2022

Black and White Student Adaptability to College at a Predominately White Historically Black University: A Single Institution Examination of West Virginia State University

Christopher D. Jackson
jacksoncd1@gmail.com

BLACK AND WHITE STUDENT ADAPTABILITY TO COLLEGE AT A PREDOMINATELY WHITE HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITY: A SINGLE INSTITUTION EXAMINATION OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A dissertation submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctorate of Education
In
Leadership Studies
by
Christopher D. Jackson
Approved by
Dr. Charles Bethel, Committee Chairperson
Dr. R. Charles Byers
Dr. Jessica Hanna
Dr. Tom Hisiro

Marshall University
August 2022

APPROVAL OF DISSERTATION

We, the faculty supervising the work of **Christopher D. Jackson**, affirm that the dissertation, **Black and White Student Adaptability to College at a Predominately White Historically Black University: A Single Institution Examination of West Virginia State University** meets the high academic standards for original scholarship and creative work established by the EdD Program in **Leadership Studies** and the College of Education and Professional Development. This work also conforms to the editorial standards of our discipline and the Graduate College of Marshall University. With our signatures, we approve the manuscript for publication.

Dr. Charles Bethel Leadership Studies	Charles Bethel Charles Bethel (Jul 12, 2022 11:54 EDT) Committee Chairperson Major	7/12/2022 Date
Dr. Tom Hisiro Leadership Studies	Thomas Hisiro (Jul 12, 2022 16:55 EDT) Committee Member Major	7/12/2022 Date
Dr. Jessica Hanna External	Jessica Hanna (Jul 14, 2022 12:23 EDT) Committee Member External	7/14/2022 Date
Dr. Charles Byers External	R. Charles Byers R. Charles Byers (Jul 14, 2022 13:16 EDT) Committee Member External	7/14/2022 Date

Dedication

I dedicate this to my grandmother Gloria Carper. Mimi, I wish you were here physically to celebrate this accomplishment with me, but I know you are looking down on me smiling and proud. I also dedicate this to my two sons, Kenyen and Christian. Everything I do, I do to provide a better life for you two. I love you unconditionally.

Acknowledgments

First, giving all the praise and honor to God for all He has done for me. I want to thank my entire family and friends for their unwavering support. I want to give a special acknowledgement to my wife for holding down the family while I pursue this degree. I could not have done this without her. I want to thank the faculty, staff, and students at West Virginia State University for supporting and assistancing on this research project. I want to thank the entire Marshall University faculty of the Leadership Studies/Higher Education Administration EdD Program. Special acknowledgements to Dr. Nicholson, Dr. Hisiro, and Dr. Hanna. Additional acknowledgement to Dr. Sherry Early. Thank you Dr. Early for getting me started on this roller coaster ride. You have always supported and believed in me, and I will never forget that. Thank you to Dr. Ron Childress and Dr. Charles Bethel. You two have worked tirelessly to get me to the finish line and I will forever be in your debt. To my mentor Dr. R. Charles Byers, thank you for all of the years of guidance, both professionally and personally. You have always been a person I have looked up to, and I hope as I elevate in my professional life, I make you proud.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

With respect to studies examining Black students at predominately White historically Black colleges or universities (HBCU), very little data exists; therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the specific benefits to Black and White students attending an HBCU (i.e., academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution) also accrue to those students whose HBCU is predominantly White. When comparing Black and White students, no research has been conducted on whether the benefits of attending an HBCU, for Black or White students, also accrue if the HBCU's student population is majority White. To conduct this nonexperimental and descriptive study, the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) was used. This instrument was distributed to approximately 1,100 West Virginia State University (WVSU) full-time students during the 2021 spring semester at WVSU via campus email. The research shows Black students at West Virginia State University (WVSU) are academically adjusting better to college than White students; however, White students are adjusting better socially and personally. According to the data, White students also have a stronger sense of attachment to WVSU; however, the cause for these outcomes is inconclusive.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The term *college experience* has always been vague to this researcher; however, Pingali (2017) reinforces two important issues related to the college experience: For each student, it is a unique journey of sorts and occurs during college. Millions of high school graduates flock to one of the thousands of higher education institutions every year. These students come from all walks of life. Some are from rural areas, although others come from urban communities; some are Christians and others are not; some of these students are Black, and others are White, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American. Some students are heterosexual. Others are gay, bisexual, pansexual, transgender. In essence, college campuses could be considered microcosms reflective of the many social and psychological nuances that exist worldwide.

People attend college for a variety of reasons. Engle and Tinto (2008) stated, "Nearly 15 million students are currently enrolled as undergraduates in U.S. colleges and universities, a number that has more than doubled in the past 35 years" (p. 5). Despite the United States having one of the highest college participation rates in the world, large gaps persist in terms of access to and success in higher education in this country; this is particularly the case for low-income, minority, and first-generation students (Engle & Tinto, 2008). Many factors play a part in this gap between success and access; factors such as a lack of family support, academic deficiencies, financial limitations, external obligations. These are a few issues plaguing incoming college students, particularly low-income, minority, and first-generation college students.

College Transition

The transition to college can pose a barrier to success for many students. Thus, a student's ability to adapt to their new college experience is paramount to college success. According to Adams and Proctor (2010):

> The transition to college can be difficult for many students as they face the challenges of adapting to their new environments. Prior research has suggested that feelings of isolation and loneliness, difficulty with separation from family, increased interpersonal conflicts, and financial pressures are common during the first few years of college, and if students cannot adjust, they may be more likely to leave the university. (p. 166)

Therefore, getting students acclimated and engaged in their respective college communities as soon as possible is imperative. Institutions must make a concerted effort to reach out to these tentative students as early and often as possible during the 1st year or risk losing them.

Retention programs and services are most likely to reach low-income and first-generation students when offered to and are mandatory for all students (Engle & Tinto, 2008). Success in college is strongly related to pre-college academic preparation and achievement and other factors such as family income and parents' education (Kuh, 2014). Students who do not attain grade-level proficiencies in math and reading by the eighth grade are much less likely to be college-ready at the end of high school (Kuh, 2014). According to Salami (2011):

> Most students are bound to move away from home to attend a higher institution of learning. Such a transition to higher institutions or colleges usually reduces contact and social support from friends and family members. Difficulties in handling the

stressors/challenges associated with the transition may lead to decreased academic performance and increased psychological distress. (p. 239)

Student engagement is a current buzzword in higher education, increasingly researched, theorized, and debated with growing evidence of its critical role in achievement and learning (Kahu, 2013). Student engagement represents the time and effort students devote to activities empirically linked to desired outcomes of college and what institutions do to induce students to participate in these activities (Kuh, 2009b). However, before a student can successfully and fully engage in their college community, they must adapt to the new college experience. The *first-year experience* is crucial to the holistic success of a new college student. First-year students need to master how to set up a new social environment, develop the orientation based on the institution where they are admitted, become productive members of the community in their university, and adjust to new roles and responsibilities (Arjanggi & Kusumaningsih, 2016b). The adjustment process is how individuals try to cope with stress, conflict, and tension while meeting their needs. Adjustment is also defined as someone interacting with their environment (Arjanggi & Kusumaningsih, 2016b).

Difficulty in college transition falls into two distinct categories: academic adjustment and nonacademic adjustment. Academic adjustment includes meeting the minimum standards regarding academic performance, although nonacademic adjustment involves social integration, participation in co-curricular activities, faculty contact, and an individual's feelings of attachment to the institution (Jackson, 2008). A sense of belonging is also associated with nonacademic adjustment.

A growing body of literature indicates that nonacademic adjustment is as important as academic adjustment. Social integration and support/attachment are vital elements in an

individual's decision to commit to and persist in an institution (Jackson, 2008). It is likely that African American students with more experience living in predominantly White or even integrated communities will adjust more smoothly to a predominately White institution (PWI), especially a rural one, than their counterparts who have lived more segregated social lives before attending college (Woldoff et al., 2011). Black and White students who have experienced integrated environments before college may receive direct, social, and indirect academic benefits (Woldoff et al., 2011). However, empirical studies have yet to fully explore the ways in how the racial-ethnic character of students' home environments affects adjustment to college life (Woldoff et al., 2011).

Racial Disparities in Higher Education

Racial segregation in public education has been illegal for 65 years in the United States, yet American public schools remain largely separate and unequal, with profound consequences for students, especially students of color (Meatto, 2019). Before *Brown v. Board of Education,* Black and White students were legally prohibited from being educated under the same roof. Segregation was deemed legal as long as all races had access to *equal* resources, a doctrine known as *separate but equal*. The separate but equal doctrine came about as the result of a landmark court case in 1896, *Plessy v. Ferguson,* wherein the U.S. Supreme Court ruled racial segregation was not a violation of the Constitution so long as equal facilities and services were available to the individual races. In 1954, U.S. Supreme Court ruled through the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* case that segregation was illegal; however, integration was a slow and painful process for America. According to Cook (2015):

> American education is rife with problems, starting with the gaping differences between White students and students of color: More than 60 years after *Brown vs. Board of*

> *Education*, school systems in the United States are separate and unequal. By 2022, the number of Hispanic students in public elementary and secondary schools is projected to grow 33% from the 2011 numbers. The number of multi-racial students is expected to grow 44%. (para. 2)

As the percentage of White students in our education system shrinks and the percentage of students of color grows, the United States will be left with an education system that does not serve the majority of its children properly; the gaps in education will prove especially problematic (Cook, 2015). Today, the education system is still racially disproportionate. In reference to higher education, the enrollment rate of White students 18–24 years of age is 42%, although the Black enrollment rate is 34% (Musu-Gillette et al., 2016). Black and Hispanic students are concentrated at less-selective and lower-funded community colleges and four-year schools. The selective top-tier schools feature student populations primarily White and Asian (Carnevale et al., 2019).

Black graduates of historically Black colleges and universities are significantly more likely to have felt supported in college and thriving afterward than their Black peers who graduated from predominantly White institutions (New, 2015). Busteed, Executive Director of Gallup Education and Workforce Development, stated, “Black students have very meaningful experiences at HBCUs, compared to Black graduates from everywhere else” (New, 2015, para. 5). About half of Black HBCU graduates said their college or university was “the perfect school” for them, compared to 34% of non-HBCU Black alumni. Nearly half said they could not “imagine a world” without the HBCU they attended. Only 25% of Black graduates of predominantly White institutions agreed (New, 2015, para. 9). In 1992, Allen reported that Black students who attend HBCUs had better academic performances, greater social involvement, and

higher occupational aspirations than Black students who attend PWIs. On Black campuses, students emphasized feelings of engagement, extensive support, acceptance, encouragement, and connection (Coaxum, n.d.).

Racial disparities play a major role in the academic success of students. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) spring 2001 through the spring 2017 enrollment component chart, in 2016, Black student enrollment in degree-granting institutions was 2.2 million, but their White counterparts' enrollment was 9.1 million (NCES, 2019). Chiles (2017) cited a study entitled "A Look at Black Student Success," which concluded that most of the nation's four-year public and private colleges and universities, a significant gap exists between Black and White student's graduation rates. At the 676 public and private nonprofit institutions included in The Education Trust survey, excluding HBCUs, the six-year graduation rate for Black students was 45.4%; this was 19.3 points lower than the 64.7% graduation rate for White students (Chiles, 2017).

Black students pose a unique challenge regarding retention and graduation rates from colleges and universities. As a regional example, in the 2007–2008 academic school year, Kentucky public institutions (including Kentucky State University—Kentucky's sole HBCU) awarded 909 bachelors', 291 masters'/specialist, and 22 doctoral degrees to Black students, compared with 13,243 bachelors', 4,257 masters'/specialist, and 259 doctoral degrees to White students (Hunn, 2014).

Nichols (2017) stated:

> Data from the NCES showed that nearly 41% of first-time, full-time Black students who enrolled at four-year institutions in the fall of 2008 earned a degree within six years. This

> was the lowest rate among all racial and ethnic groups, approximately 22% below the graduation rate for White students. (p. 1)

However, statistics for Black students who enroll at an HBCU are noticeably higher. At HBCUs with 40–65% Pell freshmen, the graduation rate is 41.8%; at non-HBCUs with 40–65% Pell freshmen, the graduation rate is 32.1%. A study by Franke & De Angelo (2018) found Black students who attend HBCUs are between 6% and 16% more likely to graduate within six years than those who attend predominantly white institutions (Wyllie, 2018).

According to Seymour and Ray (2015):

> Black graduates of HBCUs are more likely than Black graduates of other colleges to strongly agree they had the support and experiential learning opportunities in college that Gallup finds are strongly related to graduates' well-being later in life. In turn, these experiences may also contribute to Black HBCU graduates being more likely to strongly agree that their colleges prepared them for life after graduation (55%) than Black graduates of other institutions (29%). (para. 5)

These data show a clear difference between the Black student experience at HBCUs versus the Black student experience at PWIs. Would these same findings occur with Black students who attend an HBCU that is predominantly White? Currently, there is little to no research pertaining to predominantly White HBCUs. Across the nation, HBCUs are becoming more diverse. Originally, HBCUs were founded to educate Black students; however, they also enroll students of other ethnicities. This diversity has increased over time. In 2020, non-Black students made up 24% of enrollment at HBCUs, compared to 15% in 1976 (NCES, n.d.).

West Virginia State University

Originally founded as the West Virginia Colored Institute, West Virginia State University (WVSU) was designated by the United States Congress as one of the original 1890 land-grant schools under the Second Morrill Act (The Atlantic Journal Constitution, 2017). WVSU is classified as an HBCU, founded in 1891, in Institute, West Virginia (WV). From 1891 to 1915, the original Institute offered the equivalent of a high school education, vocational training, and teacher preparation. In 1915, the West Virginia Collegiate Institute began to offer college degrees (The Atlantic Journal Constitution, 2017). WVSU has graduated some of the most notable Black Americans to date, such as Earl Lloyd, the first Black athlete to play in the National Basketball Association, and Katherine Johnson, a mathematician whose calculations led to Neil Armstrong landing on the moon. In 1939 WVSU trained students in a civilian pilot program who later became Tuskegee Airmen. When segregation was deemed illegal due to the landmark decision of *Brown v. Board of Education,* in 1954, over time, WVSU's demographics drastically changed. Today, West Virginia State is a 73% White student-populated HBCU.

Problem Statement

Although neither the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) nor the U.S. Department of Education provides a number indicating how many predominately White HBCUs exist, studies show that, over the years, many HBCUs have become or are becoming racially diverse institutions. When comparing Black and White students, no research has been conducted on whether the benefits of attending an HBCU, for Black or White students also accrue if the HBCU's student population is majority White. According to Closson and Henry (2008):

> Numerous researchers (Chavous et al., 2004; Lewis et al., 2004; Nixon & Henry, 1990; Phillips, 2005; Sedlacek, 1999) exploring the experiences of Black students attending

> predominantly White institutions (PWIs) suggest that Black students have an increased challenge with equity and condescension on these campuses stemming from prejudiced attitudes and behaviors on the part of other students, professors, and university staff. (p. 517)

White undergraduate students matriculating at an HBCU express less overt evidence of social adjustment barriers than Black students at predominantly White institutions. Although White students, in general, reported a sense of underrepresentation, they reported no direct experiences of overt racism and reported good relationships and strong support from HBCU faculty (Closson & Henry, 2008)**.**

Purpose Statement

With respect to studies examining Black students at predominately White HBCUs, very little data exists; therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the specific benefits to Black and White students of attending an HBCU (i.e., academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution) also accrue to those students whose HBCU is predominantly White.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their academic adjustment?
2. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their social adjustment?
3. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their personal-emotional adjustment?

4. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their attachment to the institution?

Method

To conduct this nonexperimental and descriptive study, the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) was used. This instrument was distributed to approximately 1,100 WVSU full-time students during the 2021 spring semester at WVSU via campus email.

At a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of approximately 7, the sample size is 104, which is approximately 10% of the full-time student population. Limited funding would not allow for a larger targeted sample size.

Delimitations

Participants in this study are limited to spring semester, full-time freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors at West Virginia State University.

Significance of the Study

The research conducted for this study will add to the vast body of literature that addresses inequalities in the higher education system as it relates to Black and White students; though there is a wealth of resources that address racial disparities in higher education in the areas of enrollment, student loan debt, retention, graduation rates, post-secondary education employment, etc., there is very little data reflecting the disparities between Black and White students in the areas of student adaptability or student adjustment to higher education at predominantly White HBCUs.

Definition of Terms

- Academic adjustment is a subscale that measures a student's success in coping with various educational demands characteristic of the college experiences (Baker & Siryk, 1989).
- Attachment is a subscale that measures a student's degree of commitment to educational-institutional goals and degree of attachment to the particular institution the student attends, especially the quality of the relationship or bond established between the student and the institution (Baker & Siryk, 1989).
- Personal-emotional adjustment is a subscale that focuses on a student's intrapsychic state during his or her adjustment to college and the degree to which he or she is experiencing general psychological distress and any concomitant somatic problems (Baker & Siryk, 1989).
- Social adjustment is a subscale that measures a student's success in coping with the interpersonal-societal demands inherent in the college experience (Baker & Siryk, 1989).
- Student Adaptability to College Questionnaire (SACQ) is a 67-item, self-report questionnaire that can be administered, individually or in groups, in about 20 minutes (Baker & Siryk, 1989).

Summary

Chapter 1 provided an overview of this study. The overview included the purpose and problem statements, and some historical context of student engagement, first-generation students, and racial disparities in America. These data serve as the foundation for this particular study. Chapter 2 will provide a more detailed description of the aforementioned topics. In

Chapter 2, the reader will be exposed to the evidence supporting the statements made in the overview.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Adaptation, or adjustment, is a psychosocial process that occurs when an individual accepts and integrates into his or her life a transition from one situation to another (Bejerano, 2014). Many individuals struggle with transitions because they involve changes in the environment, roles, routines, and/or ways of looking at the world (Bejerano, 2014). According to Love (2020):

> Adjusting to college entails the complementary processes of desocialization and socialization. Desocialization is the changing or discarding of selected values, beliefs, and traits one brings to college in response to the college experience. Socialization is the process of being exposed to and taking on some of the new values, attitudes, beliefs, and perspectives to which one is exposed at college. It is also the process of learning and internalizing the character, culture, and behavioral norms of the institution one is attending. (para. 2)

First-Generation College Students

First-generation college students are perhaps the most vulnerable of students. According to Tym et al. (2004):

> Students whose parents did not attend college are more likely than their non-first-generation counterparts to be less academically prepared for college, to have less knowledge of how to apply for college and financial assistance, and to have more difficulty in acclimating themselves to college once they enroll. (p. 1)

First-generation students are often placed in vocational, technical, and/or remedial programs, which impede their progress toward transferring to a four-year program, and receive

poor counseling (Tym et al., 2004). First-generation students tend to work longer hours at their jobs, are less likely to live on campus, and are more likely to have parents who would struggle to complete financial-aid forms (Mangan, 2015). First-generation students are less likely than continuing-generation students to have parents who help them apply to and navigate college (Manzoni & Streib, 2018). They also form fewer ties in college, ask for less help from professors, and face greater financial challenges (Manzoni & Streib, 2018).

These disparities have consequences. First-generation students are more likely to drop out of college, and even those who graduate typically accumulate fewer signals of success. In particular, first-generation students are less likely to have résumés that include internships, study abroad experiences, and extracurricular activities (Manzoni & Streib, 2018). The disparity in household income is striking: Median family income at two and four-year institutions for freshmen whose parents did not attend college was $37,565 last year, compared with $99,635 for those whose parents did (Mangan, 2015).

Since the early 2000s, first-generation college students have become the object of heightened attention in higher education (Wildhagen, 2015). According to Wildhagen (2015):

> A search of existing research on first-generation college students between 1970 and 2013 showed that while the number of studies using “first-generation college student(s)” or “first generation student(s)” in the title remained small between 1970 and the 1999, the number of studies with those terms in the title increased by 606 % between 1999 and 2013. (p. 287)

First-generation college students differ compared from the rest of the student population in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status. First-generation college students

tend to be older than traditional students and are more likely to be from a lower-income family (Williams & Ferrari, 2015).

Racial Disparities

Given that higher education is a microcosm of society, it is not surprising that racially-charged events and resulting racial tensions continue to emerge on college campuses around the nation as well (Museus et al., 2015). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the United States will move from a majority White population to a largely minority nation by 2037, with about 30% of young adults who are immigrants or have foreign-born parents (Williams & Ferrari, 2015). According to Williams and Ferrari (2015):

> Caucasian students, however, continue to be overrepresented in gaining access to college and completing a higher educational degree compared to students of color. Minority groups report feeling racial tensions, intolerance and exclusion, pressure to conform to prior stereotypes, perceive less equitable treatment by faculty and staff, perceive less policy and practice commitment toward diversity, and perceive university environments as more hostile in terms of ethnicity. (p. 378)

Black and Latino students have only somewhat lower rates of post-secondary school enrollment than their White and Asian counterparts but have much lower levels of educational attainment by their mid-20s (Sablich, 2017). Among students enrolled in four-year public institutions, 45.9% of Black students complete their degrees in 6 years—the lowest rate compared to other races and ethnicities (Bridges, 2019). Black and other non-Asian minority students attending predominantly White colleges are less likely to graduate within five years, have lower grade point averages, experience higher attrition rates, and matriculate into graduate programs at lower rates than White students and their counterparts at predominantly Black or

minority institutions (Smedley et al., 1993). Nationally, white students at public colleges are 2.5 times more likely to graduate than Black students and 60% more likely to graduate than Latino students (Sanchez & Kolodner, 2021). Enrollment and persistence rates of low-income students; Black, Latino, and Native American students; and students with disabilities continue to lag behind White and Asian students, with Latino students trailing all other ethnic groups (Kuh et al., 2006). Racial underrepresentation, low academic self-esteem, and difficulty adjusting to college can manifest when enrolled, contributing to a lower rate of college completion than students with at least one parent with a 4-year degree (Falcon, 2015).

The large percentage of students who are inadequately prepared for college and/or cannot afford the high tuition cost is represented by a large portion of low-income and minority students, who also tend to be overrepresented in the poverty rating (Williams & Ferrari, 2015).

Retention

Universities are becoming increasingly concerned with ways to increase retention rates, student success in college, and comfort level on campus for demographically underrepresented and first-generation college students. Although there are many approaches for helping students transition to a university, one important intervention strategy is to increase supportive relationships on campus through counseling and support services. Specifically, by providing academic and social support services through programs like the educational opportunity program (EOP), academic support program for intellectual rewards and enhancement (A.S.P.I.R.E.), and faculty mentoring program (FMP), students can develop significant relationships with others and in turn feel more integrated into campus life (Grant-Vallone et al., 2003). Where once there were only a handful of “innovative” 1st-year programs, today there are hundreds of programs designed to address different aspects of the 1st-year experience (Tinto & Goodsell, 1993).

New student orientation, peer organizations, and support groups, and 1st-year experience courses all play vital roles in the retention of 1st-year students. Universities all across the country are ramping up such programs to retain a higher percentage of those students; in addition, student engagement in educationally purposeful activities inside and outside of the classroom is a precursor to high levels of student learning and personal development and an indicator of educational effectiveness (Zhao & Kuh, 2004). Student engagement represents the time and energy students invest in educationally purposeful activities and the effort institutions devote to using effective educational practices (Kuh et al., 2008). There have also been some critical pieces from student outcomes literature that shed light on the role involvement may play in the undergraduate persistence process. Berger and Milem (1999) suggested:

> Involving colleges" to promote the best environment for student learning and development. More specifically, contend students are more likely to be satisfied with their education and feel a sense of loyalty to their institution if the institution promotes active involvement on the part of students in campus life and learning. (p. 644)

In addition, according to Tyler et al. (2011):

> Tinto (1975, 1993) argues that the student decision to remain or leave college is a function of a longitudinal process containing three phases. The first phase is the separation stage, where there is significant decline in interactions with past associates and an overall change in new college students' behavior. The second stage is the transition phase, where college students acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to interact successfully with members of a new group, typically, other college students both in and outside the classroom. The final phase is incorporation, where a new set of interaction patterns are developed by the college students. (p. 49)

Historically Black College/University

The overwhelming majority of HBCUs opened after 1865 in response to the need for institutions to educate newly freed slaves and to avoid admitting those individuals into the existing white institutions (Coaxum, n.d.). HBCUs provide a stable and nurturing environment for those most at risk of not entering or completing college: low-income, first-generation college students (Lomax, 2020). According to Palmer et al. (2018):

> Four unique elements define historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). First, HBCUs are well-known for fostering a supportive, nurturing, family-oriented climate that helps to facilitate the psychosocial development of Black students. Second, while HBCUs are not monolithic, many of these institutions are noted for admitting students who are academically underprepared and graduating them with the skills to access some of the nation's most prestigious colleges and universities for graduate or professional school. Third, though chronically underfunded, HBCUs have garnered a reputation for being equally, if not more, effective at promoting the success of Black students. Finally, although HBCUs emerged out of an era of segregation, they have always been open to racially and ethnically diverse populations. (p. 1)

HBCUs were established to serve the educational needs of Black Americans. Before their establishment, and for many years afterward, Blacks were generally denied admission to traditionally White institutions. As a result, HBCUs became the principal means of providing post-secondary education to Black Americans (Williams, 2021). Proponents of HBCUs argue they serve Black students with considerable effectiveness. Researchers contend HBCUs provide assets for Black students unavailable and unattainable at White institutions (Coaxum, n.d.). In 1992, Walter Allen reported, Black students who attend HBCUs have better academic

performance, greater social involvement, and higher occupational aspirations than Black students who attend predominately White institutions (PWIs). On Black campuses, students emphasized feelings of engagement, extensive support, acceptance, encouragement, and connection (Coaxum, n.d.).

Female enrollment at HBCUs has been higher than male enrollment every year since 1976. The percentage of female enrollment at HBCUs increased from 53% in 1976 to 64% in 2020 (NCES, n.d.).

The Black Student Experience

Black students integrating into collegiate experiences may experience more difficulty than their majority counterparts. This is especially the case when trying to integrate at a PWI versus a HBCU. According to Chen et al. (2014):

> In an often-cited study administered to 1,529 undergraduates from 7 HBCUs and 1,062 undergraduates from 8 PWIs, Fleming (1984) reported that HBCUs promoted intellectual and interpersonal growth for Black men as opposed to PWIs. Fleming also asserted HBCUs provided greater developmental opportunities for Black students in comparison to PWIs. (p. 566)

Many Black students leave college before obtaining a bachelor's degree. Nearly 2 million students who begin college each year will drop out before earning a diploma (Hess, 2018). Astin, in 1975, studied students who left college and found Black students' experiences of isolation and alienation at PWIs might contribute to a higher Black student drop-out rate at PWIs (Chen et al., 2014).

Allen, in 1992, reported HBCUs provided a more positive social and psychological environment for Black students. As a result of the conducive environment at HBCUs, Black

students are able to achieve better grades and also have higher occupational aspirations. Socially these students experience more support, connection, and feelings of acceptance and become more engaged at HBCUs than their peers at PWIs (Chen et al., 2014).

PWIs are continually challenged with retaining Black students because of barriers to matriculation including racial climate, campus climate, culture, and lack of diverse faculty and staff (Hunn, 2014). In his model of college departure, Tinto (1993) believed social integration among students of color at PWIs was influenced more by formal forms of associations, such as involvement in student organizations (Guiffrida, 2003). According to Hinderlie and Kenny (2002):

> Tinto posited that an institution's capacity to reach out and integrate students into college academic and social life is critical to student retention and drop-out prevention. A substantive body of research supports Tinto's premise, indicating that on-campus support, including relationships with classmates and faculty, contributes to academic success, social satisfaction, and college completion among Black undergraduates. (p.327)

The importance of successfully onboarding new students cannot be understated.

Student Engagement

Student engagement is a multidimensional (i.e., multifaceted) construct that can be measured with all the dimensions dynamically interrelated. Student engagement typically includes three dimensions: Behavioral engagement, focusing on participation in academic, social, and cocurricular activities; Emotional engagement, focusing on the extent and nature of positive and negative reactions to teachers, classmates, academics, and school; and Cognitive engagement, focusing on students' level of investment in learning (Martin & Torres, n.d.). George Kuh defines student engagement as the amount of time and energy students choose to

devote to activities both inside and outside the classroom as cited by Carter and Fountaine (2012). According to Astin (1999), student engagement or student involvement, as he terms it in his theory of student involvement, is the amount of phsical and psychological energy the student devotes to the academic experience. Astin (1999) stated, “Thus, a highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students” (p. 518).

For this study, engagement is referred to as the active commitment and purposeful effort expended by students toward all aspects of their learning, including formal and informal activities (Boulton et al., 2019). Student engagement has become an increasingly important benchmark for institutional quality and measure of student learning (Carter & Fountaine, 2012). Engagement with learning is believed to be an important factor in student success in higher education.

Today engagement is the term usually used to represent constructs such as quality of effort and involvement in productive learning activities (Kuh, 2009a). Student engagement is generally considered to be among the most reliable predictor of learning and personal development. The premise is deceptively simple, perhaps self-evident: The more students’ study or practice a subject, the more they tend to learn about it. Likewise, the more students practice and get feedback on their writing, analyzing, or problem-solving, the more adept they should become (Carini et al., 2006).

Student Adaptability to College Questionnaire

The SACQ is a 67-item questionnaire designed to measure the effectiveness of student adjustment to college. This report presents scores for the full scale and the following four

subscales: academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment (Baker & Siryk, 1989). The academic adjustment subscale measures a student's success at coping with various educational demands characteristic of the college experience. The social adjustment subscale contains items relevant to the interpersonal-societal demands of college. The personal-emotional adjustment subscale is designed to examine how a student is feeling psychologically and physically. Finally, the attachment subscale focuses on a student's satisfaction with the college experience in general and with the college he or she is attending in particular. Scores on 12 critical item clusters are also included in the report (Baker & Siryk, 1989).

Academic Adjustment

Students experiencing academic situations difference compared to earlier levels of education, such as reading assignments more, prepare the article and present it in the classroom, the initiative to consult on a new understanding with the lecturers and quizzes are held to check the competence achieved (Arjanggi & Kusumaningsih, 2016a). Students must be responsible for their actions to survive the new academic situations (Arjanggi & Kusumaningsih, 2016a).

Drop-out rates in the 1st year of university are high worldwide; 33% of 1st-year university students do not continue to the 2nd year of the program they initially started (van Rooij et al., 2017). According to Foubert and Urbanski (2006):

> More than 40 percent of all college entrants leave higher education without earning a degree, 75 percent of these students drop out in the first two years of college, and an institution can expect that 56 percent of a typical entering class cohort will not graduate from college. (p. 281)

A smooth transition from secondary school to a university increases the chances of student success, in terms of achievement and persistence (van Rooij et al., 2017).

Adaptability may briefly be described as the capacity to respond to challenges with resilience (Valickas et al., 2019). The concept refers to an individual's ability/skill and/or motivation to fit changing demands (i.e., different tasks, social or environmental features; Valickas et al., 2019). Adjustment to college is perceived to be a process of transition during which students face several challenges, including greater academic demands, autonomy and responsibilities as compared with their high school experiences (Valickas et al., 2019).

Academic adjustment is only one facet of adaptation to college and it can be defined as the appropriate response of students to the new learning environment (Clinciu et al., 2021). More specifically, academic adjustment was found to be related to external outcomes of learning as overall grade point average, or utilization of counseling services for social support (Clinciu et al., 2021). Research evidence also suggests a positive association between student academic performance and retention, low adapted students being considered at risk of dropping out (Clinciu et al., 2021). According to Hazan-Liran and Miller (2017):

> Academic adjustment has been suggested to consist of and be measured by the student's functioning in four distinct domains. The first domain, ''academic achievement'' is grounded in students' learning-motivation, the appropriateness of their study skills to particular study requirements and their ability to earn satisfactory grades. The second domain, ''social adjustment'' stands for students' involvement in their study environment, including their ability to establish social networks. The third domain, ''personal emotional adjustment'' reflects students' psychological and physical conditions. It is indicative of their self-perception and represents their copying with

> study-related challenges that lead to the arousal of stress and anxiety. The fourth and last domain, ‘‘institutional adjustment’’ is revealing of how students feel about their relation to academy, in general, and to their academic environment, in particular. (p. 52)

Social Adjustment

Managing social relationships is a major task for college students (Yang & Brown, 2012). According to Yang and Brown (2012),

> The task can be especially challenging for students who enter a residential college. Not only are they physically removed from close friends and other long-standing peer associates, complicating the task of maintaining existing intimate relationships, but they are typically submerged among thousands of unknown peers from whom they need to forge new intimate bonds. (p. 404)

College students are expected to make a series of adjustments to cope with their new ways of life; these adjustments range from academic assimilation to personal, emotional, and social adjustments (Gray et al., 2013). Social adjustment to a college environment is one facet of student adjustment and serves as one of the most critical activities emerging adults undertake that predicts success in college and beyond (Gray et al., 2013). Many students overestimate their ability to adjust socially to college, often as a result of not being aware of the social demands of college and the difficulties associated with creating a new social network (Melander, 2018). According to Gray et al. (2013):

> Social adjustment is the process by which students become integrated into the campus community, build support networks, and negotiate the new freedoms afforded by college life. Student adjustment, by contrast, is a combination of students’ social, personal-

> emotional, and academic adjustment along with their reported feelings of commitment to the institution. (p. 194)

With regard to factors salient on college campuses, adjustment to college can be particularly stressful when the predominant racial and ethnic culture of the college environment differs from one's own (Hinderlie & Kenny, 2002). According to Hinderlie and Kenny (2002):

> Tinto's (1993) model of college departure has been helpful in identifying some of the factors that contribute to academic success and college completion. Tinto posited that an institution's capacity to reach out and integrate students into college academic and social life is critical to student retention and drop-out prevention. (p. 327)

To facilitate college students' social adjustment (and thus retention), it is important students identify their niche in the college community and then increase psychosocial engagement in college-related activities (Yang, 2020).

For Black students from lower socioeconomic communities, developing and sustaining relationships with individuals who understand the college environment is an even greater challenge (Alford, 2000). According to Alford (2000):

> Many Black students come from personal environments that block them from attending college. Black students from the inner city who devote their time to their studies are considered to be "acting White." They are often ostracized by their peers. Therefore, when Blacks do attend college, they are often socially excluded. (p. 3)

White undergraduate students matriculating at an HBCU express less overt evidence of social adjustment barriers than Black students at predominately White institutions (Closson & Henry, 2008). According to Closson and Henry (2008):

> Brown and Stein (1972) presented a profile of White students attending HBCUs which indicated that a majority were originally from the South, between 27 and 35 years old, typically enrolled at a state-supported institution and had expressed pleasant and unpleasant social adjustment encounters. The convenience of a low-cost college close to home as well as financial assistance have been identified as primary reasons Whites enrolled at HBCUs. (p. 518)

Personal-Emotional Adjustment

Adjustment to college can be construed in many ways, including academic, social, and personal/emotional adjustment (Kasky Hernández & Kahn, 2018). Polewchak (2002) stated:

> Emotional adjustment is a particularly important component of overall adjustment and has been studied extensively. Emotional adjustment refers to the "proper ordering of affective experiences and behavior to the demands of human nature and to the requirements imposed by the environment; emotional adjustment consists of three essential elements: harmony, balance, and control. These factors are all important to the total integration process which is necessary for maturity, adjustment, and adult living. Thus, the adolescent who is chronically worried, anxious, guilty, or depressed, is emotionally ill-balanced. (p. 24)

Indellicati (2019) found a longitudinal study by Jackson et al. in 2000, that students with fearful expectations of college reported more stress, depression, and poorer university adjustment than students with other expectations (e.g., preparedness). Some difficulties regarding emotional adjustment are encountered at a greater level among adolescents (Polewchak, 2002). Studies consistently reveal children and adolescents who are teased, harassed, picked on, or targeted in

some way by peer aggression are at increased risk for psychological, emotional, and social maladjustment (Indellicati, 2019). According to Indellicati (2019):

> Buckner, Mezzacappa, and Beardslee (2003) found that lower levels of stress may be associated with skills or abilities such as self-regulation (i.e., controlling one's emotions, thoughts, and behaviors) which is associated with better adapting to stress. Regulating positive emotions is linked to resilience to the extent that they counteract negative emotional experiences and enhance proactive thinking and doing. Therefore, students with stronger self-regulatory abilities are in greater control of themselves (emotionally and behaviorally) during stressful times and should experience greater positive outcomes and resiliency than those with poorer self-regulation. (p. 23)

College students' ability to emotionally adjust to college has been found to be related to certain personality characteristics (Melander, 2018). Melander (2018) stated:

> Beck et al. (2003) found students who have highly independent (e.g., mostly self-reliant) or highly dependent (e.g., mostly reliant on others) personality characteristics were more likely to report the presence of depressive symptoms. These findings suggest that students who have a balance of independent and dependent personality characteristics were more likely to be emotionally well-adjusted to college. (p. 4)

Many 1st-year college students experience depression to some extent (Wei et al., 2005), and the college transition might be partly responsible for these symptoms (Kasky Hernández & Kahn, 2018). According to Kasky Hernández and Kahn (2018):

> The Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors (Reetz et al., 2014) state, depression and anxiety are the two most prevalent concerns for college students who seek counseling. Thus, depression and anxiety symptoms, as well as the

> physiological stress that often accompanies them, are important indicators of a college student's emotional adjustment. (p. 313)

However, emotional adjustment is not merely the absence of symptoms. Subjective well-being, or happiness, is also an indicator of adjustment (Kasky Hernández & Kahn, 2018).

Personal/emotional and social adjustment are of particular concern because these are issues with which young adults frequently present at college counseling centers. College students who do not cope with the stress of college are more likely to have difficulties adjusting to college compared to students who do cope with the stress (Melander, 2018).

Social support is regarded by many individuals as an important factor that contributes to emotional adjustment (Polewchak, 2002). According to Polewchak (2002):

> Different types of aid that one receives from supportive social networks are socioemotional, instrumental, and informational in nature. Socioemotional aid refers to assertions or demonstrations of love, caring, esteem, and empathy. Instrumental aid includes actions or materials provided by others that enable the fulfillment of ordinary behaviors (e.g., financial and household obligations). Informational aid refers to the communication of opinions or facts relevant to a person's current difficulties (e.g., advice, personal feedback). (p. 16)

Being unaware of the importance of a social support network may lead to difficulties adjusting socially to college (Melander, 2018). Adjustment to college is critical for students to remain emotionally healthy (Polewchak, 2002).

Institution Attachment

According to Spooner (2019):

> Place attachment involves the feelings people have about places, which include their beliefs and memories associated with their actions within them. Place attachment is the emotional connection and interdependence between people and places that is influenced by the attributes and characteristics of the setting and users. (p. 27)

One common finding is, like interpersonal attachment bonds, intact place attachment bonds are frequently associated with greater well-being (Seymour & Ray, 2015). According to Scannell and Gifford (2013):

> Recently, the diversity of person–place bonds has been organized into a tripartite framework, in which place attachment consists of person, process, and place dimensions. The person dimension describes who is attached and whether the attachment is based on individually or collectively held meanings; the process dimension describes the affective, cognitive, and behavioral content of the person; and the place dimension describes the qualities and specificity of the place to which one is attached. (p. 45)

Summary

Chapter 2 provided clarification on the areas of student adaptation, first-generation college students, racial disparities, retention, the relevance of HBCUs, the Black student experience, student engagement, Social Adjustment, Academic Adjustment, Personal-Emotional Adjustment, Institutional Attachment, and the SACQ. In Chapter 3, the instrument used and its relevance for this study will be fully explained.

Chapter 3

Method

This study examined the extent to which the specific benefits to Black students attending a historically black college or university HBCU school (i.e., academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution) also accrue to Black students whose HBCU is predominantly White. This chapter provides information on the research design, population and sample selection, research instrument, survey distribution, data collection, and analysis.

Research Design

This was a nonexperimental, descriptive study that utilized a digital questionnaire. The questionnaire was accessed by West Virginia State University (WVSU) full-time students via their campus email. The questionnaire was formatted and disbursed in Qualtrics for a more efficient analysis of the data; SPSS was used to analyze the data. The questionnaire is structured in a Likert-type format. This 67-item questionnaire assesses the overall adaptability to college and adaptability in the areas of academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution.

Instrument

The Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire is a quick, convenient instrument that helps determine how well a student is handling the demands of college. This 67-item questionnaire assesses the overall adjustment to college and adjustment in four specific areas:

- Academic adjustment
- Social adjustment
- Personal-emotional adjustment

- Attachment to the institution

This report presents scores for the full scale and the four aforementioned subscales (Baker & Siryk, 1989). The questionnaire is structured in a Likert-type format. According to Baker and Siryk (1989):

> The Academic Adjustment subscale measures a student's success at coping with various educational demands characteristic of the college experience. The Social Adjustment subscale contains items relevant to the interpersonal-societal demands of college. The Personal-Emotional Adjustment subscale is designed to examine how a student is feeling psychologically and physically. The Attachment subscale focuses on a student's satisfaction with the college experience in general and with the college he or she is attending in particular. Scores on 12 critical item clusters are also included in the report. (para.31)

The Student Adaptability to College Questionnaire (SACQ) is appropriate for use with students at any time during their undergraduate career. The 67-item questionnaire is rated on a 9-point scale (i.e., 1 = doesn't apply to me at all; 9 = applies very closely to me). The SACQ consists of five basic scores: the full-scale score, based on all 67 items, and four subscale scores, each based on 15–24 items. The subscale scores measure academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution (Ayres, 2007).

Academic Adjustment Subscale

The academic adjustment subscale contains 20 items and measures the educational characteristics of students, including a student's success in coping with the various educational demands characteristic of the college experience. The academic adjustment subscale is classified

into four clusters: motivation, application, performance, and academic environment (Ayres, 2007).

Social Adjustment Subscale

The social subscale contains 20 items as well and measures multiple aspects of interpersonal and social demands on students. The social adjustment subscale is classified into four clusters: general, other people, nostalgia, and social environment (Ayres, 2007).

Personal-Emotional Subscale

The personal-emotional subscale includes 15 items that assess the psychological and physical state of students. This subscale focuses on students' intra-psychic states during the adjustment to college, and the degree to which students experience general psychological distress and concomitant somatic problems. The subscale is divided into two item clusters, psychological and physical (Ayres, 2007).

Institutional Attachment Subscale

The institutional attachment subscale consists of 12 items that assess the degree of commitment toward the educational institution. The six items exclusive to this subscale (e.g., eight are shared with the social adjustment subscale and one with the academic subscale), plus one of the items reflected on the social adjustment subscale, are divided into two item clusters, "general" and "this college" (Ayres, 2007, p. 35). Some items in the questionnaire relate to more than one subscale. Additionally, questionnaire item 53 (i.e., I feel I have good control over my life situation at college) and item 67 (i.e., I feel confident that I will be able to deal in a satisfactory manner with future challenges here at college) are not scored on any subscale and contribute to the full-scale score only (Ayres, 2007).

Limitations

Originally, the instrument was to be implemented via face-to-face, but due to the COVID-19 global pandemic, the SACQ was formatted for Qualtrics and distributed via campus email. The findings are limited to undergraduate students from WVSU who responded to the questionnaire. The students that responded may have done so out of a particular bias, either positive or negative, about their experience at WVSU. It can be assumed all of the selected participants did not participate in this study and the ones who did may not have answered all of the questions on the instrument truthfully. This study is also subject to respondent honesty and the halo effect (i.e., the respondents tendency to answer statements in ways they believe the researcher prefers; Ayres, 2007).

In addition, the COVID-19 global pandemic may have had an effect on the number of participants in this study and the nature of the responses from the students that did participate.

Population and Sample

Black and White full-time undergraduate students enrolled at WVSU during the spring 2021 semester were utilized as participants for this study. WVSU is an 1890 Land Grant HBCU with a 3,600 total student population; inclusive of dual enrollment students and part-time students. Approximately 86% of students that attend WVSU are White.

Data Collection

Due to the COVID-19 global pandemic, the SACQ (see Appendix A) was administered via Qualtrics. The SACQ was sent to approximately 1,100 WVSU students via campus email with 111 respondents; however, 104 respondents qualified for this study (n = 104). Data received from the instrument was stored on a USB drive for a period not to exceed three years; at that time the USB drive will be reformatted, permanently deleting all information on the drive. An

incentive of winning one of two raffle prizes was presented to maximize participation. The prizes included: one $50 gift card and one $20 Chick-fil-A gift card.

Approval for this research was given by West Virginia State University (WVSU) and Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB; see Appendices B & C). By completing the SACQ, participants agree to the terms of the anonymous survey consent form (see Appendix D).

Data Analysis

Participants' questionnaire responses were recorded, analyzed, and stored by the use of Qualtrics, SPSS, and Excel software. Descriptive statistics were obtained by analyzing the data from the SACQ. Descriptive statistics provide a more holistic understanding of the sample. An independent samples *t* test and an ANOVA were utilized to analyze the data gathered from the SACQ.

Summary

This was a nonexperimental, descriptive study that assessed the overall adaptability to college and adjustment in the areas of academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution of Black and White students at West Virginia State University. This research will add to the current trifling body of literature as it pertains to student adaptability to college at a predominately White Historically Black college or university. Chapter 4 will provide the instrument findings and detail those findings in the following tables.

Chapter 4

Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which specific benefits (i.e., academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution) accrue to Black and White students attending a historically Black college or university (HBCU) whose student population is predominantly White. This chapter presents the findings from this study. The chapter is organized into sections on data collection, respondent characteristics, findings for each research question, and a chapter summary.

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected using the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ; see Appendix A), a self-report inventory. Due to the COVID-19 global pandemic, the SACQ was administered digitally via Qualtrics. The SACQ was sent to approximately 1,100 West Virginia State University (WVSU) students via campus email. One hundred and eleven responses were received and 104 responses were deemed useable for this study. The classification of seven of the respondents could not be verified; therefore, they were not included in the data analysis. The SACQ was launched on June 7, 2021, and closed on June 21, 2021. Fifty dollars and $20 gift cards were offered as incentives to participate. This research study was reviewed and approved by WVSU and Marshall University Institutional Review Boards (see Appendices C and D).

Respondent Characteristics

Twenty-six percent (n = 27) of the respondents were male, and 21.2% (n = 21) were Black. One in three (33.7%) of the respondents were seniors, 28.8% were juniors, and 19.2% were freshmen or sophomores. The freshman and sophomore classifications were combined for

analysis. Nine of 10 (89.4%) respondents were full-time students, 68.3% reported grades of B+, A-, or A, and 55.7% reported majors in either business (16.3%), health science (22.1%), or social science (17.3%). These data are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	*N*	%
Classification		
Fr/Soph	20	19.2
Junior	30	28.8
Senior	35	33.7
Other	19	18.3
Sex		
Male	27	26.0
Female	76	73.1
Other	1	1.0
Ethnicity		
Black	22	21.2
White	66	63.5
Other	16	15.4

Note. $n = 104$.

Table 2

Respondent Academic Attributes

Attribute	*N*	%
Status		
Full time	93	89.4
Part time	11	10.6
GPA		
A, A-, B+	71	68.3
B or below	33	31.7
Major		
Business	17	16.3
Health Science	23	22.1
Social Science	18	17.3
Other	46	44.2

Note. $n = 104$.

Survey Findings

The following section contains the major survey findings. The findings are organized into sections on the total group full-scale and subscale scores, and sections on the analyses of the four subscales by the selected independent variables. The chapter culminates in a summary.

Full-Scale and Subscale Overview

The total group full-scale mean score was (*M* = 314.84, *SD* = 42.45); with a possible range of 67–603. The academic adjustment subscale mean score for the total group was (*M* = 101.52, *SD* = 16.42); with a possible range of 24–216. The social adjustment subscale mean score for the total group was (*M* = 101.53, *SD* = 20.54); with a possible range of 20–108. The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for the total group was (*M* = 76.40, *SD* = 21.48); with a possible range of 15–135. The attachment subscale mean score for the total group was (*M* = 72.37, *SD* = 11.65); with a possible range of 15–135. These data are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Total Group Full-Scale and Subscale Scores

Scale	*M*	*SD*	*Range
Full-scale	314.84	42.45	67 – 603
Academic adjustment	101.52	16.42	24 – 216
Social adjustment	101.53	20.54	20 – 180
Personal-emotional adjustment	76.40	21.48	15 – 135
Attachment	72.37	11.65	15 – 135

Note. *N* = 104; *Range = possible range.

One-sample *t test* (comparison mean = 5) in which each survey item mean score was compared to a mean score from a hypothetically normal distribution, were applied to each item in the four subscales. These data are presented in Tables 4–7.

The academic adjustment subscale consisted of 24 items. One sample *t-test* results indicated 18 of 24 subscale items were statistically significant at $p < .05$. Mean scores ranged from a low of ($M = 1.30$, $SD = .934$) on Item Q23 (i.e., *getting a college degree is very important to me*) to a high of ($M = 6.84$, $SD = 2.78$) on Item Q32 (i.e., *lately, I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education*). The lowest statistically significant mean scores were for Items Q3, Q5, Q13, Q19, Q23, Q44, and Q54 with mean scores between $M = 1.30$ and $M = 2.88$. The highest statistically significant scores were from Items Q10, Q21, Q32, Q41, Q52, and Q58 with scores ranging from $M = 5.78$ to $M = 6.91$. These data are provided in Table 4.

Table 4

One sample t-test Results for Academic Adjustment Scale Items

Item	Scale item	*M*	*SD*	*t value*
Q3	I have been keeping up to date on my academic work.	2.22	1.60	-17.70*
Q5	I know why I'm in college and what I want out of it.	2.10	1.99	-14.86*
Q6	I am finding academic work at college difficult.	5.15	2.21	.711
Q10	I have not been functioning well during examinations.	5.79	2.65	3.03*
Q13	I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.	2.88	2.25	-9.65*
Q17	I am not working as hard as I should at my coursework.	5.53	2.82	1.92
Q19	My academic goals and purposes are well defined.	2.39	1.72	-15.45*
Q21	I am not really smart enough for the academic work.	6.91	2.34	8.35*
Q23	Getting a college degree is very important to me.	1.30	.934	-40.44*
Q25	I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.	5.22	2.63	.859
Q27	I enjoy writing papers for courses.	5.16	2.81	.594
Q29	I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.	5.40	2.64	1.56
Q32	Lately, I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education.	6.84	2.78	6.74*
Q36b	I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses.	4.07	2.53	-3.76*
Q39	Recently, I have been having trouble concentrating.	5.15	2.79	.563

Q41	I'm not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.	6.58	2.51	6.42*
Q43	I am satisfied with the quality of courses available at college.	3.83	2.29	-5.23*
Q44	I am attending classes regularly.	1.74	1.75	-19.04*
Q50	I am enjoying my academic work at college.	3.38	2.37	-6.98*
Q52	I am having trouble getting started on homework.	5.78	2.95	2.69*
Q54	I am satisfied with my program of courses.	2.82	2.09	-10.66*
Q58	Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my coursework at college.	5.84	2.78	3.07*
Q62	I am very satisfied with the professors in my courses.	3.14	2.29	-8.27*
Q66	I'm quite satisfied with my academic situation at college.	3.00	2.22	-9.20*

Note. n = 104; *p < .05. Scale: 1 = *Doesn't apply to me at all* to 9 = *Applies very closely to me*.

The social adjustment subscale consisted of 20 items. One sample *t-test* results indicated 13 of 20 subscale items were statistically significant at $p < .05$. Mean scores range from a low of (M = 2.58, SD = 1.97) on Item Q9 (i.e., *I am adjusting well to college*) and (M = 2.58, SD = 2.24) on Item Q16b (i.e, *I am pleased with about my decision to attend this college*) to a high of (M = 7.27, SD = 2.41) on Item Q22 (i.e., *lonesomeness for home is a source of difficulty for me*). The lowest statistically significant mean scores were for Items Q1B, Q9, Q16b, Q63, and Q65b with the mean scores ranging from M = 2.58 to M = 4.42. The highest statistically significant mean scores were from Items Q22, Q26b, Q37, Q42b, Q48, Q51, Q56b, and Q57b with scores ranging from M = 6.02 to M = 7.27. These data are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

One sample t-test Results for Social Adjustment Scale Items

Item	Scale ite	*M*	*SD*	*t value*
Q1b	I feel that I fit in well as part of the college environment.	3.04	2.13	-9.41*
Q4b	I am meeting as many people and making as many friends as I would like at college.	5.06	2.76	.213
Q8	I am very involved with social activities in college.	5.54	2.86	1.92
Q9	I am adjusting well to college.	2.58	1.97	-12.55*

Q14	I have had informal, personal contacts with professors.	4.74	2.90	-.912
Q16b	I am pleased about my decision to attend this college.	2.58	2.24	-11.03*
Q18	I have several close social ties at college.	5.20	2.78	.740
Q22	Lonesomeness for home is a source of difficulty for me.	7.27	2.41	9.62*
Q26b	I enjoy living in a college dormitory.	6.13	3.32	2.95*
Q30	I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available.	4.97	2.68	-.110
Q33	I am getting along very well with my roommate(s).	5.68	3.52	1.65
Q37	I feel that I have enough social skills to get along well in the college setting.	7.04	2.07	10.04*
Q42b	I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.	6.81	2.52	7.33*
Q46	I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at college.	4.59	2.82	-1.49
Q48	I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.	6.91	2.79	7.00*
Q51	I have been feeling lonely a lot lately at college.	6.43	2.82	5.17*
Q56b	I feel I am very different from other students at college in ways that I don't like.	6.13	2.90	3.95*
Q57b	On balance, I would rather be home than here (college).	6.02	2.82	3.69*
Q63	I have some good friends or acquaintances at college with whom I can talk about any problems I may have.	3.69	2.91	-4.58*
Q65b	I am quite satisfied with my social life at college.	4.42	2.80	-2.10*

Note. n = 104 *$p < .05$. Scale: 1 = *Doesn't apply to me at all* to 9 = *Applies very closely to me.*

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale consisted of 15 items. One sample *t-test* results indicated 12 of 15 subscale items were statistically significant at $p < .05$. Mean scores ranged from a low of (M = 3.12, SD = 2.31) on Item Q24 (i.e., *my appetite has been good lately*), to a high of (M = 6.41, SD = 2.59) on Item Q38 (i.e., *I have been getting angry too easily lately*). The lowest statistically significant mean scores were for Items Q2, Q11, Q24, Q49, and Q55 with the scores ranging from M = 3.12 to M = 4.97. The highest statistically significant mean scores were from Items Q7, Q12, Q20, Q28, Q31, Q38, and Q64 with scores ranging from M = 5.56 to M = 6.41. These data are provided in Table 6.

Table 6

One sample t-test Results for Personal-Emotional Adjustment Scale Items

Item	Scale item	*M*	*SD*	*t value*
Q2	I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.	4.97	2.93	-.100*
Q7	Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.	5.56	2.61	2.17*
Q11	I have felt tired much of the time lately.	4.15	2.63	-3.28*
Q12	Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.	6.31	2.77	4.82*
Q20	I have not been able to control my emotions very well lately.	5.97	2.59	3.83*
Q24	My appetite has been good lately.	3.12	2.31	-8.33*
Q28	I have been having a lot of headaches lately.	5.67	2.74	2.50*
Q31	I have given thought to whether I should ask for help from Psychological/Counseling Services or from a psychotherapist outside of college.	6.04	3.06	3.46*
Q35	I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.	5.23	2.96	.79
Q38	I have been getting angry too easily lately.	6.41	2.59	5.56*
Q40	I haven't been sleeping very well.	5.27	2.92	.939
Q45	Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.	4.87	2.62	-.524
Q49	I worry a lot about my college expenses.	3.88	2.97	-3.87*
Q55	I have been feeling in good health lately.	3.35	2.12	-7.95*
Q64	I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college.	5.92	2.75	3.42*

Note. n = 104; *p < .05. Scale: 1 = *Doesn't apply to me at all* to 9 = *Applies very closely to me*.

The attachment subscale consisted of 15 items. One sample *t-test* results indicated 14 of 15 subscale items were statistically significant at $p < .05$. Mean scores ranged from a low of (M = 1.71, SD = 1.37) on Item Q15 (i.e., *I am pleased now about my decision to go to college*), to a high of (M = 7.97, SD = 2.11) on Item Q60 (i.e., l*ately, I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether*). The lowest statistically significant mean scores were for Items Q1b, Q15, Q16b, Q34, Q36b, Q47, and Q65b with mean scores ranging from M = 1.71 to M = 2.58. The highest statistically significant scores were for Items Q26b, 48-1, Q56b, Q57b,

Q59, Q60, and Q61 with mean scores ranging from *M* = 6.02 to *M* = 7.97. These data are provided in Table 7.

Table 7

One sample t-test Results for Attachment Scale Items

Item	Scale item	*M*	*SD*	*t value*
Q1b	I feel that I fit in well a part of the college environment.	3.04	2.13	-9.41*
Q4b	I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like at college.	5.06	2.76	.213
Q15	I am pleased now about my decision to go to college.	1.71	1.37	-24.48*
Q16b	I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.	2.58	2.24	-11.03*
Q26b	I enjoy living in a college dormitory.	6.13	3.32	2.95*
Q34	I wish I were at another college/university.	3.29	2.73	-6.40*
Q36b	I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at college.	4.07	2.53	-3.76*
Q42b	I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.	6.81	2.52	7.33*
Q47	I expect to stay at this college for a bachelor degree.	1.86	1.98	-16.17*
Q56b	I feel I am very different from other students at college.	6.13	2.90	3.95*
Q57b	On balance, I would rather be home than here.	6.02	2.82	3.69*
Q59	Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another college.	7.36	2.52	9.54*
Q60	Lately, I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether.	7.97	2.11	14.36*
Q61	I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from college and finishing later.	7.83	2.28	12.63*
Q65b	I am quite satisfied with my social life at college.	4.42	2.80	-2.10*

Note. n = 104; *p < .05. Scale: 1 = *Doesn't apply to me at all* to 9 = *Applies very closely to me*.

Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Ethnicity

An independent-samples *t test* was conducted to compare the full-scale and subscale mean scores disaggregated by ethnicity. These data are available in Table 8. The full-scale mean score for Black students was (*M* = 309.32, *SD* = 57.80) and the mean score for White students

was (*M* = 322.95, *SD* = 39.84), resulting in a mean difference of 13.63. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for Black students was (*M* = 106.45, *SD* = 13.68) and the mean score for White students was (*M* = 101.70, *SD* = 15.86) resulting in a mean difference of 4.76. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for Black students was (*M* = 92.64, *SD* = 18.59) and the mean score for White students was (*M* = 104.88, *SD* = 22.00) resulting in a mean difference of 12.24. The social adjustment subscale mean difference based on ethnicity was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for Black students was (*M* = 74.95, *SD* = 18.32) and the mean score for White students was (*M* = 80.59, *SD* = 20.24) resulting in a mean score difference of 5.64. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The attachment subscale mean score for Black students was (*M* = 68.91, *SD* = 12.08) and the mean score for White students was (*M* = 74.03, *SD* = 11.96) resulting in a mean score difference of 5.12. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 8

Independent Samples t-test Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Ethnicity

	Black		White		
Scale	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Full-scale	309.32	41.50	322.95	39.84	13.63
Academic adjustment	106.45	13.68	101.70	15.86	4.76
Social adjustment	92.64	18.59	104.88	22.00	12.24*
Personal-emotional adjustment	74.95	18.32	80.59	20.24	5.64
Attachment	68.91	12.08	74.03	11.96	5.12

Note. $n = 104$, Black $n = 22$, White $n = 66$; *$p < .05$.

An independent samples *t test* was used to compute the mean scores disaggregated by ethnicity, for each of the subscales by item. The independent sample *t-test* results disaggregated by ethnicity for the academic adjustment subscale are provided in Table 9. The academic adjustment subscale consisted of 24 items. Means scores of Black students ranged from a low of (*M* = 1.36, *SD* = 1.14) to a high of (*M* = 6.91, *SD* = 2.41); means scores for White students ranged from a low of (*M* = 1.23, *SD* = 0.70) to a high of (*M* = 7.32, *SD* = 2.44). Independent samples *t-test* results indicated the mean scores of Black students (*M* = 4.23, *SD* = 2.84) and White students (*M* = 2.62, *SD* = 1.82) on Item Q62 (i.e., *I am very satisfied with the professors I have now in my courses*) was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 9

Independent Sample t-test Results for Academic Adjustment by Ethnicity

		Black		White		
Item	Question	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Q3	I have been keeping up-to-date on my academic work.	2.36	1.47	2.02	1.53	0.34
Q5	I know why I'm in college and what I want out of it.	2.18	1.65	2.05	2.13	0.13
Q6	I am finding academic work at college difficult.	5.14	2.42	5.44	2.02	0.30
Q10	I have not been functioning well during examinations.	5.68	2.95	6.17	2.42	0.49
Q13	I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.	3.36	2.97	2.55	2.00	0.81
Q17	I am not working as hard as I should at my course work.	5.82	2.82	5.74	2.73	0.08
Q19	My academic goals and purposes are well defined.	2.86	2.01	2.24	1.62	0.62
Q21	I am not really smart enough for the academic work I am expected to be doing now.	7.41	2.30	6.97	2.21	0.44
Q23	Getting a college degree is very important to me.	1.36	1.14	1.23	0.70	0.13

Q25	I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.	4.86	2.59	5.76	2.57	0.90
Q27	I enjoy writing papers for courses.	5.64	2.65	4.95	2.78	0.69
Q29	I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.	5.86	2.83	5.38	2.55	0.48
Q32	Lately I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education.	6.50	2.84	7.32	2.44	0.82
Q36b	I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available.	4.05	2.60	3.92	2.52	0.13
Q39	Recently, I have been having trouble concentrating when I try to study.	5.82	2.94	5.12	2.74	0.70
Q41	I'm not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.	6.91	2.41	6.74	2.41	0.17
Q43	I am satisfied with the quality or the caliber of courses available.	4.09	2.51	3.67	2.19	0.42
Q44	I am attending classes regularly.	1.55	1.10	1.61	1.73	0.06
Q50	I am enjoying my academic work.	3.55	2.44	2.98	2.12	0.57
Q52	I am having a lot of trouble getting started on homework assignments.	6.00	3.21	5.82	2.84	0.18
Q54	I am satisfied with my program of courses for this semester/quarter.	2.95	2.01	2.50	1.84	0.45
Q58	Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my course work at college.	5.50	3.08	6.12	2.66	0.62
Q62	I am very satisfied with the professors.	4.23	2.84	2.62	1.82	1.61*
Q66	I'm quite satisfied with my academic situation at college.	3.36	2.44	2.76	2.10	0.60

Note. n = 104, Black, n = 22, White n = 66; *$p < .05$.

The social adjustment subscale consisted of 20 items. Mean scores for Black students ranged from a low of (M = 2.14, SD = 1.58) to a high of (M = 7.05, SD = 2.30), and the mean scores for White students ranged from a low of (M = 2.42, SD = 2.16) to a high of (M = 7.82, SD = 2.00). Independent samples *t-test* results indicated subscale Items Q1b, Q8, and Q30 were statistically significant at $p < .05$. Item Q1b (i.e., *I feel that I fit in well a part of the college*

environment) had a mean score for Black students (*M* = 2.14, *SD* = 1.58) and a mean score for White students of (*M* = 3.30, *SD* = 2.21) resulting in a mean difference of 1.16. Item Q8 (i.e., *I am very involved with social activities in college*) had a mean score for Black students of (*M* = 3.95, *SD* = 2.89) and a mean score for White students of (*M* = 6.14, *SD* = 2.75) resulting in a mean difference of 2.19. Item Q30 (i.e., *I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available at WVSU*) had a mean score for Black students of (*M* = 3.77, *SD* 2.53) and a mean score for White students of (*M* = 5.26, *SD* = 2.66), resulting in a mean difference of 1.49. These data are available in Table 10.

Table 10

Independent Sample t-test Results for Social Adjustment by Ethnicity

		Black		White		
Item	Question	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Q1b	I feel that I fit in well a part of the college environment.	2.14	1.58	3.30	2.21	1.16*
Q4b	I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like at college.	4.73	2.71	5.03	2.86	0.30
Q8	I am very involved with social activities in college.	3.95	2.89	6.14	2.75	2.19*
Q9	I am adjusting well to college.	2.27	1.67	2.59	2.01	0.32
Q14	I have had informal, personal contacts with college professors.	5.41	2.91	4.41	2.93	1.00
Q16b	I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.	2.41	2.15	2.42	2.16	0.01
Q18	I have several close social ties at college.	4.45	2.77	5.58	2.71	1.13
Q22	Lonesomeness for home is a source of difficulty for me now.	7.05	2.30	7.82	2.00	0.77
Q26b	I enjoy living in a college dormitory.	5.06	3.71	6.43	3.23	1.37
Q30	I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available.	3.77	2.53	5.26	2.66	1.49*

Q33	I am getting along very well with my roommate(s) at college.	4.35	3.81	5.80	3.41	1.45
Q37	I feel that I have enough social skills to get along well in the college setting.	6.86	2.46	7.21	1.79	0.35
Q42b	I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.	6.95	2.55	6.88	2.47	0.07
Q46	I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at college.	3.86	2.71	4.76	2.89	0.90
Q48	I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.	6.09	3.37	7.23	2.57	1.14
Q51	I have been feeling lonely a lot lately at college.	6.36	3.00	6.48	2.74	0.12
Q56b	I feel I am very different from other students at college in ways that I don't like.	6.41	2.91	6.20	2.82	0.21
Q57b	On balance, I would rather be home than here (college).	6.05	2.66	6.35	2.81	0.30
Q63	I have some friends that I can talk about any problems I may have.	3.14	2.44	4.08	3.18	0.94
Q65b	I am quite satisfied with my social life at college.	3.59	2.52	4.77	2.97	1.18

Note. n = 104, Black n = 22, White n = 66; *$p < .05$.

The independent sample *t-test* results for the personal-emotional adjustment subscale items disaggregated by ethnicity are explained in Table 11. Mean scores for Black students ranged from a low of (M = 2.73, SD = 1.55) to a high of (M = 7.00, SD = 2.29). Mean scores for White students ranged from a low of (M = 2.82, SD = 2.29) to a high of (M = 7.09, SD = 2.27). Independent samples *t-test* results indicated Item Q12 was the only statistically significant item at $p < .05$ level. Item Q12 (i.e., *being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy*) provided a mean score of (M = 4.59, SD = 2.82) for Black students and a mean score of (M = 7.09, SD = 2.27) for White students, resulting in a mean difference of 2.50.

Table 11

Independent Sample t-test Results for Personal-Emotional Adjustment by Ethnicity

		Black		White		
Item	Question	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Q2	I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.	5.00	3.27	5.39	2.75	0.39
Q7	Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.	5.41	2.61	5.94	2.54	0.53
Q11	I have felt tired much of the time lately.	4.18	2.50	4.33	2.70	0.15
Q12	Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.	4.59	2.82	7.09	2.27	2.50*
Q20	I have not been able to control my emotions very well lately.	6.23	2.64	6.38	2.35	0.15
Q24	My appetite has been good lately.	3.45	2.28	2.82	2.29	0.63
Q28	I have been having a lot of headaches lately.	6.41	2.89	5.76	2.61	0.65
Q31	I have given thought to whether I should ask for help from Psychological/Counseling Services or from a psychotherapist outside of college.	5.50	3.35	6.36	2.87	0.86
Q35	I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.	5.14	2.78	5.44	2.97	0.30
Q38	I have been getting angry too easily lately.	7.00	2.29	6.58	2.42	0.42
Q40	I haven't been sleeping very well.	5.77	2.91	5.38	2.83	0.39
Q45	Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.	4.18	2.48	5.32	2.61	1.14
Q49	I worry a lot about my college expenses.	3.64	3.20	4.21	2.97	0.57
Q55	I have been feeling in good health.	2.73	1.55	3.35	2.12	0.62
Q64	I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college.	5.68	2.78	6.36	2.70	0.68

Note. n = 104, Black n = 22, White n = 66; *p < .05.

The independent sample *t-test* results for attachment disaggregated by ethnicity are provided in Table 12. Mean scores for Black students ranged from a low of (M = 1.59, SD =

0.91) to a high of (*M* = 7.91, *SD* = 2.18). Mean scores for White students ranged from a low of (*M* = 1.55, *SD* = 0.98) to a high of (*M* = 8.30, *SD* = 1.76). There were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores based on ethnicity for the items included in the attachment subscale. These data are provided in Table 12.

Table 12

Independent Sample t-test Results for Attachment by Ethnicity

		Black		White		
Item	Question	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Q1c	I feel that I fit in well a part of the college environment.	2.14	1.58	3.30	2.21	1.16
Q4c	I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like.	4.73	2.71	5.03	2.86	0.30
Q15	I am pleased now about my decision to go to college.	1.77	1.34	1.55	0.98	0.22
Q16c	I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.	2.41	2.15	2.42	2.16	0.01
Q26c	I enjoy living in a college dormitory.	5.06	3.71	6.43	3.23	1.37
Q34	I wish I were at another college/university.	3.27	2.37	3.14	2.83	0.13
Q36d	I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at college.	4.05	2.60	3.92	2.52	0.13
Q42c	I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.	6.95	2.55	6.88	2.47	0.07
Q47	I expect to stay at this college for a bachelors degree.	1.59	0.91	2.02	2.34	0.43
Q56c	I feel I am very different from other students at college in ways that I don't like.	6.41	2.91	6.20	2.82	0.21
Q57c	On balance, I would rather be home.	6.05	2.66	6.35	2.81	0.30
Q59	Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another college.	7.00	2.64	7.65	2.32	0.65
Q60	Lately, I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether and for good.	7.77	2.20	8.30	1.76	0.53
Q61	I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from college and finishing later.	7.91	2.18	8.17	1.84	0.26
Q65c	I am quite satisfied with my social life.	3.59	2.52	4.77	2.97	1.18

Note. n = 104, Black n = 22, White n = 66; *p < .05.

Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Sex and Ethnicity

The data in Table 13 provided the results of an independent-samples *t test* comparing the full-scale and subscale mean scores disaggregated by sex. The full-scale mean score for the male students was (M = 306.81, SD = 40.47) and the full-scale score for the female students was (M = 318.04, SD = 43.17), resulting in a mean difference of 11.23. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The academic adjustment mean scores for male students was (M = 97.41, SD = 16.38) and the mean score for female students was (M = 103.05, SD = 16.39) resulting in a mean difference of 5.64. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for the male students was (M = 94.74, SD = 17.96) and the social adjustment mean score for the female students was (M = 103.95, SD = 21.09) resulting in a mean score difference of 9.21, making the difference based on sex for the social adjustment subscale statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for male students was (M = 80.85, SD = 22.16) and the personal-emotional adjustment mean score for female students was (M = 75.01, SD = 21.25) resulting in a mean difference of 5.84. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The attachment subscale mean score for male students was (M = 68.52, SD = 9.05) and the mean score for female students was (M = 73.79, SD = 12.27) resulting in a mean difference of 5.27. This mean difference for the subscale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Table 13

Independent Samples t-test Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Sex

Scale	Male		Female		M Dif
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
Full-scale	306.81	40.47	318.04	43.17	11.23
Academic adjustment	97.41	16.38	103.05	16.39	5.64
Social adjustment	94.74	17.96	103.95	21.09	9.21*
Personal-emotional adjustment	80.85	22.16	75.01	21.25	5.84
Attachment	68.52	9.05	73.79	12.27	5.27*

Note. n = 104, Male n = 27, Female n = 76; *$p < .05$.

The means, standard deviations, and *t values* for the full-scale and four subscale scores disaggregated by sex and ethnicity are provided in Table 14. An independent samples *t test* was used to compare the full-scale and subscale mean scores of Black male and Black female students and White male and White female students.

The full-scale mean score for Black male students was (M = 310.20, SD = 31.73); the full-scale mean score for Black female students was (M = 309.06, SD = 44.81) resulting in a mean score difference of 1.14. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The full-scale mean score for White male students was (M = 307.50, SD = 43.69); the full-scale mean score for White female students was (M = 328.75, SD = 37.13) resulting in a mean score difference of 21.25. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The academic adjustment subscale mean scores for Black male students was (M = 105.80, SD = 12.07); the mean score for Black female students was (M = 106.65, SD = 14.46) resulting in a mean score difference of 0.85. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for White male students was (M = 95.56, SD = 16.26); the mean score for White female students was (M = 104.00, SD = 15.24), resulting

in a mean score difference of 8.44. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p <$ .05.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for Black male students was (M = 88.40, SD = 13.24); the mean score for Black female students was (M = 93.88, SD = 20.07) resulting in a mean score difference of 5.48. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The social adjustment mean score for White male students was (M = 93.67, SD = 18.82); the mean score for White female students was (M = 109.08, SD = 21.79) resulting in a mean difference of 15.42. This mean difference was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean scores for Black male students were (M = 83.40, SD = 19.63); for Black female students it was (M = 72.47, SD = 17.76) resulting in a mean score difference of 10.93. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean scores for White male students was (M = 83.56, SD = 21.40); for White female students the mean score was (M = 79.48, SD = 19.90) resulting in a mean score difference of 4.08. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The attachment subscale mean scores for Black male students was (M = 69.40, SD = 8.85); the mean score for Black female students was (M = 68.76, SD = 13.10) resulting in a mean score difference of 0.64. This mean difference was not statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The attachment subscale of White male students was (M = 68.61, SD = 9.52); the mean scores for White female students was (M = 76.06, SD = 12.23) resulting in a mean score difference of 7.45. This mean difference was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 14

Independent Samples t-test Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Sex and Ethnicity

		Male		Female		
Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Full-Scale	Black	310.20	31.73	309.06	44.81	1.14
	White	307.50	43.69	328.75	37.13	21.25
Academic Adjustment	Black	105.80	12.07	106.65	14.46	.85
	White	95.56	16.26	104.00	15.24	8.44
Social Adjustment	Black	88.40	13.24	93.88	20.07	5.48
	White	93.67	18.82	109.08	21.79	15.42*
Personal-emotional adjustment	Black	83.40	19.63	72.47	17.76	10.93
	White	83.56	21.40	79.48	19.90	4.08
Attachment	Black	69.40	8.85	68.76	13.10	.64
	White	68.61	9.52	76.06	12.23	7.45*

Note. n = 104, n =Black female students n = 17, Black male students n = 5, White female students n = 48, White male students n = 18; *p < .05.

Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by GPA and Ethnicity

In Table 15 the means, standard deviations, and *t values* were determined for the full-scale and four subscale scores disaggregated by GPA data are reflected. An independent samples *t test* was used to compare the full-scale and subscale mean scores of all the participants.

The full-scale mean score for the high GPA students was (M = 319.00, SD = 42.03) and the full-scale mean score for the low GPA students was (M = 305.88, SD = 42.59) resulting in a mean difference of 13.12. There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores for the high GPA students and the low GPA students at the $p < .05$ level.

The adjustment subscale mean scores of the high GPA students was (M = 102.48, SD = 17.42) and the mean score for the low GPA students was (M = 99.45, SD = 14.09). There was a mean difference of 3.03. There was no statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the high GPA students and low GPA students at the $p < .05$ level in this subscale.

The social adjustment subscale mean scores between high GPA students was (*M* = 101.75, *SD* = 20.73) and the mean score for the low GPA students was (*M* = 101.06, *SD* = 20.43). There was a mean difference of 0.69. There was no statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the high GPA students and low GPA students at the $p < .05$ level.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean scores between the high GPA students was (*M* = 79.25, *SD* = 20.53) and the low GPA students was (*M* = 70.27, *SD* = 22.50). There was a mean difference of 8.98. There was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores between the high GPA students and low GPA students at the $p < .05$ level in this subscale.

The attachment subscale mean scores between the high GPA students was (*M* = 72.42, *SD* = 12.55) and the mean score for the low GPA students was (*M* = 72.27, *SD* = 9.62). There was a mean difference of 0.15. There was no statistical significant difference in the mean scores for the high GPA students and low GPA students in this subscale.

Table 15

Independent Samples t-test Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by GPA

	GPA high (*n* = 71)		GPA low (*n* = 33)		
Scale	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Full-scale	319.00	42.03	305.88	42.59	13.12
Academic adjustment	102.48	17.42	99.45	14.09	3.03
Social adjustment	101.75	20.73	101.06	20.43	0.69
Personal-emotional adjustment	79.25	20.53	70.27	22.50	8.98*
Attachment	72.42	12.55	72.27	9.62	0.15

Note. $n = 104$, high GPA = A+, A, B+; low GPA = B or below; *$p < .05$.

Table 16 contains the independent samples *t-test* results for full-scale and subscale scores disaggregated by GPA and ethnicity. The full-scale mean score of the high GPA (i.e., high GPA = A+, A, B+) Black students was (*M* = 327.92, *SD* = 37.85); the mean score for the low GPA

(i.e., low GPA = B or below) Black students was (M = 287.00, SD = 35.39), with a mean score difference of 40.92. The mean difference was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. The full-scale mean score for the high GPA White students was (M = 323.86, SD = 40.31); the mean score for the low GPA White students was (M = 320.35, SD = 39.55) with a mean score difference of 3.51. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score of the high GPA Black students was (M = 111.25, SD = 12.51); the mean score for the low GPA Black students was (M = 100.70, SD = 13.34), resulting in a mean score difference of 10.55. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The academic adjustment mean scores for the high GPA White students was (M = 102.94, SD = 16.15); the mean score for the low GPA White students was (M = 98.12, SD = 14.85), resulting in a mean score difference of 4.82. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The social adjustment subscale for the high GPA Black students was (M = 98.00, SD = 21.97); the mean score for the low GPA Black students was (M = 86.20, SD = 11.50), resulting in a mean score difference of 11.80. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The social adjustment subscale for the high GPA White students was (M = 102.29, SD = 21.93); the mean score for the low GPA White students was (M = 111.47, SD = 21.47), resulting in a mean score difference of 9.18. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score of the high GPA Black students was (M = 83.50, SD = 17.42); the mean score for the low GPA Black students was (M = 64.70,

SD = 14.08), resulting in a mean score difference of 18.80. The mean difference was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for the high GPA White students was (*M* = 82.39, *SD* = 18.74); the mean score for the low GPA White students was (*M* = 75.41, *SD* = 23.91), resulting in a mean score difference of 6.98. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The attachment subscale mean scores for the high GPA Black students was (*M* = 70.42, *SD* = 14.45); the mean score for the low GPA Black students was (*M* = 67.10, *SD* = 8.85) resulting in a mean score difference of 3.32. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The attachment subscale mean score for the high GPA White students was (*M* = 73.24, *SD* = 12.74); the mean score for the low GPA White students was (*M* = 76.29, *SD* = 9.31), resulting in a mean score difference of 3.05. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 16

Independent Samples t-test Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by GPA and Ethnicity

		GPA High		GPA Low		
Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	M Dif
Full-scale	Black	327.92	37.85	287.00	35.39	40.92*
	White	323.86	40.31	320.35	39.55	3.51
Academic adjustment	Black	111.25	12.51	100.70	13.34	10.55
	White	102.94	16.15	98.12	14.85	4.82
Social adjustment	Black	98.00	21.97	86.20	11.50	11.80
	White	102.29	21.93	111.47	21.47	9.18
Personal-emotional adjustment	Black	83.50	17.42	64.70	14.08	18.80*
	White	82.39	18.74	75.41	23.91	6.98
Attachment	Black	70.42	14.45	67.10	8.85	3.32
	White	73.24	12.74	76.29	9.31	3.05

Note. n = 104, Black high GPA = A+, A, B+ (n = 12); Black low GPA = B or below (n = 10) White high GPA = A+, A, B+ (n = 49); White low GPA = B or below (n = 17); *p < .05.

Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Class Standing and Ethnicity

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the full-scale and subscale mean scores for students categorized by classification (freshmen/sophomore n = 20, junior n = 30, senior n = 30). The freshmen and sophomore classifications were combined into one category due to the small individual sample size of each class. These data are reflected in Table 17.

The full-scale mean score for freshmen/sophomore was (M = 302.45, SD = 57.80); the mean score for juniors was (M = 328.80, SD = 34.81); and the mean score for seniors was (M = 309.49, SD = 33.09), resulting in a F value of 2.99. There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores at p < .05.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for freshmen/sophomore was (M = 92.70, SD = 18.19); the mean score for juniors was (M = 105.93, SD = 12.61), and the mean score for seniors was (M = 101.86, SD = 18.71), resulting in a F value of 3.83. There was a statistically significant difference at the p < .05 level. The magnitude of the differences of the mean scores between the groups was moderately small.

The social adjustment subscale mean scores for freshmen/sophomore was (M = 102.60, SD = 25.40); the mean score for juniors was (M = 103.37, SD = 20.46); and the mean score for seniors was (M = 102.06, SD = 16.21), resulting in an F value of 0.34. No item in the social adjustment subscale was statistically significant at p < .05.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for freshmen/sophomore was (*M* = 73.15, *SD* = 24.27); the mean score for juniors was (*M* = 83.80, *SD* = 17.48); and the mean score for seniors was (*M* = 70.03, *SD* = 19.48), resulting in a F value of 4.01. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level. The magnitude of the differences of the mean scores between the groups was moderately small.

The attachment subscale mean score for freshmen/sophomore was (*M* = 69.80, *SD* = 11.91); the mean score for the juniors was (*M* = 71.57, *SD* = 10.80); and the mean score for seniors was (*M* = 75.34, *SD* = 9.42), resulting in a F value of 2.03. No item in the attachment subscale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Table 17

ANOVA Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Class Standing

	Fr/Soph		Junior		Senior		
Scale	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	F Val
Full-scale	302.45	57.80	328.80	34.81	309.49	33.09	2.99
Academic adjustment	92.70	18.19	105.93	12.61	101.86	18.71	3.83*
Social adjustment	102.60	25.40	103.37	20.46	102.06	16.21	0.34
Personal-emotional adjustment	73.15	24.27	83.80	17.48	70.03	19.48	4.01*
Attachment	69.80	11.91	71.57	10.80	75.34	9.42	2.03

Note. $n = 104$, freshmen/sophomore $n = 20$, junior $n = 30$, senior $n = 35$; *$p < .05$.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the full-scale and subscale mean scores for students categorized by classification and ethnicity (Black freshmen/sophomore $n = 4$, junior $n = 8$, senior $n = 9$; White freshmen/sophomore $n = 17$, junior $n = 23$, senior $n = 18$). These data are provided in Table 18.

The full-scale mean scores for the freshmen/sophomore Black students were (*M* = 282.00, *SD* = 60.84); the mean score for Black junior students was (*M* = 327.50, *SD* = 36.48);

and the mean score for Black senior students was (M = 309.67, SD = 32.72), resulting in a F value of 1.73. No item in the full-scale for Black students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The full-scale mean scores for the freshmen/sophomore White students was (M = 314.64, SD = 57.42); the mean score for the junior White students was (M = 329.05, SD = 36.44); and the mean score for senior White students was (M = 317.53, SD = 25.65), resulting in a F value of 0.63. No item in the full-scale for White students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for Black freshmen/sophomore students was (M = 94.50, SD = 14.53); the mean score for Black junior students was (M = 108.88, SD = 12.61); and the mean score for Black senior students was (M = 109.56, SD = 13.59), resulting in a F value of 1.97. No item in the academic adjustment subscale for Black students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for White, freshmen/sophomore students was (M = 93.71, SD = 19.63); the mean score for White junior students was (M = 104.21, SD = 13.23); and the mean score for White senior students was (M = 102.74, SD = 17.22), resulting in a F value of 1.80. No item in the academic adjustment subscale for White students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for Black freshmen/sophomore was (M = 95.25, SD = 32.50); the mean score for Black juniors was (M = 94.13, SD = 19.80); and the mean score for Black senior students was (M = 93.67, SD = 6.04), resulting in a F value of 0.10. No item in the social adjustment subscale for Black students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The social adjustment mean score for White freshmen/sophomore students was (M = 104.79, SD = 26.03); the mean score for White juniors was (M = 107.84, SD = 21.15); and the

mean score for White seniors was (M = 104.63, SD = 19.30), resulting in a F value of 0.12. No item in the social adjustment subscale for White students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for freshmen/sophomore Black students was (M = 54.75, SD = 11.53); the mean score for Black junior students was (M = 88.13, SD = 9.96); and the mean score for Black senior students was (M = 70.56, SD = 17.94), resulting in a F value of 7.89. There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level. The magnitude of the differences of the mean scores between the classifications was large.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for White freshmen/sophomore was (M = 82.14, SD = 22.35); the mean score for White junior students was (M = 81.68, SD = 20.04); and the mean score for White senior students was (M = 73.58, SD = 17.82), resulting in a F value of 1.05. No item in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale for White students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The attachment subscale mean score for Black freshmen/sophomore students was (M = 64.75, SD = 11.50); the mean score for Black junior students was (M = 69.75, SD = 11.74); and the mean score for Black senior students was (M = 73.78, SD = 5.72), resulting in a F value of 1.29. No item in the attachment subscale for Black students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The attachment subscale mean score for White freshmen/sophomore students was (M = 71.93, SD = 12.57); the mean score for White junior students was (M = 71.95, SD = 11.41); and the mean score for White senior students was (M = 77.74, SD = 10.73), resulting in a F value of 1.53. No item in the attachment subscale for White students was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Table 18

ANOVA Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Class Standing and Ethnicity

		Fr/Soph		Junior		Senior		
Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	F Val
Full-scale	Black	282.00	60.84	327.50	36.48	309.67	32.72	1.73
	White	314.64	57.42	329.05	36.44	317.53	25.65	0.63
Academic adjustment	Black	94.50	14.53	108.88	12.61	109.56	13.59	1.97
	White	93.71	19.63	104.21	13.23	102.74	17.22	1.80
Social adjustment	Black	95.25	32.50	94.13	19.80	93.67	6.04	0.10
	White	104.79	26.03	107.84	21.15	104.63	19.30	.12
Personal-emotional adjustment	Black	54.75	11.53	88.13	9.69	70.56	17.94	7.89*
	White	82.14	22.35	81.68	20.04	73.58	17.82	1.05
Attachment	Black	64.75	11.50	69.75	11.74	73.78	5.72	1.29
	White	71.93	12.57	71.95	11.41	77.74	10.73	1.53

Note. n = 104, Black (freshmen/sophomore n = 4; junior n = 8; senior n = 9) White (freshmen/sophomore n = 17; junior n = 23; senior n = 18); $p < .05$.

Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Major and Ethnicity

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the full-scale and subscale mean scores for students categorized by selected major (i.e., business n = 17, health n = 23, social science n = 18). The business, health, and social science majors were the only majors populated by the respondents from the SACQ, with sufficient responses usable for the purpose of this study. These data are reflected in Table 19.

The full-scale mean scores for students that major in business was (M = 324.18, SD = 36.63); the mean score for students that major in health was (M = 310.48, SD = 45.00); the mean score for students that major in social science was (M = 317.61, SD = 34.61), resulting in a F value of 0.59. No item in the full-scale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for students that major in business was (M = 103.76, SD = 14.25); the mean score for students that major in health was (M = 100.91, SD =

16.11); the mean score for students that major in social science was (M = 103.56, SD = 19.46), resulting in a F value of 0.19. No item in the academic adjustment subscale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for students the major in business was (M = 108.29, SD = 20.44); the mean score for students that major in health was (M = 94.91, SD = 22.07); the mean score for students that major in social science was (M = 102.94, SD = 15.04), resulting in a F value of 2.53. No item in the social adjustment subscale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The personal-emotional adjustment mean score for students that major in business was (M = 77.65, SD = 17.50); the mean score for students that major in health was (M = 79.13, SD = 21.89); the mean score for students that major in social science was (M = 74.33, SD = 19.17), resulting in a F value of 0.30. No item in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The attachment subscale mean score for students that major in business was (M = 75.47, SD = 10.27); the mean score for students that major in health was (M = 69.70, SD = 11.38); the mean score for students that major in social science was (M = 73.33, SD = 12.11), resulting in a F value of 1.34. No item in the attachment subscale was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Though no statistical significance was found in the mean scores for the full-scale nor for the subscales in Table 19, a trend of higher mean scores emerged from the students majoring in business.

Table 19

ANOVA Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Selected Major

Scale	Business		Health		Social Science		F Val
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
Full-scale	324.18	36.63	310.48	45.00	317.61	34.61	0.59
Academic adjustment	103.76	14.25	100.91	16.11	103.56	19.46	0.19
Social adjustment	108.29	20.44	94.91	22.07	102.94	15.04	2.53
Personal-emotional adjustment	77.65	17.50	79.13	21.89	74.33	19.17	0.30
Attachment	75.47	10.27	69.70	11.38	73.33	12.11	1.34

Note. $n = 104$; Business $n = 17$, Health $n = 23$, Social Science $n = 18$; $p < .05$.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the full-scale and subscale mean scores for students categorized by selected major and ethnicity (Black: business n = 4, health n = 5, social science n = 4; White: business n = 10, health n = 15, social science n = 9). These data are provided in Table 20.

The full-scale mean score for Black students that major in business was ($M = 302.50$, $SD = 28.76$); the mean score for Black students majoring in health was ($M = 307.60$, $SD = 57.93$); the mean score for Black students majoring in social science was ($M = 313.75$, $SD = 37.58$), resulting in a F value of 0.63. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The full-scale mean scores for White students that major in business was ($M = 333.70$, $SD = 40.13$); the mean score for White students majoring in health was ($M = 315.60$, $SD = 42.97$); the mean score for White students majoring in social science was ($M = 326.67$, $SD = 32.21$), resulting in a F value of 0.66. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for Black students majoring in business was ($M = 106.50$, $SD = 10.08$); the mean score for Black students majoring in health was ($M =$

101.60, *SD* = 16.65); the mean score for Black students majoring in social science was (*M* = 109.00, *SD* = 8.29), resulting in a *F* value of 0.40. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The academic adjustment subscale mean score for White students majoring in business was (*M* = 100.40, *SD* = 15.72); the mean score for White students majoring in health was (*M* = 101.27, *SD* = 16.80); the mean score for White students majoring in social science was (*M* = 107.56, *SD* = 22.22), resulting in a *F* value of 0.45 This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for Black students that major in business was (*M* = 90.25, *SD* = 3.59); the mean score for Black students majoring in health was (*M* = 103.60, *SD* = 27.41); the mean score for Black students majoring in social science was (*M* = 90.75, *SD* = 10.08), resulting in a *F* value of 0.79. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The social adjustment subscale mean score for White students majoring in business was (*M* = 114.30, *SD* = 22.25); the mean score for White students majoring in health was (*M* = 92.40, *SD* = 22.61); the mean score for White students majoring in social science was (*M* = 108.11, *SD* = 17.52), resulting in a *F* value of 3.52. The mean difference for White students in business, health, and social science was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for Black students majoring in business was (*M* = 71.75, *SD* = 14.18); the mean score for Black students majoring in health was (*M* = 63.00, *SD* = 14.80); the mean score for Black students majoring in social science was (*M* = 78.00, *SD* = 22.11), resulting in an *F* value of 0.87. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The personal-emotional adjustment subscale mean score for White students majoring in business was (M = 84.50, SD = 16.46); the mean score for White students majoring in health was (M = 87.87, SD = 20.00); the mean score for White students majoring in social science was (M = 71.00, SD = 15.00), resulting in a F value of 2.62. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The attachment subscale mean score for Black students majoring in business was (M = 73.50, SD = 2.65); the mean score for Black students majoring in health was (M = 74.00, SD = 11.14); the mean score for Black students majoring in social science was (M = 64.50, SD = 7.33), resulting in a F value of 1.76. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The attachment subscale mean score for White students majoring in business was (M = 76.30, SD = 13.22); the mean score for White students majoring in health was (M = 67.93, SD = 12.09); the mean score for White students majoring in social science was (M = 76.97, SD = 12.09), resulting in a F value of 2.87. This mean difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 20

ANOVA Results for Full-Scale and Subscale Scores by Ethnicity and Selected Major

		Business		Health		Social Science		
Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	F Val
Full-scale	Black	302.50	28.76	307.60	57.93	313.75	37.58	0.63
	White	333.70	40.13	315.60	42.97	326.67	32.21	0.66
Academic adjustment	Black	106.50	10.08	101.60	16.65	109.00	8.29	0.40
	White	100.40	15.72	101.27	16.80	107.56	22.22	0.45
Social adjustment	Black	90.25	3.59	103.60	27.41	90.75	10.08	0.79
	White	114.30	22.25	92.40	22.61	108.11	17.52	3.52
Personal-emotional adjustment	Black	71.75	14.18	63.00	14.80	78.00	22.11	0.87

	White	84.50	16.46	87.87	20.00	71.00	15.00	2.62
attachment	Black	73.50	2.65	74.00	11.14	64.50	7.33	1.76
	White	76.30	13.22	67.93	12.09	76.97	12.09	2.87

Note. n = 104 Black (business n = 4, health n = 5, social science n = 4); White (business n = 10, health n = 15, social science n = 9); $p < .05$.

Summary

The one sample *t-test* results for the academic adjustment scale items resulted in 75% (18/24 questions) to be statistically significant at $p < .05$. The one sample *t-test* results for the social adjustment scale items resulted in 65% (13/20 questions) to be statistically significant at $p < .05$. The one sample *t-test* results for the personal-emotional adjustment scale items resulted in 80% (i.e., 12/15 quetions) to be statistically significant at $p < .05$. The one sample *t-test* results for the attachment scale items resulted in 93% (i.e., 14/15 questions) to be statistically significant at $p < .05$.

White students, specifically, White female students, had a higher mean score than Black students' mean score in the social adjustment subscale, making this subscale statistically significant.

There was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores between the high GPA students and the low GPA students in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale.

There was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores in the academic adjustment and the personal-emotional subscales between the freshmen/sophomore students, juniors, and seniors. The juniors outscored the freshmen/sophomores and the seniors in both subscales.

Chapter 5 provides detailed information on the conclusions based on the data from the SACQ. Chapter 5 also includes discussion of the data analysis, implications of the study and provides recommendations for future research.

Chapter 5

Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations

This chapter contains the problem statement, research questions, research method summary, a summary of the findings, conclusions, discussion and implications, and recommendations of future research. This chapter culminates the study.

Problem Statement

Although neither the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) nor the U.S. Department of Education provides a number that indicates how many predominately White historically Black college or universities (HBCUs) exist, studies have shown over the years, many HBCUs have become or are becoming racially diverse institutions. When comparing Black and White students, no research has been conducted on whether the benefits of attending an HBCU, for Black or White students, also accrue if the HBCU's student population is majority White.

According to Closson and Henry (2008):

> Numerous researchers (Chavous et al., 2004; Lewis et al., 2004; Nixon & Henry, 1990; Phillips, 2005; Sedlacek, 1999) exploring the experiences of Black students attending predominantly White institutions (PWIs) suggest that Black students have an increased challenge with equity and condescension on these campuses stemming from prejudiced attitudes and behaviors on the part of other students, professors, and university staff. (p. 517)

White undergraduate students matriculating at an HBCU expressed less overt evidence of social adjustment barriers than Black students at PWIs. Although White students, in general,

reported a sense of underrepresentation, they reported no direct experiences of overt racism and reported good relationships and strong support from HBCU faculty (Closson & Henry, 2008).

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study were as follows:

1. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their academic adjustment?
2. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their social adjustment?
3. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their personal-emotional adjustment?
4. Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their attachment to the institution?

Data Collection

This was a nonexperimental, descriptive study that utilized a digital questionnaire. The questionnaire was accessed by West Virginia State University (WVSU) full-time students via their campus email. The questionnaire was formatted and disbursed in Qualtrics for a more efficient analysis of the data; SPSS was used to analyze the data. The 67-item Likert-type, questionnaire assesses overall student adaptability to college and adaptability in the areas of academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution.

The SACQ was sent to approximately 1,100 WVSU students via campus email. One hundred and eleven responded and 104 met the inclusion criteria for this study. An incentive of winning one of two raffle prizes was presented to maximize participation. The prizes included:

one $50 gift card and one $20 Chick-fil-A gift card. This research was approved by the WVSU and Marshall University Institutional Review Boards (IRBs; Appendices B and C).

Respondent Characteristics

Twenty-six (*n* = 27) percent of the respondents were male, and 21.2% (n = 21) were Black. The majority (n = 76, 73.1%) of the respondents were female and 63.5% of the total sample were White (n = 66). Of all of the total respondents, 104 were used for this study. One in three (33.7%) of the respondents were seniors, 28.8% were juniors, and 19.2% were freshmen/sophomores. Nine of 10 (89.4%) respondents were full-time students, 68.3% reported grades of B+, A-, or A, and 55.7% reported majors in business (16.3%), health science (22.1%), or social science (17.3%).

Summary of Findings

There was no statistically significant difference in the full-scale or subscale scores of the total group. One sample *t-test* results indicated academic adjustment 18 of 24 subscale items, 13 of 20 social adjustment subscale items, 12 of 15 personal-emotional subscale items, and 14 of 15 attachment subscale items, were statistically significant at $p < .05$.

White students ($M = 104.88$, $SD = 22.00$) scored significantly higher than Black students ($M = 92.64$, $SD = 18.59$) on the social adjustment subscale. There were no significant differences between Black and White student mean scores for full-scale or the three other subscale scores.

Female students ($M = 103.95$, $SD = 21.09$) scored significantly higher than male students ($M = 94.74$, $SD = 17.96$) on the social adjustment subscale. Female students ($M = 73.79$, $SD = 12.27$) scored significantly higher than the male students ($M = 68.52$, $SD = 9.05$) on the attachment subscale. There were no other significant differences in the full-scale or subscale means based on sex.

White male students (*M* = 93.67, *SD* = 18.82) scored significantly lower than White female students (*M* = 109.08, *SD* = 21.79) on the social adjustment subscale. White female students (*M* = 76.06, *SD* = 12.23) scored significantly higher than White male students on the attachment subscale. There were no other significant differences in the total scale or subscale means based on sex and ethnicity.

Students with a high GPA (*M* = 79.25, *SD* = 20.53) scored significantly higher than students with low GPA (*M* = 70.27, *SD* = 22.50) on the personal-emotional adjustment subscale. There were no other significant differences in the full-scale or subscale means based on GPA.

Black students with high GPA (*M* = 327.92, *SD* = 37.85) scored significantly higher than Black students with low GPA (*M* = 287.00, *SD* = 35.39) on the full-scale. Black students with high GPA (*M* = 83.50, *SD* = 17.42) scored significantly higher than Black students with low GPA (*M* = 64.70, *SD* = 14.08) on the personal-emotional adjustment subscale. There were no other significant differences in the other subscale means based on GPA and ethnicity.

Juniors (*M* = 105.93, *SD* = 12.61) scored significantly higher than seniors (*M* = 101.86, *SD* = 18.71) and freshman/sophomores (*M* = 92.70, *SD* = 18.19) on the academic adjustment subscale. Juniors (*M* = 83.80, *SD* = 17.48) also scored significantly higher than freshman/sophomores (*M* = 73.15, *SD* = 24.27) and seniors (*M* = 70.03, *SD* = 19.48) on the personal-emotional subscale. There were no other significant differences in the full-scale or subscale means based on class standing.

Black juniors (*M* = 88.13, *SD* = 9.69) scored significantly higher than Black seniors (*M* = 70.56, *SD* = 17.94) and Black freshman/sophomores (*M* = 54.75, *SD* = 11.53) on the personal-emotional subscale. There were no other significant differences in the full-scale or subscale means based on class standing and ethnicity.

There were no statistical differences between business, health, and social science majors in any of the subscales.

Conclusions

The data analysis supports the following conclusions:

Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their academic adjustment?

There was no statistically significant difference in the self-reported academic adjustment levels of Black and White students at a predominately White HBCU. Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences in academic adjustment scores based on sex and ethnicity, GPA and ethnicity, class standing and ethnicity, and selected major and ethnicity.

Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their social adjustment?

White students reported statistically significantly higher scores than Black students on the social adjustment subscale at a predominately White HBCU. In addition, White female students scored significantly higher than White male students on the social adjustment subscale. There were no other significant differences based on ethnicity, sex, GPA, class standing, or major.

Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their personal-emotional adjustment?

There was no statistically significant difference in the self-reported personal-emotional adjustment levels of Black and White students at a predominately White HBCU. There was a statistically significant difference whereas the high GPA students scored significantly higher than the low GPA students in the personal-emotional subscale. In addition, there was a statistically significant difference in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale whereas Black

students with a high GPA scored significantly higher than Black students with a low GPA at WVSU. In addition, there was a statistically significant difference in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale between Black freshman and sophomores, Black juniors, and Black seniors at WVSU where Black juniors scored significantly higher than Black freshmen/sophomores and seniors.

Is there a difference between how Black and White students in a predominantly White HBCU report their attachment to the institution?

There was no statistically significant difference in the way Black and White students self-report their level of attachment at a predominately White HBCUs. There was a statistically significant difference between White male and female students in the way they self-report their level of attachment to WVSU; whereas, White female students scored significantly higher than White male students.

Discussion and Implications

WVSU is a predominately White historically Black institution. Of the 104 participants used in this study, only 21% of those participants were Black students. In comparison to the White student population, it was expected the Black student sample size would be smaller; therefore, the disproportionate sample size is reflective of the actual student population on WVSU's campus.

White students scored significantly higher than Black students on the social adjustment subscale. According to Coaxum (n.d.), Black students that attended PWIs had lower academic performances, lower social involvement, and lower occupational aspirations than Black students that attended HBCUs. On the other hand, Closson and Henry (2008) reported White students had no direct experiences with overt racism and reported a good relationship and strong support from

HBCU faculty. In addition, the independent samples *t-test* results show, when the data are disaggregated by ethnicity, there are no other statistically significant differences among the academic adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, or the attachment subscales.

White female students scored significantly higher than White male students on the social adjustment and attachment subscales. In a study conducted by Kuh et al. (2008), data showed successful engagement positively contributes to student persistence; therefore, it can be assumed the high score by White female students in the social adjustment and attachment subscale indicated there is a higher percentage of White female graduates than White male graduates. In fact, the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (2022a), reported of the 364 students that graduated from WVSU during the 2020–2021 academic year, 43% were nonminority and 61% of the graduates were female.

The data in the independent samples *t-test* results for full-scale and subscale scores by sex and ethnicity chart indicated, though not statistically significant, a noticeable difference in the mean scores between Black male and female students in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale. According to the data, Black male students are emotionally adjusting to WVSU at a better rate than Black female students. In addition, Black male students scored noticeably higher than White male students on the academic adjustment subscale. This data supports previous research by Chen et al. (2014), that Black students tend to adjust better to college when their institution is a HBCU.

Overall, White female students scored statistically significantly higher than White male students and outscored Black male and female students on the social adjustment subscale. This data would corroborate White undergraduate students matriculating at an HBCU express less overt evidence of social adjustment barriers than Black students at predominantly White

institutions (PWIs). Although White students, in general, reported a sense of underrepresentation, they reported no direct experiences of overt racism and reported good relationships and strong support from HBCU faculty (Closson & Henry, 2008).

There was very little difference between Black male students (M = 83.40, SD = 19.63) and White male students (M = 83.56, SD = 21.40) and their ability to personally-emotionally adjust. There was also a noticeable similarity in the way Black male students (M = 69.40, SD = 8.85) and White male students (M = 68.61, SD = 9.52) report attachment. Though none of these data were statistically significant, these data would indicate racial demographics of WVSU does not hinder Black or White male student's ability to personally-emotionally adjust or attach to WVSU. A substantive body of research supports VincentTinto's premise, indicating on-campus support, including relationships with classmates and faculty, contributes to academic success, social satisfaction, and college completion among Black undergraduates (Hinderlie & Kenny, 2002). This data indicated WVSU could be successfully providing on-campus support students need to successfully adjust to college, specifically pertaining to Black and White male students.

There was a less than one-point mean difference between high GPA students and low GPA students in the social adjustment and attachment subscales. One could speculate this data indicates a student's academic prowess plays a minimal role in their ability to socially adjust or attach. Social adjustment is the process by which students become integrated into the campus community, build support networks, and negotiate the new freedoms afforded by college life (Gray et al., 2013). Based on the data provided in relation to the social adjustment and attachment by high and low GPA students, it can be speculated these subscale items are grounded more on the social and psychological interaction and engagement between the student and the institution, and less, if at all, on academic proficiency.

The full-scale and personal-emotional adjustment mean scores are the only statistically significant scores in the independent samples *t-test* results for full-scale and subscale Scores by GPA and ethnicity among high GPA and low GPA Black students. There was a mean difference of 40.92 in relation to the full-scale. The data suggests not all Black students are adjusting well or at the same pace. It is quite possible some Black students are not personally or emotionally adjusting well because of the ethnic make-up of the institution. According to research by Chen et al. (2014), Black students integrating into collegiate experiences may experience more difficulty in comparison to their majority counterparts. A trend in this table 16 shows high GPA Black students and high GPA White students, with the exception of the academic adjustment subscale, have very similar mean scores.

In relation to the academic adjustment subscale, Black students (M = 111.25, SD = 12.51) with a high GPA have a higher mean score than White students (M = 102.94, SD = 16.15) with a high GPA. As a result of the conducive environment at HBCUs, Black students are able to achieve better grades and also have higher occupational aspirations. Socially, these students experience more support, connection, and feelings of acceptance and become more engaged at HBCUs than their peers at PWIs (Chen et al., 2014). When comparing the mean scores between the low GPA Black and low GPA White students in the academic adjustment subscale, there is a much smaller comparable mean difference, which suggests both Black and White low GPA students are similarly academically adjusting.

The ANOVA results for the full-scale and subscale scores by class standing show there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores in the academic adjustment and personal-emotional adjustment subscales. Freshman/sophomore students had the lowest mean score in the academic adjustment subscale. Academic adjustment is divided into two distinct categories:

academic adjustment and nonacademic adjustment. Academic adjustment includes meeting minimum standards regarding academic performance, while nonacademic adjustment involves social integration, participation in co-curricular activities, faculty contact, and an individual's feelings of attachment to the institution (Jackson, 2008). Research conducted by Tym et al. (2004), showed the initial transition to college can be difficult because of issues such as financial or separation anxieties. Specific to this study, 62% of degree seeking freshmen were first-generation college students (FGCS) and 61% of degree seeking sophomores were FGCS. In a study by Manzoni and Streib (2008), FGCS have minimal family support and are less likely to form ties to the institution than continuing-generation students. These data could partially explain the 59% retention rate and the 35% of freshmen completing 30 hours in the 1st year, as reported by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (2022b).

When class standing is disaggregated by ethnicity in the academic adjustment subscale, Black students outscored White students in all classification categories. This data suggests when broken down by classification, Black students, overall, are academically adjusting better than White students. In 1992 ,Allen reported HBCUs provided a more positive social and psychological environment for Black students. As a result of the conducive environment at HBCUs, Black students are able to achieve better grades and also have higher occupational aspirations (Chen et al., 2014); however, the full-scale, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, attachment subscales indicate Black students scored lower than White students. These data suggests even though WVSU is a HBCU, the ethnic makeup of the student body may play a role and the ability for Black students to adjust to the institution. In addition to the academic adjustment subscale, the only other subscale where Black students had a higher mean

score than White students was in the personal-emotional adjustment subscale where Black juniors scored higher than White juniors.

Black freshman/sophomores have the lowest mean score (M = 54.75, SD = 11.53) in the personal-emotional subscale. This mean score is the lowest among all of the other subscale groups and full-scale. This data could reflect issues of a FGCS or directly correlate with the idea ethnic makeup of the student body plays a role in the ability for Black students to personally or emotionally adjust to the institution. Indellicati (2019) indicated students with stronger self-regulatory abilities are in greater control of themselves (i.e., emotionally and behaviorally) during stressful times and should experience greater positive outcomes and resiliency than those with poorer self-regulation.

Additionally, there were very similar mean scores among freshmen/sophomore students (M = 102.60, SD = 25.40) and senior students (M = 102.06, SD = 16.21) in the social adjustment subscale. These data support Tinto's theory of student departure. Tinto theorized students who socially integrate into the campus community increase their commitment to the institution and are more likely to graduate (Tinto, 1975). The freshmen mean score and the similar senior mean score indicated freshmen are socially integrating into the campus community and maintaining their social involvement through their senior year and more than likely graduating.

Recommendations for Future Research

To better understand the role ethnic make-up of a college community plays in the ability for students to adjust to college, future research may be necessary in the following areas:

- This research is limited to students at WVSU; future research could be conducted on other diversifying HBCU campuses across the nation.

- Qualitative research could be done on this research topic, which could provide additional details, through student interviews, of how the ethnic demographics of a college campus plays a role of how a student adjusts to college.
- Future research on this topic could be conducted at a PWI.
- Future research on this topic could be conducted comparing other ethnicities or other student demographics.

References

Adams, K. S., & Proctor, B. E. (2010). Adaptation to college for students with and without disabilities: Group differences and predictors. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 22*(3), 166–184. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ906691.pdf

Alford, S. M. (2000). A qualitative study of the college social adjustment of black students from lower socioeconomic communities. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28*(1), 2–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2000.tb00224.x

Arjanggi, R., & Kusumaningsih, L. P. (2016a). The correlation between social anxiety and academic adjustment among freshmen. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 219*, 104–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.04.049

Arjanggi, R., & Kusumaningsih, L. P. S. (2016b). College adjustment of first year students: The role of social anxiety. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology, 5*(1), 30–39. https://doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.v5i1.4273

Astin, A. W. (1999). A developmental theory of higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(50), 518–529. https://www-proquest-com.marshall.idm.oclc.org/docview/195180247/fulltextPDF/57304D78C13F41D5PQ/1?accountid=12281

Ayres, A. R. (2007). *College student adaptability and Greek membership: A single institution case study* (Publication No. 3276420)[Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc3707/

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1989). *The Student Adaptability to College Questionnaire (SACQ)*. Western Psychological Services.

Bejerano, A. R. (2014). *An examination of the role of social support, coping strategies, and individual characteristics in students' adaptation to college.* (Publication No. 3618647) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a casual model of student persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(6), 641–664. https://link-springer-com.marshall.idm.oclc.org/content/pdf/10.1023/A%3A1018708813711.pdf

Boulton, C. A., Hughes, E., Kent, C., Smith, J. R., & Williams, H. T. P. (2019). Student engagement and wellbeing over time at a higher education institution. *Plus One, 14*(11), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225770

Bridges, B. (2019, December 19). *African Americans and college education by the numbers*. UNCF. https://uncf.org/the-latest/african-americans-and-college-education-by-the-numbers

Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages*. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(1), 1–32. DOI:10.1007/s11162-005-8150-9

Carnevale, A. P., Strohl, J., Gulish, A., Werf, M. V. D., & Campbell, K. P. (2019). *The unequal race for good jobs.* (pp. 1–44). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.

Carter, J. D., & Fountaine, T. P. (2012). An analysis of White student engagement at public HBCUs. *Educational Foundations, 26*(3-4), 49–66. https://www-proquest-com.marshall.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/analysis-white-student-engagement-at-public-hbcus/docview/1319438243/se-2?accountid=12281

Chen, P. D., Ingram, T. N., & Davis, L. K. (2014). Bridging student engagement and satisfaction: A comparison between historically Black colleges and universities and predominantly White institutions. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *83*(4), 565–579. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.83.4.0565

Chiles, N. (2017, March 1). *HBCUs graduate more poor Black students than White colleges*. NPR. https://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2017/03/01/517770255/hbcus-graduate-more-poor-black-students-than-white-colleges

Clinciu, A. I., Cazan, A.-M., & Ives, B. (2021). Academic dishonesty and academic adjustment among the students at university level: An exploratory study. *SAGE Open*, *11*(2), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211021839

Closson, R. B., & Henry, W. J. (2008). The social adjustment of undergraduate White students in the minority on an historically Black College campus. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*(6), 517–534. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0036

Coaxum III, J. (n.d.). *Historically Black colleges and universities – The development of HBCUs, academic and social experiences at HBCUs, conclusion*. https://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2046/Historically-Black-Colleges-Universities.html

Cook, L. (2015, January 28). *U.S. education: Still separate and unequal*. U.S. News https://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2015/01/28/us-education-still-separate-and-unequal

Engle, J., & Tinto, V. (2008). *Moving beyond access* (pp. 1–32). Washington, DC: The Pell Institute.

Falcon, L. (2015, June). *Breaking down barriers: First-generation college students and college success: The league for innovation in the community college*. League. https://www.league.org/innovation-showcase/breaking-down-barriers-first-generation-college-students-and-college-success

Foubert, J. D., & Urbanski, L. A. (2006). Effects of Involvement in clubs and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. *NASPA Journal, 43*(1), 166–182. https://doi.org/10.2202/0027-6014.1576

Grant-Vallone, E., Reid, K., Umali, C., & Pohlert, E. (2003). An analysis of the effects of self-esteem, social support, and participation in student support services on students adjustment and commitment to college. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 5*(3), 255–274. https://doi.org/10.2190/c0t7-yx50-f71v-00cw

Gray, R., Vitak, J., Easton, E. W., & Ellison, N. B. (2013). Examining social adjustment to college in the age of social media: Factors influencing successful transitions and persistence. *Computers & Education, 67,* 193–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.02.021

Guiffrida, D. A. (2003). African American student organizations as agents of social integration. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(3), 304–319. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2003.0024

Hazan-Liran, B., & Miller, P. (2017). The role of psychological capital in academic adjustment among university students. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 20*(1), 51–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9933-3

Hess, F. (2018, June 6). *The college dropout problem*. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/frederickhess/2018/06/06/the-college-dropout-problem/

Hinderlie, H. 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. https://doi.org/https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/attachment-social-support-college-adjustment/docview/195176614/se-2?accountid=12281

Hunn, V. (2014). African American students, retention, and team-based learning. *Journal of Black Studies*, *45*(4), 301–314. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934714529594

Indellicati, A. (2019). *Effects of childhood and adolescent peer victimization on academic, social, and emotional adjustment in college students* Publication No. 22616685 [Doctoral dissertation, St. John's University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Jackson, N. H. (2008). *Factors related to nonacademic adjustment of freshmen students* Publication No. 3346533 [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi. Proquest Dissertations & Theses.

Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*(5), 758–773. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505

Kasky Hernández, L. M., & Kahn, J. H. (2018). Maternal attachment and trajectories of emotional and social adjustment during the college transition. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *33*(3), 312–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2018.1553143

Kuh, G. D. (2009a). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2009*(141), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.283

Kuh, G. D. (2009b). What Student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(6), 683–706. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0099

Kuh, G. D. (2014, December 29). *What student engagement data tell us about college readiness*. AAC&U. https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/what-student-engagement-data-tell-us-about-college-readiness

Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *79*(5), 540–563. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.0.0019

Kuh, G. D., Kenzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature* (pp. 1–156). Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Lomax, M. (2020, April 21). *Six reasons HBCUs are more important than ever*. UNCF. https://uncf.org/the-latest/6-reasons-hbcus-are-more-important-than-ever

Love, P. (2020, May 28). *Adjustment to college*. Encyclopedia.com. https://www.encyclopedia.com/education/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/adjustment-college

Mangan, K. (2015, May 18). *The challenge of the first-generation student*. The Chronical of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Challenge-of-the/230137

Manzoni, A., & Streib, J. (2018). The equalizing power of a college degree for first-generation college students: Disparities across institutions, majors, and achievement levels. *Research in Higher Education, 60*(5), 577–605. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-018-9523-1

Martin, J., & Torres, A. (n.d.) *WHAT IS STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?* National Association of Independent Schools. https://www.nais.org/getmedia/61211bd0-f125-4af6-aff0-8be4dc7e691d/2016-HSSSE-Chapter-1.pdf

Meatto, K. (2019, May 2). *Still separate, still unequal: Teaching about school segregation and educational inequality*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/02/learning/lesson-plans/still-separate-still-unequal-teaching-about-school-segregation-and-educational-inequality.html

Melander, J. (2018). *Hometown size and its relationship to emotional and social adjustment to college* (Publication No. 10830373) Doctoral dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Museus, S. D., Ledesma, M. C., & Parker, T. L. (2015). Racism and racial equity in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *42*(1), 1–112. https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20067

Musu-Gillette, L., Robinson, J., McFarland, J., KewalRamani, A., Zhang, A., & Wilkinson-Flicker, S. (2016). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups 2016* (pp. 1–169). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019, February). *Indicator 20: Undergraduate Enrollment*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator_REB.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.-b). *Historically Black colleges and universities*. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=667

New, J. (2015, October 28). *Positive news for HBCUs*. Inside HigherEd. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/10/28/survey-finds-big-differences-between-black-hbcu-graduates-those-who-attended-other

Nichols, A. H., & Evans-Bell, D. (2017). (rep.). *A look at Black student success: Identifying top and bottom performing institutions* (pp. 1–13). Washington, DC: The Education Trust.

Palmer, R. T., Arroyo, A. T., & Maramba, D. C. (2018). Exploring the perceptions of HBCU student affairs practitioners toward the racial diversification of Black colleges. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 11*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000024

Pingali, V. (2017, September 24). *I asked 31 students what the 'college experience' means to them*. Odyssey. https://www.theodysseyonline.com/what-does-college-experience-mean

Polewchak, J. L. (2002). *The effects of social support and interpersonal dependency upon emotional adjustment to college and physical health* (Publication No. 304862) [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Sablich, L. (2017, July 26). *7 findings that illustrate racial disparities in education*. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2016/06/06/7-findings-that-illustrate-racial-disparities-in-education

Salami, S. O. (2011). Psychosocial predictors of adjustment among first year college of education students. *US-China Education Review, 8(2),* 239–248.

Sanchez, O., & Kolodner, M. (2021, October 11). *Why White students are far more likely to graduate than black students at public universities*. NBCNews https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/-white-students-are-far-likely-graduate-black-students-public-universi-rcna2790

Scannell, L., & Gifford, R. (2011). Personally relevant climate change: The role of place attachment and local versus global message framing in engagement. *Sage Journals: Environment and Behavior*, *45*(1), 60–85. https://doi.org/https://journals-sagepub-com.marshall.idm.oclc.org/doi/full/10.1177/0013916511421196?utm_source=summon&utm_medium=discovery-provider

Seymour, S., & Ray, J. (2015, October 27). *Grads of historically Black colleges have well-being edge*. Gallup. https://news.gallup.com/poll/186362/grads-historically-black-colleges-edge.aspx?g_source=CATEGORY_WELLBEING

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*(4), 434-452. https://doi.org/10.2307/2960051

Spooner, D. (2019). Place attachment on university campuses at what point do undergraduates connect to their academic institutions? *Planning for Higher Education Journal*, *47*(2), 27–38. https://doi.org/https://www.proquest.com/docview/2220171962/fulltextPDF/3E4CEF0D75C14E3EPQ/1?accountid=12281

The Atlantic Journal Constitution. (2017, January 9). *AJC Sepia HBCU of the week: West Virginia State University – A History*. AJC. https://www.ajc.com/news/local-education/ajc-sepia-hbcu-the-week-west-virginia-state-university-history/D2OLelABNTxw5rU45LubwL/

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*(1), 89–125. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543045001089

Tinto, V., & Goodsell, A. (1993). (rep.). *Freshman interest groups and the first year experience: Constructing Student communities in a large university* (pp. 1–19). University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Tyler, K. M., Love, K. M., Brown, C., Roan-Belle, C., Garriott, P. O., & Thomas, D. M. (2011). Linking home communalism to college adjustment and institutional attachment for African American and european american undergraduates. *College Student Affairs Journal, 30*(1), 47–61. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ913526.pdf

Tym, C., McMillion, R., Barone, S., & Webster, J. (2004). (rep.). *First Generation College Students: A Literature Review* (pp. 1–22). Research and Analytical Services.

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *What is an HBCU?* https://sites.ed.gov/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities/

Valickas, A., Raišienė, A. G., & Rapuano, V. (2019). Planned happenstance skills as personal resources for students' psychological wellbeing and academic adjustment. *Sustainability, 11*(12), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11123401

van Rooij, E. C., Jansen, E. P., & van de Grift, W. J. (2017). First-year university students' academic success: The importance of academic adjustment. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 33*(4), 749–767. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0347-8

Wei, M., Russell, D. W., & Zakalik, R. A. (2005). Adult attachment, social self-efficacy, self-disclosure, loneliness, and subsequent depression for freshman college students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(4), 602–614. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.602

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission. (2022a, April 6). *Degrees awarded at a glance.* https://www.wvhepc.edu/resources/data-and-publication-center/data-center-graduation/

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission. (2022b, April 6). *Retention data*. https://www.wvhepc.edu/resources/data-and-publication-center/data-center-retention/

Wildhagen, T. (2015). "Not your typical student": The social construction of the "first-generation" college student. *Qualitative Sociology*, *38*(3), 285–303. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-015-9308-1

Williams, K. (2021, October 19). *How HBCUs Benefit Architects and Architecture*. Architect. Retrieved from https://www.architectmagazine.com/practice/how-hbcus-benefit-architects-and-architecture_o#:~:text=%E2%80%9CHBCUs%20became%20the%20principal%20means,%2C%20Pa.%2C%20in%201837.

Williams, S. M., & Ferrari, J. R. (2015). Identification among first-generation citizen students and first-generation college students: An exploration of school sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *43*(3), 377–387. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21685

Woldoff, R. A., Washington, H. M., & Wiggins, Y. M. (2011). Black collegians at a rural predominantly White institution: Toward a Place based understanding of Black students' adjustment to college. *Journal of Black Studies*, *42*(7), 1047–1079. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934711400741

Wyllie, J. (2018, April 13). *How are Black colleges doing? Better than you think, study finds*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/how-are-black-colleges-doing-better-than-you-think-study-finds/?cid=gen_sign_in

Yang, C. -C., & Brown, B. B. (2012). Motives for using Facebook, patterns of Facebook activities, and Late adolescents' social adjustment to college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(3), 403–416. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9836-x

Yang, C. -C. (2020). Similar patterns, different implications: First-generation and continuing college students' social media use and its association with college social adjustment. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 24(1),* 79-98. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025120902755

Zhao, C.-M., & Kuh, G. D. (2004). Adding value: Learning communities and student engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(2), 115–138. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:rihe.0000015692.88534.de

Appendix A

Marshall University IRB Letter of Approval

www.marshall.edu

Office of Research Integrity
Institutional Review Board
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755

FWA 0002704

IRB1
#00002205
IRB2
#00003206

April 7, 2021

Sherry Early, Ph.D.
Leadership Studies

RE: IRBNet ID# 1745050-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. Early:

Protocol Title:	[1745050-1] BLACK AND WHITE STUDENT ADAPTABILITY TO COLLEGE AT A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITY: A SINGLE INSTITUTION EXAMINATION OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Site Location:	MU
Submission Type:	New Project APPROVED
Review Type:	Exempt Review

In accordance with Chair (d)(2) the above study was granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee. No further submission (or closure) is required for an Exempt study **unless** there is an amendment to the study. All amendments must be submitted and approved by the IRB Chair/Designee.
This study is for student Christopher Jackson.
If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/ Behavioral) Coordinator Anna Robinson at (304) 696-2477 or robinsonn1@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.
Sincerely,

Bruce F. Day, Th.D., CIP

Appendix B

West Virginia State University IRB Approval

Date: 9-7-2021

IRB #: WVSU-IRB-2020-27
Title: BLACK AND WHITE STUDENT ADAPTABILITY TO COLLEGE AT A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE
HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITY: A SINGLE INSTITUTION EXAMINATION OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Creation Date: 7-
7-2020 End Date:
Status: Approved
Principal Investigator:
Chris Jackson Review
Board: WVSU IRB
Sponsor:

Study History

Submission Type Initial	Review Type Exempt	Decision Exempt
Submission Type Modification	Review Type Exempt	Decision Exempt

Key Study Contacts

Member Chris Jackson	Role Principal Investigator	Contact
Member Chris Jackson	Role Primary Contact	Contact

Appendix C

(SAMPLE) Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ)

The 67 items included in this survey are statements that describe university experiences. Read each one and decide how well it applies to you at the present time (within the last few days). For each item, record the appropriate number in the space next to that item.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

< ------- ------- >

Doesn't apply to me at all Applies very closely to me

1. _____ I feel that I fit in well as part of the university environment.

2. _____ I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.

3. _____ I have been keeping up to date on my academic work.

4. _____ I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like at university.

5. _____ I know why I'm in university and what I want out of it.

6. _____ I am finding academic work at university difficult.

7. _____ Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.

8. _____ I am very involved with social activities in university.

9. _____ I am adjusting well to university.

10. _____ I have not been functioning well during examinations.

11. _____ I have felt tired much of the time lately.

12. _____ Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.

13. _____ I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.

14. _____ I have had informal, personal contacts with university professors.

15. _____ I am pleased now about my decision to go to university.

16. _____ I am pleased now about my decision to attend this university in particular.

17. _____ I'm not working as hard as I should at my course work.

18. _____ I have several close social ties at university.

19. _____ My academic goals and purposes are well defined.

20. _____ I haven't been able to control my emotions very well lately.

21. _____ I'm not really smart enough for the academic work I am expected to be doing now.

22. _____ Lonesomeness for home is a source of difficulty for me now.

23. _____ Getting a university degree is very important to me.

24. _____ My appetite has been good lately.

25. _____ I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.

26. _____ I enjoy living in a university residence. (Please omit if you do not live in a residence; any university housing should be regarded as a residence.)

27. _____ I enjoy writing papers for courses.

28. _____ I have been having a lot of headaches lately.

29. _____ I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.

30. _____ I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available at university.

31. _____ I've given a lot of thought lately to whether I should ask for help from the Psychological/Counselling Services Centre or from a counsellor outside of university.

32. _____ Lately I have been having doubts regarding the value of a university education.

33. _____ I am getting along very well with my roommate(s) at university. (Please omit if you do not have a roommate.)

34. _____ I wish I were at another university.

35. _____ I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.

36. _____ I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at university.

37. _____ I feel that I have enough social skills to get along well in the university setting.

38. _____ I have been getting angry too easily lately.

39. _____ Recently I have had trouble concentrating when I try to study.

40. _____ I haven't been sleeping very well.

41. _____ I'm not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.

42. _____ I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at university.

43. _____ I am satisfied with the quality or caliber of courses available at university.

44. _____ I am attending classes regularly.

45. _____ Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.

46. _____ I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at university.

47. _____ I expect to stay at this university for a bachelor's degree.

48. _____ I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.

49. _____ I worry a lot about my university expenses.

50. _____ I am enjoying my academic work at university.

51. _____ I have been feeling lonely a lot at university lately.

52. _____ I am having a lot of trouble getting started on homework assignments.

53. _____ I feel I have good control over my life situation at university.

54. _____ I am satisfied with my program of courses for this term.

55. _____ I have been feeling in good health lately.

56. _____ I feel I am very different from other students at university in ways that I don't like.

57. _____ On balance, I would rather be home than here.

58. _____ Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my course work at university.

59. _____ Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another university.

60. _____ Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of university altogether and for good.

61. _____ I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from university and finishing later.

62. _____ I am very satisfied with the professors I have now in my courses.

63. _____ I have some good friends or acquaintances at university with whom I can talk about any problems I may have.

64. _____ I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed on me in university.

65. _____ I am quite satisfied with my social life at university.

66. _____ I am quite satisfied with my academic situation at university.

67. _____ I feel confident that I will be able to deal in a satisfactory manner with future challenges here at university.

Apependix D

Anonymous Survey Consent

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled, "BLACK AND WHITE STUDENT ADAPTABILITY TO COLLEGE AT A PREDOMINANTLY WHITE HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITY: A SINGLE INSTITUTION EXAMINATION OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY" designed to analyze the extent to which the specific benefits to Black and White students of attending a HBCU (i.e., academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution) also accrue to those students whose HBCU is predominantly White. The study is being conducted by Dr. Charles Bethel and Mr. Christopher Jackson from Marshall University and has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation for Christopher Jackson.

This survey is comprised of the Student Adaptability to College Questionnaire (SACQ). The SACQ is a 67-item questionnaire designed to measure the effectiveness of student adjustment to college. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be anonymous, so do not type your name anywhere on the form. There are no known risks involved with this study. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose to not participate in this research study or to withdraw. If you choose not to participate you can leave the survey site. You may choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Once you complete the survey you can delete your browsing history for added security. Completing the on-line survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions about the study you may contact Dr. Charles Bethel at XXX-XXX-XXXX and/or Christopher Jackson at XXX-XXX-XXXX.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (XXX) XXX-XXXX.

By completing this survey, you are also confirming that you are **18** years of age or older.

Please print this page for your records.

If you choose to participate in the study you will find the survey at:

https://marshall.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3Xa4awMPf8P4N3U