PERCEPTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE HELPFUL BEHAVIORS OF PEER MENTORS WHO ASSISTED THEM DURING FRESHMAN YEAR COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT IN A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE INSTITUTION

A dissertation submitted to the
Kent State University College and Graduate School
of Education, Health, and Human Services
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Felicia M. Townsend-Green

May, 2009

Dissertation written by

Felicia M. Townsend-Green

B.S., Kent State University, 1991

M.Ed., Kent State University, 1993

Ph.D., Kent State University, 2009

Approved by

_____, Co-Director, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
John D. West

_____, Co-Director, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Donald L. Bubenzer

_____, Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Angela Neal Barnett

Accepted by

_____, Chairperson, Department of Adult, Counseling Health, and Vocational Education
Donald L. Bubenzer

_____, Dean, Graduate School of Education, Health, and Human Services
Daniel F. Mahony

Townsend-Green, Felicia, Ph.D., May 2009

Counseling and Human Development Services

PERCEPTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE HELPFUL BEHAVIORS OF PEER MENTORS WHO ASSISTED THEM DURING FRESHMAN YEAR COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT IN A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE INSTITUTION (179 pp.)

Co-Directors of Dissertation: Donald L. Bubenzer, Ph.D.
John D. West, Ed.D.

This research study was designed to address the research question: "What are the perceptions of African American college students relative to the helpful behaviors of peer mentors who assisted them during Freshman year college adjustment in a predominately White institution?" All participants of the study were undergraduate students attending Kent State University, for at least one semester and participants of The Student Multicultural Center's "University Mentoring Program." The goal of the study was to broaden our understanding of the contexts of African American freshmen on predominantly White campuses, as well as to add to the dialogue concerning how to be assistive to African American students in these environments.

Q-methodology was utilized to address the research question. The PQ Method software was used for data/factor analysis. The main source of information was 40 African American students (appropriate N for Q studies) who sorted a set of Q-sample statements (40) according to conditions of instructions and their subjective perspective. As a result of data analysis, four factors or student perspectives relative to mentor

helpfulness were identified. The Factors included, Factor 1: Providing Tips For Academic Success, Factor 2: Interpersonal Connectedness, Factor 3: Accessible and Knowledgeable, and Factor 4: Nurturing Friendship.

Relative to the significant diversity that exists among African American students, implications of this study suggest that different groups of students have differing perceived needs relative to the helpful qualities of a peer mentor. The continued study of related issues pertaining to mentoring and the college adjustment of African American freshmen may be helpful in aiding faculty and administrators in higher education, counselor educators, high school counselors, faculty and administrators, and programs that seek to serve African American freshmen.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Shana Lee and Gina Spencer and the Multicultural Center Family, to my mom, and big brother, Andre, who have always cheered me on to victory; to my Pastor, Dr. R. S. Williams, II, and the Mt. Zion Church Family; to all my Chayah Brothers and Sisters; to my Bridges mentees and spiritual sons and daughters, who are now mentoring other students and running the Mentoring Center, and to my mentors, Dr. Donald Bubenzer, Dr. West, Dr. Angela Neal-Barnett, Dr. Anita P. Jackson, Dr. Tamika Taylor, Dr. Jeff Smith, Dr. LuAnne Johnson, Dr. Jwanza Kunjufu, Goldie Alvis of The Cleveland Foundation, Carol Hoover, and the one who saw this moment before I even imagined it, the late Dr. Ferguson Meadows. To Cassandra, Sandra, and all the other Villagers who became like family. To all those "dissertation life savers," I've met along the way . . . Nyema in ACHVE (for helping me download the PQ Method on my lap top—thank you!); to Ricardo and Kevin and the other undergraduate Sigma Fraternity Brothers of KSU—who miraculously appeared in the 11th hour of recruiting participants for my Q-sort! To the nameless computer guys and gals in Tri Towers and the KSU help desk who revived my heart and my crashed quick drive. To Kim, Scheretta and Trice, I think this dissertation is as much yours as it is mine, right?! To my new children and Sisters-In-Law . . . thanks for making me feel so at home, away from home. Last, but in no ways least, to my incredible husband, thank you for sharing our "newlywed-ness" with my dissertation . . . you're amazing. To everyone who prayed, encouraged, supported, and pushed me on, "Thanks be to God, who always causes us to triumph!"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Peer mentoring appears to be associated with a positive difference in the college adjustment process of many African American students (Gallien & Sims-Peterson, 2005; Miller, 2002). For any student, adjusting to a new social and academic environment can be a challenging experience. However, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic factors (Neville, Heppner, & Wang, 1997), as well as lack of academic preparation (Bowen & Bok, 1998) can further complicate student adjustment to college, in that the high stress level often associated with making the adjustment to college can be exacerbated by the status of the above factors (Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). In particular, making the adjustment at predominately White institutions (PWIs) can be a difficult experience for some African American college freshmen (Kenny & Perez, 1996; Sedlacek, 1999). Many African American college students have been found to have social and educational disadvantages that have the potential to hinder their adjustment to a predominately White campus environment (W. R. Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991). However, peer mentoring relationships have been viewed as helpful in the college adjustment process of minority students, such as African Americans (W. R. Allen et al., 1991; Gallien & Sims-Peterson, 2005).

When paired with helpful peer mentors, literature indicated that African American students improved academically and psychosocially (Tierney, Baldwin-Grossman, & Resch, 2000). Thus, social and academic support services appear to remain important for

the effective college adjustment of African American college students. Herein lies the importance of identifying helpful behaviors of peer mentors for African American college freshmen attending PWIs. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of African American college freshmen relative to helpful behaviors of the peer mentors who have mentored them, in making the adjustment at a predominately White university.

The following section provides a review of literature that includes a brief historical overview of African American college students in higher education, followed by a discussion of the college adjustment issues of African American students in higher education. The chapter then presents an overview of peer mentoring as a supportive student service, followed by a historical overview of traditional mentoring and intrusive mentoring. Types and descriptors of peer mentoring models are discussed, followed by a review of specific mentoring models in higher education. Additionally, a review of the benefits of peer mentoring, followed by the perceived behaviors of helpful peer mentors is provided.

Historical Overview of African American College Students in Higher Education

Following the American Civil War, African Americans seized every opportunity to formalize and expand upon the underground, secretive educational practices that had functioned during the period of slavery (W. R. Allen & Jewell, 2002). Thus, the first collegiate institutions to open their doors to African Americans were Midwestern reformatory colleges and a few liberal arts colleges of New England of the 19th century (Gallien & Sims Peterson, 2005). Formal education was a chief means for African

Americans to achieve social mobility while defending and extending their newly gained rights as citizens (W. R. Allen & Jewel, 2002). Northern missionary societies soon became involved in the African American struggle to secure educational access, as they perceived their "God-given tasks" were to "civilize and educate" Blacks (Allen & Jewel, p. 243). To this end, members of these societies ventured into urban and rural Black communities as teachers, where they established and operated educational institutions of varying levels (Allen & Jewel).

In 1965, the percentage of African American students enrolled in New England institutions averaged about 1% of the student body (Bowen & Bok, 1998). In 1970, as a result of governmental efforts to increase African American student recruitment, a total of 417,000 African American students were enrolled in higher education in the United States (Cross & Slater, 1995) and African American student enrollment rates increased rapidly. According to the United States Department of Commerce (1994), by 1978, 7 in 10 African American students of the 866,315 were enrolled in PWIs. By 1982, 1,101,000 African Americans were enrolled in higher education, an increase of 164%, relative to the enrollment figures reported in 1970.

Despite the tremendous growth in recruitment and enrollment, many African Americans were challenged in gaining access to resources that would enable them to succeed in American higher education. Fleming (1984) observed that issues such as lack of academic support programs, outdated curricula, insufficient financial aid programs, and appropriate provisions for campus residential living became critical hindrances for African American students who enrolled in PWIs. Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, and

Terenzini (2004) also suggested that such problems may have negatively impacted the persistence of African American students and impeded their opportunities to participate fully in the college experience.

College enrollment rates among African Americans continue to increase. According to the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education ("Black enrollments," 2007), approximately 2.1 million African Americans were enrolled in higher education throughout the United States. College enrollment rates among African Americans continue to increase. For instance, literature reported that in 1986, 28.6% of all African American high school graduates, between the ages of 18 to 24, were enrolled in college ("Vital signs," 2008). It was further noted that in the year 2000, the percentage of all African Americans between the ages of 18 and 24, enrolled in college, increased to 30.5% ("The steady march," 2002). Moreover, in the year 2006, the percentage of all African American high school graduates, between the ages of 18 and 24, enrolled in higher education increased to 42% ("Vital signs," 2008). However, in spite of the gains that have been made by African Americans to achieve access to higher education, there still remains a significant difference in educational attainment with regard to various ethnicities (United States Census Bureau, 2004). For instance, only 19.5% of African Americans over the age of 25 have a bachelor's degree, in comparison to the 35.5% of their White American counterparts ("Vital Signs," 2008).

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2007), in the 2005-06 academic year, of the total degrees conferred in the United States (2,371,219), approximately 65% were received by White Americans and 9.1% were received by

African Americans. The attainment of higher education for all ethnicities continues to be economically beneficial and a vital instrument for individual and collective progress (Grimmet, Bliss, & Davis, 1998; "Vital signs," 2008). Academic degrees awarded to any group of students most often determine their role within their society and world (Kaba, 2005). Attewell and Lavin (2007) noted that African American students who stayed in college and completed their bachelor's degree program have a median income that is nearly equal to the median income of their White counterparts. Thus, it remains critically important for marginalized groups, such as African Americans to obtain the support needed to ensure quality education that facilitates upward mobility and quality of life. The consideration and implementation of on-going supportive services is one method of assisting these students in adjusting to PWIs and ultimately to obtaining a degree.

College Adjustment Issues of African American Students in PWIs

A vital transition for many students is the move from one's childhood home to college (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Kenny & Perez, 1996; Schwitzer, Griffin, Ancis, & Thomas, 1999). Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) posited that the transition to college is marked by complex challenges in emotional, social, and academic adjustment. For some students, moving away from home to college can create valuable opportunities for personal growth and change. For others, such a transition might potentially create patterns of thinking that lead to self-doubt, disappointment, and even self-defeating habits (Paul & Brier, 2001). During the transition to college, some students question their relationships, identity, direction in life, and self-worth (Kenny & Perez, 1996), whereas others make the necessary adjustments and achieve success in PWIs (W. R. Allen, 1992).

Consequently, college adjustment has the potential to impact every student in some way. Successful adjustment to college during the first year is an area of increasing concern for most institutions of higher education (Boulter, 2002).

Stress has been associated with the home-to-college transition of many first year college students (Hinderlie & Kenny, 2002; Kenny & Perez, 1996). The literature suggested that stress may be greatest for students entering a college environment where the predominant racial and ethnic culture differs from the students' own (Hinderlie & Kenny, 2002; Kenny & Perez, 1996). Relative to some African American college students making the adjustment at PWIs, the issues of social (A. W. Allen, 1982; Blackwell, 1987; Schwitzer et al., 1999) and academic adjustments (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Maton, Hrabowski, & Schmitt, 2000) seem to be most prominent. First year students, in particular, tend to experience academic problems and social difficulties (Schwitzer, McGovern, & Robbins, 1993). Race, ethnicity, academic preparation issues, and socioeconomic factors further impede the college adjustment of many African American students (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Neville et al., 1997), in that the stress level can be heightened by minority status (Moritsugu & Sue, 1983).

Much attention has been given to the issue of academic and social adjustment of African American students at predominately White institutions of higher learning (Hatter & Ottens, 1998). According to Maton et al. (2000), African American students have a higher probability of becoming academically and socially isolated on majority White campuses than White or Asian students. Furthermore, literature has suggested that academic and social integration appears critical to the success of African American

students attending predominately White institutions (Maton et al., 2000; Schwitzer et al., 1999). Relative to racism, Sedlacek (1999) and Schwitzer et al. (1999) suggested that a key social adjustment task for African American students at predominately White institutions was developing the ability to recognize and deal effectively with racism when it occurs. Schwitzer et al. along with Sedlacek conducted studies and found that an African American student's ability to identify and deal with systems of institutional racism resulted in better college adjustment.

Many African American students attending PWIs are faced with the reality of entering a college environment where the predominant racial and ethnic culture differs from their own; therefore many African American students may experience adjustment problems similar to those of all other college students, plus a unique set of additional challenges (Kenny & Perez, 1996). These cultural specific challenges might include perceptions of racism, under-representedness among the student body (Schwitzer et al., 1999) and faculty (Schwitzer et al.), as well as cultural barriers with faculty of a different race and ethnicity (Schwitzer et al.).

Undoubtedly, many important African American college adjustment issues are worthy of discussion, such as economic characteristics (A. W. Allen, 1982; Blackwell, 1987), emotional adjustment issues (Kenny & Perez, 1996), and first-generational issues (Terenzini, Springer, Yaeger, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996). However, for the purpose of this study, this researcher provides a review of literature that is focused on the social and academic issues of African American college students. The following sections briefly

address the social and academic adjustment issues faced by African American college students.

Social Adjustment

Tinto (1987), historically known for his theoretical model of student attrition and persistence, has emphasized the significance of social adjustment among first year, college students. The social adjustment of any college student is more than the engagement with campus social activity. According to Tinto's theory, social adjustment involves the process of integration. The literature defined social integration as a student's ability to interface with the institution's social system, which includes the frequency and quality of contact with peers and faculty, shared values in non-academic areas, and involvement in the life of the institution, outside of the classroom (Boulter, 2002; Tinto, 1987). According to Metz (2002), Tinto's theory implied that the integration, or lack thereof, into the college environment, can affect students' abilities to adjust, persist, and eventually obtain a degree. Tinto's theory (1987) suggested that the influence of institutional variables, such as faculty-student interaction, peer group interaction, and extracurricular involvement, help shape the students' progression and adjustment through college.

The social adjustment of students has been found to be one of the key aspects of the college adjustment process. Social integration of college students has been related to the positive social adjustment of college students. In a longitudinal study of retention (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994), which focused on the emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students, undergraduate students (prior to their initial college

enrollment) were given an opportunity to assess their expectations about their college adjustment, as well as an additional opportunity to assess their actual adjustment. Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) found that social adjustment was a significant factor in overall successful college adjustment among students. The purpose of the study was to investigate actual and anticipated adjustment to college in three broad areas as potential predictors of attrition. One month prior to arrival, students entering a large northwestern public university ($N = 387$) for fall term 1985 were mailed a survey with a letter inviting them to participate in a study concerning the transition to college. Of these 387 students, 232 expressed interest in academically based social groups designed to ease the transition to college, and an additional 155 were selected at random from a separate pool of potential participants containing approximately 1,200 summer orientation students. Of the 387 selected participants, there were 265 women and 122 men. All participants were 1985 high school graduates and received survey packets in the mail. Useable responses were received from 209 students (152 women and 57 men). During the seventh week of the fall term a follow-up survey was mailed to the 209 previous respondents. Of the surveys mailed in the fall, 112 students (82 women, 30 men) returned the surveys. The pre-matriculation surveys assessed expectations about adjustment to college. The follow-up surveys, mailed during the seventh week of the fall term, assessed actual college adjustment. In 1992, six full years after enrollment, each student's transcript was examined to determine his or her enrollment, graduation, and academic status.

The instrument used was the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ), which is a self-report measure of adjustment to college. The SACQ consisted of

67 items to which students responded using a 9-point scale anchored by *applies very closely to me* and *doesn't apply to me at all*. The SACQ measures academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal/emotional adjustment, and institutional adjustment. Relative to the pre-matriculation survey, each item is prefaced by "I expect to . . ." in order to assess anticipation of circumstances in the near future (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994, p. 286).

In a review of academic transcripts of 208 students (one student died during the research period), only 61 graduated within 4 years of initial enrollment. An additional 72 graduated in the fifth year, 12 graduated during their sixth year, and 4 were still enrolled but had not graduated by winter term of the sixth year. According to Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994), 6 years after enrollment, 145 students had graduated and an additional 4 were still enrolled. The researchers (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt) suggested that the results of the pre and post SACQ data revealed that for the students who were not struggling academically, informal contacts with professors, satisfaction with course quality, and a sense of self-confidence were important predictors of persistence. For students who were struggling academically, satisfaction with extracurricular activities, freedom from anxiety, and an absence of thoughts about dropping out were the best predictors of retention. Although this study did not consist entirely of African American students, Gerdes and Mallinckrodt maintained that these findings supported their contention that personal adjustment and integration into the social fabric of campus life play an important role in retention of all students. Thus, if students continue to persist to

graduation, one is led to believe that a student has successfully integrated, academically and socially, into the new college environment.

Additionally, W. R. Allen (1992) and Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) suggested that important elements of social adjustment for college students included becoming integrated into the social life of college, forming support networks, and managing new social freedoms. For instance, during Rendon's (1995) keynote address to the American River Community College, she presented findings of a research study conducted through the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. During her presentation, she explained that the purpose of her study was to obtain students' perceptions of their educational experiences and motivations during their freshman year. Rendon reported that the study was of qualitative design and focus groups were employed, in order to interview an approximate total of 100 community college freshmen, comprised of White, Hispanic, African American, Asian, and Native American students. She found that students perceived themselves as significantly more likely to persist and to develop positive attitudes about their learning ability if the faculty and administrators at the institution helped them to become socially integrated into the campus community. She emphasized that the successful students shared incidents (the author did not state the nature of the incidents) when they experienced validation from others, and when faculty, staff, friends, or family members reached out to them and affirmed them as capable. In support of the Rendon presentation, others have shared similar views, relative to African American students. A. W. Allen (1982) and Schwitzer et al. (1999) suggested that positive campus race relations, affirming relationships with

professors, and involvements with African American support networks were thought to be important elements for the successful college adjustment of African American students.

On the contrary, negative, interpersonal experiences at predominately White institutions can also hinder some African American students from positively integrating, as well as engaging in the learning process or participating in other educational and developmental opportunities that are a part of campus life (Schwitzer et al., 1999). It was noted that some of these negative interpersonal encounters have included unwelcoming residence hall environments, inaccessible developmental services, less friendly peers, and racial problems that were undetected by their White counterparts (Schwitzer et al.). In addition, feelings of loneliness and homesickness (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994), as well as exclusion (Hinderlie & Kenny, 2002), isolation, alienation, and lack of support (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Schwitzer et al., 1999) have been associated with adjustment difficulties among minority college students.

Kenny and Perez (1996) noted that in an effort to socially adjust to an environment that is culturally different from their own, African American students often create their own social and cultural networks in response to their experiences or feelings of exclusion from the wider, White-oriented university. Some of these social and cultural networks include social clubs and fraternities, cultural-specific interest groups, and academic support groups (Kenny & Perez). As a result, despite the initial difficulties that some African American students may experience, many make the necessary social adjustments and achieve success in PWIs (W. R. Allen, 1992).

In a qualitative study (Schwitzer et al., 1999), researchers investigated the social climate experienced by African American college students. The study was an expansion of previous research on the college transitions and counseling needs of African Americans in predominantly White campus environments (Schwitzer & Thomas, 1998). The Schwitzer and Thomas study involved 52 first year, African American freshmen using a counseling center peer mentoring program. Eighty-two percent of the participants were female and 18% were male. The study found that African-American students at a predominantly White university who participated in a freshman peer mentoring program were likely to raise concerns with peers that they would not have raised in other help-seeking programs. Utilizing face-to-face interviews to collect information from the students, the researchers found that half of all concerns expressed by these students were in the area of academic adjustment. Such areas of concern included managing college class loads and time-management problems, procrastination, and specific educational skills difficulties. Personal-emotional concerns, such as problems with depression and stress, and social adjustment concerns, such as dating problems and issues arising in friendships, were also common. The participants reported promising rates of problem resolution following mentor interventions. The participants also had higher two-year retention rates than non-participants, but only comparable grades. In addition to the academic and personal-emotional concerns, the researchers (Schwitzer & Thomas) reported that two thirds of participants had difficulties adjusting to the racial/cultural climate of the campus. Some of the participants described problems with interracial friendships, dating, or roommate situations. Schwitzer and Thomas suggested that

because the students' reports of social climate concerns appeared distinct from the types of adjustment demands traditionally described in literature, focus groups were employed in order to expand and clarify these findings by further examining the issue of social climate and adjustment among African American freshmen.

As an introduction to the Schwitzer et al. (1999) study, the researchers suggested that college students in general face four demands as they transition from their former high school environment to the new college setting. The four demands included (a) academic adjustment to college-level educational requirements; (b) institutional adjustment, or commitment to college pursuits, academic goals, and eventual career direction; (c) personal-emotional adjustment, or the need to independently manage one's own emotional and physical well being; and (d) social adjustment to roommate, peers, faculty, and other interpersonal relationships. Relative to the success of many African American students in a predominantly White setting, Schwitzer et al. proposed that, of these four demands, adjusting to the social environment seemed to be central and most meaningful to African American students.

Participants in the Schwitzer et al. (1999) study consisted of 22, fourth year-senior African Americans, of which 13 were women and 9 were men. The general age range of the participants was early 20s. Participants were assigned to focus groups, in which facilitators provided three open-ended stimulus, discussion questions that were related to (a) the personal experiences of African American students at predominately White universities; (b) the helpfulness or lack thereof of faculty, and whether or not race had any influence on faculty supportiveness; and (c) the comfort level in approaching

instructors, and whether or not race had any influence on approaching or refraining from approaching instructors. During the study, participants described adjusting to a general feeling of aloneness, isolation, or under-representedness at the institution, as well as confronting specific, perceived incidents of racism. Additionally, the researchers reported that participants mentioned hesitation in approaching faculty for consultation, but yet expressed having confidence in approaching faculty if the faculty member seemed more familiar with the student in some way, such as same gender, same race, or both.

The findings of the Schwitzer et al. (1999) study, coupled with the results of previous research from Schwitzer et al. (1993) and Schwitzer and Thomas (1998), resulted in the development of a model that identified four key features of African American students' social adjustments to college experiences. The four features of the model included: (a) sense of under-representedness, (b) direct perceptions of racism, (c) hurdle of approaching faculty, and (d) effects of faculty familiarity. Relative to such findings, peer mentoring may be one method of assisting African American students in their college adjustment. The presence and actions of helpful peer mentors can reduce the feelings and perceptions of under-representedness, racism, and the faculty-related obstacles often experienced by minorities at PWIs (Glass & Walter, 2000; Marable, 1999).

To further the discussion on social adjustment among African American students, Sedlacek (1999) presented an article on student affairs research with African American undergraduate students at White institutions, entitled "Black Students on White Campuses: 20 Years of Research." The purpose of his article was to examine the period

between the 1960s and 1980s, relative to student affairs research on Black undergraduate students at White institutions. In the article, Sedlacek discussed the difference between White and African American students' experiences of adjustment in a predominately White campus environment. The literature presented was organized using a model based on non-cognitive variables studied in previous research (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1976; Tracey & Sedlacek 1984, 1985, 1987). These non-cognitive variables were related to why African American students sought services from a university counseling center and were eventually shown to be related to African American students' successes in higher education.

Upon review of previous research, Sedlacek (1999) advised that there were eight non-cognitive variables that addressed the non-traditional or minority student's adjustment at a predominantly White institution. The variables included (a) positive self-concept or confidence (the way Black students feel about themselves); (b) realistic self-appraisal; (c) understanding and dealing with racism; (d) demonstrated community service; (e) preferring long-range goals to meeting short-term or immediate needs; (f) availability of a strong support person; (g) successful leadership experiences; and (h) non-traditional knowledge (i.e., knowledge acquired through unusual and/or culturally related ways of obtaining information). Sedlacek's rationale for considering these variables was to address the importance of social adjustment for African American students. He reiterated that these variables were critical in the lives of minority students and that the manner in which students adjusted to these dimensions and how faculty and staff encouraged this adjustment would determine the success or failure of the minority

student. Thus, institutions that seek positive college adjustment for minority students may find the development of peer mentoring programs using Sedlacek's non-cognitive variables to be helpful.

Academic Adjustment

The broader concept of academic adjustment involves more than simply a student's scholarly potential. Motivation to learn, taking action to meet academic demands, having a clear sense of purpose, and academic satisfaction are also important components of academic adjustment (Baker & Siryk, 1989; Boulter, 2002; Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994). Academic adjustment in college involves a student's acquisition of academic skills and motivational factors (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Maton et al., 2000), as well as having institutional commitment, or in other words, a firm resolve to complete a degree, due to a strong attachment to a particular institution (Boulter, 2002; Terenzini, Lorang, & Pascarella, 1981). Boulter (2002) specifically described academic adjustment as a student's positive attitude toward setting academic goals, completing academic requirements, the effectiveness of their efforts to meet the requirements, and their ability to adjust to a new academic environment (Boulter).

According to Maton et al. (2000), African American students have a higher probability of becoming academically isolated at PWIs than do White or Asian students. African American students are more likely than White students to come from educational backgrounds that have not adequately prepared them for the challenges of college (Bowen & Bok, 1998). For instance, in the previously mentioned research on student college adjustment, Schwitzer and Thomas (1998) found that half of the concerns

expressed by the participants in their study were in the area of academic adjustment. These concerns included class and time management issues, procrastination, and specific educational skills difficulties, which may have been indicative of under-preparedness or a lack of knowledge in a particular content. Additionally, Pounds (1990) and Schwitzer et al. (1999) suggested that African American students, whether attending public or private institutions, are often under-prepared academically, which may be a source of their dissatisfaction with the college experience (Beckham, 1987/1988; Pounds, 1990).

Because many African American students may spend a major part of their social lives in culturally homogeneous environments (Carter, 2000), this exclusive socialization may indirectly influence their academic preparedness and social adjustment when they attend predominantly White universities. In the findings of the Schwitzer and Thomas (1998) research, participants reported feelings of under-representedness, which, according to the researchers, may be attributed to the fact that during the high-school/pre-college experience, many African American students were accustomed to faculty of the same ethnicity, culture, and or community. Whereas these reported feelings of underreprentedness may be due to the participant's pre-college experience, it remains true that many PWIs have limited African American faculty representation (Schwitzer & Thomas, 1998). In addition, Stage and Hamrick (1994) added that African American students have often perceived faculty, academic support, and developmental services to be uninviting and inaccessible at some PWIs. It is clear that certain students are presented with academic challenges, while adjusting to new life at a PWI. Thus, if academic integration (as well as social integration) appears critical to the success of African

American students (Maton et al., 2000), then specific programs must be implemented to ensure the success of these students enrolled in PWIs.

Adding to the literature regarding academic adjustments of freshman students, Boulter (2002) conducted research on the relationship between self-concept and academic adjustment during the first year of college. The purpose of the research was to identify variables that predict academic adjustment during the first year of college. The researcher used a reliable, domain-specific assessment specifically designed to measure the self-concept of students. Focus was placed on specific domains of the college student's self-concept, the importance of each aspect of self-concept to the student, and the influence of five sources of support (mother, father, instructors, close friends, and people in campus organizations). Self-concept, as the independent variable, was divided into 12 domains plus a global self-worth domain and was measured with the Self-Perception Profile for College Students (SPPCS). The SPPCS also measured the importance of each of the 12 domains to the student, and assessed the influence of 5 sources of social support on the student's self-concept. The 12 domains of the SPPCS were used to predict academic adjustment.

The participants in the study consisted of 255 (132 males and 133 females) first year students enrolled at a small southeastern private liberal arts college. All the students were enrolled in a required, 1-credit college orientation course. This fall course was designed to be an introductory course, relative to the knowledge and skills that contribute to academic success. Ninety-eight percent of the student participants were between the ages of 17 and 21 years of age and 2% were over 21. White students made up 81% of the

sample, whereas 14% were African American, 2% Asian and Hispanic American, and 3% were recorded as other ethnic groups. Data were collected with the Self Perception Profile for College Students (SPPCS). The SPPCS is a multidimensional self-report survey made up of subscales designed to measure specific domains considered relevant to traditional full-time undergraduate college students, such as creativity, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, finding humor in one's life, and close friendships.

Relative to the total sample, Boulter (2002) hypothesized that college students' self-perception of their intellectual ability and ability to make friends in general would predict academic adjustment. The self-perception of intellectual ability was a positive influence on adjustment in college for both men and women, as predicted. Contrary to this hypothesis, self-perception of social acceptance by peers failed to have a significant influence on academic adjustment. The second hypothesis proposed that instructors and close friends as sources of social support would predict academic adjustment. As expected, results showed that the students' perceptions that their instructors care about and support them are positive predictors of academic adjustment.

There were several limitations to this study, such as the large homogenous sample (81% White) and that data was only collected from a single sample of students at one institution using a single instrument administered only once. The researcher (Boulter, 2002) suggested that further investigations should be conducted using a more culturally diverse population of first-year students from a variety of institutions to determine if predictors vary with different cultural groups or within institutions of different sizes or academic environments, such as commuters versus residential students. Despite the

limitations of this study, the results seem to remain useful in providing information about successful academic adjustment in college during the freshman year for some African American students.

Additionally, literature has suggested that there are certain types of factors that lead to academic adjustment and ultimately success (Boulter, 2002). These include individual factors or dispositions students have upon entering an institution, as well as interactional factors that relate to experiences the students have after entering the institution (Boulter). Individual factors or disposition refers to the student's intentions for going to college, including the extent to which the student has set educational and occupational goals and made some career decisions (Boulter). Ratcliff (1991) and Tinto (1993) also agreed that student attitudes about going to college, values, sense of purpose, and sense of independence have a direct influence on academic achievement. According to Boulter (2002), another important disposition is the student's commitment to meet individual goals and the willingness to comply with the academic and social demands of the institution. Boulter indicated that students persist in their education once they have made a commitment to their educational goals and committed to the belief that attending their institution was the right thing to do. She also mentioned that college students adjust and persist when they have the sense that they are making progress toward their academic goals.

Numerous interactional factors lead to the academic adjustment of college students. For instance, the quality of individual interactions with other members of the institution and the extent to which these interactions are perceived by the student as

positive was a factor in academic adjustment (Boulter, 2002). Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) also found that the quality of balance between closeness and distance from family and significant others leads to academic adjustment. Boulter (2002) stated that students who are able to separate from family members and others with whom they had a close emotional tie, yet maintained emotional closeness at a distance, are often better able to academically adjust to college. An additional interactional factor, as suggested by Tinto (1987) and Boulter (2002) is the degree to which a student is socially integrated into the college community. Boulter also emphasized that the more a student is socially integrated in the activities of the campus environment, the more likely the student is to academically adjust in college. She also agreed that frequent quality discussions between students and faculty, in and out of the classroom, were important factors in a student's academic adjustment. Overall, there are a myriad of components that lead to a student's successful, academic adjustment on a college campus. In order to experience a successful adjustment, some students may find that additional campus supportive services are helpful.

Mentoring and Peer Mentoring as Service

Peer mentoring gained popularity as an intervention and student support service over two decades ago (Good, Halpin, & Halpin, 2000), and became increasingly embraced within institutions of higher education that sought to provide support for first year students (Rodger & Tremblay, 2003). Good et al. acknowledged that peer mentoring has been adopted in many university settings as a means to assist entering, minority freshman students as they transition into the university environment. Peer mentoring is

also becoming known as a method used within colleges and universities as a means for meeting the diverse needs of various groups of students as they begin the college adjustment process (Correll, 2005). Fischer (2007) also proposed that one of the most crucial factors in a young person's college success, especially African American students, was a positive relationship with a significant other.

Commonly, peer mentoring is known as a one-to-one relationship shared between two people of similar age and/or status, in which the more experienced, knowledgeable, or skilled individual takes on the role of mentor and the other individual of less experience, knowledge, or skill assumes the role of mentee or protégé (Angelique, Kyle, & Taylor, 2002; Good et al., 2000; Miller, 2002). Shandley (1989) described mentoring from a higher education perspective as an intentional process involving interaction between two or more individuals for the development of the protégé. The history of traditional mentoring lends credence to the value of peer mentoring programs. The following section briefly provides a historical overview of traditional mentoring.

Historical Overview of Traditional Mentoring

The concept of mentoring has been in existence for hundreds of years (Hansman, 2002; Schwiebert, 2000; Wright, 1992). Mentoring has become largely known as a nurturing process, in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, advises, and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person (Caldwell, Casto, & Salazar, 2005; Guetzloe, 1997; McPartland & Nettles, 1991; Townsel, 1997; United States Department of Justice, 1998; Wright, 1992).

Etymologically, the term mentor was first recorded as the name of a mythological character who was to care for, guide, and advise the son of a prominent Greek King for an extended period of time (Morrison, 2003). Hence, many have come to know the term *mentor* as a relationship established between a young person and one who is older and/or more experienced, which lasts over time and is focused primarily on the developmental needs of the younger individual (Guetzloe, 1997).

Mentoring has been generally categorized into two major types, formal and natural mentoring (United States Department of Justice, 1998). Traditionally, formal mentoring programs have been developed by an organization or institution for the specific purpose of providing prescribed, structured mentoring relationships to individuals in need of leadership, guidance, psycho-social support, and/or educational support (Aoki et al., 2000; United States Department of Justice, 1998). In most formal mentoring programs, the mentoring relationship is comprised of an older, more skilled and experienced individual who voluntarily gives of his or her time, skill, personal experiences, and resources (Sipe, 1999a). Mentoring activity between the mentor and mentee is typically carried out within the context of a supervised, on-going, caring relationship of mutual commitment, over an extended period of time (Guetzloe, 1997; McPartland & Nettles, 1991; Townsel, 1997; Wright, 1992).

Natural mentoring is an informal type of mentoring relationship shared between two individuals, usually one older and more experienced than the other, which takes place in a casual setting that occurs as a result of frequent, unstructured contacts over an extended period of time (United States Department of Justice, 1998). Hansman (2002)

suggested that the overall purpose of mentoring, whether formal or natural, is to facilitate relationship building, information sharing, and reflective thinking within the mentee that will encourage the youth mentee to take the initiative for independent growth and learning.

Mentoring can be a unique tool to facilitate a warm, supportive environment that fosters experiences that allow African American college students to adjust socially and achieve academically at predominantly White universities (Braddock, 1981). Peer mentoring as a formal mentoring supportive service appears to have become widespread on the college and university level as an effective tool for aiding students in the college adjustment process. Subsequently, another form of peer mentoring, entitled intrusive peer mentoring seems to be gaining popularity, as well.

Intrusive Peer Mentoring

From a historical perspective, traditional mentoring has been the primary model for pairing individuals of less skill and experience with someone of greater skill and experience. However, in recent years intrusive mentoring has become popular on college campuses. Intrusive mentoring seems to have its origin in intrusive academic advising, traditionally conducted on college campuses. According to Glennen, Baxley, and Farren (1985), to be intrusive in academic advising means to be duly concerned about the academic affairs of students. Intrusive academic advisement takes an assertive approach in requiring the students to come in for advising at frequent intervals. Intrusive advisors do not wait for students to get into academic difficulty, but continually check on the progress of students, as well as provide academic support, referral, and advisement.

Likewise, the nature of intrusive mentoring can be similarly related to intrusive advising, in that the mentor aggressively works to frequently connect with his or her mentee. The intrusive mentor does not wait for the student's approach, but is proactive and takes the initiative to assist the mentee in the academic and social area of need.

In the review of literature on peer mentoring, intrusive mentoring was explained as assertive methods used by peer mentors to connect student mentees to the mentoring relationship (Correll, 2005). Such methods might involve pre-planned group meetings, weekly workshops, and specific mentor to mentee outings where both the mentor and the mentee agree to meet and work together. Peer mentoring programs that utilize an intrusive approach are models that promote aggressive efforts to maintain communication and involvement with the mentee participants (Correll). Correll also explained intrusive mentoring as being any attempt to reach or encourage students to meet with their assigned mentor, such as sending brief memos or letters, phone calls, or email messages. Intrusive mentoring models take into account that it is the mentor that assumes the responsibility of taking the initiative to connect with the new, incoming student (Correll). Redmond (1990) noted that intrusive mentoring approaches with underrepresented groups, such as African American students, have proven successful, as the underrepresented groups seemed to perceive the actions of the mentors as caring. Relative to this study, the researcher primarily focused on near-age, intra-institutional, intrusive peer mentoring relationships. The following section briefly provides a description of an intrusive peer mentoring program.

The Montana State University Peer Mentoring Program

Montana State University operates an intrusive, peer mentoring program (Correll, 2005). The program has been administered through a federal grant initiative for disadvantaged students as designed by the United States Department of Education's TRiO programs. According to the United States Department of Education (2006), TRiO programs help students overcome social, class, academic, and cultural barriers to higher education. Thus, the purpose of the program is to increase retention and graduation rates among disadvantaged students. Students enrolled in the program must meet at least one of three eligibility criteria: first generation, low income, or disabled. Services offered include tutoring, supplemental instruction, access to cultural events, workshops, information on financial aid and scholarships, membership in a student club, a two-day college success strategies seminar, and peer mentoring. The program employs eight paid peer mentors. Each mentor is responsible for 30-45 mentees, depending on the number of hours the mentor works per week. Mentors assist students in a variety of ways, ranging from academic needs to personal matters. Mentors are trained in campus resources, community resources, and life skills techniques. A student may meet with a mentor to develop a tentative course schedule that may then be taken to his or her advisor; seek assistance with campus concerns or questions, such as studying techniques, campus services, general "how to" questions; or inquire about community resources, such as day care, housing, and other subsidies. Mentors specifically address areas such as goal setting, heightened awareness of campus deadlines, attention to campus logistics, such as

report cards, financial aid applications, plan of study, graduation preparation, poor mid-term grades and possible remedies, and career exploration.

The mentors received two days of training and a handbook. The first day of training consisted of an ice breaker, an overview of the program, introduction of program staff, and a description of their responsibilities, along with training of documentation procedures. The mentors also received training on mentor responsibility and a clear expectation of the intrusive approach to mentoring. In addition, training from departments on campus about academic advising, financial aid, and paraprofessional counseling were also provided. The second day of training was comprised of visits to health services, multicultural support services, career services, disability support services, the academic support center, campus police, and the child care center so that mentors could view the locations, meet with department supervisors, obtain brochures, and ask questions. Training on day two concluded with the administration of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator to the mentors by a qualified campus employee. The Myers Briggs Type Indicator was used to identify the personality type, skills, and interest of the mentors, in order to make suitable matches with the mentees. Ongoing mentor training was provided during weekly mentor staff meetings with regard to program related topics.

The results of using intrusive techniques during the 2003-2004 academic year were that 243 eligible students were enrolled in the program during the fall 2003 semester. Of those 243, 171 (70.3%) students had two way communication with their mentor at least three times during the semester, 24 (10%) students had contact with their mentor twice during the semester, and the remaining 48 (19.6%) students had discussions

with their mentor once or less during the semester. During the spring 2004 semester, 269 eligible students were enrolled in the program. Of those 269, 205 (76.2%) students had two way communication with their mentor at least three times during the semester, 14 (5.2%) students had contact with their mentor twice during the semester, and the remaining 50 (18.5%) students had discussion with their mentor once or less during the semester.

Correll (2005) reported that program outcomes demonstrated that 191 (75%) of the 282 eligible students persisted to the fall 2004 semester (eligible to persist did not count graduates or transfer students); 91% of the students were in good academic standing; and 100% graduated (all 28 students who were slated to graduate, did). In summary, although there were several components to the TRiO program, this particular study leads one to wonder whether intrusive peer mentoring techniques might be helpful to the students who participate in peer mentoring.

Types and Descriptors of Peer Mentoring Models

According to Angelique et al. (2002), peer mentoring promotes educational and career enhancement and psycho-social well-being. The following section reviews the various types of college peer mentoring models.

Relative to peer mentoring, key elements describe the nature of most models (Miller, 2002). These elements include the age of the mentors and mentees, the academic ability of the mentors and mentees, the role-continuity (one-way or two-way mentoring) of the mentors and mentees, and cross-institutional or intra-institutional programs (Miller). Another key component that describes the nature of peer mentoring programs is

whether or not the peer mentoring relationship is designed to be intrusive. All of the elements above are briefly described below.

One key element that describes the type of peer mentoring program is relative to age. For instance, mentors in peer mentoring programs can be of the same-age, near-age (1-3 years age difference), or cross-age (4 years or more age difference) in relation to their mentees (Miller, 2002). Same age peer mentoring is most common in higher education as opposed to middle or high schools. Another key descriptor of peer mentoring programs is relative to academic ability, in which students can be matched with someone of a broadly similar level of academic ability, or the mentor's ability may be relatively high compared to the mentee (Miller).

Role continuity refers to the extent to which mentors and mentees remain in their roles throughout the mentorship. Peer mentoring generally involves one student as mentor and the other as mentee, but roles can be alternating in so-called "reciprocal peer mentoring" (Miller, 2002, p. 122). This is a way of making both students more comfortable since each takes on the role of learner or mentee and of mentor at different times. Reciprocal peer mentoring is probably most appropriate in same-age programs at institutions of higher education (Miller). Cross-institutional programs involve mentors and mentees from different institutions, whereas intra-institutional peer mentoring programs draw mentors and mentees from within the same school (Miller).

Peer Mentoring Models in Higher Education

As described in the previously mentioned program, there are numerous peer mentoring models developing within American colleges and universities, that are

designed with an intrusive approach, coupled with the near-age and intra-institutional design. This section reviews a few college and university peer mentoring program models, namely the Faculty-Student Mentoring Program of San Diego State University, The University of Wisconsin's Peer Mentoring Program, and the University Mentorship Program at the University of Michigan.

Faculty Student Mentoring Program, San Diego State University

The Faculty Student Mentoring Program at San Diego State University has been an intrusive, near-age, intra-institutional mentoring program which targets first year, first generational, minority students (www.sdsu.edu). The Faculty-Student Mentoring Program (FSMP) has been a faculty-directed, peer mentoring program. Developed in 1987, the FSMP connects trained, student mentors with incoming freshmen and first-time transfer students. Mentors serve as guides to assist new students through the maze of rules, regulations, expectations, and activities of general college life. The program was comprised of 300-600 active protégés, 60-100 student mentors, and 9 faculty mentors.

The mission of the FSMP was to nurture students' abilities to learn, thus enhancing their success and connectedness in college. First-year students were paired with a successful peer mentor, a caring faculty member, and were provided program services designed to support their academic success. Program mentees received one-on-one support from a student mentor, network opportunities with faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds and cultures, and exploration activities and resources designed to enhance leadership and academic skills. Protégés were paired in a one-to-one mentoring relationship with a third or fourth year student and attended weekly and monthly

academic/social events. The overall goal of the program was to provide social and academic support for program participants that lead to the retention of first year students.

The University of Wisconsin's Peer Mentoring Program

The University of Wisconsin's student peer mentoring program is also an intrusive, near-age, intra-institutional peer mentoring model (www.wisc.edu). Its focus is student academic and social success and student retention. Peer mentors first meet with groups of students during a summer program (or at another mid-year orientation program for transfer and first year students entering at the spring term). Peer mentors share their experiences and knowledge of the university and their personal tips for success. They contact the students in their groups and are on hand to greet them on move-in day. One of the peer mentors' initial roles is to help new students find their way around campus as well as help their mentees become acclimated to campus procedures. Throughout the first semester, peer mentors provide opportunities for students to learn about university resources, share in recreational and cultural activities, meet other students, and explore numerous opportunities to "get connected" with the campus and community.

University Mentorship Program, University of Michigan

The mission of the University Mentorship Program at The University of Michigan has been to provide an opportunity for new students to connect with mentors who are knowledgeable about The University of Michigan in order to ease the transition from high school to college (www. umich.edu). Each mentorship group has a three-tiered structure: one faculty/staff mentor, one peer mentor, and four first-year students (mentees) who are grouped according to their academic and extra-curricular interests.

Throughout the fall semester, mentorship groups participate in a variety of activities, both academic and social, that work towards supporting and encouraging the retention of each first-year student.

The Benefits of Peer Mentoring

Literature has suggested that peer mentoring has become a viable approach to providing role models and leadership (Good et al., 2000), social support (Brawer, 1996; Henriksen, 1995; Maton et al., 2000), academic support (Rodger & Tremblay, 2003), and positive campus climates (Good et al., 2000; Miller, 2002; Stromei, 2000) for underrepresented groups within higher education. According to Maton et al. (2000), the development of mentoring relationships can decrease academic isolation and contribute to positive outcomes. The researchers also indicated that increasing the number of African American peer mentors, who share similar interest with mentees and are academically strong, can substantially enhance peer academic and social support, reduce perceptions of racism, and increase cultural comfort in classes (Maton et al.).

A research study conducted by Maton et al. (2000) supported the notion of peer mentoring as a beneficial method in providing social support among first year, African American students. The Meyeroff Scholars Program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) was designed to increase the number of African American students pursuing graduate and professional degrees in science and engineering (Maton et al., 2000). The purpose of the study was to determine whether the program had a positive impact, and if so, which of its 14 program components appeared to contribute to effectiveness. Some of the components within the program included: community service

programs, study groups, a summer transition program, a financial support program, program staff advisement, research internships, and peer mentoring. The primary sample of participants consisted of 93 African American, male and female, freshmen Meyerhoff program participants.

Results of the study (Maton et al., 2000) indicated that participants of the program achieved higher grade point averages, graduated in science and engineering at higher rates, and gained admittance to graduate schools at higher rates than the current and historical comparison samples. Discussion, relative to the study's student survey and interview data, revealed that all 93 participants of the study reported having helpful, positive experiences with the peer mentoring component of the program. As reflected in the findings, students seemed to appreciate the opportunity to discuss future career goals, to conduct classroom research with professors, and to receive emotional support (Maton et al.).

Moreover, another study conducted at Southern Cross University in Australia revealed additional benefits of peer mentoring (Glass & Walter, 2000). The research investigated the relationship between personal and professional growth and peer mentoring with a group of women nurses. The researchers used two qualitative methods, individual reflective journaling and focus groups with interviews. The research was conducted over a 12-week period with six undergraduate student nurses and one nurse who was the degree program coordinator. At the time of the research, the students were in the second year of their three-year undergraduate nursing program and their ages ranged from 26-45 years. As a result of the study, five themes emerged: (a) experiencing

a sense of belonging, (b) being acknowledged, (c) feeling validated, (d) verbalizing vulnerability, and (e) understanding dualisms (the personal and professional views that mentors expressed regarding the mentee versus the views that the mentees expressed of themselves). The first four themes concerned personal connections within the group and consistently demonstrated how the connections provided a safe, supportive climate to explore any personal or professional issues (Glass & Walter, 2000). Relative to African Americans and peer mentoring, this study may have demonstrated the social support that can be obtained as peer mentors assist first year freshmen mentees to connect to the college environment, in order to experience a sense of belonging, to feel acknowledged and validated, and to have a safe place to express feelings of vulnerability and possible dualisms, as defined above. Results of the peer mentoring nursing study revealed personal and professional growth for all participants. Whereas all students have different needs, the results of this study may have implications for first year, African American students who engage in a peer mentoring relationship and desire to grow personally and professionally during the college adjustment process.

Behaviors of Helpful Mentors

The review of literature has suggested that the quality and characteristics of the mentor-mentee relationship is a clear determinant of beneficial outcomes within any type of mentoring relationship (Beyene, Anglin, Sanchez, & Ballou, 2002; DuBois, 2002; Johnson & Sullivan, 1995; Jucovy, 2001; Sipe, 1999b). Therefore it is vitally important to identify the behavior or characteristics of mentors that are considered as helpful, within the mentoring relationship. Although mentors tend to express their own views as to what

makes a mentoring match helpful and effective, it is equally important to give attention to the perceptions that mentees have about the helpfulness of their mentors, during a mentoring relationship (Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997). Johnson and Sullivan (1995) found that mentors who demonstrated consistency and reliability, who were able to be supportive of mentees' values, were willing to provide valuable advice, and were willing to support their mentees in coping with difficult situations proven to be helpful to mentees. Struchen and Porta (1997) added that mentoring relationships are characterized by extraordinary commitment, emotional openness, and intensity.

In a study on mentoring and relational mutuality, researchers sought to examine the nature of the mentoring process from the perspective of college mentees, within a framework that stressed the concept of a relational mutuality as a transforming step in the development of the mentoring process (Beyene et al., 2002). The study was focused on relational mutuality and supported by a relational theory, which suggests that human beings experience a primary need for connection and essential emotional joining. According to Beyene et al. relational theory moves beyond the psychosocial and instrumental aspects of mentoring relationships, to an interactional process that is basic to mentoring. Relative to mentoring relationships, the researchers examined and described mentee perceptions of the helpfulness of their mentors. Additionally, the researchers sought to understand how mentees viewed mentoring, and particularly whether they valued the relational aspects of the mentoring process.

The Beyene et al. study (2002), as well as this writer's current research, sought to give voice to the perspectives of the mentees and their points of view on the helpfulness

of their mentors. In contrast to the Beyene et al. study, this writer's research does not focus on the mentees' perceived value of a mutual relational mentoring relationship. Beyene et al. defined mentoring as a process whereby two people are engaged in a mutually beneficial relationship. Relative to the current research, this writer previously defined mentoring as a nurturing process, in which a more skilled or more experienced person helps another. Therefore this writer's research was guided by the traditional definition of mentoring and focused solely on obtaining the mentees' perspectives of the helpful behaviors of their intrusive peer mentors. The Beyene et al. study presented a different perspective, relative to this writer's study on mentoring. However, the research of Beyene et al. remains descriptive and useful, regarding mentees' perspectives of the helpful behaviors of their mentors. Such helpful behaviors are reviewed in the following sections.

In the study by Beyene et al. (2002), a sample of 133 participants was drawn from college students attending a summer training program that selects promising students of diverse backgrounds. The students in the program received mentors who advised them throughout their college experience. The desired outcome of the program was to increase the students' marketability with future employers. Participant ages ranged from 17 year olds, entering college as freshmen to 32-year-old college seniors. The instrument used to collect data was a 29-item questionnaire developed by the researchers, which was based on key concepts identified from a review of the literature on mentoring. The researchers reported the use of both descriptive statistics, as well as open-ended questions to obtain

information about students' personal experiences and perspectives on mentoring relationships.

In the analysis of the data, results of the study indicated that most participants viewed their mentor as a role model and a contributor to their success. The data also revealed that participants overall provided 340 attributes that yielded 17 general themes. Many of the themes appeared to be relational qualities. For instance, the themes described by the mentees as helpful mentor behavior included: nurturing, knowledgeable, listening, a friend, trustworthy, open-minded, a role model, approachable, helpful, encouraging, initiating, loyal, patient, nonjudgmental, sharing of similar interest, a positive attitude, and sense of humor. In addition to the 17 general themes, mentees shared relational qualities that were also helpful in the mentoring relationship, which were caring, loyal, and involved.

In another study conducted at Tennessee Technological University the viewpoints of African American mentees, attending a predominately White institution, in regards to the helpfulness of their peer mentors was revealed (Marable, 1999). In an effort to enhance the participation of minority students in engineering careers, the Tennessee Technological University (TTU) College of Engineering established the Minority Engineering Program (MEP). The goal of the MEP centered around the development of initiatives designed to increase the number of minority students in engineering majors, to increase baccalaureate degree completion rates for minorities, and to expand professional development opportunities for minority students (Marable). The program was a 6-week summer program targeted toward minority students who qualified to pursue a career in

engineering and were recent high school graduates. The aim of the program was to (a) reduce the stress of the high school-to college transition, (b) build confidence and self-esteem, (c) provide minority student mentors, and (d) develop academic skills (Marable).

Marable (1999, p. 45) suggested "good mentoring" as a key component for the success of African American students attending predominantly White institutions. The peer mentors in the program served as daily tutors and peer advisors for minority freshmen, majoring in engineering. During the study, the seven program participants were interviewed and shared comments regarding the helpfulness of their peer mentors. The mentees expressed their appreciation for having the help of students who had previously shared in similar experiences. The mentees also expressed a sense of empowerment as they received academic and social advice on how to "survive at college" (Marable, p. 50). Two of the participants stated that they felt helped when their mentors would extend themselves beyond the hourly program requirements and invite them to "do things outside of school" (Marable, p. 52), such as cooking and off-campus week-end events. Other comments, relative to the helpfulness of their peer mentors, centered on the words of encouragement and academic advisement that the mentees often received. One of the mentees appeared to express feelings of acceptance and appreciation as he stated "they told us only things that students know . . . who to watch out for . . . students and faculty . . . the mentors had a lot of time for us" (Marable, p. 52). Another mentee stated, "They were role models for us . . . they taught me to be professional and to relax without stressing out over academics" (Marable, p. 52).

Literature further supported the viewpoints expressed by the participants in the Marable (1999) and Beyene et al. (2002) research studies. In their review of the New Scholars Network mentoring program, Angelique et al. (2002) described helpful behaviors of mentors as that of providing acceptance and support, dispensing advice and guidance, offering assistance in learning the system of the institution, imparting important and sometimes privileged information, offering visibility and exposure, and extending protection, in some regard. Correll (2005) further supported the notion of helpful peer mentoring by suggesting that effective mentoring involves academic skills, attitudes, interaction, trust, communication, intrinsic motivation, and student empowerment. The current study attempted to add to the literature relative to the helpful behaviors of peer mentors, by giving voice to African American college students who participated as mentees in a peer mentoring program and who were making the transition into college life.

Summary

Overall, this chapter suggested that peer mentoring may be helpful regarding the social and academic college adjustment of African American freshmen entering PWIs. Although the literature indicated that peer mentoring is helpful in the college adjustment process of these students (Brawer, 1996; Good et al., 2000; Henriksen, 1995; Rodger & Tremblay, 2003), there is a need to further the line of research and obtain additional information from the mentee's perspective of the helpful behaviors of their mentors in PWI settings. According to DuBois and Neville (1997), greater understanding of helpful mentor behaviors and the implications for mentoring effectiveness could aid in the

development of more successful programs. Relative to mentoring, various studies have been conducted on the perceived benefits and mentoring relationship characteristics from the mentor's perspective (Campbell & Campbell, 2000; DuBois & Neville, 1997), as well as the importance of mentoring African American graduate students (Davis, 2007). Relative to the helpfulness of peer mentoring relationships, as perceived by the mentee, sparse research was found. This suggested a void in the literature and therefore encouraged the researcher to pursue the current investigation. Therefore, this study was designed to help fill in the gap concerning what is known about the helpfulness of the peer mentoring relationship from the mentees' perspective. Such a study may ultimately help PWIs develop better supportive, mentoring services for minority students, specifically African Americans.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The current research focused on the perceptions of African American college students relative to the helpful behaviors of the peer mentors who have mentored them during freshman year college adjustment, in a predominately White university. This study utilized Q methodology to capture and reveal such perceptions.

Q methodology was introduced by psychologist/physicist William Stephenson in 1953 (Brown, 1993). Utilizing the fundamentals of factor analysis, Q methodology provides a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity (Brown). McKeown and Thomas (1988) described subjectivity as an individual's own point of view, personal perspective, communication, internal frame of reference, or self-reference. Thus, Q methodology is the scientific study of human subjectivity, in which the perspectives, opinions, and experiences of participants are honored (Brown, 1980; McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

The use of Q methodology with African Americans has been supported as an appropriate methodology, since the statement items developed for the sort may be based on individual experiences and not that of other populations (Peacock, Murray, Ozer, & Stokes, 1996). Thus, the circumstances and experiences of this population can be incorporated into the study. Although Q methodology was the selected design of this

study, the following section addresses an alternative methodology that could have been employed, as well.

Alternative Methodology

With respect to an alternative methodology for this study, a phenomenological inquiry, such as a qualitative method, may have been utilized. Taylor and Bogdan (1998) explained that phenomenological inquiry attempts to discover phenomena in its natural state. They further discussed how the phenomenologist is committed to understanding social phenomena from the participant's personal perspective. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) added that phenomenologists seek to understand the meaning of events and interactions from the perspective of people in particular situations. Phenomenological inquiry does not claim to give meaning and truth "a priori" (Smith, 2000). The phenomenologist seeks to obtain understanding through the use of qualitative methods, such as participant observation and, in-depth interviewing that yields descriptive data (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Q methodology and qualitative design certainly share similarities in that both research designs respect and honor the realities of the participants. Although a qualitative design could have been employed for this study, using such a design would have provided fewer perspectives than was desired by the researcher, in order to explore the research question, in detail.

Research Question

The Human Subjects Review Board of Kent State University approved this research study (See Appendix A). One research question guided this study. The African American college students enrolled in a university peer mentoring program had the

opportunity to sort stimulus statements that reflected the possible helpfulness of behaviors of peer mentors. The following research question provided direction for the investigation: What are the perceptions of African American college students relative to the helpfulness of behaviors of peer mentors who assisted them during freshman year college adjustment in a predominantly White institution?

The remaining sections of this chapter are an overview of the theoretical foundations of Q methodology, the concourse, Q sample, P sample, Q sorting instructions, data analysis, and need for follow-up interviews. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Theoretical Foundation of Q Methodology

Q methodology includes a specific set of psychometric and operational principles that when combined with the specific statistical applications of correlation and factor-analytical methods provide the researcher with a systematic and strict quantitative methodology of examining human subjectivity (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). According to Brown (1993), Q methodology differs from traditional applications of factor analysis in that the response patterns of the participants, as opposed to a cluster of items on a given measure, are analyzed. As a result of such analyzed response patterns, the research data is enriched as the participants' views are described with greater detail.

Brown (1993) has referred to Q methodology as a set of procedures, a theory, and a philosophy affirming the study of subjectivity. Q methodology was described as a methodology through which subjective concepts can be examined (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Literature suggested that subjectivity is grounded in a person's frame of reference

and that Q methodology is a systematic way to examine and gain understandings about the person's experience (McKeown & Thomas).

Q methodology utilizes a technique, called the Q sort, to extrapolate the subjective views of individuals. When utilizing Q methodology the researcher gives a person a set of statements about a topic of interest and asks the person to rank-order them according to criteria that forms the intent of the study. The statements are usually ranked from *agree* to *disagree* or from *most* to *least*. This ranking process is called Q sorting (Brown, 1993). The statements being sorted are referred to as the Q-set. The Q-set represents a range of opinions surrounding a specific topic. Brown noted that the statements are not based on fact, but are differing perspectives about the topic of interest. Brown indicated that the point of view of an individual is not right or wrong. He stressed that the participant ranks the statements from their point of view and it is this ranking that is subjective. Brown explained that the Q set is solely developed by matters of opinion and the fact that an individual is ranking the statements from his or her own point of view is what brings subjectivity into the process.

According to Brown (1993), when the rankings are subject to factor analysis the resulting clusters of factors demonstrate common points of subjectivity or perspective among participants. Q methodology is concerned with segments of subjectivity that exist and the extent to which there are similarities or differences in the subjectivity expressed by participants (Brown).

The Concourse

According to Brown (1993), the flow of communicability surrounding any specific topic is known as a concourse. Brown noted that differences of opinion among individuals on a topic are representative of the many different individuals participating in the conversations. Stephenson (1953) and Brown (1993) defined these different views as a concourse, a collection of views on a specific topic or issue. Brown described a concourse as a flow of ideas focused on any specific topic. A variety of people may have many ideas about a specific topic and the combination of those ideas, once gathered, form a concourse. Brown stated that a concourse could be developed in several different ways. He indicated that the most common way was to interview people and write down or record what they said. However, other sources include commentaries from newspapers, essays, and talk shows.

In this study the concourse was formed from statements gathered in group and individual interviews with freshmen students concerning the helpful behaviors they experienced with their peer mentors. The phrases noted in Appendix B were gathered from the group and individual interviews and represent the concourse that formed the basis for the sorts. A total of 73 statements were in the concourse. Appendix B contains the entire set of ideas generated by participants in the group and individual interviews.

The director of a peer mentoring program in a Midwestern, predominately White university, identified a list of 16 names of African American freshmen who were invited to be a part of the group and individual interviews. The director assigned the graduate assistant of the peer mentoring program the responsibility of introducing the study to the

students and posting a sign up sheet for those students interested in participating. The graduate assistant submitted the names to the researcher and the researcher coordinated the group and individual interviews by sending follow up emails and telephone calls to the students. The group and individual interviews were conducted in the second semester (Spring) of the participants' first year as freshmen in college. The students of the group and individual interviews had participated in the peer mentoring program as first year freshmen for one semester (Fall). A copy of the consent form for the participants can be found in Appendix C. All group and individual interview participants filled out a Demographic Form (see Appendix D). Participants were between the ages of 18 and 19. The participants of the group and individual interviews consisted of 6 African American freshmen: 3 females and 3 males. This group was used to garner the concourse noted above.

Q Sample

McKeown and Thomas (1988) described a Q sample as a collection of stimulus items, taken from a concourse. The Q sample statements are provided to individuals to rank order in a Q sort. Q samples can either be "naturalistic" or "ready-made" and either "structured" or "unstructured" (McKeown & Thomas). This study used a naturalistic, unstructured Q sample.

Statements derived from individuals in either oral or written form are considered "naturalistic" whereas Q samples taken in a pre-packaged manner from other sources are "ready made." The statements for this study were drawn from the mentees' (freshmen students) verbal responses derived from interviewing and thus are labeled as naturalistic.

The advantages noted by McKeown and Thomas (1988) of naturalistic Q samples include the idea that views expressed in the Q samples are the opinions of individuals conducting the Q sorts. Because the ideas come from participants, the Q sorting process is sped up since it is based on their communication. Therefore, a largely naturalistic Q sample reduces the risk of missing what the respondents mean and of confusing their meanings with other meanings that may come from other sources outside of the study (McKeown & Thomas).

McKeown and Thomas (1988) suggested that Q samples are representations of communication contexts, thus they cannot include all of the possible communications. The process of deciding which items to include and exclude provides the selection of either a "structured" or "unstructured" sample. According to McKeown and Thomas, an "unstructured sample" uses items that are seen as being relevant to the topic being researched. Items are chosen with much effort to include all possible sub-issues. Therefore, effort is made to have a representation of all of the views on a specific issue. On the contrary, a "structured sample" is created in a more systematic manner, usually to represent theoretical models and constructs (McKeown & Thomas). This study used an "unstructured" sample since the items chosen were not grounded in a theory and were thought to be relevant to the topic as they were selected from the statements drawn from the larger pool of possible respondents of the person sample.

Relative to this study, a sample of statements was drawn from the concourse to create the Q sample. After reviewing the 73 statements included in the concourse, the researcher removed duplicate items and combined items expressing similar thoughts. The

doctoral committee assisted in this process. Appendix E contains the 40 items that made up the Q sample. These statements were provided to participants to sort according to the conditions of instruction discussed later.

The P Sample

Brown (1993) indicated that studies using Q methodology rarely have more than 50 participants (p. 99). These people are considered the person or "P" sample. McKeown and Thomas (1988) noted that Q methodology is not concerned with how many people believe a concept, but rather why and how they believe what they do (p. 45). Additionally it was said that in Q methodology a small number of respondents, including single cases, are psychometrically acceptable. The number of participants is guided by the principle of having a sample large enough to allow for a representation of a variety of opinions to surface (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). McKeown and Thomas stated that the P sample could be selected because of both theoretical and pragmatic considerations. Theoretical considerations were described as those criteria that have specific relevance to the goals of the study while pragmatic considerations focus on the practicality of obtaining participants.

The Human Subjects Review Board of Kent State University approved this research study (See Appendix A). This Q study consisted of a person sample (P sample) of 40 participants who identified themselves as African American college students at a PWI. The P sample was characterized by participants who obtained at least a 2.0 (or higher) grade point average. The grade point averages of the participants were verified by the researcher. Permission to conduct the study with the students of the Peer Mentoring

Program was obtained from the Director of The Student Multicultural Center (see Appendix E). The director permitted the program coordinator (graduate assistant) to identify and select African American male and female students for participation in the study. The program coordinator made the initial contact with the identified African American male and female students and informed them of the research study. After the program coordinator's initial contact and identification of students to participate, the researcher met with the students to conduct the Q sorts.

The participants of the Q sort consisted of 40 African American students (29 female and 11 male), ranging in ages 18-22 years old. Descriptive statistics and demographic information for the participants are presented within this chapter and in Table 1.

Q Sorting Instructions

Another key component of this study was the Q sorting. Several authors explained Q sorting as the process where participants rank-order statements in a manner that models their point of view (Brown, 1993; McKeown & Thomas, 1988; Stephenson, 1953, 1978). Q sample statements are rank-ordered based on the guidelines and instructions provided by the facilitator for completing the sorting process (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The Q statements are contained in Appendix F, whereas the conditions of instructions are contained in Appendix G.

Participants in this study conducted one sort related to helpfulness of behaviors of peer mentors. Brown (1986, 1993) and McKeown and Thomas (1988) suggested that participants first read all the statements in the Q sample and then place them into three

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Q Sort Participants

Category	Breakdown	Number	Percentage
Age	18-19	22 of 40	55%
	20-21	16 of 40	40%
	22	2 of 40	5%
Gender	Female	29 of 40	72.50%
	Male	11 of 40	27.50%
Grade Point Average (GPA)	2.0-2.5	7 of 40	17.50%
	2.51-2.99	12 of 40	30%
	3.00 and higher	21 of 40	52.50%
Credit Hours (Class Standing)	1-29 hrs. (Freshman)	21 of 40	52.50%
	30-59 hrs. (Sophomore)	8 of 40	20%
	60-89 hrs. (Junior)	6 of 40	15%
	90 hrs and higher (Senior)	5 of 40	12.50%
Residential / Commuter	Residential (Living On Campus)	37 of 40	92.50%
	Commuters	3 of 40	7.50%
High school Geographical Location	Suburban	19 of 40	47.50%
	Urban	20 of 40	50%
	Rural	1 of 40	2.50%
Father Education	Less than High School	1 of 40	2.50%
	High School Diploma/GED	19 of 40	47.50%
	Some College	10 of 40	25%
	Associates Degree	2 of 40	5%
	Bachelor's Degree	5 of 40	12.50%
	Advanced Degree	2 of 40	5%
	Not Applicable (NA)	1 of 40	2.50%
Mother Education	Less than High School	1 of 40	2.50%
	High School Diploma/GED	15 of 40	37.50%
	Some College	11 of 40	27.50%
	Associates Degree	3 of 40	7.50%
	Bachelor's Degree	6 of 40	15%
	Advanced Degree	4 of 40	10%
	Not Applicable (NA)	0 of 40	0%

(*table continues*)

Table 1 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Q Sort Participants

Category	Breakdown	Number	Percentage
Family Composition	Single Parent Household	11 of 40	27.50%
	Two Parent Household	23 of 40	57.50%
	Grand Parent Headed Household	1 of 40	2.50%
	Aunt or Uncle Headed Household	1 of 40	2.50%
	Other	4 of 40	10%

piles before beginning the rank-ordering process. Placement of the cards into these three piles allowed the participants to more easily see which statements represented most helpful and least helpful mentoring behaviors, in order to gain each person's subjective perspective for the sort (Brown, 1980). A third pile was reserved for cards that represented neutrality with regard to helpful mentoring behavior. The participants then rank-ordered the statements along a continuum from right (*most helpful*) to left (*least helpful*) which ended in a symmetrical arrangement similar to a normal curve (see Appendix H for Q sort grid). Brown (1980, 1993) suggested that the range of the rating scale for the statements could extend from -3 to +3, -4 to +4, or -5 to +5, and so forth depending on the number of statements selected. In the current study statements were arranged on a scale from -4 to +4 with zero as the center.

Data Analysis

The Q sort responses of the participants were recorded on a Q Sort Grid (Appendix H). The data from these forms were entered into the PQ Method 2.11, a

computer program for analysis of Q studies. The participants' data from the form were entered into fields of the PQ Method program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002). Participant identification demographic data was indicated through an eight digit coding process. The first two numbers in the code indicated the order in which participants from 01-40 engaged in the study. The third number represented their age (1 = 18; 2 = 19; 3 = 20; 4 = 21; 5 = 22). The fourth number referred to the participant's grade point average (1 = 2.0-2.5; 2 = 2.51-3.0; 3 = 3.1-3.5; 4 = 3.51-4.0). The fifth number represented gender (1 = male; 2 = female). The sixth digit represented credit hours achieved or class standing (1 = 1-29, freshman standing; 2 = 30-59, sophomore standing; 3 = 60-89, junior standing; 4 = 90 or higher, senior standing). The seventh digit referred to the participant as a residential or commuter student (1 = residential; 2 = commuter). The eighth digit described the geographic location of the participant's high school (1 = urban; 2 = suburban; 3 = rural). Following the entries of the participant identification demographic data, the individual Q sort responses were entered into the PQ Method for analysis.

McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated that the analysis of data in Q methodology involves statistical procedures in the following order: correlation, factor analysis, factor rotation, quantification of factor loadings, and factor interpretation. In this process each step was integrally linked to the next step, and the final product was a model of operant subjectivity.

Correlation

According to Crowl (1993), correlation is determined by statistically calculating the degree of relationship between two variables, in this case participants' perspectives. It

was expressed that the range for correlations is from +1.00 (perfect positive correlation) to -1.00 (perfect negative correlation). Brown (1980, 1993) and McKeown and Thomas (1988) emphasized that when using Q methodology the correlation of various participants' perspectives is the focus, not the correlation of test items or traits. When using Q methodology, a positive correlation indicates the level of agreement, and a negative correlation indicates the level of disagreement between the participants' perspectives on the items they sort. According to Brown (1993), each Q sort is the viewpoint of a research participant, and the correlational coefficients divulge the similarity of the participants' points of view.

In this study the freshmen mentees participated in presenting perspectives about the topic of "helpful" behaviors of their peer mentors. The participants sorted sample statements from an unstructured sample format while using specific "conditions of instruction." Then, the participants' sorts were correlated to determine the similarities and differences in their viewpoints. The correlations were used in the factor analysis to create the factor structure.

Factor Analysis

The initial steps of Q methodology provided the support for the next step in the analysis of the data. Brown (1986) recommended factor analysis as a procedure for identifying the number of groupings implicit in the correlation matrix. It was stressed that although it is possible, it is highly unlikely for all participants in a study to be in total agreement, as would be indicated by their sorting identically. Factor analysis disclosed the number of different factors or perspectives which existed within the Q sorts (Brown,

1993). McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated that the sorting process places participants into groups called families (factors) and factor analysis is the statistical methodology used to determine those factor groupings. It was emphasized that in Q methodology the factors are participant perspectives, not traits or test scores; that is, a group of participants who comprise a factor and share a common viewpoint.

Factor Rotation

The factor rotation was then the statistical procedure necessary to move toward factor interpretation. Brown (1986) emphasized that the purpose of factor rotation is to provide "structure" for the factor analysis. There are a couple of ways to achieve structure: through the theoretical judgmental rotation of factors, or through the mathematical rotation of factors. Brown (1980) noted that the theoretical judgmental rotation of factors was based on the theoretical structure of the Q sample. One mathematical rotation of factors described is the varimax rotation, which reveals a number of different Q sorts clustering around various factors (Brown, 1980). The varimax rotation was used because it has the potential for identifying and maximizing the number of significant factors and because the Q sample was not structured on theoretical lines. After completing the factor rotation, then factor loadings, factor scoring, and factor interpretation follow.

Factor Loadings

McKeown and Thomas (1988) noted that factor loadings describe how each Q sort is associated with the factors that emerge during the factor analysis. Factor loadings are in effect correlation coefficients, as they indicate the extent to which each Q sort is

similar or dissimilar to a particular factor (McKeown & Thomas). It was noted that factors represent points of view and how the respondent's point of view or sorting is expressed on the factor in comparison to the sortings of other individuals. Thus each respondent's factor loading noted the amount of similarity between the Q sort of the individual and the composite Q sort on that factor. If an individual has a positive loading on a factor then he or she has common subjectivity with others on that factor. McKeown and Thomas indicated that a factor's significance or importance is estimated by the sum of its squared factor loadings. In this study significance was considered to be at least two and one-half times the standard error. Thus, loadings were statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they were in excess of ±2.50 times the standard of error (SE); that is $SE = 1\sqrt{N}$ where N is the number of statements in the Q sample (McKeown & Thomas). For this study, $SE = 1\sqrt{40}$; and loadings in excess of 2.50 (.158) = ±.3950 or greater were considered statistically significant.

Factor Scoring

Brown (1980) indicated that factor scoring was the next step in order to perform factor interpretation. It was noted that when numerous participants load on a factor, their individual Q sorts were merged together and the outcome was representative of the perspectives of the participants on that factor. McKeown and Thomas (1988) explained that the factor array is a model Q sort for each factor. In addition, they mentioned that factor scores obtained from factor weights and presented as *z* scores are changed into whole numbers based on the position of the *z* scores in the factor array. In the end, this statistical step permitted the researcher to analyze the differences in placements of the Q

sample statements for the participants defining the different factors. Factor scoring was done to improve the factor interpretation.

Factor Interpretation

Once the correlation, factor analysis, factor rotation, loading, and scoring were completed, the researcher interpreted the results. Brown (1980) stressed that no matter how many factors emerge in the process there will always be some points of commonalties and differences. When using Q methodology, Brown (1986) stated that the researcher will do the interpretation only after the Q sorting, correlation, factor analysis, rotation, loading, and scoring have taken place. He emphasized that the order of the items is extremely important and comes before meaning. He continued by stating that the meaning is not determined "a priori," but ultimately originates from the participants' points of view. Items that were rated "high" and "low" as well as those items differentiating one grouping from another were featured in the interpretation.

Follow-up Interviews

Follow-up interviews were used to further illuminate information provided by participants. Brown (1980) indicated that follow-up interviews serve two purposes. First, interviews give participants a chance to explain their rationale for the specific rank-ordering of the Q sort (p. 200). Secondly, interviews provide the researcher an opportunity to clarify with the participant any vagueness concerning his or her sort. He emphasized the importance of this since the Q sort is a small representation of the participant's attitude and the sorting reflects that attitude in a limited way. The follow-up interviews allowed both the researcher and the participant an opportunity to further

clarify factors obtained from the Q sort. The follow-up interviews were used to assist with the factor interpretation. Interviews focused on clarification of the factors and items that participants viewed as being the most and least helpful peer mentor behaviors and on the items that the factor scoring indicated differentiated one factor from the others.

The selection of participants for the interview process involved a number of decisions. First factors were reviewed to see which participants had the highest factor loadings as indicated by the strength of their correlation with the factor. It was thought that those people with the highest factor loadings would have the purest view of the factor (Brown, 1980). It was also important that those chosen loaded significantly on only one factor. Then consideration was given to gender in an attempt to increase the likelihood that a variety of voices relative to each factor would be included. Thus, in those factors that included both men and women, a male and female were selected. Two participants were chosen for interviewing relative to each factor. Sample interview questions included "What prompted you to place these statements at +4 /-4."

Summary

This study investigated the perceptions of African American college students, attending PWIs, relative to the helpfulness of behaviors of their peer mentors. This chapter summarized the theoretical foundations of Q methodology, the concourse, Q sample, P sample, Q sorting instructions, data analysis, and follow-up interviews. The study sought to further the line of research related to the helpful behaviors of peer mentors, mentoring African American freshmen at a PWI. Q methodology was the procedure employed.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Data Analysis

In this chapter, an analysis of the data pertaining to the study of the perspectives of African American college students attending a PWI, relative to the helpfulness of behaviors of their peer mentors, is analyzed. The results of the Q sorts, completed by 40 African American participants, are reviewed and a discussion, relative to the results, is presented in Chapter IV.

According to McKeown and Thomas (1988), the analysis of data in Q methodology typically consists of data correlation, factor analysis, and the computing of factor scores. Therefore, the 40 Q sorts were correlated, were factor analyzed, and their factor scores were computed. Analysis of the data obtained from the 40 Q sorts was accomplished by utilizing the PQ Method computer program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002). The PQ Method computer program is a statistical program tailored to the requirements of Q studies and enables one to systematically enter Q sort data (Schmolck & Atkinson). Schmolck and Atkinson also added that the PQ Method computer program conducts computations of correlations among Q sorts and performs a factor analysis.

Factor Correlation

One of the benefits of using a Q methodological approach is the discovery of the manner in which the Q sorts relate to one another (Brown, 1993). Regarding this study, in particular, one of the most interesting aspects was the way in which Q sorts clustered

around certain statements. The significant statements in each cluster represented a different perspective of the African American students involved in the study, relative to the helpful behaviors of the mentors who assisted them during their freshman year at a predominately White institution. The clusters also represented the ways in which the perspectives were similar and dissimilar to each other. In this study a correlation matrix (see Appendix J) was produced in order to reveal how each person's sort correlated with all other sorts. In Q methodology, the correlation of the perspectives of persons is most important (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Brown (1993) reported that a perfect positive correlation is considered +1.00, whereas a perfect negative correlation is considered -1.00. Thus, a correlation of +1.00 between any two sorts indicates complete agreement; whereas a correlation of -1.00 would represent the inverse.

Factor Analysis

Brown (1993) stated that factor analysis examines a correlation matrix, and relative to Q methodology, determines how many basically different Q factors are in evidence. The factor analysis provided the statistical information by which the participants were grouped according to their perceptions of the research question (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Q sorts that are highly correlated with one another and not highly correlated with others may be considered to have a "family resemblance" (Brown, 1993, p. 21). According to Brown, factor analysis indicates the number of families or factors that exist within the total group. In this study, the factors represented the groupings of different perspectives that African American students, who were enrolled at a predominately White institution, had about the helpful behaviors of their peer mentors.

Utilizing the PQ Method computer program, a Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was used rather than a Centroid analysis. Although both factor analysis methods extract factors, McKeown and Thomas (1988) suggested that the PCA is more statistically precise than the Centroid analysis. According to Watts and Stenner (2005), the centroid analysis offers an infinite number of rotated solutions. Such enables researchers to consider any data set from a variety of perspectives, before selecting the most appropriate and informative rotated solutions. Although the Centroid analysis has been the method of choice for many traditional Q methodologist, the literature has reported that the Centroid method has been viewed as in-determinant, due to the fact that there is no mathematically correct solution out of the infinite number possible, regarding factor rotation (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

After the PCA computed the inter-correlations between sorts, a Varimax rotation of factors was used. The Varimax rotation method was used because it offered the greatest discrimination relative to how the data were viewed (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The PQ Method allowed the researcher to choose up to an 8-factor solution; however, the 4-factor solution was identified as the best option in this study. The 3-factor solution explained 40% of the variance, the 4-factor solution at 47% of the variance, whereas the 5-factor solution explained 52% of the variance. According to Brown (1993), there must be significant loadings on individual factors in order to indicate the various perspectives being expressed. For example, on factors 3, 4, and 5 of the 5-factor solution, only 1 person loaded significantly on each of these three factors. Therefore the 5-factor solution was rejected, due to an inadequate number of individuals

loading on these factors. The 3-factor solution was rejected, due to the fact that the 4-factor solution accounted for 7% more of the variance, at 47%. Relative to the 4-factor solution, 35 of the 40 participants loaded significantly and distinctly on one of the four factors related to this study. Thus, the 4-factor solution was accepted and factor rotations were run, in order to best identify the defining sorts. Table 2 presents the information pertaining to the rotated factor loadings.

Factor loadings were noted by McKeown and Thomas (1988) to be correlation coefficients demonstrating the strength of the relationship between individual Q sorts and the factor. According to McKeown and Thomas, to figure out how large a correlation must be to become statistically significant, the standard error (SE) must be calculated using the following formula: $SE=1/\sqrt{N}$, where N is equal to the number of items in the Q sample (p. 50). Brown (1993) suggested correlations to be statistically significant if they were between two and two and one-half times the standard error. In this study, using 40 items, the SE would equal $1/\sqrt{40}$ or .158. Using this formula, correlations greater than .3950 would be considered significant as they were two and one-half times the standard error.

Table 3 describes the correlations between factors. There were four distinguishing factors. The highest correlation between factors was between factors 1 and 3 (.3987). The four factors do not have high correlations with one another, which demonstrates the factors to be largely discrete (Brown, 1993; Taylor, 2005). Table 4 provides the factor characteristics. A factor is made up of the number of people who loaded significantly on the factor and those significant sorts are considered defining variables. For example,

Table 2

Factor Matrix With an X Indicating a Defining Sort

QSORT		Loadings 1	2	3	4
1	01221111	0.0142	0.4098X	0.0708	-0.0395
2	02122312	0.3635	0.4504	0.2367	0.4656
3	03122113	0.1642	0.6502X	0.1107	-0.1089
4	04222212	-0.2287	0.3021	0.2296	0.5272X
5	05132112	0.5725X	0.0021	-0.1319	0.3595
6	06132111	-0.2822	0.7303X	-0.0169	0.1541
7	07232111	0.2034	0.6016X	-0.0662	0.1743
8	08332211	0.1157	-0.0622	0.6642X	0.3949
9	09322212	0.1347	0.0877	0.3971X	0.0287
10	10222111	0.7484X	-0.0513	0.1672	0.1319
11	11342212	0.0542	0.0574	0.4855X	0.2021
12	12232112	0.2282	0.3546	0.1247	0.4252X
13	13221112	-0.3267	0.0250	-0.1692	0.5599X
14	14432421	-0.0207	0.2460	-0.0635	0.3111
15	15221112	0.2450	0.5163X	-0.0791	0.4392
16	16112111	0.5369X	0.1464	-0.0509	0.1678
17	17112111	-0.1504	0.1831	0.5212X	-0.1959
18	18132111	0.5585X	0.2707	0.4836	0.2774
19	19342111	0.0519	0.1242	0.8329X	0.0121
20	20112111	0.4073	0.2951	-0.0615	0.6184X

(*table continues*)

Table 2 (continued)

Factor Matrix With an X Indicating a Defining Sort

QSORT		Loadings 1	2	3	4
21	21521111	0.1611	0.0870	0.2723	-0.2516
22	22231112	0.4405	0.1813	0.6701X	0.1419
23	23321411	0.3263	0.0283	0.1545	0.5910X
24	24321212	0.5538X	0.3813	0.3682	0.0450
25	25222111	0.8032X	-0.0602	-0.1186	-0.2515
26	26422312	-0.0420	0.4412X	0.0350	0.0227
27	27412422	-0.0018	0.5151X	0.1556	0.3851
28	28112112	0.7249X	0.0338	0.0934	0.0570
29	29321311	0.6148X	0.0430	0.3370	0.2105
30	30321322	0.1538	0.6084X	0.0331	0.1912
31	31212111	-0.0763	-0.3495	0.1169	0.6083X
32	32212111	-0.1375	0.3619	0.2661	0.0418
33	33112112	0.2406	0.2355	0.1508	0.4717X
34	34222212	0.6892X	-0.2317	0.3564	-0.1633
35	35432411	-0.1731	0.8017X	0.0944	-0.0323
36	36422411	0.4982X	0.0089	0.1612	-0.0196
37	37331212	0.3502	-0.1390	0.2844	-0.0447
38	38421312	0.5352X	0.5146	0.2594	-0.1946
39	39542411	0.0402	0.5185X	0.1442	0.1627
40	40421312	0.3407	0.0123	0.6126X	-0.1068
% expl. Var.		15	13	10	9

Table 3

Correlations Between Factor Scores

	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
1	1.0000	0.0819	0.3987	0.1932
2	0.0819	1.0000	0.2146	0.3164
3	0.3987	0.2146	1.0000	0.2107
4	0.1932	0.3164	0.2107	1.0000

Factor 1 consisted of 11 people. Table 4 presents factor characteristics, which include the number of defining sorts per factor, the average reliability coefficient, the composite reliability scores, and the standard error of factor scores. Reliability refers to the likelihood that a participant would perform the Q sort in the same way on subsequent administrations (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). A factor's reliability can be estimated

Table 4

Factor Characteristics

Factors	1	2	3	4
No. of Defining Variables	11	10	7	7
Average Rel. Coef	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800
Composite Reliability	0.978	0.976	0.966	0.966
S.E. of Factor Scores	0.149	0.156	0.186	0.186

using the formula: r = .80 p/ [1 + (*p*-1) 0.80], where *p* is the number of persons defining a factor and .80 is the estimated reliability coefficient (McKeown & Thomas). The higher the reliability the lower the magnitude of error associated with the factor which has the impact of engendering confidence in the factor. The four factors all have strong reliability coefficients. For instance, the composite reliability for Factor 1 was .978, thus demonstrating high reliability.

The distinguishing statements exemplify a particular perspective. Distinguishing statements are those statements that were viewed significantly different from one group to another. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 note distinguishing statements and important but non-distinguishing statements for each factor. Each of the perspectives outlined in the factors is discussed in Chapter IV.

McKeown and Thomas (1988) discussed a difference between most research applications and Q methodology as it relates to factor interpretation. The factor loadings would be the focus of the next step in most factor analyses. With Q methodology, however, the factor scores are used for interpretation. Additionally, the goal is to create a factor array for each factor with factor scores ranging from +4 to -4 (the Q sort continuum of this study). The factor array is a proto-type composite sort which "best" represents the perspectives of persons significantly loading on a factor.

To achieve factor scoring, it is important to first calculate the factor weights of the different item placements. Then the factor scores are calculated into *z* scores and turned into whole numbers, which ranged from +4 to -4 in this study so that they were able to be compared with each other (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The factor arrays were

Table 5

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 1

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	2.07*	-2	-0.74	-2	-0.78	3	1.30
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	3	1.80	1	0.49	2	1.26	-1	-0.49
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	3	1.28*	-1	-0.69	0	0.03	1	0.67
2	My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.	3	1.10*	-1	-0.62	-3	-1.36	-1	-0.45
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	2	0.87	-1	-0.51	1	0.35	0	-0.17
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	2	0.89	0	-0.04	1	0.32	-4	-1.61
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters that related to the office of my major.	1	0.48	-2	-1.16	0	-0.08	-3	-1.59
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	1	0.40*	3	1.69	3	1.59	4	2.34
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was OK.	0	-0.11*	1	0.63	-3	-1.29	4	2.03
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	-1	-0.36*	-3	-1.19	2	1.09	1	0.68
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	-1	-0.53*	4	2.16	0	0.12	2	0.93

(*table continues*)

Table 5 (continued)

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 1

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	-1	-0.47*	3	1.13	0	0.08	1	0.38
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	-1	-0.78	-1	-0.27	1	0.45	3	1.34
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	-3	-1.12*	2	0.91	-1	-0.34	-2	-0.59
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	-3	-1.45*	-1	-0.42	0	0.30	-1	-0.54
The following items are important but not distinguishing for +4, -4, +3, and/or -3:									
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	4	1.98	-1	-0.58	4	1.62	0	0.14
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus, where other African Americans gather.	-3	-1.31	-2	-1.09	-4	-1.80	1	0.45
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-4	-2.28	-4	-1.95	-3	-1.40	-1	-0.25
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	-4	-1.57	1	0.23	1	0.52	-3	-1.35

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

Table 6

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 2

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	-1	-0.53	4	2.16*	0	0.12	2	0.93
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	-2	-1.03	4	1.92*	-4	-2.18	-2	-0.93
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	-1	-0.47	3	1.13*	0	0.08	1	0.38
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	-3	-1.12	2	0.91*	-1	-0.34	-2	-0.59
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	0	-0.27	1	0.63*	-1	-0.67	-3	-1.44
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was OK.	0	-0.11	1	0.63*	-3	-1.29	4	2.03
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	3	1.80	1	0.49*	2	1.26	-1	-0.49
15	My mentor knew when to be funny.	-2	-1.11	0	0.19*	-1	-0.70	-2	-1.04
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	2	0.82	0	0.06	1	0.56	-1	-0.51
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	-2	-0.90	0	-0.09*	-2	-1.12	2	0.88
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	-1	-0.78	-1	-0.27	1	0.45	3	1.34

(*table continues*)

Table 6 (continued)

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 2

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	4	1.98	-1	-0.58*	4	1.62	0	0.14
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	3	1.28	-1	-0.69*	0	0.03	1	0.67
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	-1	-0.36	-3	-1.19*	2	1.09	1	0.68
27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs, and values that are a part of my culture.	-1	-0.38	-3	-1.77*	-1	-0.67	-1	-0.31
The following items are important but not distinguishing for +4, -4, +3, and/or -3:									
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	1	0.40	3	1.69	3	1.59	4	2.34
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	2	0.87	3	1.33	0	0.02	3	1.04
21	My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.	0	-0.28	-3	-1.28	-1	-0.58	-2	-1.33
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	-2	-0.92	-4	-1.86	-2	-0.82	-4	-2.17
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-4	-2.28	-4	-1.95	-3	-1.40	-1	-0.25

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

Table 7

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 3

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	1	0.55	1	0.68	4	2.06*	0	0.12
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	-1	-0.42	0	-0.03	3	1.36*	1	0.52
38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	1	0.60	1	0.41	3	1.29*	0	0.17
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	3	1.80	1	0.49	2	1.26	-1	-0.49
25	My mentor was accessible by email.	0	-0.21	1	0.42	2	1.16*	0	-0.05
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	-1	-0.78	-1	-0.27	1	0.45*	3	1.34
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	2	0.87	-1	-0.51	1	0.35	0	-0.17
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	-3	-1.45	-1	-0.42	0	0.30*	-1	-0.54
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	-1	-0.53	4	2.16	0	0.12*	2	0.93
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	3	1.28	-1	-0.69	0	0.03	1	0.67
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	2	0.87	3	1.33	0	0.02*	3	1.04
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	1	0.48	-2	-1.16	0	-0.08	-3	-1.59

(*table continues*)

Table 7 (continued)

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 3

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	0	-0.11	1	0.63	-3	-1.29*	4	2.03
2	My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.	3	1.10	-1	-0.62	-3	-1.36*	-1	-0.45
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-4	-2.28	-4	-1.95	-3	-1.40	-1	-0.25
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus where other African Americans gather.	-3	-1.31	-2	-1.09	-4	-1.80	1	0.45
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	-2	-1.03	4	1.92	-4	-2.18*	-2	-0.93
The following items are important but not distinguishing for +4, -4, +3, and/or -3:									
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	4	1.98	-1	-0.58	4	1.62	0	0.14
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	1	0.40	3	1.69	3	1.59	4	2.34
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.	-3	-1.31	-2	-1.09	-4	-1.80	1	0.45

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

Table 8

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 4

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	1	0.40	3	1.69	3	1.59	4	2.34*
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	0	-0.11	1	0.63	-3	-1.29	4	2.03*
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	2.07	-2	-0.74	-2	-0.78	3	1.30*
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	-1	-0.78	-1	-0.27	1	0.45	3	1.34*
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	-1	-0.63	4	2.16	0	0.12	2	0.93*
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	-2	-0.90	0	-0.09	-2	-1.12	2	0.88*
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	3	1.28	-1	-0.69	0	0.03	1	0.67
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.	-3	-1.31	-2	-1.09	-4	-1.80	1	0.45*
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone	-1	-0.42	0	-0.03	3	1.36	1	0.52
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	4	1.98	-1	-0.58	4	1.62	0	0.14*
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-4	-2.28	-4	-1.95	-3	-1.40	-1	-0.25*

(*table continues*)

Table 8 (continued)

Distinguishing and Important Statements for Factor 4

No.	Statement	Factors 1 RNK	1 SCORE	2 RNK	2 SCORE	3 RNK	3 SCORE	4 RNK	4 SCORE
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	3	1.80	1	0.49	2	1.26	-1	-0.49*
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	2	0.82	0	0.06	1	0.56	-1	-0.51
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	0	-0.27	1	0.63	-1	-0.67	-3	-1.44*
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	2	0.89	0	0.04	1	0.32	-4	-1.64*
The following items are important but not distinguishing for +4, -4, +3, and/or -3:									
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	2	0.87	3	1.33	0	0.02*	3	1.04
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters that related to the office of my major.	1	0.48	-2	-1.16	0	-0.08	-3	-1.59
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	-4	-1.57	1	0.23	1	0.52	-3	-1.35
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	-2	-0.92	-4	-1.86	-2	-0.82	-4	-2.17

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

converted from *z* scores for each item and can be found in Appendix K. Each item is listed for each factor in descending order of the *z*-scores.

After the factor scores have been examined, themes become apparent within each group being examined. Every factor consists of significant distinguishing statements that differentiate that factor from the others. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 present distinguishing statements for this study. These tables also contain the items that persons considered to be most and least helpful, but not necessarily distinguishing for the people loading on the factor.

Summary

The results of this study of the perceptions of African American college students attending PWIs, relative to the helpfulness of behaviors of their peer mentors, were provided in this chapter. This chapter contained the factor analyses and the computation of the factor loadings. Outcomes indicated there were four significant factors. The four factors made up 47% of the explained variance. In order to begin interpretation, factor weights were calculated into z scores and compared after conversion to whole numbers. Scores ranging from +4 to -4 for each item created a factor array. Factor reliability was high. Chapter IV presents a discussion of the results.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study used Q methodology to examine the perspectives of African American college students attending a Predominately White Institution (PWI), relative to the helpfulness of behaviors of their assigned peer mentors. The purpose of the Q sort segment of this study was to identify what behaviors of peer mentors were viewed as most helpful to African American college students during their first year of college at a predominately White institution. Thus, relative to their freshman year, 40 African American college students, ranging from freshmen to seniors, completed the Q sort. The Q sort was comprised of 40 statement cards, derived from the previously mentioned group and individual interview discussion. Once the data analysis was completed, four distinctive factor groups emerged representing four different perspectives among the participants.

The four factors revealed in Chapter III resulted from the Q sorts performed by 40 African American college students attending the PWI. This chapter presents the discussion related to the helpfulness of assigned peer mentor behaviors by presenting the research question, findings, and interpretation. Discussion is also provided relative to the relationship between the results of the study and previous literature. Comments focusing on findings from the study and previous literature are presented to better understand the helpfulness of behaviors of peer mentors assisting African American freshmen at a

predominately White institution. Finally, limitations and implications for future research are provided.

Factor Correlations

In Chapter III, a description of factor correlations was provided. As shown in Table 3, the highest correlation was between Factors 1 and 3 (.3987). Factors 2 and 4 had a factor correlation of .3164, whereas Factors 3 and 2 had a correlation of .2146 and Factors 4 and 1 had a correlation of .1932. Considering the correlation between Factors 1 and 3, there is an indication that some similarities, relative to the helpfulness of peer mentors, existed between the two factor groups. Overall, as previously mentioned, the factors do not have high correlations with one another (Brown, 1993; McKeown & Thomas, 1988), therefore the factors are primarily distinct in their expression of the perspective of participants, regarding the helpful behaviors of their assigned mentors.

Factor Interpretation

Chapter III presented the factor analysis, which determined the number of perspectives that existed within the sample population. Participants sorted the Q sort cards that were created from a list of phrases developed from group and individual interviews (refer to The Q Sample in Chapter II). When sorts are highly correlated with one another they are said to be of the same "family" and contain similar views (Brown, 1993, p. 21).

In this study, four factors represented the different ways the participants sorted the helpful behaviors of peer mentors. The factors revealed the statements that distinguished one perspective from the others in the study. Along with the distinguishing

statements for each factor, statements under the +4, +3 (*most helpful*) and -4, -3 (*least helpful*) columns were also used to understand the factor's meaning.

In order to gain an enhanced understanding of the perspectives, follow-up interviews were conducted with some of the participants within the study who loaded significantly on each of the factors. Two interviews were completed for each of the four factors found in the study. In choosing interviewees the researcher considered the following guidelines. First, the researcher looked at the participants with the highest correlations for each factor. From their higher correlations, participants were identified from previous contact that appeared to be more verbal and expressive. The researcher identified male and female participants who had loaded significantly on a factor.

The question for the research was, "What are the perspectives of African American college students relative to the helpfulness of behaviors of peer mentors who assisted them during their freshman year, in a predominantly White institution?"

Factor 1: Providing Tips For Academic Success

The 11 participants who loaded in this group (see Table 9) were participants 5, 10, 16, 18, 24, 25, 28, 29, 34, 36, and 38. Sixty-four percent of the participants on the factor were between the ages of 18 and19 years old, whereas 36% were 20 or 21 years old. Seventy-three percent of this factor group were females, which was also comparable to the overall percentage of females in the sample. Of the participants loading on this factor, only 36% of them possessed grade point averages of 3.00 or above. Fifty-four percent of the participants were freshmen at the time of the Q sort. All of the participants loading on Factor 1 lived on campus (residential).

Table 9

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor 1

Participant	Age	GPA	Gender	Class Rank	Residential/ Commuter	High School Location	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Composition
5	18	3.3	F	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	Advanced	Advanced	Two parent
10	19	2.69	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Associate	Bachelor	Two parent
16	18	2.00	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Some College	Some College	Two parent
18	18	3.50	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	Some College	Two parent
24	20	3.0	M	Sophomore	Residential	Suburban	Some College	Some College	Single
25	19	3.0	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Some College	Some College	Other
28	18	2.3	F	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	HS/GED	Bachelor	Two parent
29	20	2.9	M	Junior	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Two parent
34	19	2.75	F	Sophomore	Residential	Suburban	HS/GED	Some College	Single
36	21	2.90	F	Senior	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Single
38	21	2.95	M	Junior	Residential	Suburban	HS/GED	Less than HS	Two parent

In addition, 45% of participants graduated from suburban high schools, whereas the other 55% graduated from high schools in urban neighborhoods. Relative to the education of the participants' fathers, Factor 1 had the highest percentage of fathers with high school diplomas or General Educational Diplomas (GED). Factor 1 evidenced 54% of participants' fathers who had only high school diplomas or GEDs, whereas Factor 2, 3, and 4 had 40%, 29%, and 43% respectively. Twenty-seven percent of the fathers on Factor 1 had attended some college courses, whereas 18% of the fathers on this factor had graduated from a college or university and obtained either an associates, bachelors, or advanced degree. Relative to the education of participants' mothers, 18% had only a high school diploma or GED, whereas 45% had attended some college courses. Twenty-seven percent of the mothers on Factor 1 had graduated from a college or university and received either a bachelor's or advanced degree. Relative to the family composition, 64% of all participants who loaded on Factor 1 reported having a two-parent family. Twenty-seven percent of participants reported having a single parent family composition. The remaining percentage reflected participants reporting "other," as it pertains to family composition.

Factor 1 contributed 15% of the 47% of explained variance within this sample. Participants #10 and #29 were selected for follow-up interviews because of high factor loadings (0.74 and 0.61 respectively). Participants whose views composed this factor rated the following statements highly:

#	Statement	Factor 1
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	+4

*4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	+4
*12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	+3
*2	My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.	+3
*39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	+3

Note. *represents distinguishing items

Interview comments provided more insight to the reasons why certain items were selected. Participant #10 stated that she selected item #12 as high because she experienced time management challenges as a senior in high school, and did not want to experience the same challenge in college. She stated,

> Coming into college, I knew that I would need someone to assist me with managing my course assignments if I was going to do well. I had a problem with procrastination in high school. I needed someone that would help me get on the ball and stay on task.

She continued by acknowledging her peer mentor for helping her in this area.

> I was really nervous about coming to college. I didn't know if I would pick up the same negative habits as I did when I was a high school senior. I really didn't want to continue struggling in college with procrastination like I did in high school. I was hoping to connect with someone who would show me how to manage time and class work and that's exactly what my mentor did for me.

Participant #29 stated that he selected item # 4 as high because of his desire to receive academic guidance and support that would eventually help him enter the career field of his choice. He said,

> When freshmen first arrive to college, they need guidance. Being an African American male, fresh out of high school and totally unfamiliar with such a big campus, I not only felt socially isolated, but academically isolated. I didn't know anyone. I didn't know who to ask about what. It seemed as though I needed to learn so much, at once. Everything was new to me . . . class structure, the campus, the people, everything. I really needed someone to help me learn how to study. I needed someone to tell me who and where to go to for academic help when I needed it. I also wanted to begin to learn how to build a rapport with the people that were able to tutor and guide me in relation to my career.

Participants within this factor group saw the following as least helpful in relation to the behaviors of their peer mentors:

#	Statement	Factor 1
*13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	-3
*23	My mentor and I had fun together.	-3
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places where other African Americans gather.	-3
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-4
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	-4

Note. *represents distinguishing items

> Participant #10 shared her thoughts, as to why she chose item #13 as not helpful: For me, having a mentor that was close to my age seemed to hinder my mentoring experience. My mentor was only a sophomore. She was pretty quiet. She didn't seem to be as outgoing as me. Maybe I needed someone a little closer in personality, rather than age. Often times I was letting her know campus information, rather than receiving campus related news or information from her. I realize I'm pretty outgoing and that I shouldn't expect everyone else to be like me. Even now when I see her on campus, she still seems to keep to herself and appears kind of quiet. Although I had a pretty good experience with my mentor, I think I would have received a more enriching experience if I had someone who was a few years older and had a few years more of experience with regards to campus life.

Distinguishing statements are items within the sort that express the uniqueness of a factor. By comparing the value Factor 1 participants assigned to each distinguishing statement with the assigned values in the other factor groups, the distinctiveness among each of the factors emerges. The Q sort identified 15 of the statements as "distinguishing" items within Factor 1(see Table 10).

There were 15 distinguishing items for Factor 1, which related to helpful behaviors of peer mentors assisting African American freshmen to adjust at PWIs. Particularly, there were distinguishing items that related to freshmen's desires for academic support and insight during their college adjustment at a PWI. The positive distinguishing items consisted of items # 4, 12, 2, 39, 9, 5, 40, and 11. Item #4, "My

Table 10

Distinguishing Statements Only for Factor 1

No.	Statement	Factor 1 RNK SCORE	
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	2.07*
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	3	1.80
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	3	1.28*
2	My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.	3	1.10*
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	2	0.87
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	2	0.89
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	1	0.48
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	1	0.40*
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was OK.	0	-0.11*
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	-1	-0.36*
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	-1	-0.53*
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	-1	-0.47
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	-1	-0.78
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	-3	-1.12
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	-3	-1.45*

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

mentor informed me of tutoring services," was placed at +4, and suggested the student's desire to be connected to helpful, academic resources. Item #12, "My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments," was placed at + 3, which seemed to suggest this group's understanding of the importance of time management, relative to college life and course work. Item #2, "My mentor explained a typical 'first week' of classes," was placed at +3 for Factor 1, as well. The item expressed a desire to be oriented and perhaps prepared for what would happen during their first academic week of newfound college life. In order to effectively manage academic and perhaps occupational time, it may have been that students loading on Factor 1 found it helpful to have an understanding of what a typical day or week might be like for a college student. Item # 39, "My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal," was also placed at +3. The item indicated the value that this group placed on being reminded that graduation is their main purpose for attending college. Item # 5, "My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance," was placed at +2, which may have indicated the importance that this group placed on understanding college attendance policies, and whether or not regular attendance for certain professors mattered. Item #9, "My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes," was also placed at +2. This item may have suggested the need for this group to obtain useful study skills that would help them successfully accomplish college coursework.

Additionally, several distinguishing common elements among Factor 1 participants were placed at -1. The placement of these items seems to indicate that Factor 1 participants had little desire to become involved with their mentor on a personal, social,

or emotional level, but preferred to remain focused on receiving, peer academic support and guidance. Such items included #28, #17, #29, and #31, which were respectively, "My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture," "My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus," "My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend," and "My mentor helped me gain confidence."

The remaining items included #23, "My mentor and I had fun together," which was placed at -3, and #13, "It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me," which was also placed at -3, and possibly supported the notion that the concerns for a personal, social connection with peer mentors was not meaningful for the Factor 1 participants during their college adjustment at a PWI.

Factor 1 Theme

Specific conclusions were drawn from participants loading on this factor. In particular, 54% of this group was comprised of freshmen. Sixty four percent of factor participants possessed a grade point average between 2.51-3.00, equivalent to a B-/C+. Factor 1 participants seemed to be concerned with obtaining the necessary tips or information that would help them become better academic students. Participants were interested in having a mentor who could help them understand program requirements, such as the grade point average needed to enter their major field of study. Factor 1 also expressed the desire of having a helpful mentor who could assist them in staying focused on the ultimate goal of graduation. This group was interested in learning of services, such as tutoring, that would assist them with coursework. Having a mentor who could help them with the management of class assignments, as well as having a mentor who could

help establish expectations for their first week of classes seemed to be important to this group.

The distinguishing items within this factor had to do with the students' desires to become academically connected with their peer mentors, rather than personally or socially connected. Engagement in non-academic activities with peer mentors did not appear to be a desire of the mentees. Additionally, social integrative issues, specifically, establishing personal relationships among their peer group or attending campus events did not appear to be of priority with students loading on this factor.

Peer mentors seemed to be helpful to this group, only if the mentor could function exclusively as an academic counselor who provided tips for academic success. Academic guidance and support from peer mentors seemed to be perceived as most helpful to the academic integration of this group. Factor 1 participants seemed to realize their areas of weakness; thus, in order to become successful in college, they seemed willing to take the necessary steps to become academically connected to a new, unfamiliar educational environment. Additionally, participants loading on Factor 1 desired to establish goals that led to graduation. Participants loading on this factor seemed to desire an academic mentoring relationship, similar to, metaphorically speaking, an "academic coach." It appeared that such a relationship was thought to offer the mentee helpful methods and useful resources for persisting to graduation.

Factor 2: Interpersonal Connectedness

The 10 participants who loaded in this group were participants 1, 3, 6, 7, 15, 26, 27, 30, 35, and 39 (see Table 11). Fifty percent of the participants were between the ages

Table 11

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor 2

Participant	Age	GPA	Gender	Class Rank	Residential/ Commuter	High School Location	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Composition
1	19	3.08	M	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Some College	Some College	Two Parent
3	18	3.0	F	Freshman	Residential	Rural	HS/GED	HS/GED	Two Parent
6	18	3.5	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Two Parent
7	19	3.2	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Bachelor	Some college	Two Parent
15	19	2.9	F	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	Bachelor	Bachelor	Two Parent
26	21	3.0	F	Junior	Residential	Suburban	HS/GED	Advanced	Aunt/Uncle
27	21	2.5	F	Senior	Commuter	Suburban	HS/GED	Bachelor	Two Parent
30	20	2.7	M	Junior	Commuter	Suburban	Bachelor	Bachelor	Two Parent
35	21	3.4	F	Senior	Residential	Urban	Advanced	Bachelor	Two Parent
39	22	3.9	F	Senior	Residential	Urban	Bachelor	Associate	Two Parent

of 18-19 years old, whereas the other 50% ranged between 20 and 22 years old. This factor was the only group with a participant over 21 years old. Eighty percent of this factor group was females, which was the largest group of females loading on any factor. Relative to the range of grade point, there was a distribution of grade point averages between 2.00 – 3.90, with 70% of participants possessing a grade point average of 3.00 or higher. In comparison to the other three factors, this group in particular had the largest percentage of participants with grade point averages at 3.00 or higher. This factor had the largest percentage of senior level participants (30%). Also, in relation to class rank, all other factors included sophomore participants, whereas Factor 2 had none. In comparison to Factors 1, 3, and 4, Factor 2 was the only factor group that had participants who were commuters (20%). Such a percentage was higher than the total *p*-sample of commuters, in the overall study. Factor 2 was also the only factor with a participant who graduated from a high school that was located in a rural setting. Relative to the education of the participants' fathers and mothers, Factor 2 had the highest percentage of fathers and mothers with a bachelor's degree (40%, respectively). Furthermore, Factor 2 had the highest percentage of participants belonging to households headed by both parents (90%). Factor 2 contributed 13% of the 47% explained variance within this sample. Participants #30 and #35 were selected for follow-up interviews because of high factor loadings (0.60 and 0.80, respectively). Participants whose views composed this factor rated the following statements highly:

#	Statement	Factor 2
*29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	+4

*33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	+4
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	+3
*17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	+3
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	+3

Note. *represents distinguishing items

Participant #30 revealed his rationale for choosing item #6. He spoke of the importance of having a mentor that could directly speak with him about his career:

> Having a mentor who could answer the questions that I had about my major was very important to me. I wanted information up front, so I could know what was expected of me. My mentor was able to direct me to certain resources and was able to provide me with enough information that made me feel more comfortable about pursuing my degree. I had a lot of questions about my major. I had a lot of questions about the steps I needed to take concerning my career. My mentor seemed to help me feel at ease when he was able to respond to my needs and lead me to the appropriate resources. He helped me gain a level of security. He helped me understand more about my purpose as a student here.

Participant #30 also stated why he selected item #33 as high:

> I felt as though I could better relate to someone who was like me. It was important for me to have a mentor who not only had the same personality as me, but someone who also had the same major as me, and someone who came from a similar background as I did. It was helpful for me to have a mentor who liked to laugh and have fun at times, like I do. As a freshman, I wanted to be able to relate

> to someone that could relate to me academically but also in practical ways, like day-to-day activities. I wanted to be able to go into different settings like the recreation center, as well as campus parties with my mentor. My mentor was helpful in everything—not just school related stuff, but personal situations that black males go through in college. I'm outgoing and can get along with almost anyone. I like to help people, like to have fun, but at times I can be very laid back and quiet. It was helpful that me and my mentor shared a lot of the same characteristics because it really helped me relate and connect with him as my mentor. I think it would have been difficult to relate to my mentor and receive his help if we weren't somewhat alike and didn't share similar personalities and lifestyles.

Additionally, participant #35 shared her thoughts about choosing item #33: As with participant #30, participant #35 seemed to value having a mentor with whom she could relate. She indicated that her ability to connect with her mentor strongly supported her transition into college life. She shared,

> When I met my mentor she seemed nice, open, kind and considerate. She and I appeared to have similar personalities. I consider myself as open, kind and considerate toward others—if I'm not that way then I guess what I'm saying is that is how I hope I come across to other people. So having a mentor to give me back the same positive attitude that I extend to her makes things really nice. I was able to get along with her. I could call her whenever I wanted. I think my

adjustment to college would have been a struggle if I didn't have her to turn to when I needed her.

Participants within this factor group saw the following as least helpful in relation to the behaviors of their peer mentors:

#	Statement	Factor 2
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	-3
21	My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.	-3
*27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.	-3
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	-4
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-4

Note. *represents distinguishing items

Participant #35 selected item #3 to respond to because of her academic priorities. She stated,

> For me, social activity didn't out-weigh the priorities I had concerning my academic activities or goals. I wasn't concerned about the party on Friday, but was more concerned about the test on Monday. I would rather listen to a guest presenter rather than go see a play or something social like that. So, having a discussion about whether or not social activity would continue was not real important to me. I simply wasn't interested in staying informed about the social activities around campus.

Participant #35 continued by sharing her rationale for selecting item #30:

> I really didn't have the need or desire to be introduced to members of the opposite sex, especially by someone I considered my mentor. I was already involved in various groups and organizations with both male and female, under and upper classman. I didn't view my mentor as my guide to dating. I simply was not interested in having my mentor introduce me to guys. If I did want to meet someone of the opposite sex, I felt comfortable enough to introduce myself. I didn't come to school for the so-called social life. I entered college with a plan to graduate in 4 years. Becoming involved with the whole boyfriend-girlfriend-dating thing would definitely have been a distraction for me.

There were 15 distinguishing statements on Factor 2 (see Table 12). There were 7 positive distinguishing items. The positive distinguishing items consisted of item #29, 33, 17, 23, 14, 34, and 39. Item #29, "My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend," was placed at + 4, which suggests this factor group values and acknowledges the need for the mentor to be a friend. Factor 1 ranked item #29 as -1 and Factor 3 ranked Item #29 as 0. Both Factors 1 and 3 found little to no relevance in having a peer mentor that was also a friend. However, regarding the +4 ranking of Factor 2, some African American freshmen on a predominately White campus may tend to feel more comfortable accessing campus related information from someone that they consider a personal friend. Item #33, "My mentor and I had the same type of personality," was also placed at + 4, which supports the notion that a freshman may value being guided by someone they perceive to be "like them," versus someone sharing little feelings of personal connection,

Table 12

Distinguishing Statements Only for Factor 2

No.	Statement	Factor 2 RNK SCORE	
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	4	2.16*
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	4	1.92*
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	3	1.13*
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	2	0.91*
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	1	0.63*
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was OK.	1	0.63*
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	1	0.49*
15	My mentor knew when to be funny.	0	0.19*
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	0	0.06
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	0	-0.09*
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	-1	-0.27
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	-1	-0.58*
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	-1	-0.69*
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	-2	-1.19*
27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs, and values that are a part of my culture.	-3	-1.77*

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

which may cause the mentee to feel more at ease, as though they have someone in their lives with whom they can relate. Item # 17, "My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus," was placed at +3, which may have indicated the importance of a freshman's need to remain connected to a resourceful peer. It may also have suggested the need for a freshman to feel welcomed and accepted by a peer or group of peers who may potentially have valuable, useful college and career-related information. Item # 23, "My mentor and I had fun together" was placed at +2, suggesting that some freshmen may view some social time with peer mentors as meaningful.

Of particular note among the negative items, #27, "My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs, and values that are a part of my culture," was placed at –3, which may have indicated the lack of cultural consciousness or this group's high level of connectedness with their culture. Item #28, "My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture," was placed at –2, which also may speak to the lack of desire for cultural awareness or confidence of such.

Factor 2 Theme

The academic adjustment to college did not seem as critical to participants who loaded on Factor 2. In a sense, this group appeared to have academics under control, seeing that 70% of the participants had a 3.00 or higher grade point average. Factor 2 participants seemed to be academically proactive and confident, as this group appeared to be comfortable with taking the initiative to inquire of their own academic career needs. Therefore, this group's perspective was different from Factor 1, relative to the helpfulness of peer mentors. Factor 2 participants did not seem to need as much structure

as Factor 1. For example, needing assistance in understanding how to handle the first week of classes or how to manage time was not of importance to Factor 2 participants. Participants on Factor 2 seemed to be academically ready for college life, but at the same time, very open to having a peer mentor that could offer the kind of guidance that would help them get closer to their graduation goals. Whereas being able to positively relate or connect to a peer mentor seemed important, it was not necessary for this group to be "be-friended" by their peer mentor, relative to social fun. Those loading on Factor 2 appeared to have an understanding of what they needed to assist them academically, this group seemed to need the positive relationship of a peer who would almost serve as a "human google." In other words, this group needed a peer mentor who was consistently available to provide answers and academic guidance, as needed. Once given the information, this group appeared to take the initiative to accomplish their academic goals. This group seemed to value the kind of peer mentoring relationship that was supportive yet easy going, where a sense of interpersonal connectedness existed. Such may indicate that this group was confident in taking initiative, nevertheless appreciated remaining connected to their peer mentor. With 70% of this factor group possessing a 3.00 or higher grade point average, with 90% of participants coming from two-parent homes of which many of these parents had earned bachelor degrees, the participants of Factor 2 may have experienced a great deal of support and college preparation directly from within their homes.

Factor 3: Accessible and Knowledgeable

The seven participants who loaded significantly in this group were participants 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 22, and 40 (see Table 13). Factor 3 held the smallest group of 18-19 year

Table 13

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor 3

Participant	Age	GPA	Gender	Class Rank	Residential/ Commuter	High School Location	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Composition
8	20	3.20	Female	Sophomore	Residential	Urban	Bachelor	Bachelor	Two Parent
9	20	2.75	Female	Sophomore	Residential	Suburban	Some College	Some College	Two Parent
11	20	3.80	Female	Sophomore	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Other
17	18	2.00	Female	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Less Than High School	HS/GED	Other
19	20	3.90	Female	Freshman	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Other
22	19	3.11	Male	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	HS/GED	Associate	Two Parent
40	21	2.27	Male	Junior	Residential	Suburban	Some college	Some college	Single

olds (29%). Of the total participants loading on this factor, 71% were between 20-21 years old, which was the highest percentage of all four factors. Relative to grade point average, 57% of participants possessed a 3.00 grade point average or higher. Relative to gender, 71% of the participants loading on this factor were female. Freshmen loaded on this factor at 43%. Sophomores also loaded on this factor at 43%. Only one junior participant loaded on Factor 3. No senior participants loaded on this factor. Of the students loading on Factor 3, 100% resided on campus. Forty-three percent of participants loading on Factor 3 graduated from high schools in suburban areas, whereas 57% of participants graduated from high schools in urban areas. Relative to the education of the participants' fathers, 14% possessed a bachelor's degree, 28% had completed some college coursework, 43% had only a high school diploma or GED, and 14% had less than a high school education. Interestingly, the mothers' educational backgrounds of Factor 3 participants seem to mirror the educational background of the fathers of Factor 3 participants. For instance, regarding the mothers of Factor 3 participants, 14% possessed a bachelor's degree, 28% had completed some college coursework, and 43% had only a high school diploma or GED. In contrast to the fathers' backgrounds, there was one Factor 3 participant that reported having a mother who possessed an associate's degree. Relative to family composition, 43% of participants loading on this factor reported living in a two parent family, whereas only 14% reported living with one parent. Factor 3 was the only factor that reported "other" (43%), relative to family composition. Regarding this large percentage of "other" being reported, there was no further description provided

by the participants. Participants whose views composed this factor provided a high rating for the following statements:

#	Statement	Factor 3
*19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	+4
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	+4
*38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	+3
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	+3
*24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	+3

Note. *represents distinguishing items

> Participant #19 revealed why she chose item #19 as high:
>
> My mentor seemed to know everything. She knew where I could go for advice . . . all kinds of advice like academic advising and financial aid help. It didn't matter what question or concern I had, if she didn't know the answer herself she was quick to find out who might be able to help me. I also wanted to be involved in campus life. I wanted to be actively involved in campus life and meet people. I wanted a job. I wanted to know my campus. I figured I'd do better if I could be involved in programs or activity that would help me adjust to my new life, academically and socially. It was important for me to be involved with my campus as a student, and my mentor's knowledge about campus resources enabled me to do just that.

Participant 19 discussed why she chose #40 as high:

> My mentor made it easy for me to talk to her. She never made me feel uncomfortable or awkward asking those freshmen kinds of questions. She always appeared to be willing to listen to me. She had a way of making me feel really comfortable enough to share certain, personal things with her. If she wasn't easy to talk to, as a freshman I don't believe I would have shared as much with her or gone to her for her feedback regarding certain things I was going through. We both had the same major, which seemed to make communication easier. We were both science majors and if I needed to talk science—she understood me. She was very calm and easy going. She never appeared stressed! She never appeared to have any problems even though I know she did because she was a student like me! Her sense of calmness and peace made me very comfortable in talking with her. We had an awesome, awesome year together. I did very well academically and socially. I think having my mentor played a big part of my success.
>
> Participant #29 chose item #40 as high because
>
> It helped to have someone to go to and to know that this someone would welcome you every time. That's how my mentor made me feel. He was always approachable. He never made me feel as though I was being a bother or inconveniencing him.

Participant #29 acknowledged the importance of having an accessible mentor, who was knowledgeable about his (the mentee's) program major. He stated,

> Me and my mentor had the same major. He helped me pick classes and instructors that would be useful and suitable for my particular field of study. My mentor was

like my personal advisor. One of the greatest things for me, as a freshman was to be able to talk to someone when I needed to. My mentor also became my fraternity brother, which made communication between the two of us even easier. My mentor was down to earth and was willing to help me in whatever way I needed it.

Participant #40 stated his purpose for choosing item #18 as high:

I chose #18 because understanding the issues surrounding my GPA was huge for me—really eye opening. My mentor explained that I must maintain a certain GPA to remain in my major. I wasn't aware of that before my mentor made mention of it. He told me to work a little harder and to aim as high as possible in terms of getting good grades. My mentor also told me the importance of protecting my GPA. In other words, he told me not to wait too late to drop a course if it was getting too difficult to manage. He followed up by letting me know that I needed to register for the course again, as soon as I knew I would have time to focus better on the course material.

Participant #40 added his feelings about the helpfulness of his mentor, as it related to balancing campus fun and academics. He said,

Honestly, as a freshman, I didn't want to come to college for the academics. I was one of those students that simply wanted the social, playful side of college life. However, my mentor helped me gain focus and talked to me about the importance of learning how to balance campus fun and academics. He helped me understand why I needed to take my college experience more serious. He helped

me realize that protecting my GPA and my academic experience was like protecting my future. He talked to me about his past mistakes as a college student and showed me what he did to become a better, more focused student. That really helped me.

Participants within this factor group saw the following as least helpful in relation to the behaviors of their peer mentors:

#	Statement	Factor 3
*34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	-3
*30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-3
*2	My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.	-3
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.	-4
*33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	-4

Note. *represents distinguishing items

Participant #19 stated her reason for choosing item #20 as low:

If I want to go somewhere, I often go alone. There are times that I go places with a few friends, but I definitely don't see myself as hanging out with my mentor. I probably would have made the connection to other African American students on my own, even if I didn't have the friends that I do. I am pretty much an academic person, more so than a social one, anyway. I have my own set of friends and know how to make them. I chose to have a mentor because I wanted to be influenced, more so, academically rather than socially.

Participant #40 spoke of his choice in selecting item #33. He noted,

> I don't feel like I need to be so-called-friends with my mentor in order to get things accomplished. For me, personality doesn't really matter. If my mentor is here to pass along information to me that will help me academically, then that's all to it. As long as we can get along and communicate clearly, I think we are able to put our differences aside, if need be.

Participant #40 also stated why he chose item #34, and he related this choice to his childhood past:

> I'm pretty much a self-starter. As long as I can remember, that's how I've been. Even as a kid, I never really needed anyone to check up on me. Being a college student, I definitely don't need anyone to check in on me. My mom was young when she became pregnant with me. She was 22 years old and single, when I was born. She said she wasn't very focused on her own life when she had me. I was the only child. Somehow I became pretty independent, and many times I took matters into my own hands. I guess I eventually had to learn how to take initiative regarding my life and the things that mattered to me. At certain times, my mother was not very engaging or helpful in certain areas of my life with me. As a result, I learned how to help myself, or either find the kind of help that I needed.

There were 17 distinguishing statements for Factor 3 (see Table 14). They included statements 19, 24, 38, 39, 25, 31, 9, 13, 29, 12, 6, 11, 34, 2, 30, 20, and 33. The positive statements were 19, 24, 38, 39, 25, 31, and 9. The neutral statements were 13, 29, 12, 6, and 11. The negative statements were 34, 2, 30, 20, and 33. Of the more

Table 14

Distinguishing Statements Only for Factor 3

No.	Statement	Factor 3 RNK SCORE	
19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	4	2.06*
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	3	1.36*
38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	3	1.29*
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	2	1.26
25	My mentor was accessible by email.	2	1.16*
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	1	0.45*
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	1	0.35
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	0	0.30*
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	0	0.12*
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	0	0.03
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	0	0.02*
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	0	-0.08
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	-3	-1.29*
2	My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.	-3	-1.36*
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-3	-1.40
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places where other African Americans gather.	-4	-1.80
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	-4	-2.18*

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

defining items, #19, “My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources,” was placed at +4, possibly indicating the value of having a mentor that could help them identify resources on campus that would assist them in adjusting to a new academic and social environment. Item #24, “My mentor was accessible by cell phone,” was placed at +3, suggesting the significance of being able to personally connect to someone in the time of need. Item #38, “My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment,” was placed at +3, which may suggest the value that this group places on having a peer mentor that was aware of the importance of maintaining a certain quality of character as college students. Item #39, “My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal,” was placed at +2, indicating that this group may have valued the knowledge their peer mentor had regarding the academic issues surrounding graduation. Item #25, “My mentor was accessible by email,” was placed at +2, which may suggest that emailing is also a helpful method in remaining personally connected, but not as helpful as remaining accessible by cell phone, as previously discussed.

Other relevant distinguishing items related to the lack of desire or concern that this group had toward developing intimate, personable, and social relationships with their peer mentors. For instance, item #34, “My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok,” was placed at -3. Item #2, “My mentor explained a typical first week of classes,” was placed at -3. Item #30, “My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex,” was placed at -3. Item #20, “My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus where other African Americans gather,” was placed at -4. Item # 33, “My mentor and I had the same type of personality,” was placed at -4. Although many of the items suggested the

peer mentor's knowledge in particular areas, such as understanding the agenda of the first week of classes or having knowledge of the various locations that African American students gather, such items may have received a low ranking because this group did not feel as though they would have benefited from this type of information.

Factor 3 Theme

Factors 1 and 3 are moderately related in that both factor groups addressed the importance of being able to obtain information from their mentors that was related to their academic lives. Both factor groups also addressed the insignificance of having a peer mentor that would become culturally or closely involved in their lives (e.g., item #20 was negatively ranked on both factors, "My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus, where other African Americans gather," and item #30, "My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex."). Relative to differences between Factor 3 and Factor 1, age or maturity appeared to be an issue in that 71% of the participants were between 20-21 years old. Factor 3 also appears to differ from Factor 1 in that participants loading on Factor 3 seemed to be more academically focused. For instance, 57% of the participants possessed a grade point average of 3.00 or higher, whereas for Factor 1, 54% of the participants were freshmen and only 36% of the participants possessed a grade point average of 3.00 or higher. In addition, individuals loading on Factor 3 did not seem as structure seeking as those on Factor 1. For instance, Factor 1 viewed having a peer mentor inform them of tutoring services (item #4 ranked at +4), having a mentor explain what the first week of classes would be like (item #2 ranked at +3), and having a peer mentor help them manage class assignments (item #12 ranked at

+3) as very helpful. Factor 3, on the other hand, demonstrated that they were not interested in certain structure seeking tips from a peer mentor, such as learning what the first week of classes would be like. Factor 3 participants seemed to desire a mentor that would efficiently respond to their academic inquiries and needs, given the positive ranking placed on item #24 ("My mentor was accessible by cell phone.") and item #25 ("My mentor was accessible by email."). Relative to Factor 3, friendship with a mentor did not seem to be as important as having a mentor that could provide immediate access to knowledge and resources. As evidenced in the interview excerpts, participants on Factor 3 also seemed to become more academically confident as their peer mentors were able to connect them to college resources, as well as provide them with academic information that lead to academic success. Additionally, this group was distinct from all other factor groups, in that having a mentor that encouraged them to exercise good academic judgment was expressed as highly important. For instance, participants on this factor expressed the helpfulness in having a mentor that assisted them in re-focusing on academic priorities, in the event that they were distracted by too much social fun. Consistency, availability, approachableness, and knowledgeable were the primary mentor behaviors that seemed to help this particular group.

Factor 4: Nurturing Friendship

The seven participants who loaded in this group were participants 4, 12, 13, 20, 23, 31, and 33 (see Table 15). At 86%, Factor 4 held the highest population of 18-19 year olds and held the highest percentage of freshmen (71%). No seniors loaded on this factor.

Table 15

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor 4

Participant	Age	GPA	Gender	Class Rank	Residential/ Commuter	High School Location	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Family Composition
4	19	3.0	F	Sophomore	Residential	Suburban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Single
12	19	3.30	F	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	Some College	Advanced	Single
13	19	3.0	M	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	N/A	Some College	Grandparents
20	18	2.5	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	HS/GED	Single
23	20	3.0	M	Junior	Residential	Urban	HS/GED	Associate	Single
31	19	2.0	F	Freshman	Residential	Urban	Some College	HS/GED	Two Parent
33	18	2.20	F	Freshman	Residential	Suburban	Associate	HS/GED	Single

Relative to grade point average, 57% of participants possessed a 3.00 or above. Relative to gender, Factors 4 and 3 were identical, in that 71% of those loading on the factors were female and 29% were male. Similarly, of the students loading on Factor 4, as in Factor 3, 100% of participants lived on campus. Again, Factors 4 and 3 shared identical demographics regarding participants who graduated from high schools in urban (43%) and suburban (57%) areas. Relative to the education of the participants' parents, this factor was the only factor that had a participant report father's education as "not applicable." Over half of the mothers (57%) of the participants loading on this factor were reported as having attained a high school diploma and/or GED. Relative to family composition, Factor 4 held the largest single parent population, by far, at 71%. Factor 4 was also the only group having a grandparent as head of a household. Participants whose views composed this factor provided a high rating for the following statements.

#	Statement	Factor 4
*40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	+4
*34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	+4
*4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	+3
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	+3
*31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	+3

Note. *represents distinguishing items

Participant # 13 expressed his view of item #31 and explained why he selected it as high:

When it was time for me to come to Kent, I really lacked confidence in myself. I had problems with acne the summer just before my first semester as a freshman began. I was very upset because of how my face looked and my confidence became very low. My mentor helped me break out of my shell. I thought I wasn't good enough to fit in—to be on campus. My acne problem kept me depressed and isolated a bit, but my mentor managed to help me feel more confident about myself, in spite of my acne. My mentor introduced me to people and connected me to people and campus resources. He really helped me build my confidence as a freshman.

Participant #31 reported why she selected item #40:

I came to a big campus and didn't know anyone when I arrived. My mentor was encouraging. I came into contact with 'stuck up' people. I even heard some of my own instructors and peers say that I probably wouldn't have the GPA to get into my program. However, my mentor never talked down to me. Although I received a lot of discouragement from faculty and friends alike, my mentor continued to encourage me in the midst of it all. To have a mentor say "you can do this" was so relieving. She constantly related her personal experience, to what I was going through and was very down to earth. She really kept me encouraged through a very tough time.

#	Statement	Factor 4
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	-3
*14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	-3

32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	-3
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	-4
*5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	-4

Note. *represents distinguishing items

Participant #13 shared his reason for selecting item #5 as low. He stated,

> Most professors didn't seem to care about attendance. Most of my classes were lecture classes and attendance was not taken. Maybe this would have mattered later on, but as a freshman, understanding how professors viewed attendance was of no importance to me. In my opinion, it didn't appear that professors really paid attention to who was or was not in the classroom. It didn't take me long to understand that I needed to be accountable to myself and attend class. I didn't need anyone to help me with that.

Participant #31 shared her reason for choosing item #3. She said,

> My goal for coming to college is to graduate. Even though I didn't do well my first semester, it wasn't because of my need to be socially involved. I really am more concerned about my academics, far more than I am in hanging out around campus. So to have a mentor tell me there would be less social activities after the first week of course work wouldn't have made a difference for me. I didn't come to school looking for a schedule of social activities.

There were 15 distinguishing items on Factor 4 that related to the helpfulness of a nurturing friendship (see Table 16). There were 9 positive distinguishing items (Statements 34, 40, 4, 31, 29, 20, 10, 12, and 24) and 5 negative distinguishing items

Table 16

Distinguishing Statements Only for Factor 4

No.	Statement	Factor 4 RNK	Factor 4 SCORE
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	4	2.34*
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	4	2.03*
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	3	1.30*
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	3	1.34*
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	2	0.93*
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	2	0.88*
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	1	0.67
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.	1	0.45*
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	1	0.52
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	0	0.14*
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	-1	-0.25*
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	-1	-0.49*
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	-1	-0.51
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	-3	-1.44*
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	-4	-1.64*

Note. No Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .05$; Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

Both the Factor Q Sort Value and the Normalized Score are shown.

(Statements 16, 30, 39, 5, and 14). Among the items noted as more important, item #34, "My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok," was placed at + 4, which might speak to this particular group's need for one-on-one attention. Participants on Factor 4 uniquely stood out from Factor 1 participants, regarding the need for a peer mentor to "check on them." Unlike Factor 4, participants loading on Factor 1 placed very little relevance in Item #34. Item #40, "My mentor was easy to talk to," was also placed at +4, which may speak to the group's perspective on having someone in whom they could confide. Item #4, "My mentor informed me of tutoring services," was placed at + 3, which indicated this group's interest in being aware of the available academic support services. Item #31,"My mentor helped me gain confidence," was placed at + 3, which related to the value that this group placed on feeling self-assured. Item #29, "My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend," was placed at +2, again indicating friendship and the building of interpersonal relationships was helpful during their college transition as freshmen. Item #10, "In addition to academic activity, my mentor and I shared in social activity, too," was placed at + 2, which also reiterated the value that this group placed on building nurturing friendships in social settings, as well as academic settings.

Additionally, certain distinguishing items were not positively associated with Factor 4. For example, item #39, "My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal," was placed at -1, indicating that this group may not have valued conversation with the peer mentor regarding graduation as a main goal. Item #14, "My mentor knew when to be serious," was placed at -3, indicating that knowing when to be serious may not have been important to this group. Item #5, "My mentor helped me

understand how some professors view class attendance," was placed at -4, which suggested that this group was not concerned with the mentor's personal viewpoint on attending class. It may have also suggested that this group intended on attending class regularly, regardless of the views of their peer mentor. Although graduation goals, issues of seriousness, and mentor's viewpoints on class attendance may not have been of importance to this particular group, it is possible that the participants of this group may have already had an understanding in these areas and merely did not need it explained by their assigned peer mentor.

Factor 4 Theme

Factor 4 was distinct from all the other factors, in that receiving nurturance from their mentor was the main focus. It seemed that having a confidant who would listen and provide one-on-one attention and reassurance regarding new college life was most important. Although Factor 4 participants found it helpful to receive academic, tutorial guidance, this group seemed to be more concerned with having a peer mentor to talk to as well as having a peer mentor who would check in on them to make sure they were okay. College success for this group seemed to be directly related to having an individual who could consistently "cheer them on to academic victory." For instance, interview excerpts from participants loading on Factor 4 included comments such as "to have a mentor say 'you can do this' was so relieving," and "she really kept me encouraged through a tough time." Having a mentor who could consistently check on them, similar to a parent, seemed to be very helpful. In order for Factor 4 participants to thrive, receiving approval and affirmations from mentors appeared important.

Results as Informed by Literature

Factor 1

Some literature supports participants' views from Factor 1, *Providing Tips For Academic Success*. Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994), Schwitzer et al. (1999), as well as Boulter (2002) have addressed issues of academic integration, specifically related to African American students. Relative to Factor 1, the themes that emerged were issues related to academic integration, such as college preparedness and academic guidance.

According to Flowers (2006), academic integration includes those experiences that students have on a college campus that support academic development, encourage cognitive development, and enhance a student's motivation to pursue academic tasks in a meaningful way. Participant #10 stated that due to her perceived time management and procrastination challenges during high school, she wanted to be sure that she did not have similar challenges as a freshman in college. She expressed a desire to become a better student in college, but seemed nervous about beginning college life, for fear of repeating negative academic habits that occurred during high school. She also seemed to lack some of the necessary skills that often facilitate academic success, such as study skills that support time management strategies. This participant also appeared to be experiencing a degree of fear as it related to starting college life. Participant #29 expressed being unfamiliar with campus life, both academically and socially. In addition, he seemed overwhelmed with the size of the college campus and expressed feelings of academic and social isolation. Although this participant seemed interested in his major and future career possibilities, he often spoke of the "newness" of college life and his lack of knowledge,

concerning life as a college student on a new campus. According to Hicks (2005), certain fears or doubts that some freshmen students have about college life, particularly at a PWI, can often be diminished if college preparation is provided for students, such as those loading on Factor 1.

Bowen and Bok (1998) suggested that academic preparation issues are one of the factors that can complicate the college adjustment of African American students. They indicated that some African American students may arrive at college, unprepared for the challenge of college life, because they may not have been prepared academically or socially. Although the concept of college readiness appears to be somewhat murky (Cline, Bissell, Hafner, & Katz, 2007; Olsyn, 2006; Phillips & Skelly, 2006), literature has suggested that being college-ready not only involves fulfilling academic eligibility requirements (Cline et al., 2007), but also involves the mental readiness necessary for post-high school success (Phillips & Skelly, 2006).

Furthermore, the Schwitzer and Thomas (1998) study (previously mentioned in Chapter I) on African American students and college adjustment supports the views expressed by Factor 1 participants. The Schwitzer and Thomas study indicated that participants had concerns related to class and time management issues, procrastination, and certain educational skill difficulties, as they pertained to their adjustment at a PWI. As a result of the study, Schwitzer and Thomas agreed that under-preparedness and a general lack of knowledge in a particular content were primary issues of African American students adjustment at a PWI. Additionally, Pounds (1990) and Schwitzer et al. (1999) suggested that African American students, whether attending public or private

institutions, are often under-prepared academically. Nasim, Roberts, Harrell, and Young (2005) purported that minority students who are academically successful at the collegiate level generally have a strong academic support. Such support may come in many forms and may provide different levels of support, such as academic assistance, cultural and individual affirmation, assistance finding available personal resources, and guidance in the process of psychosocial adjustment and development (Nasim et al.). Thus, relative to African American students, the need for academic support is warranted.

Participants loading on Factor 1 appeared to be unprepared for the academic challenge of college life, however a peer mentor could be helpful to Factor 1 participants, if the peer mentor assisted the first year, freshman student in becoming more academically and mentally prepared. Participants loading on Factor 1 appeared to be in need of academic support and help identifying academic resources and obtaining guidance that would support their academic adjustment. Peer mentors may be of assistance to some African American students by providing specific tips that help them successfully adjust academically, as first year freshman students. The academic tips might be as general as providing examples of how college life as a freshman will differ from the life lived as a senior in high school, or as specific as offering certain skills that will help the mentee study for certain courses and exams. Other tips might include ways to avoid procrastination and how to effectively manage time. Providing tips on how to navigate around large campuses, as well as helping the mentee learn the location of various campus buildings and residence halls would also be helpful.

In summary, Factor 1 participants represent the voices of some African American freshmen students who are academically adjusting at PWIs. The literature has suggested that high-school and college and university administration must become actively involved in providing African American students with college adjustment support, that will assist students who have similar issues as the participants loading on Factor 1 (Hicks, 2005; Hyslop, 2006). Relative to the perspectives of participants loading on Factor 1, some African American students may find it helpful to have peer mentors that can offer academic guidance and support that lead to academic success.

Factor 2

Some literature supports the views expressed by the participants who loaded on Factor 2, *Interpersonal Connectedness*. Social integration and adjustment, as referred to in the literature, support this group's perspectives on the helpfulness of their peer mentors, during college adjustment. As indicated in Chapter I, social integration was referred to as a student's ability to interface with the institution's social system (Boulter, 2002; Tinto, 1987). Social integration of a college student often involves the frequency and quality of contact with peers and faculty, shared values in non-academic areas, and involvement in the life of the institution outside the classroom (Boulter, 2002; Tinto, 1987). Social integration includes those experiences that help to connect students to the college environment, that aid in their psychosocial development, and that contribute to their overall satisfaction in college. For instance, participant #30 reported feeling helped as his peer mentor was able to connect him to certain academic and career resources on campus. He also expressed feelings of being supported as his peer mentor was able to

answer questions related to the completion of his degree. The participant, as well as other participants of Factor 2, appeared to experience satisfaction in connecting to the college environment, as their peer mentors were able to personally connect and relate on both the academic and social level (i.e., laughing and having fun, as well as discussing important academic issues).

Factor 2 evidenced themes directly related to social integration. Participants on Factor 2 found it very helpful to have a peer mentor they could consider a friend, not merely for socializing purposes but as a foundation to build a strong, useful academic relationship. It was important for this group to frequently connect with their peer mentors, as friends, in and out of the classroom, socially, in order to strengthen themselves academically. Factor 2 participants strongly emphasized the importance of having a friendly interpersonal relationship with their peer mentor that led to academic success. According to Chiang, Hunter, and Yeh (2004), support networks, such as peers, family, and mentors, facilitate adjustment to college. Chiang et al. also stated that some college students cope by relying on peer support and that peer network models have been utilized in working with racial and ethnic minority college students.

Factor 2 was unique in that the majority (80%) of participants were female, possessing grade point averages of 3.00 or higher. The majority (90%) of participants came from two-parent households. Seventy percent of the participants had parents who held college or university degrees. While the research remains scant, relative to the importance of African American families in supporting college adjustment (Hinderlie & Kenny, 2002), the Factor 2 demographics (90% of Factor 2 participants with both mother

and father in home) suggested that interpersonal relationships with certain family members might also be supportive and helpful, in conjunction with having a peer mentor. Chiang et al. (2004), Wallace and Constantine (2005), and Jackson and Sears (1992) all suggested that the African American culture possesses worldviews that emphasize the importance of human relationship, reliance on strong social network ties, and interconnectedness with people. Because of the diversity that exists within all cultures, many African American students may live outside of the African American worldview. However, relative to the participants loading on Factor 2, the African American worldview of human relationship, strong ties, and interconnectedness appeared noteworthy. For this group, having the parental support and benefit of an academic role model directly in the home might speak to the academic drive and motivation of this group to further pursue interpersonal and academically supportive relationships with a peer mentor, on campus.

Factor 3

Literature regarding accessibility to campus resources supports the views of participants loading on Factor 3, *Accessible and Knowledgeable*. According to Hinderlie and Kenny (2002), on campus support contributes to academic success, social satisfaction, and college completion among African American undergraduates. They also shared that on-campus networks and supports have appeared to buffer some of the many stressors often associated with college life. Although obtaining insight to available campus resources may be difficult for some African American students attending PWIs, literature reported that African American students often valued affiliation with a

supportive community that offered advice in navigating the institutional systems and processes (Hinderlie & Kenny). Participants loading on Factor 3 valued the support received from their peer mentor, relative to campus resources. Factor 3 members not only appreciated having a peer mentor that could point them in the direction of certain campus resources, but this group was appreciative toward their peer mentor's consistent availability and reliable advice. As mentioned in Chapter II, Jucovy (2001) and Johnson and Sullivan (1995) reported that mentors who were consistently available, reliable, and willing to provide valuable advice proved to be helpful to mentees. Those loading on Factor 3 seemed to be positively struck by the fact that their peer mentor encouraged the use of good judgment. As previously mentioned in Chapter I, relative to peer mentors sharing their thoughts regarding the use of good judgment with their mentees, Struchen and Porta (1997) shared that mentoring relationships have frequently been characterized by emotional openness, such as discussions that might include comments on exercising good judgment and making good decisions that may ultimately impact their academic future. Factor 3 participants referred to the helpfulness of their peer mentor sharing personal experiences and consistently providing advice, regarding academic, as well as personal issues. The consistent support regarding on-campus resources received by Factor 3 participants, was viewed as helpful.

Factor 4

The literature, relative to traditional, formal mentoring, supports the views of participants loading on Factor 4, *Nurturing Friendship*. Having nurturing and caring peer mentoring relationships was significant to this group, as this group sought to build

relationships with peer mentors that would ultimately cause them to develop academically. Earlier in Chapter II, literature reported that the overall purpose of mentoring, whether formal or natural, was to facilitate relationship building, information sharing, and reflective thinking within the mentee that will encourage the mentee to take the initiative for independent growth and learning (Hansman, 2002). Additionally discussed in Chapter I, mentoring in the traditional sense has become largely known as a nurturing processes, in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, advises, and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person (Guetzloe, 1997; McPartland & Nettles, 1991; Morrison, 2003; Townsel, 1997; United States Department of Justice, 1998; Wright, 1992). Factor 4 participants clearly expressed a need for a peer mentor that could teach, encourage, and offer advisement, while also serving as a nurturing friend. This group appeared to rely on the nurturing friendship of their mentors, in order to be self-assured about their new college life. Paul and Brier (2001) previously mentioned that the transition to college might cause some freshmen to develop patterns of thinking that lead to self-doubt, disappointments, and even self-defeating habits. Kenny and Perez (1996) added that some freshmen students might question their relationships, identity, direction in life, and self-worth, during the transition to college. It may be likely that Factor 4 participants could have experienced self-doubt or began to question their identity as freshmen; however, this group evidently realized the meaningfulness and usefulness of a nurturing, encouraging relationship with a peer mentor.

Limitations

The reader should keep in mind a few limitations when reviewing the results of this study. First, the sample drawn for the group and individual interviews were freshmen students. However, in order to meet "success criteria" the researcher had to deviate from the original sampling plan to use only freshmen. In order to obtain a sufficient sample (n = 40), the researcher had to use freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The researcher found it necessary to deviate from the original plan of utilizing all freshmen for the Q sort, due to not having a sufficient number of freshmen who consented to do the Q sort and met the required grade point average. Thus a portion of the sample (19) performed sorts based on their ability to remember college life as a freshman. Thus, it is possible that these students may have forgotten certain feelings or needs they had during their freshman year. They might have answered differently in their freshman year. Hence, the outcome of this study may have been different if all participants were only male and female freshmen.

Secondly, the majority of participants involved in this study were African American female. The female to male ratio of the participants in this study was 72.50% female to 27.50% male. During the time of this study, of the 18,136 students enrolled at the university in which the research was conducted, only 1,496 were African American students (www.kent.edu/rpie/upload/2007-08studentsection.pdf). Of the total student population, 5.5% were African American female and 2.8% were African American male. The results of the study may have been different had the voices of African American males been better represented.

Lastly, with respect to the results of this study, it remains important for the reader to acknowledge the diversity that exists within the African American culture. Whereas some literature supported this research study, relative to the academic and social needs of some African American students, there is also literature that supported other needs of African American students attending PWIs (Neville et al., 1997; Terenzini et al., 1996). Although the literature seemed to generalize the academic and social needs of some African American students, the results of this study appears to challenge some of the literature, relative to the needs of African American students (i.e., African American worldview, academic under-preparedness, social integration). Because of the significant diversity that exists among African American students, especially the participants of this study, certain perspectives regarding the helpfulness of mentors that proved true for some participants did not prove to be true for other participants.

Implications for Future Research

The findings and limitations of this study suggest further research in the area of mentoring and college adjustment for African American freshmen. The continued study of related issues pertaining to mentoring and the college adjustment of African American freshmen may be helpful in aiding faculty and administrators in higher education, counselor educators, high school counselors, faculty and administrators, and programs that seek to serve African American freshmen. The continued study of such may also be helpful for university counselor educators and counselors in practices that seek to effectively teach or counsel African American freshmen, enrolled at a predominately White institution.

Although this study sought to gain the perspectives of African American students, it may be meaningful to further this line of research by obtaining the perspectives of faculty, as well as African American freshmen, as to the variety of methods that might facilitate academic and social integration, outside of the classroom. In doing so, it is possible that the results from such studies may identify additional practices that can be implemented toward developing a stronger academic and social network for African American students enrolled at a predominately White institution.

As evidenced in this study, peer mentoring may have been helpful for some African American freshmen during their first year of college adjustment. Due to the limited research relative to parental support and the college adjustment of African American students, research studies focusing on family support as it relates to the success of African American freshmen may be useful. Perspectives from two parent families, as well as single parent families who have freshmen entering a predominately White institution, may have information that is useful for the effectiveness of peer mentoring programs.

Research relative to "Best Practices in Peer Mentoring Programs" may also be informative. Such research might be conducted with the assistance of administrators, faculty, and mentors who participate either as staff or mentors, within peer mentoring programs designed for African American freshmen, attending PWIs. Having the viewpoints of these individuals, as to what they perceived as effective in developing viable peer mentoring programs may be informative. Additionally, related to research involving "Best Practices In Peer Mentoring," the development of a peer mentoring

assessment device that is designed to identify the type of peer mentor that a student desired may be useful. The student mentees could be matched with the appropriate mentor, as identified by the assessment device and then formally assigned to the peer mentor for one academic year. Specific academic goals, expressed by the student mentee in tandem with the mentor, would be established at the onset of the mentoring relationship. Academic success would be established as the criterion variable for the study. Such a study might demonstrate that the peer mentee's self-selection of a certain type of peer mentor may be effective in helping them academically and socially adjust as African American freshman at a PWI.

Conclusion

This study utilized Q methodology to examine the perspectives of African American college students, relative to the helpful behaviors of peer mentors who assisted them during their freshman year in a predominantly White institution. The study involved 40 African American participants who sorted 40 statements identifying various views of the helpfulness of their peer mentor's behaviors on a continuum of *most helpful* (+4) to *least helpful* (-4). The results of the data were factor analyzed and rotated. Four factors emerged from the resulting data. The factors represented the groupings of different perspectives expressed by the participants. The factor interpretations, as well as the suggested implications of the study's findings, were the responsibility of the researcher, and were the purpose of this chapter.

As a result of this research, it was discovered that different groups of students have different perceived needs. Some students needed a peer mentor who could provide

them with tips for academic success, such as informing them of tutoring services or assisting them with time management. Some students needed the type of peer mentor relationship that offered a personal connectedness with one's mentor. On the contrary, other students lacked interest in social relationships with their peer mentor and simply desired an accessible relationship with the mentor who could provide helpful information, when needed. While this research study was comprised of only 40 students, undoubtedly there are other groups of students who would report receiving differing assistance from their peer mentors. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine and give voice to the perceptions of some African American college students, relative to helpful behaviors of the peer mentors who have mentored them, in making the adjustment at a predominately White university, during their freshman year.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPLICATIONS (INTERVIEWS AND Q SORT) FOR APPROVAL

TO USE HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL TO USE HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Send completed forms to one of the reviewers designated for your Department or Katherine Light, Research and Graduate Studies, 113 University Auditorium

LOG NUMBER 07-303

Form can be downloaded from http://www.kent.edu/rags-alpha/forms/

Please type all information. HANDWRITTEN FORMS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED. Move through the document using TAB or Mouse. Do not use the enter Key. To mark a box, click with the mouse.

Name: Felicia M. Townsend
Telephone: 330-908-1500 **Address:** 2000 Heron Glen Ct. Macedonia, Oh 44056 **Email:** ftownsen@kent.edu

Department: ACHVE-CHDS **FacultyRank/StudentStatus:** Doctoral Candidate

Project Title: Perceptions of African American College Freshmen Relative To The Helpful Behaviors of Intrusive Peer Mentors Who Assisted Them During College Adjustment In a Predominately White Institution

Type of Project: ☐ **FACULTY RESEARCH** ☐ **External Funded (Agency:**) Include copy of proposal
STUDENT DIRECTED RESEARCH (Advisor: DR.) BUBENZER
☐ Thesis ☒ Dissertation ☐ Course Requirement (Course #:)
☐ Other (Specify:)

Duration of Project: Starting Date: 1/10/2007 (But not before approval is obtained)
Ending Date: 12/15/2007

I certify that the research procedures for this project and the method of obtaining consent (if any), as approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board, will be followed during the period covered by this research project. Any future changes will be submitted for Board review and approval prior to implementation.

If this project involves approval/permission from other institutions, the principal investigator (and the faculty advisor if the PI is a student) must sign below to certify the following statement: "I/we will not begin research at other institutions before having obtained their permission to do so."

Felicia M. Townsend 1/19/07
Principal Investigator Date

Donald L. Bubenzer 1/19/07
Faculty Advisor (If PI is a student) Date

Action Taken:

By REVIEWER :

☒ Level I, Category II
☐ Level II, Category
☐ Level III, To Full Board

Project Involves:
☐ Deception ☐ Identifiable medical information
☐ Waiver of Consent

K Scott Olds 1/23/07
Primary Reviewer Date

By KSU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD:

☒ Approved, Level I
☐ Approved, Level II
IRB Comments:

Katherine Light 1/23/07
Administrator, IRB Date

Co-Reviewer (Level II) Date

IRB Level III Action:
☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Contingent Approval (Comments or Contingencies):

RECEIVED JAN 26 2007 KSU IRB

Copy sent 1-31-07 again on 4-30-07 Sig on file

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL TO USE HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Send completed forms to one of the reviewers designated for your Department or Katherine Light, Research and Graduate Studies, 113 University Auditorium

LOG NUMBER 07-444

Form can be downloaded from http://www.kent.edu/rags-alpha/forms/

Please type all information. HANDWRITTEN FORMS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED. Move through the document using TAB or Mouse. Do not use the enter Key. To mark a box, click with the mouse.

Name: Felicia M. Townsend
Telephone: 330-908-1500 **Address:** 2000 Heron Glen Ct. Macedonia, Oh 44056 **Email:** ftownsen@kent.edu

Department: ACHVE-CHDS **FacultyRank/StudentStatus:** Doctoral Candidate

Project Title: Perceptions of African American College Freshmen Relative To The Helpful Behaviors of Intrusive Peer Mentors Who Assisted Them During College Adjustment in a Predominately White Institution

Type of Project: ☐ **FACULTY RESEARCH** ☐ **External Funded (Agency:**) Include copy of proposal
STUDENT DIRECTED RESEARCH (Advisor: DR. DONALD BUBENZER & JOHN WEST (ACHVE))
☐ Thesis ☒ Dissertation ☐ Course Requirement (Course #:)
☐ Other (Specify:)

Duration of Project: Starting Date: 10/5/2006 (But not before approval is obtained)
Ending Date: 12/12/2007

I certify that the research procedures for this project and the method of obtaining consent (if any), as approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board, will be followed during the period covered by this research project. Any future changes will be submitted for Board review and approval prior to implementation.

If this project involves approval/permission from other institutions, the principal investigator (and the faculty advisor if the PI is a student) **must** sign below to certify the following statement: "I/we will not begin research at other institutions before having obtained their permission to do so."

Felicia M Townsend 4-11-07 — Principal Investigator — Date
Donald L Bubenzer 4-11-07 — Faculty Advisor (If PI is a student) — Date

Action Taken:

By REVIEWER :

☑ Level I, Category II
☐ Level II, Category
☐ Level III, To Full Board

Project Involves:
☐ Deception
☐ Waiver of Consent
☐ Identifiable medical information

R. Scott Olds 4/12/07 — Primary Reviewer — Date

Co-Reviewer (Level II) — Date

By KSU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD:

☒ Approved, Level I
☐ Approved, Level II
IRB Comments:

Katherine Light 4-12-07 — Administrator, IRB — Date

IRB Level III Action:
☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ Contingent Approval (Comments or Contingencies):

RECEIVED
APR 20 2007
KSU IRB

Sig copy e-mailed 3-07, 4-26-07, 4-27

APPENDIX B

THE CONCOURSE

CONCOURSE

1. She introduced me to students and faculty on campus.
2. My mentor explained a typical “first week” of classes.
3. My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.
4. My mentor informed me of tutoring services.
5. My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.
6. My mentor responds to my phone calls.
7. My mentor considers the questions I ask and does the best to answer them.
8. I can talk to my mentor about my course material.
9. She helped me understand the teaching styles of certain professors.
10. My mentor teaches me study skills that relate to my classes.
11. In addition to academic activity, we share in social activity, too.
12. My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.
13. My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.
14. My mentor and I spend social time together.
15. It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.
16. My mentor knows when to be serious.
17. My mentor knows when to be funny.
18. When I get off task academically, my mentor communicates the importance of remaining focused.
19. My mentor takes time to talk to me when he sees me on campus.

20. My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.
21. My mentor makes me laugh.
22. My mentor encourages me to share my true feelings without being afraid.
23. My mentor's humorous personality enables me to be comfortable in sharing my thoughts.
24. My mentor gives me academic advice.
25. My mentor is knowledgeable about campus resources.
26. My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.
27. My mentor makes sure to spend social time with me, at least once every week.
28. My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.
29. During meals my mentor talks to me about dorm life and campus activities.
30. We have fun together.
31. My mentor is accessible by phone.
32. My mentor is accessible by email.
33. My mentor introduced me to other students of my same ethnicity and culture.
34. My mentor introduced me to other students on campus who reside in my home town.
35. My mentor helped me act more like a college student, rather than a high school student.

36. My mentor teaches me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.
37. My mentor encourages me to attend campus events that relate to my culture.
38. My mentor's comments have an impact on me.
39. My mentor introduces me to members of the opposite sex.`
40. My mentor helped me gain confidence.
41. My mentor motivates me to take risks.
42. My mentor helped me identify professors that I might connect with, academically.
43. My mentor and I have the same type of personality.
44. My mentor checks to make sure I'm doing ok.
45. My mentor shares life skills for positive college living.
46. My mentor referred me to an academic advisor once I told him I didn't know how to register for next semester's classes online.
47. My mentor was familiar with my major.
48. My mentor helped me register for classes.
49. My mentor asked me what classes I was going to take next semester.
50. My mentor told me how to become involved on campus.
51. My mentor and I play basketball at the recreation center, together.
52. I stopped having the sensation of always feeling lost on campus.
53. I no longer have that feeling of "I don't know what I'm doing."

54. My mentor helps me to feel more accountable when he asks about my academic studies.
55. My mentor is helpful when he listens to my problems.
56. My mentor encourages me to have fun.
57. My mentor encourages me to use good judgment.
58. My mentor expresses the importance of keeping graduation as my primary goal.
59. My mentor shows me that he is my friend.
60. My mentor is easy to talk to.
61. I don't think I would have realized that there were as many other African Americans if my mentor hadn't told me about other events and hangouts on campus.
62. My mentor showed me that it is ok to be quiet, at times.
63. My mentor and I talk about my classes, but we spend most of our time together at the recreation center.
64. I trust my mentor a lot. I don't think he would do or say anything that would potentially harm me.
65. My mentor motivates me to go to class.
66. My mentor is very laid-back, like me.
67. My mentor engages with me whenever I'm ready to talk with him.
68. My mentor's words pop up in my thoughts and help me to refrain from doing what I shouldn't do.
69. My mentor asks if I've studied, which seems to keep me accountable.

70. My mentor gave me a tour of the campus.
71. My mentor introduced me to upperclassman.
72. My mentor prepared me for the difference between a high school party atmosphere and college party atmosphere.
73. My mentor taught me about the history of Black Greek fraternities and how they play a large part in African American culture.

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORMS

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FORM –FOCUS GROUP/INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW

Perceptions of African American College Students Relative To The Helpful Behaviors Of Peer Mentors Who Assisted Them During Freshman Year College Adjustment In A Predominantly White Institution.

I want to do research on how African American freshmen perceive the helpful behaviors of peer mentors who assisted them during freshman year college adjustment at a Predominately White Institution. I want to do this in order to better understand how some African American freshmen view the helpfulness of peer mentoring during their first year of enrollment at a Predominately White University. In this study we will be discussing ideas related to the behaviors of peer mentors. The data obtained from this study can potentially inform university administrators as to how to better assist African American freshmen adjust academically and socially, during their first year of college at a Predominately White Institution. I would like you to take part in this project. If you decide to do this, you will be asked to participate in a focus group or individual interview for about one hour, one time during the Spring 2007 semester. Confidentiality will be maintained to the limits of the law.

If you take part in this project you will be given the opportunity to provide your personal experience and perspective of the helpful behavior of your peer mentor. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you do take part, you may stop at any time.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at 216-849-2969, or my advisors: Donald Bubenzer, Ph.D at 330-672-7955 or John West, Ed.D at 330-672-2662. This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. Peter Tandy, Acting Vice President, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (330-672-2704).

You will receive a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

Felicia M. Townsend, Doctoral Candidate

CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to take part in this project. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time. I am aware the focus group and/or individual interview will be audio taped and choose not to listen to the tape.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Department of Counseling, Health and Career Technical Teacher Education
Counseling and Human Development Services Program
P.O. Box 5190 • Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
Program Area Web site: http://chdsw.educ.kent.edu
330-672-2662 • Fax: 330-672-2472 • http://www.kent.edu

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FORM -Q SORT

Perceptions of African American College Students Relative To The Helpful Behaviors Of Peer Mentors Who Assisted Them During Freshman Year College Adjustment In A Predominantly White Institution.

I want to do research on how African American freshmen perceive the helpful behaviors of peer mentors who assisted them during freshman year college adjustment at a Predominately White Institution. I want to do this in order to better understand how some African American freshmen view the helpfulness of peer mentoring during their first year of enrollment at a Predominately White University. In this study we will be discussing ideas related to the behaviors of peer mentors. The data obtained from this study can potentially inform university administrators as to how to better assist African American freshmen adjust academically and socially, during their first year of college at a Predominately White Institution. I would like you to take part in this project. If you decide to do this, you will be asked to participate in a Q-sort lasting perhaps 45 minutes. I may also want to interview some of you regarding the placement of your items. Confidentiality will be maintained to the limits of the law.

If you take part in this project you will be given the opportunity to provide your personal experience and perspective of the helpful behavior of your peer mentor. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you do take part, you may stop at any time.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at 216-849-2969, or my advisors: Donald Bubenzer, Ph.D at 330-672-7955 or John West, Ed.D at 330-672-2662. This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. Peter Tandy, Acting Vice President, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (330-672-2704).

You will receive a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

Felicia M. Townsend, Doctoral Candidate

CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to take part in this project. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time. I am aware that I might be asked to participate in an in interview and that the interview will be audio taped. If interviewed I do not want to listen to the tape.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Department of Counseling, Health and Career Technical Teacher Education
Counseling and Human Development Services Program
P.O. Box 5190 • Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
Program Area Web site: http://chdsw.educ.kent.edu
330-672-2662 • Fax: 330-672-2472 • http://www.kent.edu

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Study Title: Perceptions of African American College Students Relative To The Helpful Behaviors of Peer Mentors Who Assisted Them During Freshmen Year College Adjustment In Predominately White Institution.

Instructions: Please answer each question about yourself and your family.

General Student Information
Age: ___

Date of Birth: _____

Gender: ___Female ___Male

To date, write the number of college credit hours that you have earned: _____

Are you a ___Residential student or a ___Commuter student? (Check one)

What was the geographical location of your high school? (Check one)
____Urban ____Suburban _____Rural

Family Information:

Your father's highest attained education level:

___	Less than high school graduate	____	Associate's Degree
___	High School Diploma or GED	____	Bachelor's Degree
___	Some college	____	Advanced Degree

Your mother's highest attained education level:

___	Less than high school graduate	____	Associate's Degree
___	High School Diploma or GED	____	Bachelor's Degree
___	Some college	____	Advanced Degree

Describe your family composition:

___	Single-parent home	____	Two- parent home
___	Grandparent headed household	____	Aunt or Uncle headed household
___	Other		

APPENDIX E

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL TO CONDUCT STUDY

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

April 10, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall serve as written approval for Felicia Townsend, doctoral candidate at Kent State University in the Counseling and Human Development Services Program, to conduct her Q-sort study with the University Mentoring Program.

Gina Spencer, Graduate Assistant, will assist with identifying students to participate in a focus group regarding the program during the Spring semester of 2007.

We are extremely honored and eager to be of assistance. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office at (330) 672-3560.

Sincerely,

Shana M. Lee
Director

Gina C. Spencer
Graduate Assistant

Student Multicultural Center
P.O. Box 5190 • Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
330-672-3560 • Fax 330-672-9399 • http://www.kent.edu

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

December 5, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall serve as written approval for Felicia Townsend, doctoral candidate at Kent State University in the Counseling and Human Development Services Program, to conduct a study with the University Mentoring Program.

Gina Spencer, Graduate Assistant, will identify ten students to participate in a focus group regarding the program during the Spring semester of 2007.

We are extremely honored and eager to be of assistance. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office at (330) 672-3560.

Sincerely,

Shana M. Lee
Director

Gina C. Spencer
Graduate Assistant

Student Multicultural Center
P.O. Box 5190 • Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
330-672-3560 • Fax 330-672-9399 • http://www.kent.edu

APPENDIX F

Q SAMPLE STATEMENTS

Q SAMPLE STATEMENTS

1. My mentor introduced me to students and faculty on campus.
2. My mentor explained a typical "first week" of classes.
3. My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.
4. My mentor informed me of tutoring services.
5. My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.
6. My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.
7. I can talk to my mentor about my course material.
8. My mentor helped me understand the teaching style of my professor.
9. My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.
10. In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.
11. My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.
12. My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.
13. It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.
14. My mentor knew when to be serious.
15. My mentor knew when to be funny.
16. When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.
17. My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she sees me on campus.
18. My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.
19. My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.

20. My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.
21. My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.
22. During meals my mentor talked to me about dorm life and campus activities.
23. My mentor and I had fun together.
24. My mentor was accessible by cell phone.
25. My mentor was accessible by email.
26. My mentor helped me act more like a college student, rather than a high school student.
27. My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.
28. My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.
29. My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.
30. My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.
31. My mentor helped me gain confidence.
32. My mentor motivated me to take risks.
33. My mentor and I had the same type of personality.
34. My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.
35. My mentor told me how to become involved on campus.
36. My mentor helps me to feel more accountable when he asks about my academic studies.
37. My mentor is helpful when he listens to my problems.
38. My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.
39. My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.
40. My mentor was easy to talk to.

APPENDIX G

CONDITIONS OF INSTRUCTION

CONDITIONS OF INSTRUCTION

In this research study, you are invited to rank order statements related to the helpfulness of behaviors of peer mentors during your freshman year in college. If you are a sophomore, junior, or senior, you are to reflect back on your experience during freshman year, as you rank the statements.

You are being asked to read and respond to the statements on the cards given to you. You have 40 cards and will be asked to simply rank-order them according to the statements that suggest to you the most helpful behaviors (+4) of your peer mentor to the least helpful (-4) behavior of your peer mentor.

Read through all the statements presented in order to become familiar with what is printed on each card. After you have read through the statements begin to sort them into three piles. Place to the right those items that are the most helpful behaviors of your peer mentor. To the left, put those items that are the least helpful behaviors of your peer mentor. In the middle, place those items about which you are neutral, ambivalent, or uncertain.

Beginning on the right side, arrange 2 items that are the most helpful behaviors under the +4 marker. The order of the items under the marker is not important. Turning now to the left side, study the items and place the 2 items that are least helpful behaviors under the -4 marker. Again, the order below the marker does not matter. Returning to the right side, now choose the next 3 items that were more helpful to you, but which are not as descriptive as the first 2 already selected and place them below the +3 marker. Do the same with the left (least helpful behaviors) side working your way to the center.

If you change your mind during the sorting process, you are free to switch your items as long as you maintain the requested number of items in each column. Finally, you are invited after completing the Q- sorting to record the statement numbers by writing them on the Q-sort Grid. Please consult your researcher if you have questions.

APPENDIX H

Q SORT GRID

Q SORT GRID

Least Helpful Behaviors — Neutral — Most Helpful Behaviors

(-4)	(-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(0)	(+1)	(+2)	(+3)	(+4)
2 Items	**3 Items**	**4 Items**	**7 Items**	**8 Items**	**7 Items**	**4 Items**	**3 Items**	**2 Items**

APPENDIX I

THE CORRELATION MATRIX

Correlation Matrix Between Sorts

SORTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1 01221111	100	10	22	27	4	38	40	-4	26	-7	12	5	-4	-2	1	-9	5	21	11	10	16	-5	6	19	6	7	8	7	4	26
2 02122312	10	100	35	30	31	33	34	47	15	33	12	41	-2	30	54	43	6	60	26	46	14	45	38	38	15	14	27	25	47	49
3 03122113	22	35	100	24	-3	38	31	-2	4	6	23	22	-9	-15	30	7	9	13	13	15	5	34	20	44	2	18	29	16	21	35
4 04222212	27	30	24	100	0	27	23	23	19	-17	22	44	37	-5	21	-12	16	20	8	32	-14	23	26	10	-26	1	41	-9	13	27
5 05132112	4	31	-3	0	100	-15	18	18	16	41	-4	29	-15	16	46	27	-20	46	1	45	-10	28	15	31	40	-13	18	46	15	18
6 06132111	38	33	38	27	-15	100	43	-2	-10	-21	9	22	11	19	47	-20	15	4	12	19	17	-6	10	4	-25	19	34	-9	-2	38
7 07232111	40	34	31	23	18	43	100	-5	-1	8	18	38	9	16	46	28	9	27	12	27	21	13	10	40	12	-1	32	13	12	34
8 08332211	-4	47	-2	23	18	-2	-5	100	16	35	14	24	-15	16	0	10	13	48	56	24	9	54	37	30	-7	-1	27	11	30	18
9 09322212	26	15	4	19	16	-10	-1	16	100	-1	11	7	-10	6	5	24	11	43	29	0	3	34	23	28	-1	23	4	13	4	18
10 10222111	-7	33	6	-17	41	-21	8	35	-1	100	6	34	-31	6	15	24	-6	49	18	40	25	34	43	56	47	14	18	45	62	18
11 11342212	12	12	23	22	-4	9	18	14	11	6	100	25	24	-24	21	7	32	23	36	10	11	32	18	24	1	8	13	20	30	-5
12 12232112	5	41	22	44	29	22	38	24	7	34	25	100	1	18	41	4	-2	34	7	47	11	33	30	38	6	19	49	13	26	36
13 13221112	-4	-2	-9	37	-15	11	9	-15	-10	-31	24	1	100	7	13	15	-11	-16	-16	26	-27	-20	29	-21	-40	8	22	-17	-11	-7
14 14432421	-2	30	-15	-5	16	19	16	16	6	6	-24	18	7	100	25	23	-19	12	4	25	12	9	11	13	-26	24	27	-10	6	17
15 15221112	1	54	30	21	46	47	46	0	5	15	21	41	13	25	100	24	7	32	12	43	-8	30	22	25	15	22	29	30	32	34
16 16112111	-9	43	7	-12	27	-20	28	10	24	24	7	4	15	23	24	100	-12	41	2	23	-12	25	30	37	29	16	2	31	20	12
17 17112111	5	6	9	16	-20	15	9	13	11	-6	32	-2	-11	-19	7	-12	100	12	38	-11	29	27	-7	-7	-2	4	-9	16	16	15
18 18132111	21	60	13	20	46	4	27	48	43	49	23	34	-16	12	32	41	12	100	45	48	4	65	22	52	30	15	29	45	41	33
19 19342111	11	26	13	8	1	12	12	56	29	18	36	7	-16	4	12	2	38	45	100	-2	12	54	11	45	-9	5	20	18	32	-3
20 20112111	10	46	15	32	45	19	27	24	0	40	10	47	26	25	43	23	-11	48	-2	100	0	26	49	20	16	18	31	37	37	38
21 21521111	16	14	5	-14	-10	17	21	9	3	25	11	11	-27	12	-8	-12	29	4	12	0	100	18	13	13	15	-26	-9	-1	21	20
22 22231112	-5	45	34	23	28	-6	13	54	34	34	32	33	-20	9	30	25	27	65	54	26	18	100	27	51	26	8	30	41	51	16
23 23321411	6	38	20	26	15	10	10	37	23	43	18	30	29	11	22	30	-7	22	11	49	13	27	100	37	-1	2	22	23	46	29
24 24321212	19	38	44	10	31	4	40	30	28	56	24	38	-21	13	25	37	-7	52	45	20	13	51	37	100	23	21	48	27	43	38
25 25222111	6	15	2	-26	40	-25	12	-7	-1	47	1	6	-40	-26	15	29	-2	30	-9	16	15	26	-1	23	100	-10	-17	59	41	5
26 26422312	7	14	18	1	-13	19	-1	-1	23	14	8	19	8	24	22	16	4	15	5	18	-26	8	2	21	-10	100	34	-4	2	23
27 27412422	8	27	29	41	18	34	32	27	4	18	13	49	22	27	29	2	-9	29	20	31	-9	30	22	48	-17	34	100	-5	7	40
28 28112112	7	25	16	-9	46	-9	13	11	13	45	20	13	-17	-10	30	31	16	45	18	37	-1	41	23	27	59	-4	-5	100	60	1
29 29321311	4	47	21	13	15	-2	12	30	4	62	30	26	-11	6	32	20	16	41	32	37	21	51	46	43	41	2	7	60	100	2
30 30321322	26	49	35	27	18	38	34	18	18	18	-5	36	-7	17	34	12	15	33	-3	38	20	16	29	38	5	23	40	1	2	100
31 31212111	1	11	-40	16	23	-5	4	24	1	0	27	7	21	7	22	-12	0	26	7	23	-17	6	11	-21	-11	-21	-4	7	7	-7
32 32212111	3	34	18	7	8	30	15	29	18	4	4	16	-13	11	29	1	16	29	29	2	5	24	-10	13	-16	23	11	-1	-8	23
33 33112112	19	56	33	34	12	37	35	27	5	13	30	5	23	-2	34	30	3	29	28	36	4	24	58	24	12	-11	15	24	38	24
34 34222212	-16	11	2	-27	25	-32	-3	20	28	54	10	5	-37	-21	1	22	14	45	33	10	26	46	23	40	52	-18	-16	63	55	-5
35 35432411	26	26	35	14	-7	60	38	-1	8	-22	4	11	15	27	38	10	31	23	26	25	-5	8	-15	11	-17	38	38	-1	-7	40
36 36422411	18	16	19	-2	16	-20	17	5	18	35	35	3	5	-30	-13	38	11	43	5	15	4	27	13	26	38	2	8	41	30	9
37 37331212	24	4	-16	-16	7	-24	-6	25	16	29	4	3	-4	24	-27	31	-22	29	30	12	15	22	20	37	26	5	7	6	12	-3
38 38421312	21	33	50	13	9	18	35	6	19	29	21	24	-21	2	30	36	6	57	29	29	19	53	7	56	44	10	21	40	40	26
39 39542411	17	30	24	18	1	26	17	18	3	1	-3	12	19	27	13	26	23	39	17	37	-17	30	12	15	-13	35	43	23	20	23
40 40421312	-4	20	11	2	10	-17	-4	37	16	31	32	17	-14	1	4	18	19	46	46	13	24	54	5	44	21	5	12	13	33	13

Correlation Matrix Between Sorts (continued)

SORTS	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
1 01221111	1	3	19	-16	26	18	24	21	17	-4
2 02122312	11	34	56	11	26	16	4	33	30	20
3 03122113	-40	18	33	2	35	19	-16	50	24	11
4 04222212	16	7	34	-27	14	-2	-16	13	18	2
5 05132112	23	8	12	25	-7	16	7	9	1	10
6 06132111	-5	30	37	-32	60	-20	-24	18	26	-17
7 07232111	4	15	35	-3	38	17	-6	35	17	-4
8 08332211	24	29	27	20	-1	5	25	6	18	37
9 09322212	1	18	5	28	8	18	16	19	3	16
10 10222111	0	4	13	54	-22	35	29	29	1	31
11 11342212	27	4	30	10	4	35	4	21	-3	32
12 12232112	7	16	5	5	11	3	3	24	12	17
13 13221112	21	-13	23	-37	15	5	-4	-21	19	-14
14 14432421	7	11	-2	-21	27	-30	24	2	27	1
15 15221112	22	29	34	1	38	-13	-27	30	13	4
16 16112111	-12	1	30	22	10	38	31	36	26	18
17 17112111	0	16	3	14	31	11	-22	6	23	19
18 18132111	26	29	29	45	23	43	29	57	39	46
19 19342111	7	29	28	33	26	5	30	29	17	46
20 20112111	23	2	36	10	25	15	12	29	37	13
21 21521111	-17	5	4	26	-5	4	15	19	-17	24
22 22231112	6	24	24	46	8	27	22	53	30	54
23 23321411	11	-10	58	23	-15	13	20	7	12	5
24 24321212	-21	13	24	40	11	26	37	56	15	44
25 25222111	-11	-16	12	52	-17	38	26	44	-13	21
26 26422312	-21	23	-11	-18	38	2	5	10	35	5
27 27412422	-4	11	15	-16	38	8	7	21	43	12
28 28112112	7	-1	24	63	-1	41	6	40	23	13
29 29321311	7	-8	38	55	-7	30	12	40	20	33
30 30321322	-7	23	24	-5	40	9	-3	26	23	13
31 31212111	100	4	12	6	-21	0	-10	-29	-11	-12
32 32212111	4	100	-12	-4	26	-12	-26	6	18	-10
33 33112112	12	-12	100	5	12	24	9	22	10	5
34 34222212	6	-4	5	100	-20	35	15	32	4	34
35 35432411	-21	26	12	-20	100	-4	-10	37	63	8
36 36422411	0	-12	24	35	-4	100	19	20	20	21
37 37331212	-10	-26	9	15	-10	19	100	28	2	55
38 38421312	-29	6	22	32	37	20	28	100	23	45
39 39542411	-11	18	10	4	63	20	2	23	100	0
40 40421312	-12	-10	5	34	8	21	55	45	0	100

APPENDIX J

Z-SCORES

Table J1

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 1

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	2.075
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	18	1.982
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	39	1.799
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	12	1.285
2	My mentor explained a typical first week of classes.	2	1.103
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	5	0.892
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	6	0.873
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	9	0.868
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	16	0.820
1	My mentor introduced me to students and faculty on campus.	1	0.794
36	My mentor helped me to feel more accountable when he asks about my academic studies.	36	0.782
38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	38	0.599
19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	19	0.551
7	I could talk to my mentor about my course material.	7	0.531
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	11	0.475
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	40	0.395
8	My mentor helped me understand the teaching style of my professor.	8	0.273
26	My mentor helped me act more like a college student, rather than a high school student.	26	0.119
37	My mentor was helpful when he/she listened to my problems.	37	0.040
35	My mentor told me how to become involved on campus.	35	-0.003

(*table continues*)

Table J1 (continued)

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 1

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	34	-0.107
25	My mentor was accessible by email.	25	-0.214
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	14	-0.272
21	My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.	21	-0.281
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	28	-0.355
27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.	27	-0.383
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	24	-0.420
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	17	-0.467
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/she was my friend.	29	-0.530
22	During meals my mentor talked to me about dorm life and campus activities.	22	-0.762
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	31	-0.781
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	10	-0.898
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	3	-0.915
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	33	-1.028
15	My mentor knew when to be funny.	15	-1.110
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	23	-1.115
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus where other African Americans gather.	20	-1.306
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	13	-1.450
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	32	-1.575
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	30	-2.283

Table J2

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 2

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/ she was my friend.	29	2.157
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	33	1.923
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	40	1.689
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	6	1.333
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	17	1.125
37	My mentor was helpful when he/she listened to my problems.	37	1.048
7	I could talk to my mentor about my course material.	7	0.942
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	23	0.906
1	My mentor introduced me to students and faculty on campus.	1	0.744
19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	19	0.678
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	14	0.629
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	34	0.628
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	39	0.485
25	My mentor was accessible by email.	25	0.416
38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	38	0.413
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	32	0.226
15	My mentor knew when to be funny.	15	0.186
22	During meals my mentor talked to me about dorm life and campus activities.	22	0.181
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	16	0.057
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	24	-0.025
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	5	-0.038
8	My mentor helped me understand the teaching style of my professor.	8	-0.067

(*table continues*)

Table J2 (continued)

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 2

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	10	-0.094
35	My mentor told me how to become involved on campus.	35	-0.139
36	My mentor helped me to feel more accountable when he asks about my academic studies.	36	-0.225
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	31	-0.265
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	13	-0.419
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	9	-0.510
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	18	-0.584
2	My mentor explained a typical first week of classes.	2	-0.617
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	12	-0.687
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	-0.735
26	My mentor helped me act more like a college student, rather than a high school student.	26	-1.056
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places, off campus where other African Americans gather.	20	-1.095
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	11	-1.155
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	28	-1.194
21	My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.	21	-1.276
27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.	27	-1.770
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	3	-1.864
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	30	-1.952

Table J3

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 3

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	19	2.062
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	18	1.622
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	40	1.591
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	24	1.358
38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	38	1.289
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	39	1.256
25	My mentor was accessible by email.	25	1.158
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	28	1.088
35	My mentor told me how to become involved on campus.	35	0.942
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	16	0.559
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	32	0.519
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	31	0.453
1	My mentor introduced me to students and faculty on campus.	1	0.390
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	9	0.349
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	5	0.323
36	My mentor helped me to feel more accountable when he asks about my academic studies.	36	0.322
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	13	0.303
37	My mentor was helpful when he/she listened to my problems.	37	0.167
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/ she was my friend.	29	0.118
7	I could talk to my mentor about my course material.	7	0.093
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	17	0.079

(*table continues*)

Table J3 (continued)

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 3

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	12	0.028
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	6	0.025
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	11	-0.081
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	23	-0.339
21	My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.	21	-0.575
8	My mentor helped me understand the teaching style of my professor.	8	-0.650
27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.	27	-0.668
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	14	-0.672
15	My mentor knew when to be funny.	15	-0.698
26	My mentor helped me act more like a college student, rather than a high school student.	26	-0.714
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	-0.780
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	3	-0.819
22	During meals my mentor talked to me about dorm life and campus activities.	22	-0.940
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	10	-1.124
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	34	-1.294
2	My mentor explained a typical first week of classes.	2	-1.362
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	30	-1.400
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus where other African Americans gather.	20	-1.800
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	33	-2.178

Table J4

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 4

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
40	My mentor was easy to talk to.	40	2.340
34	My mentor checked on me to make sure I was ok.	34	2.035
31	My mentor helped me gain confidence.	31	1.339
4	My mentor informed me of tutoring services.	4	1.303
6	My mentor considered the questions I asked and did the best to answer them.	6	1.044
35	My mentor told me how to become involved on campus.	35	0.969
29	My mentor demonstrated that he/ she was my friend.	29	0.933
10	In addition to academic activity, we shared in social activity, too.	10	0.876
1	My mentor introduced me to students and faculty on campus.	1	0.843
37	My mentor was helpful when he/she listened to my problems.	37	0.799
28	My mentor encouraged me to attend campus events that related to my culture.	28	0.677
12	My mentor helped me learn how to manage my class assignments.	12	0.669
24	My mentor was accessible by cell phone.	24	0.515
20	My mentor was able to take me to other places off campus where other African Americans gather.	20	0.453
17	My mentor took time to talk to me when he/she saw me on campus.	17	0.382
38	My mentor encouraged me to use good judgment.	38	0.165
18	My mentor explained the importance of achieving the required GPA for entrance into my major.	18	0.143
19	My mentor was knowledgeable about campus resources.	19	0.125
26	My mentor helped me act more like a college student, rather than a high school student.	26	0.016
25	My mentor was accessible by email.	25	-0.045
36	My mentor helped me to feel more accountable when he asks about my academic studies.	36	-0.081

(*table continues*)

Table J4 (continued)

Normalized Factor Scores—For Factor 4

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
22	During meals my mentor talked to me about dorm life and campus activities.	22	-0.100
9	My mentor taught me study skills that related to my classes.	9	-0.167
7	I could talk to my mentor about my course material.	7	-0.247
30	My mentor introduced me to members of the opposite sex.	30	-0.254
27	My mentor taught me specific traditions, customs and values that are a part of my culture.	27	-0.308
8	My mentor helped me understand the teaching style of my professor.	8	-0.345
2	My mentor explained a typical first week of classes.	2	-0.455
39	My mentor expressed the importance of keeping graduation as my main goal.	39	-0.489
16	When I got off task academically, my mentor communicated the importance of remaining focused.	16	-0.513
13	It was helpful that my mentor was only a year older than me.	13	-0.536
23	My mentor and I had fun together.	23	-0.591
33	My mentor and I had the same type of personality.	33	-0.933
15	My mentor knew when to be funny.	15	-1.036
21	My mentor confronted me about my negative behavior and it was helpful.	21	-1.334
32	My mentor motivated me to take risks.	32	-1.349
14	My mentor knew when to be serious.	14	-1.437
11	My mentor helped me understand the administrative matters related to the office of my major.	11	-1.595
5	My mentor helped me understand how some professors view class attendance.	5	-1.638
3	My mentor told me that there would be less social activities after classes began.	3	-2.173

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allen, A. W. (1982). *Minorities in American higher education: Recent trends, current prospects, and recommendations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success. African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*, 45-65.

Allen, W. R., & Jewell, J. (2002). A backward glance forward: Past, present, and future perspectives on historically Black colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, *25*, 241-261.

Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., & Haniff, N. (Eds.). (1991). *College in black and white: African American students in predominantly White and historically Black public universities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Angelique, H., Kyle, K., & Taylor, E. (2002). Mentors and muses: New strategies for academic success. *Innovative Higher Education, 26*(3), 195-203.

Aoki, W. T., Wilson, R., Engert, P. A., Chen, J., Turk, A. A., & Latu, E. (2000). Mentoring and the discipleship of adolescents: Research and applications to the church. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 19*(4), 377-385.

Attewell, P., & Lavin, D. E. (2007). The economic benefit of higher education for Blacks and their families. Passing the torch: Does higher education for the disadvantaged pay off across the generations? *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, *56,* 92.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1989). *Student adaptation to college questionnaire*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Beckham, B. (1987/1988, Fall/Winter). Strangers in a strange land: The experiences of Blacks on White campuses. *Educational Record*, *68/69*(4/1), 74-78.

Beyene, T., Anglin, M., Sanchez, W., & Ballou, M. (2002). Mentoring and relations mutuality: Proteges' perspectives. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, *41,* 87-102.

Black enrollments in higher education continue to climb. (2007, Summer). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 56*, 30.

Blackwell, J. (1987). *Mainstreaming outsider: The production of Black professionals*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Boulter, L. T. (2002). Self-concept as a predictor of college freshman academic adjustment. *College Student Journal*, *36*, 234-246.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Braddock, J. H. II (1981). Desegregation and Black student attrition. *Urban Education*, *15*(4), 403-418.

Brawer, F. B. (1996). *Retention-attrition in the nineties*. (Report No. EDD00036). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (Eric Digest No. ED393510)

Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Brown, S. R. (1986). *Q technique and method: Principles and procedures*. In W. D. Berry & S. Lewis-Beck (Eds.), *New tools for social scientists* (pp. 57-76). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Brown, S. R. (1993). A primer on Q-methodology. *Operant Subjectivity*, *16*(3/4), 91-138.

Caldwell, C., Casto, C., & Salazar, C. (2005). Creating mentoring relationship between female faculty and students in counselor education: Guidelines for potential mentees and mentors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 83*(3), 331-336.

Campbell, D. E., & Campbell, T. A. (2000). The mentoring relationship: Differing perceptions of benefits. *College Student Journal, 34*(4), 516-523.

Carter, D., & Wilson, R. (1997). *Fifteenth annual status report on minorities in higher education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Carter, K. (2000). *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Chiang, L., Hunter, C. D., & Yeh, C. J. (2004). Coping attitudes, sources, and practices among Black and Latino college students. *Adolescence*, *39*(156), 793-815.

Cline, Z., Bissell, J., Hafner, A., & Katz, M. (2007). Closing the college readiness gap. *Leadership*, *37*(2), 30-33.

Correll, M. S. (2005). Peer mentoring: An intrusive approach. [Computer File]. *Essays in Education, 14,* 1-7.

Cross, T., & Slater, R. B. (1995). A first view of the academic performance of African Americans as three highly ranked colleges. *The Journal of Blacks in Education*, *7,* 76-79.

Crowl, T. K. (1993). *Fundamentals of educational research.* Madison: Brown & Benchmark.

Davis, J. D. (2007). Access to academe: The importance of mentoring to Black students. *Negro Educational Review, 58*(3-4), 217-231.

DuBois, D. (2002). Life imitates (and informs) meta-analysis: A participatory approach to increasing understanding of effective youth mentoring practices. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *24*(2), 3-15.

DuBois, D. L., & Neville, A. H. (1997). Youth mentoring investigation of relationship characteristics and perceived benefits. *Journal of Community Psychology, 25,* 227-234.

Fagenson-Eland, E. A., Marks, M. A., & Amendola, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *51*, 29-42.

Fischer, M. J. (2007). Settling into campus life: Difference by race/ethnicity in college involvement and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(2), 125-161.

Fleming, J. (1984). *Blacks in college: A comparative study of students' success in Black and White institutions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Flowers, L. A. (2006). Effects of attending a 2-year institution on African American males' academic and social integration in the first year of college. *Teachers College Record, 108*(2), 267-286.

Gallien, L. B (2005). The historical and cultural context of educating African American college students. In L. B. Gallien & M. Sims Peterson (Eds.), *Instructing and mentoring the African American college student: Strategies for success in higher education* (pp. 3-15)*.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gallien, L. B., & Sims Peterson, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Instructing and mentoring the African American college student: Strategies for success in higher education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *72*, 281-288.

Glass, N., & Walter, R. (2000). An experience of peer mentoring with student nurses: Enhancement of personal and professional growth. *Journal of Nursing Education, 39*(4), 155-160.

Glennen, R. E., Baxley, M., & Farren, P. (1985). Impact of intrusive advising on minority student retention. *College Student Journal, 19*, 335-338.

Good, J. M., Halpin, G., & Halpin, G. (2000). A promising prospect for minority retention: Students becoming peer mentors. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*(4), 375-382.

Grimmet, M. A. S., Bliss, J., Davis, D., & Ray, L. (1998). Assessing Federal TRIO McNair program participants' expectations and satisfaction with project services; a preliminary study. *Journal of Negro Education*, *67*(4), 404-415.

Guetzloe, E. (1997). The power of positive relationships: Mentoring programs in the school and community. *Preventing School Failure*, *41*, 1-6.

Hansman, C. A. (2002). Mentoring: From Athena to the 21st century. In C. A. Hansman (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on mentoring: Trends and issues* (pp. 1-3). Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Hatter, D. Y., & Ottens, A. J. (1998). Afrocentric world view and Black students adjustment to a predominantly White university: Does worldview matter? *College Student Journal*, *32*(3), 472-481.

Henriksen, J. A. S. (1995). *The influence of race and ethnicity on access to postsecondary education and the college experience.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (Eric Digest ED386242)

Hicks, T. (2005). Assessing the academic, personal and social experiences of pre-college students. *Journal of College Admission*, *186*, 18-24.

Hinderlie, H., & Kenny, M. (2002). Attachment, social support, and college adjustment among Black students at predominantly White universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *43*(3), 327-340.

Hyslop, A. (2006). Establishing a clear system goal of career and college readiness for all students. *Techniques*, 81(6), 37-39.

Jackson, A. P., & Sears, S. J. (1992). Implications of an Africentric worldview in reducing stress for African American women. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *71,* 184-190.

Johnson, A. W., & Sullivan, J. A. (1995). Mentoring program practices and effectiveness. *New Direction For Adult and Continuing Education*, *66*, 43-57.

Jucovy, L. (2001). *Building relationships: A guide for new mentors.* Philadelphia: Public Private Ventures.

Kaba, A. (2005). Progress of African Americans in higher education attainment: The widening gender gap and its current and future implications. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *13*(25), 1-34.

Kenny, M., & Perez, Y. (1996). Attachment and psychological well being among racially and ethnically diverse first year college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *37*(5), 527-533.

Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., Ginder, S. A., & Miller, E. (2007). *Postsecondary institutions in the United States: Fall 2006 and degrees and other awards conferred: 2005-06* (NCES 2007-166). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved December 27, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch

Marable, T. D. (1999). The role of student mentors in a pre-college engineering program. *Peabody Journal of Education, 71*(2), 44-54.

Maton, K. I., Hrabowski, A. H., & Schmitt, C. L. (2000). African American college students excelling in the sciences: College and post-college outcomes in the

Meyeroff Scholars Program. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27*(7), 629-654.

McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. (1988). *Q methodology. Series: Quantitative applications in the social sciences*. Newbury Park: Sage.

McPartland, J. M., & Nettles, S. M. (1991, August). Using community adults and advocates for at-risk middles school students: A two-year evaluation of Project RAISE. *The American Journal of Educati*on, *99*, 568-586.

Metz, G. W. (2002). Challenges and changes to Tinto's Persistence Theory. (Report No. JC 030 037). Columbus, OH: Midwestern Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 471529)

Miller, A. (2002). *Mentoring students and young people: A handbook of effective practice.* London: Routledge, Falmer.

Morrison, J. V. (2003). *A companion to Homer's Odyssey*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Moritsugu, J., & Sue, D. (1983). Minority status as a stressor. In R. D. Felner, L. A. Jason, J. N. Moritsugu, & S. S. Farber (Eds.), *Preventive psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 162-174). New York: Pergamon Press.

Nasim, A., Roberts, A., Harrell, J., & Young, H. (2005). Non-cognitive predictors of academic achievement for African Americans across cultural contexts. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *74*(4), 344-358.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). Digest of Education Statistics: Outcomes of education. Retrieved February 2, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04/tables/dt04_380.asp

Neville, H., Heppner, P., & Wang, L. (1997). Relations among racial identity attitudes, perceived stressors, and coping styles in African American college students. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 75*(4), 303-311.

Olsyn, L. (2006). Views differ on defining college prep. *Education Week*, *25*(33), 1-29.

Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First generation college students. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *75*(3), 249-284.

Paul, E., & Brier, S. (2001). Friendsickness in the transition to college: Pre-college predictors and college adjustment correlates. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*(1), 77-89.

Peacock, M. J., Murray, C., Ozer, D., & Stokes, J. (1996). The development of the Black family process Q-sort. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of tests and measurements for Black populations* (pp. 475-492). Hampton, VA: Cobb & Henry.

Phillips, D., & Skelly, K. (2006). College readiness for all. *School Administrator*, *63*(1), 26-32.

Pounds, A. W. (1990). *Black students*. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & Associates (Eds.), *The freshman year experience* (pp. 277-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ratcliff, J. L. (1991). Dropout prevention and at-risk college students. In L. L. West (Ed.), *Effective strategies for prevention of at-risk youth* (pp. 251-282). Gaithersburg: Aspen.

Redmond, S. P. (1990). Mentoring and cultural diversity in academic settings. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34*(2), 188-200.

Rendon, L. I. (1995). Beyond involvement: Creating validating academic and social communities in the community college. National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, University Park, PA. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Rodger, S., & Tremblay, P. (2003). The effects of a peer mentoring program on academic success among first year university students. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 23*(3), 1-18.

Schmolck, P., & Atkinson, J. (2002). PQ Method (Version 2.11) [Computer software and manual]. Retrieved June 26, 2006, from http://www.1rz-muenchen.de/-schmolck/qmethod/

Schwiebert, V. (2000). *Mentoring: Creating connected, empowered relationships.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Schwitzer, A. M., Griffin, O. T., Ancis, J. R., & Thomas, C. R. (1999). Social adjustment experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*(2), 189-197.

Schwitzer, A. M., McGovern, T., & Robbins, B. (1993). Influences of goal instability and social support on college adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 34*, 21-25.

Schwitzer, A. M., & Thomas, C. (1998). Implementations, utilization, and outcomes of college freshman mentor program. *Journal of Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition, 10*(1), 31-50.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, Jr., G. C. (1976). *Racism in American education: A model for change*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Black students on white campuses: 20 years of research. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*, 484-495.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1999). Blacks on White campuses: 20 years of research. *Journal of College Student Development, 40,* 538-550. Originally published in 1987.

Shandley, T. C. (1989). The use of mentors for leadership development. *NASPA Journal, 27*, 59-66.

Sipe, C. (1999a). Mentoring adolescents: What have we learned? In J. Baldwin-Grossman (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in mentoring* (pp. 11-24). Philadelphia: Public Private Ventures.

Sipe, C. (1999b). *Mentoring: A synthesis of P/PV's research: 1988-1995*. Philadelphia: Public Private Ventures.

Smedley, B. D., Myers, H. F., & Harrell, S. P. (1993). Minority-status stresses and the college adjustment of ethnic minority freshmen. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*, 434-452.

Smith, J. (2000). The use of Q methodology to assess the possibility that fear is a barrier preventing the use of mental health services by African American men. (Doctoral

Dissertation, Kent State University, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*.

Stage, F., & Hamrick, F. (1994). Diversity issues: Fostering campus wide development of multiculturalism. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *35,* 331-336.

Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1978). Concourse theory of communication. *Communication, 3*, 21-40.

Stromei, L. (2000). Increasing retention and success through mentoring. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 112,* 55-62.

Struchen, W., & Porta, M. (1997). From role-modeling to mentoring for African American youth: Ingredients for successful relationships. *Preventing School Failure*, *41,* 119-123.

Taylor, S., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (3rd ed.). Canada: John Wiley & Sons.

Taylor, T. L. (2005). *Parental perceptions of encouragers and discouragers of involvement with their African American preadolescent sons' school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Ohio.

Terenzini, P., Lorang, W., & Pascarella, E. T. (1981). Predicting freshmen persistence and voluntary dropout decisions: A replication. *Research in Higher Education, 15,* 109-127.

Terenzini, P., Springer, L., Yaeger, P., Pascarella, E., & Nora, A. (1996). First-generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education*, *37*, 1-22.

The steady march of African Americans into higher education. (2002). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 38*, 22.

Tierney, J. P., Baldwin-Grossman, J., & Resch, N. L. (2000). *Making a difference: An impact study of big brothers big sisters*. Philadelphia: Public Private Ventures.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*, 89-125.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Townsel, K. (1997). Mentoring African American youth. *Preventing School Failure*, 41, 125-127.

Tracey, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1984). Noncognitive variables in predicting academic success by race. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 16,* 171-178.

Tracey, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1985). The relationship of noncognitive variables to academic success: A longitudinal comparison by race. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26,* 405-410.

Tracey, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Prediction of college graduation using noncognitive variables by race. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 19,* 177-184.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1994). Current Population Reports, Series P20, No. 476, Educational Attainment in the United States: March 1993 and 1992, Table 8.

United States Department of Education. (2006). Retrieved February 9, 2006, from http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/trio/triohistory.html

United States Department of Justice. (1998). Juvenile Mentoring Program: 1998 Report to Congress United States Census Bureau (2004). Educational attainment in the United States: 2003. Retrieved July 8, 2005, from http://www.census.gov

Vital signs: Statistics that measure the state of racial inequality. (2008, Spring). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 59*, 39.

Wallace, B. C., & Constantine, M. G. (2005). Africentric cultural values, psychological help-seeking attitudes, and self-concealment in African American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *31*(4), 369-385.

Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: Theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2,* 67-91.

Wright, S. K. (1992). From the odyssey to the university: What is this thing called mentoring? *American Counseling Association Bulletin, 79,* 45-53.