundred sixty-four scholars responded representing a return rate of 96%. The African-American Male Doctoral Scholar Survey was employed to collect data.

Analyses of the data included ANOVA, independent sample t-tests, analysis of frequencies, percentages of responses, and Tukey's Post-hoc analysis. Responses to open-ended questions were analyzed and cited from comments written by scholars.

There were six major findings. Factors affecting scholars' decision to persist unto graduation at PWIs differed from those who attended HBCUs when considering mentoring, social adjustment, race relations, and institutional climate. No significant differences were discovered between age groups upon the decision of scholars to persist. Employment classification affected persistence of scholars at both types of institutions. Institutional geographical location affected the decision of scholars to persist. Scholars' classification status did not affect persistence at either type of institution. The number of scholars within the department significantly influenced persistence unto graduation.

Recommendations were made for replication of the study and refinement of the instrument. A 13-point institutional plan of action was developed toward improving the persistence rate of scholars. A 12-point plan was developed to assist scholars in achieving a successful doctoral experience.
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Evidence from the literature of the past two decades show that access to higher education does not necessarily mean academic success. Today, Black male students have more access to colleges of their choice, but there is a high probability that they may not complete their course work nor attempt more advanced programs...Their success and survival can be measured by the number of Black males who realize their ability potential and who achieve high enough grade point averages in college to remain there. (Johnson, 1993, p. 10)

In America, a doctoral degree is perceived as a key to unlock socioeconomic barriers and to provide an opportunity to realize life long dreams. It is a symbol of status, an emblem of achievement, and a bridge to monetary potential (Robinson, 1990).

Because African-Americans are disproportionately represented at the doctoral level, the actualization of this dream becomes less of a reality for them. Despite gains made in the 1980s, doctoral degree production for African-Americans has taken a downward turn, especially for African-American males (Blackwell, 1981; Smith & Davidson, 1992; Wilson & Carter, 1993). Because of this implication, Johnson (1993) stated:

Many educators, community activist [sic], and policy makers have come together to attempt to assess the magnitude of this trend and its impact on the fabric of the American society. Experts are eager to identify ways to redress the precipitous drop in the quality of life for the African-American, with special focus on the male. Of particular concern is the impact that the sociological phenomena surrounding African-Americans have on their interest in and/or ability to acquire a good education. (p. 4)
According to statistics presented in the Summary Report 1994 (Simmons & Thurgood, 1995), doctoral degrees conferred in colleges of education to African-American male citizens declined from a total of 649 in 1975 to 407 in 1994. African-American men showed a 22.8% decrease from 1980 to 1991 in total doctoral degrees conferred (Wilson & Carter, 1993). From a total of 41,011 doctoral degrees conferred in America in 1994, only 407 doctoral degrees were conferred to African-American men (Simmons & Thurgood, 1995). All minority groups have increased their numbers and proportions of new doctoral degrees since 1975. African-Americans, however, increased their numbers of doctorate only slightly since 1975 and not at all since 1993 (Simmons & Thurgood, 1995).

While one-third of the nation's colleges and universities' professorate will need to be replaced by the end of the 20th century (Smith & Davidson, 1992; Solorzano, 1995), the number of African-Americans, especially African-American male doctoral scholars, has shrunk to disproportionately small numbers (Wilson & Carter, 1993). This low number of African-American doctoral degree holders underscores the inequity in higher educational attainment for African-Americans (Love, 1993). Despite efforts of many colleges and universities to retain African-Americans, it has had little effect upon overall graduation rates (Allen, 1992). Without precise, decisive action by policy makers, doctoral degree attainment for African-American scholars will only worsen.
Statement of the Problem

"Somewhere there is a gap between the research showing what factors affect persistence and graduation rates and the programs or organizational strategies developed to increase admission and retention of Black students." (Love, 1993, p. 27)

African-American male scholars in higher education have historically experienced a “poor fit” at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) (Fleming, 1984), thus, resulting in a low rate of degree attainment. Similarly, Thompson and Fretz (1991) showed that African-American scholars at PWIs experience significant degrees of incongruency (fit between personal attributes and the environment) as compared with their White counterparts. This becomes a critical issue given that 80% of African-American scholars attend PWIs (Allen, 1988; Manzo, 1994).

Noel, Levitz, and Saluri (1985) found African-American male scholars at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) persist and graduate at approximately the same graduation rate as their White counterparts at PWIs. Additionally, studies by (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Astin, 1982; Fleming, 1984; Lang & Ford, 1993) suggest there is a problem with high attrition for African-American scholars at PWIs. Studies by Allen (1991) and Nettles (1988) suggested African-American scholars experienced a lack of academic identity at PWIs.

Purposes of the Study

The principal reason of this study was to provide an in-depth inquiry into factors enabling African-American males to persist toward graduation at the doctoral level in
colleges of education. A secondary purpose of the study was to gather baseline data that would assist policy makers in intensifying institutional commitment toward increasing African-American male scholars' doctoral degree attainment. Additionally, it is hoped that educators would use findings presented in this study as a conceptual framework toward increasing doctoral degree production for African-American scholars.

**Significance of the Problem**

Studies over the last two couple of decades have documented the cumulative outcomes of specific variables upon persistence of minority students at the master's level. While these studies covered a broad spectrum, they tended not to assess the outcome of these variables upon the persistence of African-American male scholars at the doctoral level. At the same time, institutional efforts to reduce the attrition rate of African-American male scholars at the graduate level have not produced desired outcomes. Considering budgetary constraints faced by many institutions, it is important that resources are spent in a way that will have significant and lasting results.

Analyses have shown that mentoring, social adjustment and climate play a significant role in the graduate experiences of African-American scholars (Adams, 1992; Baird, 1990; Davis, 1995; Love, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1994). What presently exists in the literature does not address an immense disparity between research findings, institutional efforts, and persistence of African-American scholars (Allen, 1991; Love 1993; Tinto, 1990).
As stated by Tinto (1990):

The secret of effective programs lies, however, in the observable fact that their commitment to students goes beyond the concern for retention per se, to a concern for the education of students. The social and intellectual growth of students, not their mere retention, is the mark of effective retention efforts... Education, not retention, is the primary principle of effective retention. (p. 38)

The study will provide data on the experiences and perceptions of African-American male scholars at the doctoral level at both PWIs and HBCUs. Further, it is possible that it will serve as a reference point for policy makers to develop a conceptual framework for reducing the attrition rate of African-American male scholars at the doctoral level.

Limitations

While conducting the study the following limitations were found:

1. This study was limited to African-American male scholars enrolled in doctoral studies in Colleges of Education.
2. This study was limited to African-American male scholars enrolled at the time of the study.
3. This study was limited to African-American male scholars who were currently persisting toward graduation.
4. The name African-American limited this study.
Definition of Terms

1. **Climate** - Climate is the current, common patterns and attitudes of an organization's members toward the organization (Peterson & Spencer, 1990).

2. **Critical Mass** - An adequate number of different students to meet the social needs of a diverse population (Fidler & Godwin, 1994).

3. **Culture** - Culture is the deeply embedded pattern of behavior and meanings, symbols, rituals, and values of an institution (Peterson & Spencer, 1990).

4. **Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)** - Institutions whose student body is majority African-American.

5. **Mentor** - Teacher or advisor; one who leads through guidance (Adams, 1993).

6. **Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs)** - Institutions whose student body is majority Caucasian.

7. **Protégé** - One who is under the special care of a usually older person of superior position and experience to be guided in the development of a talent or career (Adams, 1993).

8. **Social Adjustment** - Social adjustment is an ongoing process where a person learns the ways, customs, values, and norms to become a part of a group or society (Kozier & Erb, 1988).
9. African-American Scholar - A student whose origin extends to the continent of Africa or who identifies as African-American.

10. Persistence - Ability of a student to persevere until graduation.

11. Alienation - Feelings of meaninglessness or estrangement (Cooke, 1994).

12. Retention - Power to hold or to keep in possession.

Overview of the Study

Chapter one included the following: (a) an introduction, (b) a statement of the problem, (c) purposes of the study, (d) significance of the study, (e) limitations, and (f) definitions of terms. Chapter two presents a synthesis of the literature apropos for answering the research hypotheses. This chapter also provides a synthesis of research that policy makers may use to construct a theoretical framework toward improving persistence efforts at the doctoral level for African-American male scholars.

Chapter three describes the following: (a) population characteristics, (b) research design and rationale, (c) instrumentation, rationale, and reliability, (d) data collection procedures, and (e) data analyses.

Chapter four presents a presentation of the data, null hypotheses that guided the study, and an analysis of the data.

Chapter five includes an annotation of the research problem, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Persistence

Although many studies have assessed the implications of African-American scholars’ persistence rate at the undergraduate level, few have documented the experiences of African-American scholars at the doctoral level. Additionally, researchers have conducted analyses concerning retention, recruitment and institutional environments in higher education (Pascarella & Terenzini 1991; Tinto 1994). Nevertheless, few have specifically addressed issues surrounding the persistence of African-American male scholars at the graduate level (Allen 1991; Lang & Ford, 1993; Robinson, 1990). Particularly apparent in the literature is an insufficiency of research documenting variables affecting African-American male scholars’ persistence toward graduation at PWIs (Robinson, 1990).

An even more apparent absence of research exists analyzing the beliefs of White faculty and administration’s attitudes toward nonmajority persistence rates. Researchers and practitioners alike agree that studies are needed to isolate correlates that tend to most influence the persistence of African-American male graduate scholars (Adams, 1993; Allen, 1992; Blackwell, 1987; Korbak, 1992). Keller (1988) concluded “... education planners, policy makers, and leaders must create new structures and experiment as never before--with deep compassion to reverse the erosion in the number of Black students” (p. 8).
Solorzano (1995) reported that an aging professorate is quickly approaching retirement. One-third of the nation's colleges and universities professorate will need to be replaced by the end of the 20th century (Smith & Davidson, 1992; Solorzano, 1995) and one-third of the nation's population around the 21st century is expected to be minority. All the while, the number of African-American graduates, especially African-American male doctoral degree holders, have declined to disproportionately small numbers (Wilson & Carter, 1993).

Although it is unfortunate that such dismal realities exist, it is self-evident that this national problem needs to be addressed. Accordingly, this situation presents profound opportunities to increase African-American male representation among faculty, staff, and administrative ranks (Smith & Davidson, 1992). This rare opportunity has arisen when the African-American doctoral pool is at an all time low (Brown, 1988; Willie, Grady, & Hope, 1991). According to Blackwell (1981):

Few areas in the academic community have stirred as much controversy or have created a crisis of such monumental proportions as has that of the production of doctoral degrees among black Americans . . . Is essential to note that the actual number of black Americans enrolled in doctoral degree programs is minuscule when measured by any of the traditional standards. This disproportionately low number of black students enrolled in doctoral programs continues even as the pool of blacks who have graduated from college expands . . . (This) suggests that any number of barriers must be operating that effectively prevent them from enrolling and (persisting until graduation) in doctoral programs. (p. 289-290)
Because the doctorate is often prerequisite for upper tier employment within the academy (Solorzano, 1995), doctoral degree attainment for nonmajority scholars must become the central focal point of institutional policy. Additionally, even the slightest improvement in equitable distribution of compensation amid the nation’s citizenry should be good news for everyone. Efforts that are fragmentary and inconsequential are inadequate to eliminate blocks to persistence toward graduation for minority students (Conyers, 1986). Arguably, insignificant efforts will only continue to undermine the ideologies of the constitutional rights of our nation’s citizenry. An increase in the number of African-American doctorate degree holders will translate into incalculable benefits not only for African-Americans, but also will serve the prosperity of the nation. Concerning the state of affairs of African-American men, Wilson and Carter (1993) wrote:

African-American men continue to have more difficulty increasing their college going rates than African-American women. In 1989, a greater percentage of African-American females participated in college than during the mid 1980s. Consequently, during the latter half of the 1980s African-American women made some progress in regaining ground they lost in college participation during the late 1970s and early 1980s. The same cannot be said for African-American men. Their college participation rates fluctuated during the late 1980s but remained the lowest of all groups. (p. 3)

Allen (1992) concluded while many studies have identified similar adjustment experiences between African-American and White scholars, nonetheless, African-American scholars at PWIs find it necessary to create their own cultural webs because of feelings of exclusion from the predominant White culture. Although it is conceivable that the inverse holds true for minority students at HBCUs, research studies have definitively concluded that feelings of exclusion are very real at PWIs for African-
American graduate students. A study by Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) showed a strong causal link between academic success and social integration for majority and nonmajority scholars.

Mow and Nettles (1990) stated "social integration was equally important, perhaps even more important than academic integration as an influence on ultimate degree completion for black students" (p. 84). Perhaps one of the most important aggregate commitments of graduate schools at PWIs, is to have a vision that articulates and embraces a goal of improving the persistence rate of African-American scholars. Western Michigan University is one such institution that has shown a unique commitment toward improving the persistence rate of its African-American scholars.

Students Taking Advantage of Resources (STAR), established by Western Michigan University, awards $1000 incentives to eligible African-American scholars who voluntarily participate in a set of structured activities designed to enhance persistence at the university (Kobrak, 1992). According to Kobrak (1992), STAR encourages African-Americans to:

Participate in orientation sessions and academic advising, attend six cultural activities, attend and/or participate in the university's Minority Leadership workshop, volunteer for a minimum of ten hours university service, participate in an appropriate skill building workshop, participate in the minority Mentor/Mentee program, and participate in a professional development program. (p. 523)

Additionally, many studies have suggested African-American scholars at PWIs as contrasted with HBCUs, experience greater degrees of anxiety that negatively affect their decision to persist (Allen et al., 1991; Astin, 1982). Additionally, Fleming (1984),
suggested African-American students at PWIs are experiencing intense levels of anxiety. Researchers (Allen et al., 1991; Astin, 1982; Nettles, 1985) concurred with Fleming’s study by finding that intense levels of anxiety at PWIs affected academic success of African-American scholars.

Studies conducted by Allen et al., (1991) and Nettles (1988) purported "noncognitive anomalous" experiences at White institutions lead to higher attrition of African-American scholars. While conducting a review of the literature concerning climate and social adjustment, it was found that both domains had overlapping characteristics. Before downward trends in attrition of African-American can be reversed, universities must discover and understand rationales. What key variables seem to have the greatest influence upon persistence of African-American scholars?

**Climate**

There is growing awareness that a hospitable and nourishing campus climate is necessary to guarantee diversity in higher education institutions. Women and people of color need to work (and learn) in an environment that promotes their professional growth and development. There is growing recognition of the significant role campus climate plays in the retention of faculty, staff and students. In an era that emphasizes commitment to diversity, it is important to ensure commitment to an equitable and hospitable climate for all members of a campus community. (Denise Wilbur, as cited by Adams, 1993, p. 1)

Arguably, many studies have identified acceptable explanations for the decline in the number of African-American doctorate holders (Allen et al., 1991; Blackwell, 1991; Cabrera & Nora, 1996; Fleming, 1984). However, full recognition, acceptance, and remediation of this problem remain an important issue in many PWIs. A synthesis of
research studies has shown a correlation between an amicable racial climate and persistence for graduate students, particularly African-American scholars at PWIs (Davis, 1995; Love, 1993). A study conducted by Hughes (1987) at several PWIs found that:

The predominantly white [sic] campuses studied had negative external mediators for both black men and black women... White campuses are not necessarily healthy environments for their development, nurturance, confidence building, and positive identity formation are stifled on these campuses. An environment filled with prejudices and stereotypes provokes tentativeness, suspicion, restriction, and harsh self-examination. Black students in this study suggested that blacks who attend PWIs must be self starters who are fully independent persons with strong defenses to combat stereotypes, fears, alienation, and loneliness. (p. 543)

Moreover, Allen’s (1992) study purported that African-American scholars at PWIs experienced strong feelings of exclusion and attempted to abate those feelings by creating their own social culture. Nonetheless, some African-American scholars at PWIs do manage to overcome cultural barriers, achieve academic success, and establish healthy relationships with their counterparts (Allen et al., 1991; Blackwell, 1987). PWIs can address issues of a monolithic educational community by assuring acculturation of all minority scholars and by accentuating the reciprocal importance of all students and faculty respecting differences in students’ ethnicity. Moreover, Leon (1993) postulated that “a multi-cultural, pluralistic society needs to be reflected and modeled through the culture and curricula of colleges and universities” (p. 11).

Additionally, convergent evidence shows among many factors, that an indifferent climate is a chief cause of attrition, particularly among nonmajority scholars in higher education (Allen, 1988; Cabrera & Nora, 1996; Fleming, 1984; Kobbak, 1992; Peterson, 1990; Smith & Davidson, 1992; Tinto, 1987). Apart from institutional climate
research, little is known about the causal links between scholars' perception, climate, and educational outcomes of African-American doctoral students (Baird, 1990; Johnson, 1993).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993) discovered that "the vertical slice, vision not deficiencies, collegial relationship, trust and support, values and interests, not power and position, broad participation, lifelong growth, present life but long-term perspective, access to quality information, continuous and sustained improvement, and individual empowerment" (p. 41) are keys to building and strengthening relationships within an academic community. Arguably, graduate schools should lend themselves to an orientation that promotes pluralistic values where all scholars may achieve legitimacy.

On the other hand, Tinto (1990) rejected the theory that educational institutions should exhaust every effort to retain students. What seems important is that they target retention efforts toward scholars whom the institution evaluates as consonant with its educational mission. Most institutions do appropriately retain students; however, Tinto (1990) suggested that there was a necessary and imposed limit to what institutions should do to retain students. Additionally, institutions should judge the educability of a scholar and that they align retention efforts with institutional policy Tinto (1990). Balancing retention efforts with the needs of all students is crucial to effective retention efforts.

Baker (1991) and Fidler and Godwin (1994) proposed the thesis that if there was an acceptable level of social support, a critical mass of minority students and faculty, and encouragement was common in an institution's climate, the graduate school experience would be less of a formidable experience. African-American scholars at PWIs often
encounter a culture and climate that inhibit them as major players in the life of the institution (Epps, 1989). Of all problems encountered by African-American students at PWIs, isolation, alienation, and a lack of social support are the most detrimental to persistence toward graduation (Epps, 1989; Fleming, 1984; Nottingham, Rosen, & Parks, 1992).

As is with any student, a scholar who believes that the attitude of an institution is one that seeks to promote his general welfare, it is likely that he will be less sensitive to ethnic differences. An institution’s climate can be key to assuaging high attrition rates among African-American scholars (Allen, 1988; Cabrera & Nora, 1996). Peterson and Spencer (1990) expressed that climate was more readily susceptible to change than culture, therefore, less enduring. As posited by Fryer and Lovas (1991) climate is:

The ambient, affective character of a place—the conditions that evoke feelings, either positive or negative, from the people in the organization. Climate is to the affective aspect of human beings in an organization what air is to the physical aspect. Climate is an organization’s emotional atmosphere. People breathe it. (p. 14)

Assessing an institution’s climate has been identified as pivotal to creating a climate that is amiable toward those who have not become familiar with departmental or institutional norms, and customs. According to Baird (1990), this assessment should include the perceptions of all minority students and faculty so that an accurate portrayal of the institution’s climate can be captured. Baird (1990) presented his rationale by stating “if the climate of a college or university is formed partially by institutional goals, consistent with organizational theory, and if its goals are a large part of its climate, then it
makes sense to assess the perceptions of those goals by students, faculty, administrators, and others" (Baird, 1990, p. 35-36).

According to Turner (1994), a study was conducted at the University of Minnesota to decide what nonmajority scholars’ perceptions were concerning the climate at the university. Some of their responses were as follows:

**Hispanic student**: CLA [College of Liberal Arts] was difficult, and I was an honor’s student and was more alone. I felt loneliness and [lack of encouragement from] professors.

**African-American student**: Based on my experience here, I would tell the black students to go somewhere else. It’s difficult here because you don’t have credibility; there is an attitude, we, you’re not going to make it. You have to prove yourself because of skin color as well as prove yourself academically.

**Native American student**: As a student, I felt (the University of Minnesota) was too big and I never received feedback from instructors or TAs. They were not accessible. I never got individual attention.

**Hispanic student**: I couldn’t go to a white [sic] professor and say that I want to change advisors when my advisor [also white] [sic] is racist.

**African-American student**: At the U, it was like nobody knows you. My advisor is too busy. He never welcomed me to sit down even if I had an appointment. As I was leaving, he’d be typing, he didn’t really care. (Turner, 1994, p. 360)

Although not all experiences echoed by students of color are this dispiriting, reasonable inferences could be drawn from this study concerning possible implications resulting from excluding perceptions of nonmajority scholars in a climate audit.

Additionally, Adams (1993) maintained a campus audit is central to improving an institution’s climate and suggested the following variables as important keys to this process:
1. Move early to integrate under represented graduate students into the department and assist them to build a sense of belonging such as: appoint departmental ambassadors from among current graduate students, conduct departmental orientation sessions for all new graduate students, implement written guidelines for departmental staff functions regarding acclimation of new graduate students.

2. Encourage and reward the advising and nurturing of minority and women students—make mentoring those students okay.

3. Facilitate the match of under represented students with faculty mentors—don’t leave forming the mentoring alliance to chance.

4. Treat all students as legitimate members of the graduate school community by respecting and nurturing their academic and scholarly attributes and potential. (p. 12)

In summary, as policy makers explore ways to improve varying dimensions of institutional climate, it is imperative that the administration use resources that will assist them in capturing an accurate portrayal of the institution’s climate.

**Mentoring**

Mentoring as defined by Bowen (1985) occurs when:

a senior person (the mentor) in terms of age and experience undertakes to provide information, advice and emotional support for a junior person (the protégé) in a relationship lasting over an extended period of time and marked by substantial emotional commitment by both parties. If the opportunity presents itself, the mentor also uses both formal and informal forms of influence to further the career of the protégé. (p. 31)

Mentoring relationships encompass a mutual sharing of ideas, respect, trust and nurturing of integrity that has ethical implications. According to Gift, Creasia, and Skelton (1991) a mentor is primarily responsible for socializing the student into the culture of the
program. The mentoring relationship embraces the ideas of professional development, intellectual stimulation and the protégé’s persistence in higher education (Conway 1992; Gift et al., 1991).

While in the past mentoring relationships have been salient and extant (Astin, 1977) in the graduate experience, its efficacy has become threatened by exhausted faculty resources. Extensive literature exists detailing the student-faculty mentoring relationship, but little information specifically addresses African-American male scholars' mentoring needs (Blackwell, 1981; Smith & Davidson, 1992). Wagner (1992) cited the following comments made by an African-American graduate student concerning mentoring:

I met him [a faculty member] at a reception. He was the only psychology professor and black person on the stage. I introduced myself, and he said. [sic] Come by and see me. [When I did] I had a great conversation with him about his interests, my interests...Later he told me he had been offered authorship of a book chapter, and asked did I want to coauthor it with him. I said "yes" and asked for the responsibility of the data analysis, although I had limited statistical experience before I came here. He let me do this. Through ongoing research meetings, I learned more about analyzing the data. At our meetings, he would say, "Do you know about this and about that?" And if I didn't, he would introduce me to a new body of literature. He has been extremely helpful to my professional and personal development. He would ask all the time, How are you doing? (p. 5)

Smith and Davidson (1992) found during a review of the literature on mentoring in Psychological Abstract, that only about 4% of the articles in the past two decades examined the influence of mentoring upon African-American doctoral scholars. Likewise, Holland (1993) showed that empirical research is seriously lacking concerning the student-faculty relationship of African-American doctoral students. Mentoring is an indispensable component of the doctoral experience and necessary for survival in higher
An exploratory research study conducted by Holland (1993) identified five types of relationships African-American doctoral students had with their major advisors: (a) formal academic advisement, (b) academic guidance, (c) quasi-apprenticeship, (d) academic mentoring, and (e) career mentoring (p. 6). In formal academic advisement, little engagement transpires between advisee and major professor. The scope of this type of advisement is relegated to basic and routine academic advisement that is essential to the student negotiating the doctoral program. Additionally, three qualities are characteristic of the formal advisement relationship “basic and routine academic advisement, limited contact and non developmental” (Holland, 1993, p. 7).

Holland (1993) related the major advisor provides such information as: (a) specific departmental procedures and policies, (b) typical sequencing of courses in the program, (c) transfer credit information, (d) grade point requirements, and (e) fundamental dissertation requirements. (p. 8) The limited contact relationship may be categorically summarized as aloof and impersonal. Students have limited opportunities to establish a meaningful relationship with their major advisor and a student’s contact is often limited to procedural issues.

In the third type of informal academic advisement, nondevelopmental, the structure of the relationship inhibits establishment of a social rapport with the major advisor. As stated by Holland (1993), “The advisor is not involved in nurturing or grooming the doctoral student” (p. 9). An African-American doctoral student had the following comments about his experiences in an informal academic advisement
Unlike other professors in the department, their students had unlimited access to them. They (the students) were in and out of their offices all the time... With him it was different. I could only see him by appointment. And sometimes the appointment would have to be made two days in advance. So I'm wasting two days not knowing what to do. And then when I would get to see him, he would take over the conversation and go down paths that were new to me. When I would leave I would be no closer to anything... I think he was ill-fitted to provide me with what I needed. The relationship was difficult and did not help my Ph.D. work. In fact, sometimes I think it was a hindrance. (Holland, 1993, p. 9)

In the second type of advisement, academic guidance, the relationship between the advisee and the major professor is traditional. Here the major advisor not only provides the student with academic advisement, but also shows the student he or she is genuinely interested in what interests the student (Holland, 1993). The structure is flexible, less formal, they give student views serious consideration, and the advisor meets frequently with the student as the need arises. Holland identified advisors who showed these types of qualities as supportive advisors.

Additionally, advisors attempt to build a professional relationship with the advisee both inside and outside the school setting. The advisor shows that they are sensitive to the realization of a minority scholar at a PWI. The following is a citation of an African-American doctoral scholar about her experiences with a supportive advisor:

He is very approachable. I haven't had any difficulties with him. He is willing to listen. He makes suggestions. He doesn't try to impose his views on me. He doesn't try to push me into any particular direction. We can discuss things and he will give me his viewpoint, but he doesn't tell me things that I must do. I find him flexible. (Holland, 1993, p. 11)
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Advisors who are supportive recognize the importance of building collaborative relationships with scholars that creates positive educational environments. Collaboration serves a twofold purpose, it establishes the student within the educational setting and it socializes the student into the department (Anderson, 1996). Anderson stated “the level of participation by graduate students in collaborative efforts within a department can be thought of as a measure of the interconnectedness of the departments’ research agendas and projects” (p. 306). The third type of advisement is the quasi-apprenticeship relationship (Holland, 1993).

Quasi-apprenticeship relationships provide the doctoral student with an opportunity to engage in “educational research opportunities that are not available to all doctoral students” (Holland, 1993, p. 12). Additionally, this relationship allows the major advisor to give the student basic academic advice, professional guidance, and political advice that will help the student to be successful in his or her academic career (Holland, 1993). An African-American doctoral student had the following comments about his experiences in a quasi-apprenticeship relationship:

In one way my advisor looks out for me and in another way he looks out for himself. He does not take anyone under his wing and direct them... I you [sic] are not seeing what he is talking about he will continue to try to move you, but he does not take you and say 'I think you need to do this or that.' He talks to me about the things he is working on. He ask [sic] my advice and I ask [sic] his advice about things. The bottom line is he gets his stuff done. He draws on personal relationships with people to ensure that his work gets done. He cultivates personal relationships, then he develops business relationships. That's how he gets his stuff done. (Holland, 1993, p. 14)
Academic mentoring and career mentoring, the fourth and fifth advisement types, are relationships where they provide the student with a broader range of opportunities to work in a collaborative milieu designed to enhance the quality of the relationship between the major advisor and student (Holland, 1993). Of the five mentor relationships with African-American doctoral students, quasi-apprenticeship, academic mentoring and career mentoring were the most important to doctoral students. Davidhizar (1988) further emphasized the doctoral experience would be incomplete without a mentoring relationship.

In studying mentoring, Blackwell (1989) contended the academy should constantly increase the number of African-American faculty to give African-American students visible role models and to offset demeaning stereotypes about African-Americans. Similarly, Adams (1992) recognized the advantages of mentoring upon the self-concept and self-esteem of an African-American scholar. In a study conducted by Howard-Vital and Morgan (1993), female African-American scholars reported these feelings concerning mentoring:

great sounding boards... often an emotional oasis where I can cast aside my “aura” and be myself, and ask naive questions; be irrational in my anger, and not have to worry about having my weaknesses used against me. But most importantly where [sic] I can get honest “no holds barred” assessments of what’s going on.... openness to discuss any issue... open, honest and caring relationship... the open and honest dialogue we have developed... we were able to be honest and direct with each other... relaxed and open, there when I needed... how to bite the bullet and maintain
In a set of related issues and findings, Leon (1993) identified the following characteristics as useful in establishing a minority mentoring program:

1. Minority students and majority educators need to be placed in culturally diverse situations.

2. Majority faculty need to seek a greater understanding of the cultural background of minority students. Again this will improve communication and cross-cultural understanding.

3. Following careful screening and matching, minority students in colleges and universities should be assigned majority faculty advisors, as a supplement to their regular advisors. The supplemental advisor functions more as a mentor and less as a traditional college advisor.

4. Majority faculty should be involved in programs designed to recruit minority students into the teaching profession at an early age and help prepare these students for the key transition points in an academic career.

5. All graduate students, especially minorities, should meet regularly with graduate faculty members, formally and informally, to learn about their profession. They should be placed in situations where the parties talk about themselves, their lives, and aspirations, where a common culture based on academic interests can develop.

6. Graduate students should be given a formal orientation by the department in the written and unwritten rules of earning the Ph.D. and succeeding in the profession. Some states have special programs to help minority students overcome barriers along the way.

7. Departments should also convene groups to discuss specifically how the department and discipline are adjusting to the social and educational dynamics on campus and in the nation. Departments should report periodically to all concerned on their efforts to recruit and retain minority students and faculty. Departments should seek to establish at least one relationship with a public school with a high percentage of minority students to encourage these students to consider academic careers and to work with "at-risk" youths. (p. 21)
Adams (1993) articulated the mentor's function as crucial to the success of the African-American doctoral student. Adams further suggested the following as ways the mentor engages in various roles:

1. A source of information regarding departmental programs, politics, protocol, policies and procedures, etc.
2. An advisor who guides the protégé through the intricacies of program planning, course selection, preparing to take and pass milestone examinations, identifying and selecting a research area, writing and presenting the dissertation;
3. An advocate for the protégé as progress is made toward completion of the doctorate;
4. A confidant and friend who lend support to bolster the protégé’s self-confidence by modeling good scholarship / research practices;
5. A sounding board who gives constructive and critical review of protégé’s work, free of judgmental bias;
6. A door opener to run interference for the protégé in gaining access to departmental resources, space, equipment, information and;
7. A sponsor and promoter of the protégé into the profession. (p. 14)

Adams (1992) listed the following as benefits of effective mentoring practices that empowers scholars to excel in graduate studies and to:

Master those competencies necessary to successfully meet the milestones of a doctoral program, understand and adapt to the academic, social, political, and cultural mores of the department—standards, norms, values, history, programs, people, etc..., become a legitimate and valued member of the department, develop the following competencies that new doctoral recipients are expected to possess, i.e., organizational skills, presentation skills, coping skills, time management skills, transition skills, and procurement skills. (p. 15)
Adams (1992) summarized the underlying assumptions of mentoring relationship by stating "much of what is required to complete the doctorate is predicated on the student (protégé) being able to say, it's just you and me, doc. You tell me what to do and I will do it. Together, with you as mentor and me as protégé, we will complete this doctorate" (p. 8).

In summary, a review of the apropos literature suggests that mentoring of scholars, specifically African-American scholars, is indispensable and should be a part of the graduate school experience. However, while literature unquestionably concludes that outcomes of mentoring are positive, nonetheless, there is little collaborating evidence supporting that the same holds true for African-American males at the doctoral level. Because of this, it is imperative that base line data be gathered to support the outcomes of mentoring African-American male scholars at the doctoral level.

Social Adjustment

Socialization is characterized as an ongoing process of educating a person to the ways, customs, values and norms of a group that they may engage as a meaningful participant of that group or society (Kozier & Erb, 1988). Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), expressed:

It is clear that many of the most important effects of college occur through students' interpersonal experiences with faculty members and other students. It is equally clear that the academic, social, and psychological worlds inhabited by most nonwhite students on predominantly white [sic] campuses are substantially different in almost every respect from those of their white [sic] peers. On some campuses, minority students feel a powerful need to band together for psychological and social support of one another, sometimes in defense against the tacit and not-so-tacit condescension and hostility some feel from white [sic]
Accordingly, researchers (Cabrera & Nora, 1996; Fleming, 1984; Jones, 1992; King, 1994; Loo & Rolison, 1986) concluded minority students at PWIs consistently experience the trauma of depression, loneliness, alienation, and racism that were cited in the literature as correlates of student attrition and socialization. On the other hand, Arbona and Novy's (1990) study did not support the thesis of Tracey and Sedlacek (1985 & 1987) that loneliness, alienation, and racism were predictors of persistence of African-American scholars. An investigation conducted by Nottingham, Rosen, and Parks (1992) sought to answer whether students at a predominantly African-American university were at a lesser risk of experiencing social alienation as compared with their counterparts at a PWI. The study's findings concluded that the risks were small.

Although research studies repeatedly indicate that African-American students at PWIs experience significant adjustment difficulties, however, many institutions are not inclined to acknowledge the severity of this problem (Fleming, 1984). Ward (1995) further affirmed, "These campuses fail to establish and implement support mechanisms that serve to minimize the student's feelings of alienation and maximize the student's ability to successfully adjust to the environment" (p. 47).

Allen (1987) documented the experiences, characteristics, and achievements of 1,583 African-American students at six public PWIs and eight HBCUs and found that a significant correlation existed between good academic performance, campus life involvement, and scholars who had positive relationships with the faculty.
African-Americans fully experienced the preceding, they were more likely to fend off feelings of alienation. Inversely, African-American scholars at PWIs who felt socially alienated, less connected with campus life, and experienced a less positive relationship with White faculty were less likely to be academically successful (Fleming, 1984; Love, 1993; Nettles, 1985).

Allen (1987) concluded social adjustment significantly affected academic outcomes, persistence, and satisfaction levels at either HBCUs or at PWIs. Similarly, Turner (1994) suggested finding an acceptable level of comfort through positive social adjustment is key to academic success for scholars of color. Allen (1987) also suggested when nonmajority scholars perceived environmental inequalities they were less likely to get involved with faculty, students and campus activities, thus, heightening feelings of isolation and alienation. When a group of White students at a PWI was asked if they felt the institution was supportive of minorities, 68 percent believed that the institution was supportive of minorities while only 28 percent of the Black and Chicano students reported the same feelings (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Although feelings of isolation and alienation are not exclusive to PWIs, research indicates it more apparent at most of these institutions.

During an interview conducted by Turner (1994) with Ron Wakabayashi, national director of the Japanese American Citizens League, Wakabayashi reported feelings of exclusion by stating, “We feel that we’re a guest in someone else’s house, that we can never relax and put our feet up on the table” (p. 357). Turner (1994) concurred by stating that, “Guests have no history in the house they occupy, there are no photographs
on the wall that reflect their image, and their paraphernalia, paintings, scents, and sounds do not appear in the house,” (p. 356) thus feelings of alienation and exclusion are acerbated. Exclusionary practices are not exclusive to PWIs, these practices tend to pervade society as a whole.

Arce (1978) proposed a construct of “academic colonialism” to explain social adaptation. Academic colonialism describes the imposition of the dominant prevailing ideas, notions, and practices upon nonmajority groups. Similarly, other researchers (Jackman, 1984; Jackman, 1977; McClelland & Auster, 1990) assert that the purposes of group dominance are served in preserving the status quo so that inequities in social relationships are maintained. Arce (1978) further argued that the sustaining of group dominance pivots around the secondary group’s austere adherence to dominant group values. Arce (1978) suggested this position seeks to uniformly exclude minority (students and faculty) and their perspectives on issues within the academic community. Accordingly, when dominant group values and practices are challenged by minority groups, they are forced to defend their privileges under the guise of the democratic system where the majority rules.

Comparative analyses of experiences of nonmajority students at PWIs have shown a stalwart relationship between social adjustment and educational outcomes (Allen et al., 1991; Jay & D’Augelli, 1991; Hurtado, 1992; Sedlacek, 1987). Research literature suggests that scholars of color experience feelings of exclusion and racial tension while attending colleges and universities where social support is deficient to help them deal with the imposition of dominant group values (Arce, 1978; Fleming, 1984; Hurtado,
1992; Thompson & Fretz, 1991). On the other hand, African-American scholars who perceive they are supported by their university are less reluctant to withdraw.

Jones (1992) cited results of a study concerning recruitment and retention of black students in baccalaureate nursing programs that identified six blocks to persistence. The blocks were as follows: (a) inadequate financial aid, (b) feelings of loneliness and alienation, (c) failure to use available counseling, (d) inadequate secondary school preparation, (e) cultural and racial identity adjustment problems and problems with social, and sexual (f) relationships. (p. 79)

This finding is consistent with Hughes (1987) who found African-American students at PWIs were consumed with the need to survive, thus, delaying social gratification until they graduated. Hughes (1987) further emphasized, "The stress of racial tension and inadequate social lives generates feelings of alienation, that in turn lead to serious adjustment problems, psychological withdrawal, and impaired academic functioning." (p. 84) While these studies examined the outcomes of social adjustment, they did not conclusively indicate if these experiences were atypical for either majority or nonmajority students. Also, numerous studies have described and implicated correlates of social adjustment, but often failed to establish a link between these correlates as predictor variables upon persistence of African-Americans in higher education.

An observation made by Fidler and Godwin (1994) asserted nonmajority students have special adjustment needs and that universities, "Historically structured their curricula, student services, and campus environment based on white [sic] middle class norms" (p. 35). Admittedly, this is a convincing conjecture, still, no definitive evidence
was presented by Fidler and Godwin indicating a predictive correlation between curricula, student services, and campus environment and nonmajority scholars' persistence or student attrition.

Socialization of African-American scholars serves an important function in scholars' adjustment, persistence, and decision to graduate. The quality of faculty's engagement with African-American scholars serves an even more crucial function in their overall decision to persist. Johnson (1988) asserted without faculty involvement restructuring the environment would be all but futile. Adams (1993) suggested the faculty can empower scholars to become successful by using the following strategies:

1. Move early to integrate underrepresented graduate students into the department and assist them to build a sense of belonging.

2. Appoint departmental ambassadors from among current graduate students.

3. Conduct departmental orientation sessions for all new graduate students.

4. Implement written guidelines for departmental staff functions regarding acclimation of new graduate students.

5. Encourage and reward the advising and nurturing of minority and women students.

6. Treat all students as legitimate members of the graduate school community by respecting and nurturing their academic and scholarly attributes and potential.

7. Facilitate collaboration building with other graduate students. (p. 12)

Anderson (1996) suggested collaborative efforts would also help students to establish a sense of attachment with an academic environment. Collaboration involves interdependence, cross-fertilization of ideas, building consensus, and shared principles.
and values (Anderson, 1996). Benefits derived from collaboration include a dissipation of feelings of alienation, loneliness, racism, powerlessness, and social detachment.

**Summary**

It is likely that many correlates operate to cause African-Americans to experience a sense of social alienation at PWIs. Assessing the implications of alienation is particularly problematic because definitive measures of the construct have not been empirically established (Cooke, 1994). Nevertheless, a strong commitment by institutions to adequately socialize nonmajority students will assist students to fend off feelings of alienation and estrangement. Organizational commitment to improve socialization of African-Americans is highly correlated with their commitment to stay at the institution (Cooke, 1994). While research studies have identified social adjustment as crucial to persistence at the undergraduate level, empirically based research is needed to establish a causal link between social adjustment at PWIs and persistence of African-American male doctoral scholars.

This chapter reviewed the related literature concerning the effects that climate, social adjustment, and mentoring have upon a scholar's decision to persist toward graduation. While numerous studies identified correlates of persistence at the undergraduate and graduate level, to date none have identified correlates specific to the persistence of African-American male scholars at the doctoral level. As a result of the findings of the review of the literature, it is apparent that studies need to be conducted concerning persistence of African-American male scholars at the doctoral level.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of Chapter Three is to discuss: (a) the population under study, (b) the research design and the rationale, (c) the design of the instrument, (d) procedures for data collection, and (e) data analyses.

Population

The target population under investigation consisted of all actively enrolled African-American male scholars at the doctoral level in Colleges of Education throughout the United States. The population was selected from all PWIs and HBCUs with either: education leadership, curriculum and instruction, education administration and supervision, educational instructional media design, educational statistic/research methods, educational assessment/test and measurement, educational psychology, school psychology, social/philosophical/foundations of education, counseling education and guidance, higher education evaluation and research, elementary and secondary education, or adult and continuing education programs. A list of all institutions with educational doctoral programs was obtained from Simmons and Thurgood (1995). Each institution was contacted by telephone to verify enrollment of African-American male scholars.

The following states had institutions with education doctoral programs: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts,

**Research Design**

The study employed the nonexperimental research design. The nonexperimental research design is particularly useful for describing existing phenomena without manipulating variables to affect subjects' responses. The survey method was employed to collect data. The survey method is apropos for collecting data from "participants in a sample about their characteristics, experiences, and opinions to generalize the findings to a population that the sample is intended to represent" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 289).

**Instrumentation**

The Graduate Opinion Survey was used as a model in this study and was designed by Howard Adams. The Graduate Opinion Survey consisted of 67 items that solicited the perceptions of African-American graduate students concerning their graduate experiences and the campus climate (Adams, 1993).

The researcher contacted Adams requesting permission to use the Graduate Opinion Survey as a guide in developing the African-American Male Doctoral Survey (Appendix A). Adams granted the researcher permission to use the Graduate Opinion Survey to develop the African-American Male Doctoral Scholar Survey (AAMDSS).

The AAMDSS measures the four constructs of the study. The constructs were developed through the literature cited in the study. The instrument sought to gather
scholars' perceptions of mentoring, social adjustment, race relations, and institutional climate as it influenced their decision to persist until graduation. The AAMDSS is composed of 29 items that respondents selected either very important, somewhat important, not at all important, and do not know (Appendix B). The AAMDSS had eight open-ended questions that solicited respondents' perceptions concerning mentoring, climate, social adjustment, and race relations. Scholars were asked six demographic questions.

A paneled committee of experts was used to evaluate the appropriateness and quality of the instrument items (Appendix C). The panel consisted of Onetta Williams, Michael Hillis, and Wanda Ward. Williams is an African-American who received a doctorate from the University of Oklahoma and is an assistant professor at East Tennessee State University. Hillis received a doctorate degree from the University of Washington and is the coordinator of the Minority Opportunity for Success in Teaching program. Hillis is also an assistant professor in the college of education at East Tennessee State University. Ward is an African-American who received a doctorate degree from the University of Texas at Austin and is an assistant professor in the college of education at East Tennessee State University.

A pilot study was conducted using African-American male undergraduate scholars at East Tennessee State University from the department of physical education. Because of the difficulties involved in finding African-American male doctoral scholars or graduate scholars for the pilot study, the most viable option was to use undergraduate African-American male scholars. The researcher contacted Edward Howat in the
The researcher convened with the participants and gave them a brief of the study. The instrument was administered to 74 undergraduate African-American males. The researcher timed the administration to establish an approximate completion time for the instrument. Participants provided feedback on the quality of the questions at the end of the session. Results were analyzed using SPSS and an item analysis was conducted to refine the instrument. This analysis yielded a reliability of .7325 using Cronbach alpha method.

Data Collection Procedures

A program consent cover letter was sent to each chairperson obtaining their permission for the researcher to survey African-American male scholars in their departments (Appendix E). The consent form contained: (a) purposes of the study, (b) importance of the study, (c) importance of scholar’s participation, (d) methods of data analyses, (e) how a copy of the final report could be obtained, and (f) a copy of the instrument. Within the consent form, the researcher requested chairpersons either to provide a list of names and addresses of African-American male doctoral scholars in their department or to distribute the surveys.

Each department chairperson was requested to sign the consent form approving his or her department’s participation in the study. Chairpersons were requested to return
the consent form in a self-addressed stamped envelope to the researcher. A follow-up telephone call was made to chairpersons who had not responded within two weeks.

A participant consent form was sent to each African-American male scholar in his respective program of study that explained the: (a) purposes of the study, (b) importance of the study, (c) importance of scholar's participation, (d) confidentiality of responses, (e) estimate of the time needed to complete the survey, (f) how to obtain a final copy of the data analyses, (g) a copy of the instrument, and (h) a thank you citation (Appendix F).

**Data Analysis**

All survey results were analyzed using SPSS. Surveys were analyzed to:
(1) answer the research hypotheses, (2) describe the differences of perceptions between African-American male scholars at PWIs and HBCUs, (3) percentages were used to describe demographic characteristics about the population, (4) and to analyze responses to the open-ended queries. A t-test was used to test hypotheses between groups. Analysis of variances (ANOVA) was used to compare the within group variances of individual scores and the between group variances (Gall et al., 1996). The rationale for the t-test and ANOVA was based upon the items in the AAMDS.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The analyses presented in this chapter were based upon data collected from doctoral students who completed the African-American Male Doctoral Scholar Survey. Hypotheses were tested to obtain what factors were primary to the decision of African-American male doctoral scholars to persist until graduation in Colleges of Education.

The chapter is outlined as follows: (1) a demographic summary will be presented to describe the population, location of institutions, and scholars’ demographic profile, (2) presentation of descriptive data analysis of survey items, (3) a presentation and analysis of open-ended responses from surveys, and (3) an interpretation of the statistical analysis of null hypotheses that guided the study.

Demographic Information

One hundred sixty-four of 170 (96%) African-American male doctoral scholars surveyed responded. Demographic data from the surveys revealed that 140 (85%) respondents were from Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) and 24 (15%) were from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). About 50% of the scholars who responded were from institutions located in the south. Table 1 presents institutional
demographic data. Northern institutions were those institutions located in either Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, or the District of Columbia. Southern institutions were those institutions located in either Alabama, Arkansas, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, or Mississippi. Eastern institutions were those institutions located in either Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Virginia. Western institutions were those institutions located in either Arizona, California, Colorado, Missouri, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, or Wyoming.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>PWIs</th>
<th></th>
<th>HBCUs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents age, classification status, and employment demographic information. Of the 164 respondents, 63 (38.4%) identified themselves as 43+ years of age, 100 (61%) were employed on a full-time basis, and 115 (70.1%) identified themselves as attending school on a full-time basis.
TABLE 2

SCHOLARS' DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Grouping</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43+</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyses and Interpretation

Scholars were asked to rate the importance of 29 items in the African-American Male Doctoral Survey to reflect the item's influence on their decision to persist until graduation (see Table 3). The following are highlights of their responses:

1. 118 (72%) reported feedback from their major advisor was very important.

2. 105 (64%) reported racial tolerance was very important.

3. 105 (64%) reported faculty accessibility was very important.

4. 104 (63.4%) reported respect for their ethnicity and values were important.
### TABLE 3

**KEY FACTORS WITHIN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY THAT INFLUENCES THE DECISION OF SCHOLARS TO PERSIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial tolerance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect for ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belonging</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fac./scholar social events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conducive Climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-Cult. relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequate # Black faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. VI=Very Important, SI=Somewhat Important, NI=Not Important, DK=Don’t Know (table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration with depart.</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars' Interaction</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Speakers</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VI=Very Important, SI=Somewhat Important, NI=Not Important, DK=Don't Know

Scholars were asked to rate the climate of support at their institution, race relations within the department, if they were essential members of their department, if African-American scholars were treated equally within the department, and the effectiveness of the mentoring program in their department. Of the 164 who responded, 62 (37.8%) rated the climate of support as good, 54 (32.9%) responded it was fair, and 28 (17.1%) rated the climate of support as poor. Sixty-three (38.4%) rated race relations as good, 70 (42.7%) rated it as fair, and 15 (9.1%) rated race relations as poor within their department. Eighty-six (52.4%) reported they were not essential members of their department. Seventy-three (44.5%) reported they did not treat them equally within their department. Forty-five (27.4%) reported that the mentoring program in their department
was effective.

An analysis of the query about mentoring showed that 18% of scholars at PWIs reported the mentoring program at their institution was effective, but there were areas of the mentoring program that needed attention. The following are examples of their responses: “the program is very loosely structured and the intent of the department is to foster inclusion, yet mentoring relationships frequently fall short of my expectations” and “it just happens and so does the benefits.”

Additional comments by scholars suggested mentoring relationships were very informal and activities were inconsistent. Scholars suggesting there were no mentoring programs reported mentoring was crucial to their decision to persist unto graduation. The following are examples of their responses: “the department desperately needs a mentoring program,” and “I feel that without mentoring I would be an academic failure.”

Table 4 presents scholars’ responses from PWIs concerning mentoring.

TABLE 4
CONDITION OF MENTORING AT PWIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Program</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 17% of the scholars at HBCUs reported the mentoring program was effective at their institution. Scholars' comments indicated that mentoring was an important aspect of their doctoral experience and it allowed them to build a needed rapport with their chairperson. The following are examples of their comments:

"mentoring has become the medium by which scholars can communicate their honest feelings to someone who cares" and "without a mentor I could not have survived the doctoral experience."

Of the scholars who responded to this query, 45% reported there was no mentoring program at their institution. Scholars strongly supported the establishment of a formal mentoring program or a desire to establish an informal mentoring relationship.

Table 5 presents scholars' responses from HBCUs concerning mentoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Program</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query about race relations at PWIs showed that 41% of the scholars reported that race relations were good and 44% reported race relations were fair...
at their institution. Additional comments suggested that race relations were mostly amicable but suspect. The following are examples of responses from scholars concerning race relations: “race relations are exemplary as compared with a friend who attends another PWI,” “they treat all students with respect, worth, and dignity,” and “there is no overt animosity, however, there does exist a chill in the atmosphere at times.” Only 10% responded that race relations were poor.

Scholars who perceived poor race relations indicated their experiences were not always unacceptable and that they encountered similar experiences outside of the school setting. The following are examples of their comments: “institutional racism exists,” “unaware faculty and staff victimize me because of stereotypes,” and “race relations are poor due to ignorance, fear, intimidation, and closed mindedness.”

Table 6 presents scholars’ responses from PWIs concerning race relations.

TABLE 6
CONDITION OF RACE RELATIONS AT PWIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 96% of the scholars surveyed at HBCUs reported that overall race relations were acceptable in their department. Only one scholar reported race relations were poor.

Table 7 presents scholars' responses from HBCUs concerning race relations.

TABLE 7

CONDITION OF RACE RELATIONS AT HBCUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query about equality at PWIs showed that approximately 4% of the scholars reported they were treated as equals within the department. While about half reported they were treated somewhat as equals, additional comments suggested scholars felt isolated and frustrated. About 51% of the scholars reported they were not treated as equals within their department. Scholars related feelings of acceptance by faculty and colleagues, but reported this did not necessarily preclude exclusionary practices from occurring outside of the department or within the classroom.

The following are examples of their comments: "they treat me as an equal" and "my department makes no distinctions between scholars." The following are examples of
their responses: “when they felt I had met their standards only then was I treated more equally”, “there are times when they treat me with disdain”, and “I think the chairperson does not particularly care for Blacks, therefore, he belittles us.”

Table 8 presents scholars’ responses from PWIs concerning equality.

TABLE 8
STATE OF EQUALITY AT PWIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Equal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Equal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Equal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query concerning equal treatment at HBCUs showed that approximately 71% of the scholars reported they were treated very equally within the department. Scholars commented sometimes African-American female scholars were shown preferential treatment. The following are examples of their comments: “they treat all students equally, except females are shown favoritism,” “I feel they treat me equally within the department although White scholars probably would not respond in a like manner,” and “there is no difference in the way students are treated (culturally) they make the distinction, academically.”
Table 9 presents scholars' responses from HBCUs concerning equality.

TABLE 9
STATE OF EQUALITY AT HBCUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Equal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Equal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Equal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query concerning essentialness at PWIs showed that 31% of the scholars reported they were essential members of their department. The following are examples of their comments: “my department is designed to include ideas of minorities” and “if I am not an essential member I sure do not know it and I feel the faculty is concerned about my academic success.” Of the 140 responses, 59% of the scholars related they were not essential members of their department.

Additional comments reflected strong feeling of discontentment, exclusionary practices, and lack of departmental commitment to engage African-Americans as meaningful participants. The following are examples of their comments: “not involved in anything that makes a difference,” and “my opinion is not pursued or valued,” and “African-Americans are tolerated as intellectual after-thoughts.”
Table 10 presents scholars' responses from PWIs concerning social adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query concerning social adjustment at HBCUs showed that 79% of the scholars reported they were essential members of the department. Scholars' responses indicated they had established healthy relationships within the department that helped them to feel socially adjusted. The following are examples of their comments concerning social adjustment: "I feel right at home although I am not", "we all share commonalities that enhance our department output", and "I really enjoy attending this school, I feel I have a family."

Table 11 presents scholars' responses from HBCUs concerning social adjustment.
TABLE 11
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT AT HBCUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query about the climate of support showed that approximately 37% of the scholars at PWIs rated the overall climate of support as good. Scholars related their institution was supportive of their commitment to persist and the faculty’s actions were consistent with departmental and university policies. The following are examples of their comments: “the personality of my department is supportive and concerned,” “I have visited other schools and have colleagues at other institutions and I am proud to be a part of what is going on in my department,” “my department attempts to reach out to African-Americans,” “I am confident that they are attempting to recruit more African-American faculty,” “everyone gets along extremely well,” and “my department demonstrates respect.”

Only 17% of the scholars reported their institution did not support them. The following are examples of their comments: “faculty is aware of race and class issues, and are either unable or unwilling to address them in any meaningful way,” “they often turn their heads hoping the problem will go away,” “I don’t want to go any further,” “although
we are considered the new south, their ways have not changed much towards Blacks,” “I am not proud to say that I am a member of this institutions,” and “the personality of the department is cold and impersonal.”

Table 12 presents scholars’ responses from PWIs concerning a climate of support.

TABLE 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate of Support</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the query concerning a climate of support at HBCUs showed about 83% of the scholars reported there was an acceptable level of support within their institution. Scholars’ comments reflected their institution’s commitment to give them a strong support system. The following are examples of scholars’ comments concerning a climate of support: “they treat me with respect and have shown that they value me and the department will do whatever it takes to help me in completing the program” and “my chairperson monitors my progress very closely throughout the semester and gives me appropriate feedback.” About 17% of the scholars reported that the climate of support
within their institution was poor, however, there was no response to the open-ended query concerning a climate of support.

Table 13 presents scholars' responses from HBCUs concerning the climate of support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate of Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher formulated the following research hypotheses to address the research problem. The data was analyzed and interpreted as they pertained to each null hypothesis. Each hypothesis was tested at $p<.05$ level of significance.

**Analyses of the Hypotheses**

1. **Null Hypothesis One:** There is no difference between the type of institution upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

2. **Null Hypothesis Two:** There is no difference between age groups upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering climate.
race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

3. **Null Hypothesis Three**: There is no difference between employment status upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

4. **Null Hypothesis Four**: There is no difference between institutional location upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

5. **Null Hypothesis Five**: There is no difference between classification status upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

6. **Null Hypothesis Six**: There is no difference in critical mass upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

Null hypothesis one stated there is no difference between the types of institution upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring. A t-tests was performed on the hypotheses and the t values for these hypotheses were significant; therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected (see Table 14). The t-test values for climate $t = 3.261; p < .001$, $t = 2.044; p < .043$ for social adjustment, and $t = 2.654; p < .009$ for mentoring, and $t = 3.319; p < .001$ for race relations were statistically significant.
Null hypothesis two stated there is no difference between age groups upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring. An ANOVA was performed on the hypotheses (see Table 15). $F(2, 161) = 3.468; p < .034$ for climate, $F(2, 161) = 7.877; p < .001$ for mentoring, and $F(2, 161) = 3.185; p < .044$ for race relations were significant; therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected when considering those factors. The value of $F(2, 161) = 1.828; p < .164$ for social adjustment was not significant; thus, the study failed to reject the null hypothesis when considering social adjustment.
#### TABLE 15

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>127.490</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.745</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>33.215</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.607</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>172.017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.008</td>
<td>7.877</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>48.236</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.118</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>2959.163</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18.380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>1462.907</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>9.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1757.886</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>1219.203</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *Significant at p < 0.05

Tukey’s post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which age group indicated a statistically significant difference when considering climate, mentoring, and race relations (see Table 16). The analysis showed that the mean difference = 2.07; SE = .795; p < .025 between age groups 31-36 and 43+, mean difference = -2.07; SE = .795; p < .025 between age groups 43+ and 31-36 were statistically significant at p < .05 for climate. The mean difference between age groups 31-36 and 37-42, 37-42 and 43+ were not statistically significant for institutional climate.

The mean difference = 2.18; SE = .613; p < .001 between age groups 31-36 and 43+, mean difference = 2.01; SE = .637; p < .004 between age groups 37-42 and 43+, mean difference == -2.18; SE = .613; p < .001 between age groups 43+ and 31-36, mean difference = -2.01; SE = .637; p < .004 were statistically significant for mentoring. The mean
difference between age groups 31-36 and 37-42 were not statistically significant for mentoring.

The mean difference $= 1.23; \ SE = .510; p < .042$ between age groups 31-36 and 43+, mean difference $= -1.23; \ SE = .510; p = .042$ between age groups 43+ and 31-36 were significant at $p < .05$ for race relations. The mean difference between age groups 31-36 and 37-42, 37-42 and 43+ were not statistically significant. There was no statistically significant mean difference between age groups for social adjustment.

**TABLE 16**

TUKEY'S POST HOC RESULTS FOR AGE WHEN CONSIDERING MENTORING, RACE RELATIONS, AND CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>31-36 &amp; 43+</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43+ &amp; 31-36</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>31-36 &amp; 43+</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37-42 &amp; 43+</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43+ &amp; 31-36</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43+ &amp; 37-42</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>31-36 &amp; 43+</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43+ &amp; 31-36</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p \leq .05$

Null hypothesis three stated there is no difference between employment classification upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and
mentoring. An ANOVA was performed on the hypotheses (see Table 17). The $F(2, 161) = 4.671; p< .011$ for social adjustment and $F(2, 161) = 8.182; p< .000$ for mentoring were statistically significant at $p< .05$; therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected. The $F$ values for climate and race relations were not statistically significant; therefore, the study failed to reject the null hypotheses.

**TABLE 17**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR EMPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>47.403</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.702</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>82.048</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.024</td>
<td>4.671</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>178.061</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89.031</td>
<td>8.182</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>19.350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.675</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>3039.249</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>1414.074</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1751.841</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>1248.089</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *Significant at $p< .05$*

Tukey's post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which employment classification indicated a statistically significant difference when considering social adjustment and mentoring (see Table 18). The analysis showed that the mean difference $= -2.19; \ SE = .629; p< .001$ for full-time and no classification, mean difference $= -3.03; \ SE = .840; p< .001$ for part-time and no classification, mean difference $= 3.03; \ SE = .840; p< .001$. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
.001 for no classification and full-time were statistically significant when considering mentoring.

The mean difference = -1.72; SE = .565; p<.006 for full-time and no classification, mean difference = 1.72; SE = .565; p<.006 for no classification and full-time were statistically significant when considering social adjustment. The F values for part-time and full-time, part-time and neither were not statistically significant when considering social adjustment.

There was no statistically significant mean difference when considering climate and race relations.

TABLE 18
TUKEY'S POST HOC RESULTS FOR EMPLOYMENT WHEN CONSIDERING MENTORING AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>full-time &amp; no classification</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>part-time &amp; no classification</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no classification &amp; full-time</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no classification &amp; part-time</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>full-time &amp; no classification</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no classification &amp; full-time</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Significant at p<.05

Null hypothesis four stated there is no difference between institutional location upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring. An
ANOVA was performed on the hypotheses (see Table 19). The values for $F(3,160) = 3.057; p < .030$ for climate and $F(3, 160) = 3.720; p < .013$ for race relations were significant; therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected when considering those factors. The $F$ values were not significant when considering social adjustment and mentoring; therefore, the study failed to reject the null hypotheses.

**TABLE 19**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>167.310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.770</td>
<td>3.057</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>26.616</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.539</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>42.395</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.132</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>82.644</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.548</td>
<td>3.720</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>2919.343</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>18.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>1467.506</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1887.508</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>1184.795</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>7.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Significant with $p < .05$

Tukey’s post hoc was conducted to determine which locations indicated a difference when climate and race relations were considered (see Table 20). The analysis showed that the mean difference = -2.33; $SE = .789; p < .017$ for South and East, mean difference = 2.33; $SE = .017; p < .017$ for East and South were statistically significant when considering climate. The mean scores between North and South, North and East,
and North and West were not statistically significant when considering institutional climate.

Null hypothesis five stated there is no difference between classification status upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring. An ANOVA was performed on the hypotheses and the \( F \) values were not significant; therefore, the study failed to reject the null hypotheses (see Table 20).

**TABLE 20**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR CLASSIFICATION STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>45.892</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.946</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>17.646</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.823</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>19.438</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.719</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relation</td>
<td>10.517</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.259</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>3040.760</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>1478.476</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>9.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1910.465</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>11.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relation</td>
<td>1256.922</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Significant at \( p \leq .05 \)

Null hypothesis six stated there is no difference in critical mass upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring. An ANOVA was
performed on the hypotheses (see Table 21). The values for $F(2, 161) = 4.253; p< .016$ for social adjustment and $F(2, 161) = 4.262; p< .016$ for mentoring were statistically significant; therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected when considering those factors.

**TABLE 21**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR CRITICAL MASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>69.137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.569</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>75.083</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.542</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>97.044</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.522</td>
<td>4.262</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relation</td>
<td>24.423</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.211</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>3017.515</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>1421.039</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1832.858</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>11.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relation</td>
<td>1243.016</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Significant with $p \leq .05$

Tukey's post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which critical mass classification indicated a statistically significant difference when considering social adjustment and mentoring (see Table 22). The analysis showed that the mean difference $= 2.18; \text{SE} = .751; p< .010$ for classifications 2-5 and 6-11, mean difference $= -2.18; \text{SE} = .751; p< .010$ for classifications 6-11 and 2-5 were statistically significant when considering mentoring. Mean difference between classifications 2-5 and 12+, 12+ and 6-11 were not statistically significant.
Mean difference = 1.65; $SE = .661; p < .034$ for classifications 2-5 and 6-11. 

mean difference = -1.65; $SE = .661; p < .034$ for classifications 6-11 and 2-5, mean difference = -2.69; $SE = 1.023; p < .024$ for classifications 6-11 and 12+, mean difference = 2.69; $SE = 1.023; p < .024$ for classifications 12+ and 6-11 when considering social adjustment were statistically significant. Mean difference between classifications 2-5 and 12+ was not statistically significant. There was no statistically significant difference for classification when considering institutional climate and race relations.

**TABLE 22**

**TUKEY’S POST HOC RESULTS FOR CRITICAL MASS WHEN CONSIDERING MENTORING AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>2-5 &amp; 6-11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-11 &amp; 2-5</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>2-5 &amp; 6-11</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-11 &amp; 2-5</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-11 &amp; 12+</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+ &amp; 6-11</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p < .05$
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 contains the summary of the study, conclusions based on the analyses of the data, and recommendations based on the results of the study.

Summary

The primary purpose of the study was to examine what institutional factors most influenced the decision of African-American male doctoral scholars to persist unto graduation. The literature review showed mentoring, institutional climate, race relations, and social adjustment as key factors in persistence of minorities in graduate studies. An objective specific to the study was to explore the cumulative outcome that mentoring, social adjustment, institutional climate, and race relations had upon persistence between scholars who attended PWIs and those who attended HBCUs.

The population included scholars at both PWIs and HBCUs throughout the United States in Colleges of Education. One hundred sixty-four scholars responded which represented a return rate of 96%. Of the 164 scholars, 140 scholars attended PWIs and 24 scholars attended HBCUs. The instrument used to collect data was the African-American Male Doctoral Scholar Survey. The instrument solicited responses to six demographic variables, 29 Likert-type items, and eight open-ended questions.

The study consisted of six hypotheses posed to test mean differences between institution types, institutional location, age, employment status, academic classification,
and critical mass when considering mentoring, social adjustment, climate, and race relations. Analyses of the data included ANOVA, independent sample t-tests, analysis of the frequencies, and percentages of responses, and Tukey’s Post-hoc analysis. Presentation of responses to open-ended questions were analyzed and cited from comments written by scholars. Hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Findings

Analysis of the demographic data for the respondents resulted in the following:
(a) 71% of the scholars were between the ages of 31-43, (b) 61% were engaged in full-time employment, (c) 70% attended school on a full-time basis, (d) 85% attended PWIs, and (e) 51% attended institutions located in the northeastern and southeastern United States. A synopsis of the findings for the research hypotheses are presented below.

Hypotheses

1: There is no difference between the type of institution upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Scholars’ decision to persist at PWIs differed from those at HBCUs when considering mentoring, social adjustment, race relations, and institutional climate.

2: There is no difference between age groups upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.
The null hypothesis was rejected between age groups when considering climate, mentoring, and race relations and was not rejected when considering social adjustment.

3: There is no difference between employment status upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

The null hypothesis was rejected between employment status when considering social adjustment and mentoring and was not rejected when considering climate and race relations.

4: There is no difference between institutional location upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

The null hypothesis was rejected between institutional location when considering climate and race relations and was not rejected when considering social adjustment and mentoring.

5: There is no difference between classification status upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.

The study failed to reject the null hypothesis. Although scholars’ responses differed according to classification, the difference was not statistically significant.

6: There is no difference between critical mass upon the decision of African-American male scholars to persist until graduation when considering institutional climate, race relations, social adjustment, and mentoring.
The null hypothesis was rejected when considering social adjustment and mentoring and failed to reject when considering climate and race relations. Although scholars indicated that the number of other African-Americans in their program impacted their decision to persist until graduation, the difference was not statistically significant.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on results of the data collected and the literature review:

1. A statistically significant difference was indicated between scholars who attended PWIs versus those who attended HBCUs when considering race relations, social adjustment, mentoring, and institutional climate. This difference may be partly explained by the inclusionary practices of HBCUs in contrast with some PWIs. One scholar who attended a PWI related that the intent of his department was to foster inclusion, but there was no mechanism in place that perpetuated this idea.

   Additionally, a preponderance of the scholars at HBCUs related they were vital members of the culture of the department. At HBCUs the climate of the departments was appropriate in that they permitted scholars from various geographical locations to sense immediate acceptance as integral members of the doctoral program. Perhaps this may be explicated because, scholars participate as members of the predominate culture and are familiar with the norms, customs, and practices of that culture.

2. Scholars at both PWIs and HBCUs tended to value feedback on their progress throughout the program from their major advisors. Scholars highly rated faculty
accessibility as significantly affecting their decision to continue until graduation. While general feedback is important, it is reasonable to conclude that scholars expect critical feedback that will help them engage in meaningful introspection as it relates to their professional, personal, and academic goals. Approximately 90% of the scholars surveyed, reported that publishing and meeting key contacts were pivotal to their professional development.

3. Mentoring of scholars was unequivocally valued at both types of institutions. Based upon both statistical findings generated from the study and the literature, mentoring whether formal or informal, can be concluded as an integral correlate to the academic success of African-American male doctoral scholars.

4. Over three-fourths of the scholars who responded to the survey related that institutional climate was one of the key factors that strongly influenced their decision to persist until graduation. Amiableness of climate not only provoked a sense of belonging, but also assisted in the acculturation of African-American scholars into the prevailing culture at PWIs. In regards to departmental climate, one scholar at a PWI wrote “the prevailing atmosphere (climate) is to develop the majority population.” Another comment by a scholar at a PWI related that the outward appearance of acceptance of his ethnicity, values, and perceptions by his department, was no indication of his worth as a scholar.

Scholars at the HBCUs reported they were essential members of the department, they were supported in their endeavors as scholars, and they were treated fairly within their departments. On these same factors, approximately 30% of the scholars who
attended PWIs reported they were treated equally within their department. Approximately 60% reported they were not essential members of the department with 83% reporting they were supported by faculty in their academic efforts.

Although some responses were quasi-paradoxical, perhaps this could be explained as a result of faculty and colleagues extending themselves to assure that nonmajority scholars were not handicapped due to their ethnicity. Such is the case with the author of this research who attends a PWI and was unofficially mentored by his chairperson, who by the way was a White female, and was inspired by her insatiable desire to see equality for all scholars. While the department was without faculty of African-American decent, there existed a tonality of acceptance of diversity as a fact of life. There were similar experiences cited by scholars at PWIs. Based on these findings, it may be concluded that a scholar's success resides in the intuitive ability of the climate to assist the scholar in developing a sense of inclusion and essentialness with the department.

5. Scholar's integration into the department, social interactions, and race relations all significantly influenced whether a scholar was socially adjusted within the department. Although social adjustment is commonly used in a more global sense to characterize a state of being, its cognate meaning is less extensive when used to describe how entrenched one feels in a situation. Social adjustment is racially neutral. Based on statistically significant findings of the study, it can be concluded that persisting until graduation hinges upon, not exclusively, a scholar's ability to become a viable member of the social context of the academic community at both PWIs and HBCUs.
6. The 96% survey response rate implies strong support for examining of this topic. There exists an exigent for institutions to evaluate similar factors that correlate with increased persistence rates.

The conclusions derived from the study were attributable to differences and similarities between scholars at PWIs and HBCUs.

**Recommendations**

As a result of the outcomes of the study and existing literature, the following recommendations are offered:

1. A general consensus exits among researchers that empirical studies need to be conducted that will validate factors that contribute to the overall success of African-American scholars at the doctorate level, particularly males. Because of an absence of empirical studies documenting experiences of African-American males in graduate school, particularly at the doctorate level, a critical need exists for studies that will provide insightful data to delineate problems from symptoms.

   Research ferrets sources of causalities, challenges assumptions and stereotypes and often involves an interdisciplinary approach to problem resolutions. Research studies provide data that may be used to assist in developing strategies that will eliminate, ameliorate, or remediate issues under investigation.

2. Because the study was limited to Colleges of Education, it is recommended that the study be replicated using all African-American scholars at the doctorate level. This would enhance and provide a richer context for the study, a more comprehensive
understanding of the experiences of scholars at both PWIs and HBCUs, and would augment implications within the findings.

3. To further amplify implications within the findings, longitudinal studies need to be conducted to identify any causal links that may exist between institutional efforts and personal achievements after graduation such as, relatedness of degree to career and salary potential. It is strongly recommended that a correlational study be conducted that will isolate factors that correlate with retention outcomes.

4. The study should be replicated to include the opinions of scholars who were not successful at completing the doctorate degree. Those perceptions and opinions will help to establish a bridge between scholars’ commitment to persist and institutional commitment to retain scholars.

5. The instrument should be refined to include such items as length of time in the program, to solicit names and addresses of respondents, and sensitive open-ended queries that will attempt to discover meaningful feelings of scholars about their experiences at PWIs.

6. Inferences may be drawn from the study’s findings about the consequential role that institutional climate has upon persistence of African-American males at the doctorate level. It is imperative that departmental climate be evaluated using a multivariate approach. An apropos set of evaluation tools would collect: (a) the attitudes, perceptions, and opinions of faculty concerning their role as it relates to retention, (b) an exploration of tacit issues that are not salient in the language of the department’s culture such as, curriculum addendums that reflect educational leadership contributions of
African-American, and (c) an examination of policies and practices that may result in negative outcomes for African-American scholars.

7. The implications encompassing retention of minorities in higher education creates a compelling case for consideration of resource allocation that would assist in stimulating dialogue between students of color and educators that barriers to completion of the doctorate degree may be negotiated. Despite dwindling monetary resources, it is recommended that intercollegiate resources be used to assist in the understanding of cultural diversity.

8. Most colleges of education have at their disposal a counseling program with expertise for conducting workshops to expand understanding and policy regarding diverse population. Linkages in the community would also foster enhanced perspectives. Grant funding and other alternative resources are readily available to assist in improving retention rates for African-American male doctoral scholars.

9. Mentoring prevailed in the literature and as an outcome of this study, as a compelling and effective mechanism that may be used to increase the persistence rate among African-American scholars. One important aim of mentoring minority scholars encompasses imparting strategies to assist them in negotiating specific impediments that severely affect their chances of academic survival as well as career guidance. One particular impediment that minority scholars face is inadequate support for cultural and social enrichment.

   In a reciprocal fashion, mentoring provides unique opportunities for faculty to understand the culture of African-American scholars. Increased understanding leads to
improving instructional strategies, enhancing personal interactions, and providing collegial support and encouragement.

10. An independent assessment of the institution’s climate should be conducted to assess the extent to which departments are achieving institutional objectives concerning retention of African-Americans. One chief aspect of the evaluation should include indices that will reveal social concerns of African-American scholars. The aim of the independent assessment is to strengthen the analytical capacity of colleges and universities to design, implement, and effectively monitor microretention efforts. The outcomes of the assessment should provide a conceptual framework for creating macropolicy initiatives that attempt to enhance social and race relations throughout the institution. Additionally, analyses of the initiatives should result in a clearly identifiable link between micro and macoretention initiatives.

An appropriate institutional program that may increase the persistence rate of African-American male scholars should include the following 13 points of action:

1. A mentoring program that provides structured support with low faculty to student ratios for maximum interactions.

2. Integration of scholars into the department through providing fellowship activities with ethnically majority students.

3. Engaging scholars in collaborative publishing experiences with faculties.

4. Providing opportunities for scholars to engage in dialogues that will assist in successfully negotiating the doctoral experience.
5. Recruiting and retaining African-American faculty who are appropriate role models for scholars.

6. Inviting African-American scholars to faculty and student social events.

7. Developing an African-American cohort to address specific needs.

8. Integrating perspectives of African-Americans as an integral part of curriculum design.

9. Articulating a clear vision of multiculturalism.

10. Respecting symbols, heritage, culture, and ways that depict African-American perspectives.

11. Starting early in helping scholars to establish a scholarly research agenda.

12. Conducting a climate assessment that includes the perceptions of faculty, administration and minorities.

13. Closely scrutinizing whether students' needs can be appropriately satisfied with current resources.

Scholars must also share in the responsibility for increasing their probability of completing their doctorate degree. Listed are 12 recommendations that may lead to a successful doctoral experience:

1. Become more involved in departmental activities, particularly those that provide scholars with an opportunity to make a difference in admission procedures.
2. If no mentoring program exists, scholars should seek to establish faculty relationships that will support academic and professional goals. If a mentoring program exists, seek avenues to clarify structures and strengthen the experience.

3. A proactive agenda is an affable thoroughfare by which demeaning stereotypes concerning African-Americans can be changed.

4. Place yourself in the person of those who may not have had exposure to the customs, ways, and norms of African-Americans. Attempt to be empathic.

5. Seek ways to address and improve race relations within your department. Sponsor departmental activities that will clearly identify your values and ideas.

6. Establish an active research agenda early in your program of study. Collaborate, collaborate, collaborate. Collaboration helps scholars to avoid feelings of isolation and exclusion. Publish, publish, publish. Do not wait to be asked, seek ways to participate in publishing activities.

7. Before signing the dotted line, explore options to assure that an appropriate choice is made concerning the most appropriate program and institution. Ask about the African-American retention rate for the department and institution.
8. Explore the possibilities of writing a dissertation that will make a significant contribution to the body of research that currently exists concerning persistence and the experiences of African-American males at the doctorate level, especially at predominantly white institutions.

9. Find or create a web site for African-American male doctoral scholars to engage in dialogue with other scholars. This will serve as a support system.

10. Seek funding sources for your education and dissertation research. Numerous private foundations and scholarships sources support diverse areas of research.

11. If time permits, mentor other African-American male undergraduates and graduate students. Seek avenues that involve engagement with African-American males in middle or high schools. Community service is another challenging experience that reflects good citizenry and helps dissipate negative stereotypes.

12. Employment in higher education, particularly as faculty, may help to provide African-American scholars with a role model with whom they can share cultural commonalities and engage in meaningful discourse.

In summary, perhaps such actions, activities, considerations, and recommendations can provide a conceptual framework toward strengthening retention.
efforts. These efforts can result in higher persistence rates among African-American male doctoral scholars. If the downward trend in doctoral degree production for African-American male scholars is to be reversed, paths must be cleared to assure that more African-American males can move into visible leadership positions.
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APPENDIX A

GRADUATE OPINION SURVEY
August 20, 1996
Dr. Howard Adams
GA Institute of Technology
College of Engineering
Atlanta, GA 30332-0360

Dear Dr. Adams,
Thank you very much for your permission to use the Graduate Opinion Survey. Because of your efforts in designing the survey, it has inspired me to design an instrument specific to my study. I am requesting your written permission to manipulate the Graduate Opinion Survey. There are numerous items on your instrument that I have found extremely useful and would like to incorporate them into my instrument. As we discussed before, you will be acknowledged in the study and I will forward you a copy of the instrument with the data results at the conclusion of the study.

Sincerely,

William Respess
APPENDIX B

AFRICAN-AMERICAN MALE DOCTORAL SCHOLAR SURVEY
AFRICAN-AMERICAN MALE DOCTORAL SCHOLAR SURVEY

Doctoral scholar, I need you assistance in assessing what influence does mentoring, social adjustment, race relations, and institutional climate have upon your decision to persist unto graduation. Please fill out the survey by circling the choice that best represents your opinion or experiences for each question. Please keep in mind that your responses will be kept confidential.

Please place a check mark by the item that best describes the following:

1. Institution type:
   _ Predominantly White Institution
   _ Historically Black College and University
   _ Neither

2. Institution location:
   _ North
   _ South
   _ East
   _ West

3. Age:
   _ 31-36
   _ 37-42
   _ 43+

4. Classification Status:
   _ Full-time
   _ Part-time

5. Are you employed?
   _ Full-time
   _ Part-time
   _ No classification

6. Number of African-American scholars in your department:
   _ 1-5
   _ 6-11
   _ 12+
7. How important are each of these key elements of your campus community to your decision to persist unto graduation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on performance by major advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial tolerance within department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling of belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental response to scholars’ needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity of department’s faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish with faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American scholar integration into department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for interaction with other doctoral scholars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, ethnic, racial, diversity of invited speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending social events with fellow doctoral scholars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate number of African-American faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building cross-cultural relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting key contacts external to the department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To feel a part of the culture of the department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for your ethnicity and values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inclusive departmental climate towards African-Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/scholar social events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of your perspectives as an African-American scholar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative relationship with major advisor and other scholars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing and delivering presentations with advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental orientation for African-American scholars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s climate conducive for African-American participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Overall, how would you rate the climate of support your institution provides African-American male doctoral scholars?

   Excellent       Good       Fair       Poor       Don’t Know

9. If your department has a mentoring program, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of the program?

   Very Effective       Effective       Somewhat Effective       Not Effective

   If not effective, why?

10. How would you rate race relations within your department?

    Excellent       Good       Fair       Poor       Don’t Know

    If poor, why?

11. Do you feel you are an essential member of your department?

    Yes       No       Don’t Know

    If no or don’t know, why?

12. In the space below make any comments you have regarding your department's climate (personality of the department).

13. If you could make any changes within your department to enhance the climate of support for African-American male scholars, what would be the single most important change you would make?

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
14. Do you feel African-American male scholars are treated equally within your department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Equal</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>Somewhat Equal</th>
<th>Not At All Equal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Is there any information you would add or delete from this survey?

Yes
No
October 30, 1996

Dear Drs. Hillis, Williams, and Ward:

I am requesting your assistance in developing the African-American Male Doctoral Scholar Survey. As having has done extensive research in the area of multiculturalism, your expert counsel is needed in assessing the appropriateness of the instrument's items as it relates to the null hypotheses. Enclosed is a copy of an introduction to the study, statement of the problem, purposes of the study, significance of the problem, research questions and hypotheses, the instrument, and studies that support the instrument's items.

Please provide me with your written responses.

Sincerely,

William Respress
APPENDIX D
PERMISSION LETTER FROM
EDWARD HOWAT
August 19, 1996

Dear Mr. Respress:

It is with pleasure that the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics make available its' student-athletes for your research. Please let me know if I can assist in making the student-athletes available at a convenient location for your research.

Best of luck with your study.

Sincerely,

Ed Howat
Director of Athletic Academic Advising
November 20, 1996

Dear Chairperson:

As you may be aware, there is an immense disparity in the production of doctoral degrees for African-American male scholars. For example, the Survey of Earned Doctorates Summary Report 1994 indicates that from a total of 41,011 doctorate degrees conferred in 1994, African-American men were conferred 407 degrees. To assess the implications of this disparity, I am conducting a national study examining factors that influence the decision of African-American male scholars to persist to graduation at the doctorate level.

This study will collect baseline data to assist policy makers in intensifying institutional commitment toward increasing doctoral degree attainment of African-American male scholars. Additionally, it is hoped that educators would use findings presented in this study as a tool in creating a conceptual degree framework toward increasing doctoral degree production for African-American male scholars.

I am asking for your permission to survey all African-American male scholars in your department. Would you please provide me with the addresses of African-American male students in your department? If you are not able to provide me a list of addresses, would you give out the surveys to African-American male scholars in your department? Neither participant nor institution's name is required on the survey; therefore, complete anonymity is assured. Attached is a copy of the instrument. Data analyses may be obtained by contacting researcher. Your department's participation would be greatly appreciated.

By signing and returning this letter, you are consenting to your department’s participation.

Sincerely,

William Respress
APPENDIX F

SCHOLAR PARTICIPATION LETTER
Title of Research: *Perceptions of African-American Males Regarding Factors Supporting Doctoral Completion in Colleges of Education.*

Dear Participant:

As you may be aware, there is an immense disparity in the production of doctoral degrees for African-American male scholars. For example, the *Survey of Earned Doctorates Summary Report 1994,* indicates that from a total of 41,011 doctorate degrees conferred in 1994, African-American men were conferred 407 degrees. To assess the implications of this disparity, I am conducting a national study examining factors that influence the decision of African-American male doctoral scholars to persist unto graduation.

The purposes of the study are to: (1) provide an in-depth exploration into factors that enable African-American males to persist, (2) collect baseline data to assist policy makers in intensifying institutional commitment toward increasing doctoral degree attainment for African-American male scholars, and (3) provide educators with a tool that will assist in establishing a conceptual degree framework toward increasing doctoral degree production for African-American male scholars. You may benefit from institutional commitments to increase doctoral degree production for African-American male scholars.

Please read each item carefully. It will only take approximately 16 minutes to complete the survey. Once you have completed the survey, please return it in the self-address, stamped envelope. **Neither your name nor institution's name is required on the survey; therefore, complete anonymity is assured.** There are no risks to participants in this study. You may withdraw or decline to answer any question or decline to take part in this study without prejudice or adverse repercussions.

After the data has been collected, all surveys will be destroyed and only conclusions will be reported. Data analyses may be obtained by contacting the researcher. If you have any further questions or concerns, please contact William Respress at 423.439.4430. Your contribution is greatly appreciated. **Please keep this form for your record.**

Sincerely,

William Respress
VITA

William Respress

Address: 402 East Mountainview Road #6
          Johnson City, TN 37601

Personal Data: Date of Birth: March 25, 1958
                Marital Status: Married, 1 Son.

Education: Public Schools. Atlanta, Georgia.
            Atlanta Junior College, Atlanta, Georgia; industrial management,
            Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia; hotel/restaurant/travel
            Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee;
            East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;

Honors: Cum Laude, Georgia State University, 1985.
        Departmental Scholastic Achievement Award, 1984.

Professional Experience: Corporate Liaison, Area Supervisor, California Plant Protection,
                          Manager, Denny’s Restaurant Corporation, Atlanta Region, 1983-
                          1987.
                          Multi-Unit Supervisor, Franchise Inspector, Georgia Region, 1987-
                          Senior Store Manager, Corporate Training Manager, Old Fashion
                          Residential Rehabilitation Counselor, New Leaf Recovery Center,
                          Residential Rehabilitation Counselor, Plateau Mental Health,
                          Youth Service Officer/ Emergency Correctional Counselor
                          Tennessee Department of Children Services, Johnson City,

Hobbies: jogging
         reading