

11-20-2012

Identification and Integration Within Campus Life Among First-Generation U.S. Citizens: An Exploration of Campus Climate Perception

Shannon Marie Williams
DePaul University, swilli54@depaul.edu

Recommended Citation

Williams, Shannon Marie, "Identification and Integration Within Campus Life Among First-Generation U.S. Citizens: An Exploration of Campus Climate Perception" (2012). *College of Science and Health Theses and Dissertations*. 39.
https://via.library.depaul.edu/csh_etd/39

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Science and Health at Via Sapientiae. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Science and Health Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Via Sapientiae. For more information, please contact wsulliv6@depaul.edu, c.mcclure@depaul.edu.

IDENTIFICATION AND INTEGRATION WITHIN CAMPUS LIFE AMONG FIRST-
GENERATION U.S. CITIZENS:
AN EXPLORATION OF CAMPUS CLIMATE PERCEPTIONS

A Thesis
Presented in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

BY
SHANNON MARIE WILLIAMS
JUNE, 2012

Department of Psychology
College of Health and Behavioral Sciences
DePaul University
Chicago, IL

THESIS COMMITTEE

Joseph R. Ferrari, Ph.D.

Chairperson

Howard Rosing, Ph.D.

Committee Member

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful for the direction I have received from my advisor and thesis chair, Dr. Joseph R. Ferrari. His support and opportunities for rich experiences have given me valuable graduate and career prospects at DePaul University and beyond. In addition, I thank my committee reader, Dr. Howard Rosing, for his guidance and encouragement in my endeavors, as well as for his supportive direction to incorporate varying voices and views.

In addition, I thank Fr. Ed Udovic and Georgianna Torres Reyes for their dedication to DePaul University mission and values research. Such research has given me the opportunity to continue in my professional development and pursue related areas of interest.

VITA

The author was born in Chicago, Illinois, July 3, 1986. She graduated from Proviso West High School and received her Bachelor of Arts degree from DePaul University in 2009.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thesis Committee	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Vita	iv
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Underserved Populations and First-Generation U.S. Citizens.....	1
Low-Income Impacts Educational Attainment with Academic Interferences.....	5
Poverty.....	5
Inequitable access to adequate schooling.....	7
Two-year vs. four-year colleges.....	9
Extra responsibilities and financial aid barriers.	11
First- and Second-Generation Immigrant Backgrounds.....	13
Variation in immigrant experiences.....	16
Assimilation & Acculturation.....	18
Cultural demands.....	18
Assimilation.....	20
First-Generation College Students' Backgrounds.....	22
First-generation college students' characteristics.....	22
Lack of college familiarity.....	24
Lack of positive family support for college.....	26
Campus involvement.....	28
Sense of Community, College Persistence, Student Adjustment and Institutional Engagement.....	29
Sense of Community.....	30

Mission statements.....	31
College persistence.....	32
Student adjustment and institutional engagement.....	34
Purpose of Research.....	35
Rationale.....	37
Statement of Hypotheses and Research Questions.....	38
CHAPTER II. METHOD.....	41
Participants.....	41
Psychometric Measures.....	43
Institution’s Identity.....	43
School Sense of Community.....	44
Social Desirability.....	45
Demographic Information.....	45
Procedure.....	46
CHAPTER III. RESULTS.....	47
Preliminary Analyses	47
Table 1.....	47
Hypothesis I	47
Table 2.....	49
Table 3.....	50
Table 4.....	51
Hypothesis II	51
Table 5.....	53

Table 6.....	54
Table 7.....	55
Hypothesis III	55
Table 8.....	56
CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION	57
Hypothesis I	57
Hypothesis II	60
Hypothesis III	62
Implications for Community Psychology.....	63
Implications for Higher Education Policy.....	65
Limitations in the Present Study	66
Future Research	69
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY.....	73
References.....	75
Appendix A. Description of Target University: Vincentian Heritage.....	85
Appendix B. Mission and Values Inventory	87
Appendix C. Sense of School Membership Scale (Short Form).....	94
Appendix D. Social Desirability Scale (Short Form).....	96
Appendix E. List of Demographic Variables.....	98

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Underserved Populations and First-Generation U.S. Citizens

The United States will move from a majority-white population to a majority-minority nation by 2037, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (Cooper, 2010).

Additionally, about 25% of the current population in America is either an immigrant or the child of an immigrant (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). In 2010, the U.S. had the highest percentage of immigrants ever recorded in history at 13% of the population with 40 million immigrants, or 1 out of 8 people foreign-born (Camarota, 2011). The 2000-2010 decade saw immigration at its highest in U.S.'s history and currently, the majority of the immigrant population was born in Latin America or in Asia, as compared to the large European group that encompassed arrivals during the early 1900's (Keller & Tillman, 2008; Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010).

Furthermore, mixed families (i.e. immediate families with more than one generation that include U.S. citizens as well as noncitizens) are becoming more prevalent as about 1 out of 10 U.S. families has at least one child who is a U.S. citizen with at least one parent who is not a U.S. citizen (Fomby & Cherlin, 2004). About 70% of immigrant children are native born and are from a diverse and heterogeneous population, where the fastest growing portion of the U.S. population under 15 years of age and of the immigrant population is the first- and second- generation immigrant children group (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008; Board on Children and Families, 1995). With the large influx of immigrants every year, the amount of school-aged immigrant children continues to

increase, and the adaptation of this population into the education system will ultimately greatly impact American society (Keller & Tillman, 2008).

First-generation immigrants are those persons who were first in their immediate family to set permanent residence in the U.S. The diverse *second generation immigrant* group, and soon the *third-generation immigrant* group, is growing larger and reaching the age when it will become necessary to decide between furthering education or entering the labor market (Farley & Alba, 2002). A second-generation immigrant is a U.S. born citizen with one or both parents who are foreign-born, whereas third-generation immigrants are people who were born in the U.S. along with their parents born there as well (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Therefore, there will be evident changes of the increasing demographic changes that may need to be considered throughout society and institutions.

As U.S. minority populations along with the rate of people of color are rapidly growing in the nation, the group of students transitioning from high school to college is drastically changing. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) predicts an expansion of well over two million students attending colleges by 2015 with the majority being from minority populations (Carnevale & Fry, 2000). As there are almost 70 million young adults, from 18-34 years old, about 30% in the U.S. are foreign-born or their parents were born elsewhere (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). It is also expected that by 2100, about 50% of the student population will consist of Hispanics and Asian Americans (Swail, 2002).

Despite these demographic changes, underrepresented groups tend to perceive campus climates as less welcoming and supportive than their Caucasian counterparts. Minority groups feel racial tensions, intolerance and exclusion, pressure to conform to

prior stereotypes, view less equitable treatment by faculty and staff, view less policy and practice commitment towards diversity, and perceive university environments as more hostile in terms of race as opposed to Caucasian students who report more positive views of campus climate and hold more positive helpseeking attitudes (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Pewewardy & Frey, 2002; Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Hurtado & Carter, 1997). As such, Caucasian students are still expected to be over-represented in college with students of color continuing to be under-represented.

With about 4,000 colleges and universities in the U.S. and 53 million public school students, there continue to be huge gaps in gaining access and in completing a higher educational degree for underserved populations, despite the recent push from educational policies (Swail, 2002; Pewewardy & Frey, 2002). Additionally, school contexts also lack the resources to tend to the distinct needs of immigrant and minority populations. As students perceive their campus environment in terms of their experiences, including positive connections with peer groups and faculty, the aforementioned campus climate perceptions and lack of support may influence the college persistence and degree attainment of underrepresented groups (Worthington et al., 2008; Johnson, Soldner, Leonard, Alvarez, Inkelas, Rowan-Kenyon, & Longerbeam, 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Pewewardy & Frey, 2002; Cokley, 2002).

The inability of schools to work with minority populations is an issue as a higher educational degree is in high demand for persons globally and across diverse age groups. In today's society, with such economic turmoil, holding a college degree is essential to reach financial stability and long-term employment in the U.S., as opportunities are

limited for people who hold lower degrees (Suarez-Orozco, 2009; Murnane & Steele, 2007). Postsecondary education in particular is related to economic gains, societal benefits, and preparation for future careers (Ishitani, 2006). In addition, class differences as well as the large gap between the lower class and the upper class is often ignored as it relates to educational attainment (Tough, 2008; Books, 2004; O' Connor, 2001). Nevertheless, the divide between hard, low-paying jobs and jobs that require a higher education and are higher-paying is continuing to grow (Goldin & Katz, 2009; Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). For instance, the population that holds higher degrees finds lower percentages of unemployment as well as higher income (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2009; Acs & Loprest, 2005).

As U.S. college attendance rates and the school age population grow rapidly compared to other industrialized nations (Murnane & Steele, 2007), unfortunately the rate of high school graduates as well as the U.S. college completion has significantly dropped (Goldin & Katz, 2009). The fallen high school and college completion rates are particularly true for immigrant groups who arrive with low education and then in turn have low levels of educational attainment. The diverse population of immigrant children not only arrives with varying experiences and adaptation challenges, but some find supportive networks and inviting communities that are well-established while other groups are more isolated (Suarez-Orozco, 2009). Long-term employment and economic well-being for the immigrant and minority populations will be effected by the navigation and experiences of the educational system.

Low-Income Impacts Educational Attainment with Academic Interferences

Poverty. Although 1 in 7 Americans live in poverty (Gonzalez, 2011), this number includes a disproportionate number of minority, foreign-born and low-income working families (Acs & Loprest, 2005). These low-income families typically hold jobs that provide a smaller amount of hours and benefits as compared to middle-income families. As the larger portion of society has a misconception about the face of poverty, stereotypes and stigma play a role in the view of the culture of poverty (Eitzen, 2009; Books, 2004). For example, certain groups are stigmatized and viewed as deserving of poverty with a lack of potential for educational improvement. Poorer populations are seen as inferior and are depicted as passing down such negative traits to their children in a nasty cyclical, unavoidable process (O'Connor, 2001). However, such cultural and individualistic approaches to poverty deny acknowledging the structural and institutional barriers that are in place that lead to inadequate education, health and nutrition (Eitzen, 2009). As such, poverty-stricken areas are found in isolation from the rest of American society with substandard schooling, unstable families, and segregation (Tough, 2008). Furthermore, low-income families find additional problems related to poor physical and mental health, stressful home environments, and a lack of engagement in school activities that are often ignored (Acs & Loprest, 2005).

For instance, low-income and marginalized groups often have issues related to obtaining social services. Fomby and Cherlin (2004) found that noncitizen parents, and a large number of foreign-born citizens, are less likely to improve the well-being of their native children through the use of social services. While immigrant families may be eligible for available social services, there is a disparity between the native parents and

immigrant parents who receives services such as TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), SSI (Supplemental Security Income), Medicaid enrollment, and food stamp use for their U.S.-born children. This is because of confusion about parental status in requirements for obtainment, despite their children actually qualifying for these assistance programs (Fomby & Cherlin, 2004). Discriminate laws that previously denied access for legal and illegal immigrants to public benefits have caused fear and thus continuously keeps families away from such services and assistance programs who are in need (Board on Children and Families, 1995). Access to services may also be dependent on available information that may help discourage or enhance program use, including extra steps or necessary paperwork. This further suggests that service enrollment is planned according to parental eligibility rather than according to that of the children, causing children who are first-generation U.S. citizens to have less access to services that they are eligible for and could benefit from.

Furthermore, the 2001 Income Survey showed that the U.S. has one of the highest child poverty rates and income gaps. Nevertheless, the U.S. also is top in military technology, and hosts a large percentage of the richest people in the world (Books, 2004). Children living in poverty are confronted with issues of violence, poor health, pollution, and parents with work-intensive jobs that provide low-income and high-stress (Books, 2004). Additionally, academic achievement is lowered as students have priorities to take care of household chores and other responsibilities, where emotional and psychological problems impact academic outcomes (Acs & Loprest, 2005). Moreover, not only do educational gaps start out early for low-income children, but as poverty continues to

climb, academic growth among low income children continues to not occur for various reasons.

Inequitable access to adequate schooling. Research noted that while higher education in the U.S. is deemed highly accessible, quality learning and opportunities for higher educational skills are unequally distributed. Therefore, the participation and preparation levels among students are greatly varied as many schools are not adequately preparing students for college or with the necessary skills for entering the work force (Murnane & Steele, 2007), especially when socioeconomic conditions are taken into consideration (Swail, 2002). For instance, second-generation immigrant groups typically attend public schools in low-income, urban areas and this is particularly true for students whose parents are undocumented and have a low level of education (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010; Suarez-Orozco, Bang, & Onaga, 2010). Such public schools are noted as unsuccessful at preparing students for a higher education and for advanced demanding jobs (Farley & Alba, 2002).

Research found that college attendance is higher among immigrant populations when high academic achievement has been gained in high school, increasing college preparedness (Keller & Tillman, 2008). However, students who attend schools in low-income areas, compared to students in more affluent districts, tend to have increased deficiencies academic-wise. There tend to be restricted opportunities for educational development as well as the pursuit of higher education for under-represented populations in low-income areas.

The large percentage of students who are inadequately prepared for college and/or cannot afford the high tuition cost is unfortunately represented by a large portion of low-

income and minority students, who also tend to be overrepresented in the poverty rating (U.S. Census Data, 2010; Murnane & Steele, 2007). With the lack of resources and funding to schools in poverty-stricken neighborhoods, children are not being adequately prepared as they should be (Tough, 2008). It is particularly evident that populations with minimal resources, support, and low income are provided with a lack of academic opportunity. This further exacerbates the lack of equitable access to quality education as there are high disparities in resources and educational opportunities.

For instance, schools in low-income areas generally have high levels of violence and gangs, and lack being able to offer quality technology, after-school programs and extracurricular activities that middle-class neighborhoods provide (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010; Books, 2004; National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). Furthermore, high-poverty schools are more likely to have teachers with inadequate credentials, lack funding, materials and curriculum, computers, higher educational opportunities, updated books, and safe buildings. Old facilities, a lack of resources to serve students with a variation in needs, and overcrowded classes lead to schooling issues in low-income areas (Murnane & Steele, 2007). Inequitable access to a quality education is noted by the larger majority of funding going to affluent schools which also have higher access to the needed resources and learning opportunities that enhance educational achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2011). On that note, equitable access to such things as resources, college prep courses, and higher curriculum programs should be a main focus of equalizing support in marginalized communities to increase the rate of college preparedness.

Additionally, schools with high concentrations of low-income and minority students often find teachers that are ill-equipped and ill-prepared to teach the subjects

being taught and have a lack of experience and certification (Murnane & Steele, 2007). Such issues lend to the low graduation rates that are particularly noticeable in low-income, minority populations as these communities typically have less qualified teachers and available programs to assist students in the efforts to achieve a higher education. Therefore, more qualified and ethnically diverse teachers are needed for the increasing minority and disadvantaged populations in public schools in the U.S. Unfortunately, schools with students from diverse backgrounds are generally the most difficult to provide qualified teachers for, with the lack of support, resources and tough working conditions. Teachers are unable to deal with the struggles that the students face and do not have the resources that should be provided to low-income students (Books, 2004). Therefore, the teacher attrition rate is high in poverty-stricken schools and more-qualified teachers thus end up in more affluent neighborhoods (Murnane & Steele, 2007; Books, 2004), which lead to further declines in educational attainment for disadvantaged populations. Thus, teachers in low-income schools need more support, professional development, higher wages, and more resources to assist disadvantaged populations. The quality of the education provided determines a discrepancy in skills that low-income and high-income students may acquire, and this thus may differently impact their future schooling and careers.

Two-year vs. four-year colleges. As 44% of college students in the U.S. are enrolled in two-year institutions (Gonzalez, 2011), the majority of low-income students and students from underserved populations who do attend college typically attend small colleges with few resources and a lack of support (Santibanez, Gonzalez, Morrison, & Carroll, 2007; Swail, 2002). Two-year colleges tend to be closer to one's residence and

more affordable than four-year colleges for low-income populations, racial and ethnic minorities, and among first-generation immigrants.

However, two-year colleges are less rewarding financially in the long run as they appear less esteemed than four-year colleges (Arbona & Nora, 2007; Keller & Tillman, 2008). Furthermore, the National Center for Statistics shows that in reality only 31% of two-year college students complete a degree and less than a quarter of students actually transfer to a four-year institution (Gonzalez, 2011). Moreover, minority populations as well as low-income groups have not had high rates of success for transferring to a four-year college to obtain a bachelor's degree after attending a two-year college.

One study noted that in 1992, 44% of a Hispanic student cohort earned a college degree by year 2000 if they first attended a four-year college versus only 7% of the same cohort who attended a community college first (Arbona & Nora, 2007). The student group that attended a four-year college first, which was a smaller proportion of the students, also had a higher percentage of parents who had a degree. Research has shown that college attainment percentages go up for students whose parents have a college education (Warburton, Bugarin, & Nunez, 2001). Furthermore, the Arbona & Nora study found that students of Hispanic descent who graduated high school, along with high-risk students from various backgrounds, were more likely to attend a four-year institution if they had expectations to attend college, had college preparedness, a high school curriculum that was academically rigorous, and had peers with similar college plans (Perna & Titus, 2005). Therefore, it is imperative that public schools improve in their quality of college preparation for students, particularly in minority and low-income

populations. Furthermore, college institutions must assist students in becoming fully integrated on college campuses despite prior schooling experiences.

Extra responsibilities and financial aid barriers. Unfortunately, with tuition rates mounting, low and middle income students find financial burdens as a barrier to access and completion in higher education (Sanchez, Esparza, Colon, & Davis, 2010; Fry, 2004). Financial issues are particularly relevant for community-college students who have a hard time of earning a degree due to issues related to poverty. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, 79% of students in the nation take classes while working part- or full-time and another 29% have low levels of household income, under \$2,000 (Gonzalez, 2011). Additionally, not only do first-generation college students have limited time for study, they also struggle with full-time enrollment and with higher level coursework because of other responsibilities (Pascarella et al., 2003). First-generation students, compared to traditional students, often leave school within a couple of years before finishing their degree (Ishitani, 2006). Reasons for their withdrawal include hours of work and lack of time for participation and school work, leading to lower grades (Terenzini, 1996). First-generation college students, therefore, may not have as much time to attend full-time or be involved on campus and may need financial aid to continue with taking courses.

Furthermore, for immigrant families, there is more reciprocity in terms of support. Young adults in immigrant families typically stay at home to reduce expenses, provide resources and social support because of the low-income levels of their families. One study found that about 50% of children of immigrants contribute financial assistance to support parents who cannot legally work, drive, obtain financial aid or numerous social

services (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Therefore, within immigrant families, there is more of a feeling of obligation to one's family and their security, which lends more to a collectivistic view rather than a more Americanized individualistic focus. Essentially, these students from immigrant families have less opportunity to focus on school work, despite their academic motivations to succeed and can often feel overwhelmed with all of their tasks.

While students in immigrant families may have the motivation to attend college, succeed and do well, they have their obligations that they are expected to uphold for their families. These students may end up having less time to devote to their school work in their efforts to attend to their families' needs and household duties, including working to help with financial situations (Sanchez, et al., 2010; Acs & Loprest, 2005, Tseng, 2004). Research showed that youth working and lending numerous hours of assistance to families leads to lower academic achievement (Sanchez, et al., 2010). Other obligations include translation issues, appointment accompaniment, caretaking burdens and household responsibilities that can often interfere with school demands. The environmental context impacts students' college persistence, particularly for ethnic minority and at-risk populations (Nora, 2003). For instance, minority women who had responsibilities to care for family members were less likely to finish school (as much as 83%) than their peers who did not have such a burden (Arbona & Nora, 2007). Students may decide not to stay enrolled in college because of family and work responsibilities that keep them from the opportunity to be fully immersed in the social and academic arena on campus.

The financial obligations of working to provide for a family and commuting from home may also be related to choice of college, as students from low-income families tend to have a lack of sufficient funds and financial aid. In addition, there may be a lack of awareness of the funds necessary to attend college which may be another factor that deters first-generation college students from continuing to further their education (Garcia, 2010). However, research shows that financial resources do assist students in continuing college and in graduating (Gonzalez, 2011). When financial needs cannot be met, many students decide not to continue schooling, which in turn may interfere not only with academic achievement but also social integration (Pascarella et al., 2004; Terezini et al., 1996). These students may feel unwelcomed causing negative interactions with school life and this may allow them to not benefit from college experiences. Financial assistance is necessary for underserved and low-income populations to persist through college and to complete degrees; otherwise academic gaps will inevitably continue to escalate. Nevertheless, challenges related to social, financial and legal issues make college retention and graduation difficult.

First- and Second-Generation Immigrant Backgrounds

Research notes that the first year of college may often be the most difficult to maneuver and adjust to with varying stressors related to social, academic, physical and psychological issues (Hicks & Heastie, 2008; Thompson, 2008). With percentage rates for college dropouts at 20-30% in the first year, it is important to define what aids in student retention (Thompson, 2008). It is further difficult for immigrant populations to obtain a college degree who have additional barriers in navigating a new country (Tseng, 2004). Those who arrive in the U.S. with their parents as well as U.S.-born children of

immigrant parents are considered immigrant children and children of immigrants (Board on Children and Families, 1995). Many students from immigrant populations are first-generation U.S. citizens, generally those who were born elsewhere and immigrated to the United States with their families (Tseng, 2004). Most parents of these groups of students do not speak English and have lower socioeconomic statuses and higher unemployment rates, compared to U.S.-born parents (Keller & Tillman, 2008). Additionally, immigrant adults have a significantly lower high school educational attainment as compared to native adults (Camarota, 2004). For instance, 67% of the adult foreign-born population had completed an education level of high school or more as compared to 86.6% of the native population (Schmidley, 2000).

In recent years, about 50% of new immigrant arrivals mainly came from Mexico, the Caribbean, and Latin American countries, with about 30% from Asia and 15% from Europe and Canada (Farley & Alba, 2002). The Current Population Survey (CPS) in 2000, conducted for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, found that the quite young second generation group of more than 15 million, consisted of 35% Hispanics, 4% African Americans, and 10% Asians. The new diverse second-generation group may face racial discrimination and greater challenges than the earlier second-generation Europeans during the 1900's (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). The native-born population is widely encompassed by about 90% of White and Black populations who are third-generation or higher, where, conversely, the foreign-born population finds that Hispanic populations and Asian populations are respectively 80% and 94% foreign-born, or their parents are foreign-born (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010).

As immigrant populations are arriving in the U.S. with a large range of backgrounds, over 100 languages, and varying origins and cultures (Board on Children and Families, 1995), this is unfortunately during a time when economic opportunities may be more limited. Such limitations occur with sharp changes in the availability for access to social services, education, health and other programs for immigrant and illegal immigrant populations. As about 75% of immigrants are in the U.S. legally, where the number of undocumented immigrants has been declining (Camarota, 2010; Camarota & Jensenius, 2009; Passel & Chon, 2008), the second generation of immigrants, who are largely first-generation U.S. citizens, is growing rapidly (Farly & Alba, 2002). With over 150 countries where immigrants come from to the U.S., there are an assortment of cultures and histories to be taken into consideration (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Educational needs will ultimately vary across groups with numerous experiences from countries of origin as well as countless backgrounds, economic levels, and social classes that may impact educational achievement (Board on Children and Families, 1995). This is particularly evident for the first-generation immigrants who have limited English proficiency (LEP) as well as limited access to additional integrated programming, materials and trained teachers within schools to assist this population.

Moreover, gender and racial differences may play a role in the academic performance of immigrant students. For instance, females compared to males tend to have better educational outcomes for reasons including varying expectation levels, discrimination and stigmatization that often lead minority male students to be less engaged in academics (Suarez-Orozco, et. al, 2010; Nicolas, DeSilva, & Rabenstein, 2009). Furthermore, female compared to male students also view more support from

school environments and have more meaningful relationships with teachers along with more responsibilities to be engaged in school, which may impact varying outcomes.

Parental roles also may play an integral role in immigrant children's education. One study (Hossain & Shipman, 2009) noted that while Mexican immigrant mothers may spend more time with students, father engagement positively impacted student education levels. Additionally, in terms of Hispanic and Black American immigrants, educational attainment appears to be most impacted by socioeconomic status (Nicolas, et. al, 2009), which is particularly related to the low-income neighborhoods that minority and immigrant populations tend to live in that often lack resources and adequate schooling. Therefore, it may be important for institutions and policy makers to keep such demographic variances in mind when planning to reach targeted populations and in deciding how to reach students with a plethora of backgrounds and experiences.

Variation in immigrant experiences. As immigrant children have a wide range of performance standards, the separate paths are contributed to family resources, socioeconomic status, country of origin along with social networks and school settings (Suarez-Orozco, 2009). For instance, while about 28% of native families live in or near poverty, 45% of immigrants and their young children live in poverty (Camarota, 2004). However, some immigrant families have an advantage of better integration into society with higher educational levels, employment and income. Asian and European immigrant groups have more beneficial situations while Mexican and Puerto Rican immigrant groups deal with the lowest income and highest poverty levels (Farley & Alba, 2002). Unfortunately, this continues to be an issue for the second-, third- and higher generations as well. Furthermore, risk factors are increased as the parents of many immigrant children

often have limited English proficiency and education, which makes it hard for them to understand and be involved in the education of their children (Suarez-Orozco, 2009). For example, for school-age children under 17, about 21% in 2009 spoke a language other than English at home (National Center for Statistics, 2011). As the first-year of college may be the most difficult for the transition of foreign students, additional support may benefit students who are unfamiliar with American concepts and have lower English language proficiency (Fischer, 2011).

Research shows that first- and second-generation immigrant students, as compared to the third-generation immigrant native-born youth, have higher college attendance, where further generations find declining college attendance (Keller & Tillman, 2008). Moreover, the second generation group has been found to have higher educational attainment in comparison to their first-generation parents as well as third-generation and higher Caucasian and African American groups; however, this was found in Asian, European, and South American groups rather than in Puerto Rican and Mexican groups (Farley & Alba, 2002). For instance, one study found that almost 90% of Asian immigrants entered the U.S. with a college degree, where only 2% did not finish high school, with similar percentages transferring to the second-generation group (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Conversely, the same study noted that only about 5% of Latino immigrants entered the U.S. with a college degree, with over 60% who did not finish high school because of the low access to schooling in their countries.

This research reflected that while the second-generation groups may be better off than the first-generation groups, some groups clearly have an economic advantage, as educational attainment for children is linked to the attainment of parents. As parents are

able to provide assistance based off of their prior experiences related to obtaining a college degree, children are thus able to feel more connected to a campus and are more likely to have higher education expectations and attainment (Sanchez, Esparza, & Colon, 2008). Therefore, immigrant groups that came in with more advanced degrees and skills are the same groups whose second-generation groups end up with a higher education, higher ranking and higher paying jobs, and are more able to assist their children in educational and other costs.

On the other hand, while the U.S. born second-generation may be more likely to attend college, compared to first- and third-generation populations, the second-generation tend to be the least likely to finish school (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). High expectations, available resources, control and involvement from parents in terms of academic achievement has been shown to be a protective factor for academic attainment from disadvantaged populations (Sanchez, et al., 2008; Acs & Loprest, 2005; Warburton et al., 2001). Other important factors that are crucial in academic attainment include family members or friends who are able to provide motivation, knowledge, and guiding experiences to support children in college decisions (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). Nevertheless, opposing cultural views make it especially difficult for these youth to succeed in college.

Assimilation and Acculturation

Cultural demands. The cultural demands families place on young adults from immigrant populations is also one of the multiple barriers that may detract such youth from attaining academic success. Although many schools and institutions in the U.S. stress fast-paced acculturation for immigrant families, many immigrant parents choose to

retain portions of their culture and fuse it with American culture, as determined through the process of selective acculturation (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). Therefore, it is crucial to consider the context of families when researching children of immigrants, as social and economic experiences and adaptations for immigrant children are often determined by family affiliations (Board on Children and Families, 1995). Cultural differences are found within families who lean towards independence of their youth and young adults whereas other groups tend to hold onto ideas of interdependence.

Interdependence focuses more on the close relationships with others, where, on the other hand, independence is geared more towards separation (Tseng, 2004). Dependent support includes emotional, financial, and time commitment obligations. Youth and young adults within these cultures are expected to continue to live near their families, provide support, and respect their elders in networks of extended families. In addition, important decisions are considered family matters and are in need of discussing together.

Research further suggested that such cultural values may also be connected to immigrant adaptation. Social and cultural strains place immigrant populations in a stressful situation in trying to adapt to an unfamiliar environment (Board on Children and Families, 1995). There are often tensions between family customs and American society. Not only does college lend more challenges to students in terms of academic rigor, but young adults from immigrant populations have higher expectations from their families to assist in the aforementioned challenges that they face in a country with a different culture from their own. In trying to navigate living in a new country, families may ask youth members to assist in linguistic, economic and cultural challenges faced in navigating various institutions (Tseng, 2004). Children of Mexican and Central American immigrant

families, for instances, noted their sense of giving back to their families for struggling in a new country for their benefits, including a better future and for more opportunities. Therefore, family unity may be further strengthened during these harder times for these families. These children tend to be more motivated in excelling at school, particularly in high school, in order to have success for their families. However, research notes that such high motivations tend to diminish towards the end of high school and during the beginning of college (Tseng, 2004).

Acculturative stress then becomes a problem when immigrant and early generation citizens try to manage the differences between their culture and the new culture that they interact with after immigrating (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). So while children of these families are faced with the notions of independence through college and U.S. ideologies, they are also receiving opposing interdependence dynamics from their families (Tseng, 2004). These opposing ideologies may cause these students to feel less welcomed and more stressed as they are trying to find a balance between such varying views. Research noted that full integration into the norms of the majority population may not be as relevant for minority groups as keeping their social identities and backgrounds (Johnson, et al., 2007). Furthermore, that feeling that one does not belong in a specific society, plus a sense of perceived discrimination from people of different cultures, may lead to stress and lower self-esteem, particularly for immigrant populations (Mena et al., 1987). This stress can then impact on other crucial areas in life.

Assimilation. The theory of assimilation highlights the idea that social, economic, and linguistic disadvantages experienced by the first-generation immigrant population make it difficult for high socioeconomic achievement, although later generations are

expected to have better acculturation (Keller & Tillman, 2008). However, the later immigrant population may experience upward or downward mobility according to the segmented assimilation theory. The three features that researchers note as necessary to effect the upward or downward assimilation of the second-generation immigrant group include the education and skill level of immigrant parents, the social context in which immigrant families are received, and the family structure (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). The segmented assimilation theory notes that educational attainment levels may vary for immigrant peers from various racial and ethnic backgrounds. The low-income, negatively viewed and disadvantaged groups are found to be disproportionately represented in downward assimilation. For example, one study noted how less than 1% of the sample from a disadvantaged population were able to overcome the obstacles associated with low-income and negative receptions in order to graduate college (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008).

There are varying circumstances and patterns of migration that impact immigrant populations (Suárez-Orozco, Todorova, & Louie, 2002). Some immigrant groups, for example, arrive with extensive educational levels and skills such as the older Asian and European groups, whereas narrow educational achievement is found within the younger Caribbean, Mexican, and Latin American groups, as compared to U.S. citizens (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008, Farley & Alba, 2002). The higher skilled and documented groups typically have fewer issues with assimilating into American society. For example, after Congress' realization of the labor shortage, many skilled immigrants began to arrive in the U.S. with low levels of discrimination where the number of documented immigrants, largely Asian groups, was noted as exceeding the unauthorized immigrant group, largely

Latin American (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). Therefore, documented and professional immigrant groups may face fewer barriers and have a better foundation for assimilation in the U.S. culture with how they are perceived by other communities.

Additionally, family experiences that include motivational relatives, conflicting ideas, and separation from family members may impact immigrant children in their assimilation and transitions (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008; Suárez-Orozco, et al., 2002). Family separation becomes an issue in terms of transnationalism as many immigrant family members remain in the home country, making assimilation more complicated. For second-generation immigrant groups, family characteristics, preparation, resources, culture and socio-demographic variables may also impact academic outcomes (Keller & Tillman, 2008). Family and community characteristics allow children to have set community values, norms and behaviors (Blank, 2004). Therefore, as many second-generation groups, especially Mexican populations, tend to follow in the occupation of their parents, levels of educational attainment continue to be an issue (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). Therefore, second- and third-generation groups' socioeconomic status will rely greatly upon the social capital of parents as well as the location, background, and ethnic community protections (Farly & Alba, 2002).

First-Generation College Students' Backgrounds

First-generation college students' characteristics. It is important for colleges to note that there has been an increase in the first-generation college student population recently, where 34% of four-year institutions were first-generation college students as well as 53% of two-year colleges between 1995-96 (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004). Terenzini, Springer, Yaeger, Pascarella, & Nora (1996) noted that there

continues to be an increase in the number of first-generation college students who attend higher institutions of learning. However, just as first-generation U.S. citizen students face greater challenges to attending college and completing a degree, first-generation college students (those whose parents lack a postsecondary education allowing these students to be the first in the family to attend college) also face barriers to educational attainment (Garcia, 2010).

First-generation college students differ compared to the rest of student populations in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status. First-generation college students tend to be older than traditional students and are more likely from a lower-income family (Garcia, 2010; Pascarella, Wolniak, Pierson, & Terenzini 2003). As studies noted, socioeconomic status, parental educational attainment, and financial aid complicate the lives of first-generation college students with a negative impact on social integration and academics (Ishitani, 2006). Age and economic differences may include numerous responsibilities outside of the classroom including work and family obligations that may interfere with time for school. Besides work commitments, there will also be less time for school involvement, which research suggests may have a positive impact on school related endeavors.

While these students might benefit from a variety of college experiences, first-generation college students have a variety of other life demands plus they report they are less prepared for college level academic responsibilities (Terezini et al., 1996; Garcia, 2010). There are pre-college characteristics, characteristics prior to college entry, which help deter students from continuing college and lead to higher college attrition as compared to other students (Ishitani, 2006; Pascarella et al., 2003). These characteristics

include family income, previous high school academic level work and rank in school, lower academic expectations, and types of colleges that are being attended. The parents of first-generation college students are not as able to assist their children in preparing for entrance exams. Furthermore, schools in lower-economic communities do not have as many opportunities for advanced classes nor in helping students understand the college admissions process (Garcia, 2010; Pascarella et al., 2004). Students in low-income areas as well as first-generation college students may not be aware of the rigor of colleges and may become disillusioned with the daunting tasks related to the academic requirements of universities.

Lack of college familiarity. Besides the anxieties faced by college students, first-generation college students may face cultural, social, and academic transitions (Pascarella et al., 2004; Terezini et al., 1996). Therefore, it is essential to note the cultural capital, the difficulty and the limited familiarity with the dominant culture that these students are coming more into contact with. One study found that first-generation college students and students whose parents had some interaction with college but no bachelor's degree had similar academic and social experiences (Pascarella et al., 2003). The similarities between these students suggest that being unaware of college cultures might deter students from successful campus interactions. Research noted that first-generation college students are less aware of college dynamics and the importance of college in the world today which may impact their attendance (Pascarella et al., 2004). First-generation college students tend to have limited assistance from families with a lack of college knowledge and a disadvantage in terms of high school education and college expectations (Pascarella et al., 2003; Terezini et al., 1996). Other students not only have better access

and ease with such information with family members who have attended college, they also tend to have a better understanding of crucial college decisions. With the awareness of important collegiate benefits, these students' college experiences tend to be more positive in terms of academics and student involvement (Pascarella et al., 2004).

Research also shows that students are more likely to attend college if their parents graduated from college (Garcia, 2010; Terezini et al., 1996). Family members with prior college knowledge are more influential to students in attending college and continuing on. A lack of college knowledge from families of first-generation college students may tend to allow these specific students to focus less on college aspirations and the importance it may have for future opportunities (Garcia, 2010). Without such family support, there is often a lack of familiarity with all that college entails and what is required of students to be admitted and to receive good grades (Terenzini et al., 1996).

Research showed that first-generation college students tend not to complete college degrees in a timely manner and have lower college retention rates in contrast to traditional students (Ishitani, 2006). Furthermore, first-generation students, as compared to other students, may be less likely to attend graduate and professional schooling (Pascarella et al., 2004). It is unfortunate that many first-generation students do not attend nor complete college degrees due to various aforementioned and other factors. The lack of familiarity with the university system leads many first-generation college students to attend two-year colleges and only on a part-time basis (Garcia, 2010). For example, research showed that when a variety of other variables are taken into account (e.g. pre-college characteristics and aspirations), first-generation students still tend to attend less selective institutions in comparison to other students (Pascarella et al., 2004). However,

one study noted how when first-generation college student persist through the two-years at a community college, they actually have the same academic benefits as other students (Pascarella et al., 2003). Therefore, it is important to note how the decisions related to attending and completing a college degree may leave these students more at risk in terms of academic levels, and economic and social ties that may impact their future career and job opportunities.

Lack of positive family support for college. While parent support and participation have been shown to have positive benefits for students who attend college (Davis, 2010; Hurtado & Carter, 1997), parents of first-generation college students generally do not have adequate time or knowledge to be supportive. Parents, when they do try to be supportive, often give first-generation college students ill-informed and unproductive information regarding college as compared to parents of traditional students (Davis, 2010). Despite this fact, parental influence may impact where these students attend schools. The lack of accurate information may cause problems with attending and sustaining college life when parents are unable to give information, which may hinder college participation. For instance, some parents often may also give unproductive advice regarding academic requirements and may tell their first-generation students that certain classes are not necessary, work will not interfere with schooling, and that extracurricular involvement is irrelevant (Davis, 2010). Families may also help persuade students to attend specific colleges for reasons that seem more beneficial to the family rather than for the student, including distance and positive notions expressed in media portrayals.

Not only may the lack of knowledge on the part of first-generation college students' family members make it more difficult to be geared towards attending college,

these families may also make it harder for these students to transition to college life.

Parents of first-generation college students can also feel that college is unnecessary and express negative views about attending college (Davis, 2010). Cognitive dissonance may be caused when students receive opposing values and expectations from their parents.

These tensions are particularly important when such families do not want any separation between the family members. Family demands while wanting college mobility can cause first-generation students to have conflicts between these two varying aspects (Terezini et al., 1996). Therefore, these students may feel that it is necessary to keep family and friendship ties when attending such a foreign place as college (Garcia, 2010). Such family dynamics help to further exacerbate the issue related to not allowing first-generation students the opportunity to become involved on campus and to make new friendships to gain a sense of belonging on campus.

Often times family members may not understand or fully try to comprehend all of the necessary work that is involved with college life and asking first-generation college students to keep their same roles back home makes the transition to college that much more difficult (Davis, 2010). Therefore, these students may feel faced with adhering to family members' requests to attend to responsibilities and to remain close to home, which not only impact where they choose to attend college but how long they stay as well.

There is also a sense of loyalty to families as these students are more familiar with home life than with college life (Davis, 2010). First-generation college students are facing large amounts of pressure from two opposing sides without feeling that they have many people to turn to for advice. Therefore, even when first-generation students have the motivation to attend college, especially when they know they have a chance to represent their

families academics-wise, they often find themselves with a lack of time to delegate to school tasks and life (Davis, 2010). Thus, it is more difficult for these students to become better acclimated to college life. However, research and the student involvement theory show that being actively involved on campus and socially integrated is important for continuing on in college and leads to learning and personal development benefits (Garcia, 2010; Pascarella et al., 2004).

Campus involvement. Students decide to continue attending schools based on their interactions and connections with the campus environment (Ishitani, 2006). First-generation college students tend to have varying social experiences as compared to traditional students and also perceive their institutions in a different light (Terezini et al., 1996). One study found that first-generation college students, compared to traditional students, tended to feel less faculty concern and interest towards their student development and less encouragement from friends towards college enrollment (Terezini et al., 1996). Traditional students with more positive faculty perceptions had better grades in school. Also, first-generation college students typically reported discrimination related to gender and to racial/ethnic identities. When students have a lack of campus interactions and negative experiences related to college, they eventually no longer attend college whereas, on the other hand, more and positive interactions may allow students to be further committed to school (Garcia, 2010).

Research notes that higher involvement and academic effort for first-generation college students lead to positive academic outcomes from year to year (Pascarella et al., 2004). Social and peer network engagement from first-generation college students has been shown to not only be beneficial academically but also lends to a greater sense of

control over their college lives (Pascarella et al., 2004). For instance, extracurricular involvement allows these students the chance to be exposed to more aspects of college life, including meeting other students and becoming more familiar with college culture that may have otherwise been unknown. However, even though first-generation students can be enriched considerably from being more engaged in school life, literature recognizes that this group of students has fewer avenues to be involved due to other duties and barriers such as work and limited schooling time (Pascarella et al., 2004). Institutions need to make connections with students to facilitate academic and social integration to allow for more feelings of campus inclusion (Terenzini et al., 1996). Therefore, it is crucial that higher institutions of learning provide more convenient opportunities of involvement for students who would find beneficial results in doing so.

Sense of Community, College Persistence, Student Adjustment, and Institutional Engagement

As immigrant families expect that their children will continue to be supportive even through young adult ages and will be readily accessible in times of need, native children of immigrant populations can be indirectly affected on their academic achievement during high school because of parental behaviors and expectations (Keller & Tillman, 2008). Some research points to the idea that generational status can impact various racial and ethnic groups differently in terms of academic outcomes. For example, high school and college graduation rates continue to be low for Hispanic immigrants in comparison to Asian immigrants and native-born students. (Keller & Tillman, 2008; Arbona & Nora, 2007; National Center for Statistics, 2002).

College experiences and family contexts impact these educational gaps. Immigrant children tend to continue to hold onto close ties to the culture of family interdependence. Many first-generation U.S. citizen students stay at home with their families during college where they are able to stay close to their family (Tseng, 2004). Therefore, these student populations have less time for school work and for school-related involvement. Students who live on campuses tend to have an increased sense of belonging due to social engagement and further integration into college life (Fry, 2002). Research shows how social and academic support along with students' involvement in school and related activities also have positive links to completing school (Thompson, 2008, Garcia, 2010). Organizational participation has been shown to increase access to assistance and social resources as well as to further promote educational attainment. Outside of social and family networks, community interactions and available programs to assist immigrant families are also of particular importance (Board on Children and Families, 1995). Cultural views impact academic achievement as well as a feeling of belonging to the school and the U.S. environment and may cause students to be distant from related social and community networks.

Sense of community. A sense of community hosts four aspects that include a feeling of belonging through membership, impacting a group through influence, obtaining resources through integration and fulfillment of needs, and similar experiences through shared emotional connections (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). A sense of belonging measure developed by Hagborg (1994) investigated participation perceptions and support from faculty and peers and found that a strong sense of community leads to better academic outcomes and college retention (Jacobs & Archie, 2008). Literature has rarely

studied a sense of belonging and hosts inconsistent definitions within higher education (Johnson, et al., 2007). A sense of belonging includes the perception of inclusion within college climates along with welcoming, affirming, and supportive interactions and environments from the institution. Additionally, campus membership and identification includes varying roles of participation and multiple affiliations, and therefore should be addressed subjectively by individuals in academic and social forms (Hurtado & Carter, 1997).

Research notes that minority populations have less of a sense of belonging as compared to Caucasian students on college campuses, which leads to lower academic achievement (Johnson, et al., 2007; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Pewewardy & Frey, 2002; Ancis, et al., 2000). For instance, one study noted how Latino students, despite precollege characteristics that were geared towards high college achievement, had variability in terms of a sense of belonging (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Minority students have a higher sense of belonging when they find positive and supportive relationships with peers and faculty along with perceptions of fair treatment and acceptance. Conversely, a sense of belonging is lowered and college persistence decreases with negative racial climates, negative peer and faculty interactions, and perceptions of discrimination (Johnson, et al., 2007; Ancis, et al., 2000; Hurtado & Carter, 1997).

Mission statements. A sense of inclusion is particularly important in terms of campus missions as mission statements are able to encourage diversity through commitment to action. Institutional values reflect the mission, values, and identity through goals specified in mission statements (Ferrari & Cowman, 2004). For instance, institutions have the ability to incorporate campus climate influence towards racial

inclusion through various operations (Johnson, et al., 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005), and can be more inclusive through innovative ideas to include diversity aspects (Pewewardy & Frey, 2002; Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006). As environments both influence and are influenced by its dwellers, institutional programs and policies have the ability to support diversity and inspire multicultural interactions that lead to positive outcomes (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Research has shown how mission-identity characteristics have been related to students' school sense of community as well as to that of faculty and staff (Ferrari, Cowman, Milner, Gutierrez, & Drake, 2009; Ferrari, McCarthy, & Milner, 2009). Not only must institutions support cultural awareness, but policies, activities, initiatives, and programming must reflect such support to impact students' perceptions (Pewewardy & Frey, 2002). Therefore, college campuses need to be aware of the perceptions and experiences that students encounter and how conducive missions are to including diverse populations through continuous evaluations of campus environments.

College persistence. Institutions are able to facilitate the integration within academic as well as social structures for students that will ultimately impact college persistence. Student college persistence includes the interaction between precollege characteristics and the school environment fit for students, according to the Student Adjustment Model (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). Additionally, Tinto's Student Persistence Model suggests that academic and social involvement, engagement, and affiliation are crucial components to college satisfaction and college retention (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Students are more likely to feel integrated into campus life with positive interactions and feelings of acceptance. The college experience, including expectations,

and interactions with faculty, staff and students, impact the academic development along with a stronger commitment to an institution and college degree obtainment (Arbona & Nora, 2007). One study showed how Hispanic students who attended school in a continuous manner and had better grades earlier on were more committed to the school and also had higher chances of obtaining a bachelor's degree. Unfortunately, Hispanic students, while they may be just as likely to enroll in college as their White peers, have been found to be least likely to stay enrolled continuously, at a full-time status, or to graduate college because of various reasons including financial burdens and family responsibilities (Sanchez, et al., 2010; Fry, 2004). Research also notes that the lack of persistence is because of the college experiences that minority students encounter, which in turn helps to increase the educational attainment gaps. Therefore, there are challenges to obtaining a degree that impedes students from the attempted completion.

Even equally prepared Hispanic students still tend to attend less-selective schools than their Caucasian counterparts and are less likely to persist, as these students have different experiences than other students. Along with the necessary adjusting and adapting that must take place on college campuses, many Hispanic students also state that they fear discrimination, worry about affordability, have a lack of belief in academic ability, and have a preference to stay close to home (Fry, 2004). Also, the community expectations along with a sense of fitting in were mentioned as strongly imperative to persistence. The Adjustment Model notes that positive social and academic integration is particularly important for nontraditional and minority students (Nora & Cabrera, 1996). Through this model, the Student/Institutional Engagement Model (Nora, 2003)

highlighted that the college persistence of students comes from the connections between the student and the institution.

Student adjustment and institutional engagement. Students' adjustment and transition to college are impacted by precollege characteristics and environmental factors. For instance, students who first attend a two-year college and graduate or transfer to a four-year college are found to have similar precollege characteristics and social support as students who first-attend four-year colleges (Arbona & Nora, 2007). Social support, family and work responsibilities, school proximity, and precollege features that include prior academic experiences and achievements, financial issues, and family educational levels and encouragement all play a role in the student and campus engagement (Fry, 2002; Arbona & Nora, 2007). Therefore, prior academic preparation and other crucial aspects essentially assist students in becoming better integrated on college campuses, where perceptions of the institutional factors and a sense of community push students towards degree commitment.

Student and faculty interactions may provide students with the support necessary to face school challenges, participate in school-related events and be more committed to the school and obtaining a higher degree. The Theory of Social Capital denotes that the social networks of a campus lead to variations in the type of resources that are available to varying racial and ethnic groups, particularly for those that are underrepresented in higher education, mainly African American and Hispanic students (Perna & Titus, 2005). The social capital of a school may impact college enrollment as minority populations may feel that they have less access to support, resources and available social networks.

Purpose of Research

Post-secondary educational attainment has only recently been researched more in terms of various immigrant groups (Keller & Tillman, 2008). It will be essential to further research on race, ethnicity and nativity status and how such demographics may impact the educational experience with the ever-changing shifts in American society. Educational needs will ultimately vary across groups with numerous experiences from countries of origin as well as countless backgrounds, economic levels, and social classes that may impact educational achievement (Board on Children and Families, 1995). It will be necessary for institutions to take into consideration a number of aspects including family structures, support systems, communities of residence, financial status and the legal status of the family to learn more about potential risk and protective factors. What propels students towards adjustment versus those aspects that are essentially more hindering to success? Generalizations of immigrant groups will not be as readily helpful in understanding the differences among groups towards their attainment of a higher education. This research is interested in how students navigate and are influenced by the educational system, as this will likely impact their future occupations and economic success.

Research is needed to understand the sense of belonging, perceptions of engagement and campus involvement by minority students to see how they are being impacted (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Campus climates need to be assessed to determine minority students' positive perceptions of inclusion that may otherwise hamper college retention (Rankin & Reason, 2005). While research notes that there are racial differences in perceptions, there is limited research that looks at other important variables, although

individual experiences are expressed as highly important in campus perceptions (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). As varied backgrounds, racial identities, cultural values, acculturation and adjustment experiences differ among and between groups (Ancis, et al., 2000; Pewewardy & Frey, 2002), it is important to look at first- and second-generation immigrants along with first-generation college students as they will increasingly continue to be an essential part of American schools, communities, and society (Board on Children and Families, 1995).

It will be necessary to ensure that the young foreign-born populations have access to and attain higher education in order to be integrated into social, economic, and political arenas in the U.S. (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). A key focus will be on the factors that keep minority populations from academic achievement and successful college degree obtainment (Arbona & Nora, 2007). Furthermore, researchers note how Latino and African American youth who have not attended college tend to have more difficulties in obtaining employment compared to their White counterparts, despite having similar levels of education (Fuligni & Hardway, 2004). With current social and ethnic inequalities that are in place, the large percentage of immigrants and their native-born children will continue to be unprepared for the nearing labor force changes that will occur with the retirement of the large baby boom generation.

Are the precollege characteristics, family contexts, community environments, or school atmospheres the largest barriers to college persistence and which have the biggest impact? Fry (2002) noted that prior school preparation is not the biggest issue but how well schools integrate students and motivate them to succeed. There need to be educational initiatives and integrated culturally-sensitive programming provided that are

geared towards an improvement in educational aspirations and developments of several student populations (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). Where parents are unable to provide information to their children, available groups on campus would then be able to fill in lack of information voids. Information on barriers to educational attainment can assist programs in aiding students of varying generations and backgrounds through the educational ladder towards an effective obtainment of academic potential and achievement.

Rationale

Research shows that a lack of belongingness may lead to lower academic achievement as well as school dropouts and less school involvement. A school sense of community scale (specifically measuring belongingness in school environments), may determine whether there is an identification with school life with similar peers among varied groups. In addition, the innovative and inclusive subscale from the DePaul Mission and Values Inventory measures positive notions of the campus mission and may assess students' perceptions of their institution as all-encompassing. Research is lacking in terms of assessing mission and values at Catholic institutions, and in particular, how school sense of community may be related to perceptions of school missions. As there is limited research that distinguishes between campus, academic, and racial climates (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003), differentiating between school sense of community and campus inclusion will add to this gap in the literature.

The present study will examine school sense of community and perceptions of an innovative and inclusive campus climate among student groups who may feel marginalized and disempowered on an urban university campus, particularly in the U.S.

higher education system. More specifically, the study will compare between first-generation U.S. citizens to non-first-generation U.S. citizens. Furthermore, there will be an investigation to explore whether first-generation U.S. citizens have a higher or lower school sense of community and to assess how they view their institution as compared to other students. While previous research yielded differences based on race, student leaders and on highly engaged students on campus climate perceptions (e.g., student leaders of two or more campus clubs vs. non student leaders; Ferrari et al., 2009; Ferrari, Cowman, & Milner, 2010), this study will examine differences between demographic variables such as first-generation U.S. citizenship, race, and first-generation college status.

It is expected that there would be a significant difference between first-generation U.S. citizens and traditional students. Students who were first-generation U.S. citizens would have a significantly lower school sense of community and perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive than students who were not first-generation U.S. citizens. In addition, it is anticipated that first-generation U.S. citizens who are also first-generation college students, or from specific racial backgrounds will report a significantly lower school sense of community and perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive than students who are not first-generation U.S. citizens with these demographic variables.

Statement of Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesis I: *There will be 3 statistically significant main effects regarding mean scores of the School Sense of Community scale for students such that first-generation U.S. citizens will report a significantly lower SSOC compared to non-first-generation U.S. citizens; first-generation college students will*

report a significantly lower SSOC compared to non-first-generation college student; and, students from Black, Hispanic or Other racial backgrounds will have a significantly lower SSOC score than students from Caucasian or Asian racial backgrounds. Additionally, there will be 4 interactions such that citizen status x race, citizen status x college status, college status x race, and citizen status x race x college status interactions will be significant.

Hypothesis II: *There will be 3 statistically significant main effects regarding mean scores of the Innovative and Inclusive subscale for students such that first-generation U.S. citizens will perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive compared to non-first-generation U.S. citizens; first-generation college students will perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive compared to non-first-generation college students; and, students from Black, Hispanic or Other racial backgrounds will perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive than students from Caucasian or Asian racial backgrounds. Additionally, there will be 4 interactions such that citizen status x race, citizen status x college status, college status x race, and citizen status x race x college status interactions will be significant.*

Hypothesis III: *Students' perception of the target university to be innovative and*

inclusive will significantly predict students' reported levels of school sense of community, where the addition of U.S. citizen status will significantly add to the variance explained.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Participants in the current study included students at a large, urban, and Catholic university. The target university is located in Chicago, IL, and follows a Vincentian tradition (see Appendix A for a description of the target university's mission and values). A total of 4,492 participants (women: 2,689; men: 1,797; M age = 26.81, SD = 8.71) completed relevant psychometric scales used in this study in the Fall of 2010. Most participants (53.8%) self-identified as Caucasian, as opposed to 19.3% Other/Multiple, 11.8% Hispanic, 7.6% Asian, and 7.5% Black/African American. Furthermore, 30.9% were Christian-Catholic, 15.9% were Other, 15.6% were Christian-Non-Catholic, 8.0% were None/No Preference, and 29.6% omitted the question. Additionally, 20.8% of this population stated that they were first-generation U.S. citizens along, with 24.8% of the participants stated that they were the first in their immediate family to attend college (more detailed information listed in below paragraphs).

More specifically, 936 (20.8%; 549 women; 386 men; M age = 25.94, SD = 8.03) students stated they were first-generation U.S. citizens, and 38.4% of this group noted that they were the first in their families to attend college. Furthermore, this first-generation U.S. citizen group self-identified as 30.9% Caucasian, 27.0% Hispanic, 20.1% Asian, 16.8% Other/Multiple, and 5.2% Black/African American. In addition, 36.9% were Catholic, 18.7% were Other, 13.2% were Christian, 6.0% were None/No Preference, and 25.2% did not respond to the question.

For the 3,556 (2,140 women; 1,411 men; M age = 27.04, SD = 8.87) students who stated they were not first-generation U.S. citizens, 21.2% noted they were the first in their families to attend college. Furthermore, the non-first-generation U.S. citizen group self-identified as 59.8% Caucasian, 20.0% Other/Multiple, 8.0% Black/African American, 7.8% Hispanic, and 4.3% Asian. In addition, 29.4% were Catholic, 16.2% were Christian, 15.1% were Other, 8.6% were None/No Preference, and 30.7% omitted responding to the question.

Additionally, for the present study, 1,114 (690 women; 423 men; M age = 27.22, SD = 8.98) students stated they were first-college students, compared to 3,378 (1,999 women; 1,374 men; M age = 26.68, SD = 8.62) who were not the first in their family to attend college. For the group of students who stated they were first-generation college students, 32.2% noted they were the first in their families to be a U.S. citizen. Moreover, this first-generation college group self-identified as 42.5% Caucasian, 22.6% Hispanic, 19.0% Other/Multiple, 8.3% Black/African American and 7.5% Asian. In addition, 34.7% were Catholic, 16.8% were Other, 14.8% were Christian, 7.1% were None/No Preference, and 26.6% did not respond to the question.

For the students who stated they were not first-generation college students, 17.1% noted they were the first in their families to be a U.S. citizen. Furthermore, the non-first-generation college group self-identified as 57.5% Caucasian, 19.4% Other/Multiple, 8.2% Hispanic, 7.6% Asian, and 7.2% Black/African American,. In addition, 29.7% were Catholic, 15.8% were Christian, 15.6% were Other, 8.3% were None/No Preference, and 30.6% omitted the question.

Psychometric Measures

Institution's Identity. The *DePaul Mission and Values Inventory* (DMV; Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006; Ferrari & Janulis, 2009), a 39-item multi-dimensional scale measuring perceptions of the institution's mission-identity and the mission-driven activities and programs, was completed by all participants. Institutional values have been defined as the goals and outcomes that reflect a university's institutional identity that are expressed to the students, staff, faculty and administrators through statements of the mission (Ferrari & Cowman, 2004; Filkens & Ferrari, 2004). Studies showed that school sense of community, level of campus engagement, and social desirability positively correlated with DMV scores (Ferrari, et al., 2009; Ferrari, et al., 2009; Ferrari, Bristow, & Cowman, 2005).

Two separate factor analyses were performed on DMV scores yielding 5 reliable subscales in two separate yet connected components (Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006). One component of the DMV is related to mission-identity and included 16-items that tapped into the university's urban, Catholic, and Vincentian identity, and was labeled as *inclusive and innovative* (10-items) and *religious pluralism* (6-items). The second section of the DMV contained 23-items (which were not used in the proposed study), and focused on the campus-related activities reflecting how activities are perceived to support the mission and values of the target institution. Three reliable subscales were labeled, namely *urban and global engagement*, *religious heritage*, and *faith formation programs*.

The current study only used the *innovative and inclusive* (I/I) subscale from the first section of the DMV, which included a total of 10 items and reflected the university's willingness to assume risks in the development of new programs and educational

initiatives, particularly related to the target institutions' urban and Vincentian identities (See Appendix B for a complete list of items by subscale in the DMV). Items in this subscale were rated on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). The authors reported a mean subscale summary score of 63.18 ($SD = 9.16$) and a coefficient alpha of 0.76. For the present population, Cronbach's α was 0.92 for the I/I measure (M sum score = 56.31; $SD = 10.10$). Two sample items from this subscale include *I believe that at ___ our very diverse personal values and religious beliefs contribute to an atmosphere that fosters mutual understanding and respect*, and *I believe that we manifest personalism by our care for each member of the university community*.

School sense of community. Participants also completed Hagborg's (1994) 11-item uni-dimensional *Sense of School Belongingness* (SSOC), a shorter version of the 18-item Psychological Sense of School Membership Scale (Goodenow, 1993). The SSOC scale assesses a person's sense of school belongingness (see Appendix C for a list of scale items). Previous studies found mission-identity characteristics of the university related as a significant predictor of school sense of community (Ferrari et al., 2009; Ferrari et. al., 2009; Ferrari, et al., 2010). Items in the measure were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = *completely false*; 5 = *completely true*). Hagborg (1994) reported an overall PSSM-Brief mean score of 3.37 (SD range = 0.46 to 0.85), and internal consistency alphas that ranged from 0.71 to 0.94 across grade-level samples. For the present population, Cronbach's α is 0.90 (M sum score = 38.32; $SD = 8.35$). Sample items from this scale include *I feel proud of belonging to ___ University*, and *Other students here like me the way I am*.

Social desirability. Also, participants completed Reynolds' (1984) *M-C Form C*, a shortened version of the original 33-item Marlow-Crowne social desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), to assess whether the individual has a tendency to provide socially appropriate responses. The *M-C Form C*, a uni-dimensional measure, included 13 true-false items (*true* = 1, *false* = 0) that were highly correlated with the original 33-item scale ($r = 0.93$; Reynolds, 1982). One study found a negative correlation with social desirability and students' perceptions of the university's mission and values (Ferrari, Kapoor, & Cowman, 2005). However, another study found that students had a desire to impress others in terms of their perceptions of the campus mission and values, which may impact students' responses (Ferrari, et. al., 2005). Ferrari, Mader, and Milner (2010) stress how social desirability can lead to biased responses. Therefore, we include this subscale to ensure whether students' responses are based on their tendency to respond in a socially-desirable manner. For the *M-C Form C*, Reynolds reported a mean score of 5.67 ($SD = 3.20$; $\alpha = 0.76$). For the present population, Cronbach's α is 0.69 for the social desirability measure (M sum score = 5.25; $SD = 2.83$). Sample items from this measure include *I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable*, and *I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake*.

Demographic information. The questionnaire for this study included various questions to include descriptive information from participants. More specifically, all participants completed demographic items included year in college, age, religious affiliation, and ethnic identification (See Appendix E for list of demographic variables).

Procedure

Data were collected for this study through an online administration of the questionnaire during the autumn quarter of the 2010-2011 academic year. An email message from university administrators sent to all students asked for participation in the study and provided a link leading to the online questionnaire. Participation was voluntary, and anonymity was assured. The survey was posted online for three weeks through the email invitation. After the first two weeks of the initial launch, a second reminder was emailed to students reminding them to participate in the study. To promote participation, students who complete the questionnaire were eligible to win a prize, such as an iPad or a book store gift certificate. Students who completed the survey during the 3-week launch were randomly chosen for one of the incentive prizes through a raffle. Participants completed all survey items within 15-20 minutes, where the subscales were presented in counterbalanced order.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses determined whether social desirability scores significantly correlated with innovative and inclusive perceptions and the school sense of community scores. Mean scores, Cronbach alpha for each of the scales and subscales, and intercorrelates are displayed in Table 1. As noted in Table 1, social desirability scores were significantly negatively correlated with school sense of community and innovative and inclusive mission-identity perceptions. The magnitude of the coefficients were not large; nevertheless, social desirability was statistically controlled in all ensuing analyses.

Table 1. Mean Score, Coefficient Alpha, & Zero-Order Coefficient across Report Measures

	<i>M</i>	SSOC	I/I	SD
School Sense of Community (SSOC)	38.32 (8.35)	[.90]		
Innovative/Inclusive Perceptions (I/I)	56.31 (10.10)	.43**	[.92]	
Social Desirability (SD)	5.25 (2.83)	-.14**	-.16**	[.69]

n = 4,432-4,492 ** $p < .01$

Note. Value in parentheses is standard deviation; value in brackets is coefficient alpha.

SSOC = school sense of community; I/I = innovative and inclusive mission perceptions; SD = social desirability.

Hypothesis I: *There will be 3 statistically significant main effects regarding mean scores of the School Sense of Community scale for students such that first-generation U.S. citizens will report a significantly lower SSOC compared*

to non-first-generation U.S. citizens; first-generation college students will report a significantly lower SSOC compared to non-first-generation college students; and, students from Black, Hispanic or Other racial backgrounds will have a significantly lower SSOC score than students from Caucasian or Asian racial backgrounds. Additionally, there will be 4 interactions such that citizen status x race, citizen status x college status, college status x race, and citizen status x race x college status interactions will be significant.

A 2 (U.S. citizen status; 1st-generation U.S. citizen vs. non-1st-generation U.S. citizen) x 2 (college student status; 1st-generation college student vs. non-1st-generation college student) x 5 (race; Black, Hispanic, Other/Multiple, Caucasian, Asian) ANCOVA, controlling for social desirability, was conducted to determine whether there were differences across generation statuses and racial background pertaining to SSOC scores. The dependent variable was mean scores of the SSOC scale. *Scheffe simple effects post hoc analyses* ($p < .01$) determined where the differences occurred.

Mean scores for school sense of community by generational statuses and race are displayed in Tables 2 and 3. Results indicated a significant 2-way interaction of first-generation college student status x first-generation U.S. citizen status $F(1, 4432) = 9.25, p = .002$. Students who were first-generation U.S. citizens and first-generation college students reported significantly higher levels of school sense of community than students who were non-first-generation U.S. citizens and first-generation college students; furthermore, non-first-generation U.S. citizens and non-first-generation college students

also reported higher SSOC levels as compared to first-generation U.S. citizens and non-first-generation college students. No other interactions were found.

Additionally, a significant main effect for racial background $F(4, 4432) = 3.19, p = .013$ was found; however, no other main effects were found regarding generational status. A *Sheffé simple effects post-hoc test* ($p < .01$) for significance indicated that within the entire sample Caucasian students ($M = 38.96, SD = 1.13$) reported higher levels of SSOC than Hispanic ($M = 37.94, SD = 1.47$) or African American background students ($M = 36.48, SD = 2.79$). Therefore, Hypothesis I was only partially supported.

Table 2. Mean Scores for School Sense of Community by Generational Statuses and Race

	<u>1st-Gen Col</u>	
	<u>1st Gen Cit</u> ($n = 353$)	<u>Non-1st-Gen Cit</u> ($n = 750$)
Race:		
African American	39.86(10.76)	36.04(8.15) ⁴
Hispanic	39.20(8.94)	37.19(8.41) ³
Other	39.93(9.82)	38.82(8.01)
Caucasian	39.39(9.52)	38.80(8.49) ^{3,4}
Asian	38.56(9.67)	38.03(8.56)

$p < .05$

Note. Values in parentheses are standard deviations; Similar superscript numerals indicate significant mean differences; Abbreviations are: 1st-Gen Col = First-generation college student; 1st Gen Cit = First-generation U.S. citizen

Table 3. Mean Scores for School Sense of Community by Generational Statuses and Race

	<u>Non-1st-Gen Col</u>	
	<u>1st Gen Cit</u> (<i>n</i> = 566)	<u>Non-1st-Gen Cit</u> (<i>n</i> = 2763)
Race:		
African American	34.77(8.48) ⁵	37.25(9.49) ⁶
Hispanic	37.59(9.02)	39.41(8.53)
Other	37.28(8.75)	38.03(8.28)
Caucasian	39.11(7.98) ⁵	38.42(7.87) ⁶
Asian	37.38(8.77)	38.36(8.83)

p < .05

Note. Values in parentheses are standard deviations; Similar superscript numerals indicate significant mean differences; 1st-Gen Col = First-generation college student; 1st Gen Cit = First-generation U.S. citizen

Table 4. Main Effects for School Sense of Community

Variables	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>F</i>
1 st -Gen Col			1.79
Yes	1,103	38.28 (.36)	
No	3,329	37.70 (.24)	
1 st -Gen Cit			.11
Yes	919	38.06 (.36)	
No	3,513	37.92 (.24)	
Race			3.19*
African American	329	36.48 (.71)	
Hispanic	526	37.94 (.38)	
Other	854	38.45 (.41)	
Caucasian	2,387	38.96 (.29)	
Asian	336	38.13 (.53)	

* = $p < .05$

Note. Values in parentheses are standard deviations; 1st-Gen Col = First-generation college student; 1st Gen Cit = First-generation U.S. citizen

Hypothesis II: *There will be 3 statistically significant main effects regarding mean scores of the Innovative and Inclusive subscale for students such that first-generation U.S. citizens will perceive the target university's mission as*

significantly less innovative and inclusive compared to non-first-generation U.S. citizens; first-generation college students will perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive as compared to non-first-generation college students; and, students from Black, Hispanic or Other racial backgrounds will perceive the target university's mission as significantly less innovative and inclusive than students from Caucasian or Asian racial backgrounds. Additionally, there will be 4 interactions such that citizen status x race, citizen status x college status, college status x race, and citizen status x race x college status interactions will be significant.

A 3-way factorial analysis of variance, a 2 (U.S. citizen status; 1st-generation U.S. citizen vs. non-1st-generation U.S. citizen) x 2 (college student status; 1st-generation college student vs. non-1st-generation college student) x 5 (race; Black, Hispanic, Other/Multiple, Caucasian, Asian) ANCOVA, controlling for social desirability, determined group differences for students across generation statuses and racial background on I/I scores. *Scheffe simple effects post hoc analyses* ($p < .01$) established where the differences were occurring.

Mean scores for innovative and inclusive perceptions by generational statuses and race are displayed in Tables 4 and 5. Results found no significant interaction effects. However, the interaction of first-generation college student status x racial background approached significance $F(4, 4432) = 2.12, p = .076$. Furthermore, a significant main effect for first-generation college student was found, such that first-generation college students perceived the target university as more innovative and inclusive as compared to

non-first-generation college students, $F(1, 4432) = 5.14, p = .023$, which was not expected.

Another significant main effect also was found for racial background $F(4, 4432) = 5.96, p = .000$. A *Sheffé simple effects post-hoc test* ($p < .01$) indicated that within the entire sample Hispanic students ($M = 58.16, SD = 1.77$) reported significantly higher levels of I/I scores than students from Caucasian ($M = 56.98, SD = 1.35$) or Other/Multiple racial backgrounds ($M = 55.02, SD = 1.93$). These analyses only partially support Hypothesis II.

Table 5. Mean Scores for Innovative and Inclusive Perceptions by Generational Statuses and Race

	<u>1st-Gen Col</u>	
	<u>1st Gen Cit</u> (<i>n</i> = 353)	<u>Non-1st-Gen Cit</u> (<i>n</i> = 750)
Race:		
African American	62.21(7.12)	58.82(8.03)
Hispanic	59.19(10.53) ³	58.89(8.66)
Other	54.53(12.49) ²	55.75(10.16) ⁴
Caucasian	57.22(11.70) ^{2,3}	58.05(9.84) ⁴
Asian	54.48(12.84)	57.83(7.82)

$p < .05$

Note. Values in parentheses are standard deviations; Similar superscript numerals indicate significant mean differences; 1st-Gen Col = First-generation college student; 1st Gen Cit = First-generation U.S. citizen

Table 6. Mean Scores for Innovative and Inclusive Perceptions by Generational Statuses and Race

	<u>Non-1st-Gen Col</u>	
	<u>1st Gen Cit</u> (n = 566)	<u>Non-1st-Gen Cit</u> (n = 2763)
Race:		
African American	53.83(12.37)	56.90(10.21) ⁶
Hispanic	58.93(7.88) ⁶	57.68(10.22) ⁷
Other	54.76(10.39) ⁵	55.36(9.27)
Caucasian	56.90(9.95) ^{5,6}	55.60(10.20) ⁷
Asian	55.59(9.58)	56.62(9.70)

$p < .05$

Note. Values in parentheses are standard deviations; Similar superscript numerals indicate significant mean differences; 1st-Gen Col = First-generation college student; 1st Gen Cit = First-generation U.S. citizen

Table 7. Main Effects for Innovative and Inclusive Perceptions

Variables	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (SD)	<i>F</i>
1 st -Gen Col			5.14*
Yes	1,103	57.32 (.44)	
No	3,329	56.14 (.28)	
1 st -Gen Cit			1.10
Yes	919	56.46 (.44)	
No	3,513	57.00 (.28)	
Race			5.96**
African American	329	57.31 (.85)	
Hispanic	526	58.16 (.45)	
Other	854	55.02 (.49)	
Caucasian	2,387	56.98 (.35)	
Asian	336	56.18 (.63)	

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.

Note. Values in parentheses are standard deviations; 1st-Gen Col = First-generation college student; 1st Gen Cit = First-generation U.S. citizen

Hypothesis III: *Students' perception of the target university to be innovative and inclusive will significantly predict students' reported levels of school sense of community, where the addition of U.S. citizen status will significantly add to the variance explained.*

A multiple linear regression analysis (controlling for social desirability) was conducted with scores of the school sense of community (SSOC) measure as the dependent variable. Predictor variables included scores from the innovative and inclusive (I/I) subscale and U.S. citizen status. Step one of the regression included adding social desirability as a constant, step two included the predictor variable of scores for the I/I subscale, I/I scores and citizen status at step three, and I/I, citizen status, and the interaction term of I/I x citizen status at step four. Table 5 presents the standardized regression coefficients for I/I and citizen status as predictors of SSOC and the proportion of variance in SSOC explained by the model. A significant proportion of the variance in I/I, $R^2_{\text{adj}} = .192$, $F(4, 4431) = 263.53$, $p < .001$, was explained by the overall model.

In the final step of the full model, only students' perceptions of I/I significantly predicted students SSOC, $\beta = .372$, $t(4431) = 6.32$, $p < .001$, whereas first-generation U.S. citizen status and the interaction of I/I x citizen status were not significant additions to the model. These results only partially support Hypothesis III (see Table 6).

Table 8. Standardized Regression Coefficients for Innovative and Inclusive Mission Perceptions on School Sense of Community and Proportion of Variance Explained by Model

Predictors	<u>SSOC</u>		
	β	R^2	t
Innovative and Inclusive	.372	.192	6.32**
I/I and then Citizen Status	.011	.192	.84
I/I x Citizen Status	-.052	.192	-.88

$N = 4432$; ** $p < .01$

Note. SSOC = School Sense of Community scale; I/I = Innovative and Inclusive subscale

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The current study explored the relationships within a higher education institution between innovative and inclusive mission-identity perceptions (I/I) and school sense of community (SSOC) among first-generation U.S. citizens and first-generation college students, with varying racial backgrounds. Overall, results found that Caucasian students reported a stronger school sense of community, whereas Hispanic students reported stronger mission-identity perceptions. Furthermore, generational statuses significantly interacted for SSOC, whereas first-generation college students perceived higher I/I perceptions compared to non-first-generation college students. Additionally students' perceptions of I/I significantly predicted students' school sense of community.

Hypotheses I expected a significant difference between first-generation college students as compared to non-first-generation college students, and between first-generation U.S. citizens as compared to non-first-generation U.S. citizens, between the varying racial backgrounds, and also between interactions of all of these groups in terms of students' perceived SSOC. Results found a significant interaction effect for generation statuses ($p = .002$), and a significant main effect for racial background. Specifically, Caucasian students reported a significantly stronger SSOC than Hispanic and African American students. There were no main effects for generational statuses and no interaction effect for racial background with either generational status.

These results suggest that, without significant main effects for generation status, differences in terms of SSOC scores were found only when the generational statuses interacted. The significant interaction found that students who were first-generation U.S.

citizens and first-generation college students reported significantly higher levels of school sense of community than students who were non-first-generation U.S. citizens and first-generation college students. Furthermore, non-first-generation U.S. citizens and non-first-generation college students also reported stronger SSOC levels, compared to first-generation U.S. citizens and non-first-generation college students. Essentially results found that, in terms of first-generation college students, first-generation U.S. citizens have higher SSOC scores, whereas for non-first-generation college students, the non-first-generation U.S. citizens scored higher.

Moreover, the group with the highest SSOC scores was the combined first-generation college students and first-generation U.S. citizens group. This result did not support the hypothesis. The group with the lowest scores was the combined non-first-generation college students and first-generation U.S. citizens group. Such mixed results may suggest that there are multiple variables that are impacting the outcomes. For instance, one study noted that while some first-generation college students fair quite well in terms of education and occupation, other first-generation college students tend to be left quite far behind (Portes & Fernandez-Kelly, 2008). The authors claimed that family background and even the ease of incorporation into American society, through acceptance of some minority groups over others, may have an impact on the children and their success. Therefore, while some immigrant parents may have an education or be well off financially, other immigrant parents may have come to the U.S. with starkly different experiences that may in turn impact their children and their integration into American educational and occupational society. In another view, it is important to keep in mind the constraints of undocumented students who struggle to pay for college because of their

status, often taking fewer courses while working and have increased stress and burdens, impacting college retention, as compared to documented students (Diaz-Strong, Gomez, Luna-Duarte, & Meiners, 2011).

With DePaul's pluralistic and diversity views, found via the urban, Catholic, and Vincentian values, it is possible, however, that a plethora of students feel engaged through the focus on incorporating varying and pluralistic views on campus and in community service values manifested through top service learning opportunities, courses, and campus groups (DePaul University: Division of Student Affairs & Enrollment Management & Marketing, 2012). The small class sizes, largely diverse campus including multiple ethnicities, backgrounds, and students from all geographic areas, and accepting views may help impact the results of this study. Moreover, DePaul specifies its high rate of low-income students, high retention rates, and portrayed mission expressions that may have led to the unexpected SSOC results (DePaul University: Enrollment Management & Marketing, 2012).

There were no interaction effects with racial background on SSOC. However, a main effect portrayed that Caucasian students perceived a higher sense of community at the institution as compared to other racial backgrounds, which did support the hypothesis, as well as previous literature (Johnson, et. al, 2007; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Ancis, et. al, 2000; Hurtado & Carter, 1997). The present study results were consistent with previous research that found that Caucasian students reported significantly stronger SSOC scores compared to minority students (Ferrari, et. al, 2010). Negative racial climates, negative peer and faculty interactions, and perceptions of discrimination may help lead to a lower sense of belonging and decreased college persistence (Johnson, et al.,

2007). The present research may further promote the idea that a new sense of community scale may need to be constructed to include diverse views for multiple populations, as cultural perceptions and varying groups may hold differing definitions of SSOC.

Hypotheses II expected a significant difference between first-generation college students compared to non-first-generation college students, between first-generation U.S. citizens compared to non-first-generation U.S. citizens, between the varying racial backgrounds, and between interactions with all of these groups in terms of students' I/I mission perceptions. Results found no significant interactions, although the interaction of first-generation college student status x racial background approached significance ($p = .076$), and a significant main effect for first-generation college student status was found, as well as another significant effect for racial background. Specifically, Hispanic students reported significantly stronger I/I perceptions compared to Caucasian and Other/Multiple racial backgrounds. There were no main effects or interactions for first-generation U.S. citizen status, and again an insignificant interaction effect for racial background with both generational statuses.

These results, without any significant interaction effects, suggest that differences in terms of I/I scores were found only between racial backgrounds and then separately between college generational status. Hispanic students had significantly stronger innovative and inclusive mission perceptions at their institution compared to students from Caucasian and Other/Multiple backgrounds, which does not support the hypothesis. Such results may indicate, again, that DePaul's diverse campus and mission and values that encourage diversity may impact the particular group of students included in the current study.

Another possible explanation stems from the idea that students of Hispanic backgrounds tend to report a stronger campus belongingness along with positive campus perceptions when they perceive supportive social environments with their peers and faculty, are involved on campus, and live on campus (Johnson, et. al, 2007; Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Easier social and academic shifts may have also been beneficial in building a sense of belonging, which may have impacted results here as well. Components including the incorporation of a diverse campus climate, represented through campus missions as well as the environment, may have positively impacted minority students' campus perceptions. Campus missions that are present, represent diversity and are strongly portrayed on campus in varying aspects, may directly impact minority students' positive perceptions of campus inclusion (Rankin & Reason, 2005). Therefore, it would be worthwhile to tease apart which components have been most influential in the reported results to determine the factors that have the largest impact. Perhaps there is a particular subgroup of students who are attending campus club events or who live on campus and thus feel that the campus is more inclusive, suggesting that further research may need to have a better understanding of the variables that are crucial in relation to the specified factors.

On the contrary, Caucasian students, with a lack of awareness of racism, may feel exclusion and perceive cultural programming to be unnecessary (Ancis, et. al, 2000). In similar scenarios it becomes relevant for school stakeholders to take such views into consideration. It will be necessary to increase cultural awareness along with an understanding of differences and how to come together, not only for minority students but for non-minority students as well. The previously mentioned results may also point to

a reason for first-generation college students' perceptions of the target university as more innovative and inclusive as compared to non-first-generation college students, which also did not support the hypothesis. The first-generation college student may feel that the mission is inclusive with diversity notions within the values; however, non-first-generation college students may somehow feel excluded and believe that there should be less of a focus on first-generation college students, not understanding the relevance of diversity issues. Institutions may need to connect on a deeper level with students to facilitate campus inclusion through academic and social integration (Terenzini et al., 1996). Therefore, it is important for higher institutions of learning to provide more applicable opportunities of involvement for students of various backgrounds.

Finally, Hypothesis III expected that school sense of community would be predicted by students' perceptions of their institutional missions as innovative and inclusive. This assumption also tested whether U.S. citizen generational status would significantly add to the prediction. The results indicated that SSOC did significantly predict students' reported levels of I/I, after controlling for social desirability. This result was expected as SSOC and I/I mission perceptions were significantly positively correlated. However, neither U.S. citizen status nor the interaction of I/I x citizen status significantly predicted I/I scores above and beyond the individual SSOC predictor. The findings in Hypotheses I and II also did not find any main effects for citizen status, and therefore it makes sense that citizen status did not significantly add to the regression results.

Research has shown how mission-identity characteristics have been related to students' school sense of community as well as to that of faculty and staff (Ferrari,

Cowman, Milner, Gutierrez, & Drake, 2009; Ferrari, McCarthy, & Milner, 2009). Also, in the present study, perceptions of the institutional mission as innovative and inclusive significantly predicting students' reported school sense of community essentially notes that as students perceive their institution in a more positive light, they also tend to report a stronger sense of community. Of course, as noted in the previous analyses, specific student populations may have varying positive and negative perceptions of their campus. However, the regression analyses show that the more students feel that the campus missions and values are reflective of including others, the more they feel that they belong to and are a part of the campus.

Implications for Community Psychology

A sense of community incorporates a feeling of belonging through membership, impacting a group through influence, obtaining resources through integration and fulfillment of needs, and similar experiences through shared emotional connections (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Unfortunately, literature has rarely studied a sense of belonging and there are inconsistent definitions within higher education (Johnson, et al., 2007). To add to this gap, the present study included a sense of belonging measure (Hagborg, 1994) that investigates perceptions of participation and support from faculty and peers (Jacobs & Archie, 2008). This sense of belonging includes the perception of inclusion within college climates along with welcoming, affirming, and supportive interactions and environments from the institution.

Research noted that when students have a lack of campus interactions and have negative experiences related to college, college retention decreases whereas more frequent and positive interactions may lead to school commitment (Garcia, 2010). The

present research may provide community research with the knowledge that racial backgrounds may impact a sense of belonging on campus or that school sense of community may need to be further constructed in a manner to represent students from varying backgrounds. Additionally, research is lacking in terms of assessing mission and values at Catholic institutions, and in particular, how school sense of community may be related to perceptions of school missions. As there is limited research that distinguishes between campus, academic, and racial climates (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003), differentiating between school sense of community and campus inclusion will add to this gap in the literature. Previous research yielded differences based on race, student leaders, and on highly engaged students on campus climate perceptions (e.g., student leaders of two or more campus clubs vs. non student leaders; Ferrari et al., 2009; Ferrari, Cowman, & Milner, 2010). However, the present study examined differences between demographic variables such as first-generation U.S. citizenship status, race, and first-generation college student status.

Furthermore, the Theory of Social Capital (Perna & Titus, 2005) denotes that the social networks of a campus lead to variations in the type of resources that are available to underrepresented groups in higher education, mainly African American and Hispanic students. The social capital of a school may impact college enrollment as minority populations may feel that they have less access to support, resources and available social networks. Furthermore, other studies found that color-blind racial attitudes and racial privilege tended to be related to perceptions of campus climates (Worthington, et. al, 2008; Ancis, et. al, 2000). For instance, Caucasian students that are unaware of racial privilege report more positive campus climate perceptions as opposed to minority

students. Additionally, social dominance orientation was also related to an unawareness of general racial issues as well as institutional discrimination. Institutions and the nearby communities need to be aware of discrimination, regardless of its blatant manner, as it may impact minority students and their feelings of positive campus perceptions. This holds particularly true for institutions and students who may not realize the importance race and how much it may matter to students of varying backgrounds.

Implications for Higher Education Policy

A sense of inclusion is particularly important in terms of the ability of mission statements to encourage diversity through commitment to action. Institutional values reflect the mission, values, and identity through specific goals in mission statements (Ferrari & Cowman, 2004). As the target university in this study is an urban and diverse Catholic setting, there are a myriad of clubs and diverse campus groups for student engagement. Overall, it may be presumed that the dynamics of the university might have impacted the unexpected results of the study. For instance, while this university may be extremely diverse and tailored to various campus groups, those individuals who expect more non-traditional forms of college interactions (e.g., opportunities for persons from a certain immigrant culture to meet and socialize) may feel a lack of inclusiveness and a sense of being “left out.” In addition, students who are first-generation college students may feel little opportunity to bond with similar others on campus. Whereas, on the other hand, students who are first-generation college students or first-generation U.S. citizens may have bonded with specific groups on campus that assist in catering to their needs to help them feel more positive notions towards their university.

However, those who expect more traditional forms of college interactions, such as finding only specific groups on campus like Catholic religious groups for instance, may feel a lack of inclusiveness from their university and may in fact feel left out as well. These groups may feel that there are too many options in terms of diversity and may not find enough of an overarching theme that pulls all of the students together.

Therefore, it may be important for institutions and policy makers to note not only demographic variances but the environment and atmosphere of the campus when planning to reach targeted populations and in deciding how to reach students with a plethora of backgrounds and experiences. Additionally, such diverse universities may want to look into ways to bring the entire university population together through some theme where all feel welcomed on various levels. This is especially important at an urban university where the majority of the students also tend to be commuters and may have less interactions with the school campus, so portraying a mission to the entire student body is all the more difficult and necessary.

Limitations in the Present Study

Some limitations of the current study need to be considered despite the contribution to knowledge that may have been made. For instance, only certain demographic variables were used in the present study: namely, generational statuses and racial background, without looking at other grouping variables such as gender, age, school year, parental citizen status, socio-economic status, religion, housing situation, etc. Therefore, the present study was limited in the scope of varying groups in which it provides information. Results may have considerably differed had other, or perhaps more relevant, descriptors been targeted for the analyses. Significant effects may have also

been caused by the large population size and power. On the other hand, some of the interactions may not have produced significant results because of the limited number of participants within specific grouping variables, which may increase the chance of a Type I error. Some of the racial groups, for example, represented less than 10% of the participant population, also decreasing generalizability. Again, looking at the data and grouping by other variables may have been a more viable route to pursue.

Furthermore, generalizability is uncertain as the present study was conducted with students at a large, urban, and Catholic faith-based university in the Midwest. Including data from other campuses across the nation as well as comparing to campuses outside of the U.S. would be helpful to learn more about students' perceptions of their campus environments and what factors may be most impactful in varying geographical regions. It may also be difficult to tease apart whether the campus dynamics impacted the results of the study or if precollege characteristics were most at play, and as such, further research is warranted.

Additionally, the population for this study was a bit older than the average undergraduate and graduate population, particularly the first-generation college students and the non-first-generation U.S citizens. Therefore, it is necessary to research further how age may play a role in campus dynamics and expectations. Gender was also excluded as a variable and would be important to note differences as prior research suggests differences in academic performance for gender. Females tend to have more positive perceptions and experiences with the campus and faculty compared to male students, and this is particularly true for minority males (Suarez-Orozco, et. al, 2010; Nicolas, DeSilva, & Rabenstein, 2009).

Another possible limitation focused around the survey construct components, includes how school sense of community was operationalized. For example, Hurtado and Carter (1997) note that it is important how constructs are assessed and defined, particularly for varying student groups. A sense of belonging is noted as the interplay between the individual and the institution (Johnson, et. al, 2007). Overall, support, faculty relationships, and positive campus climates lead to more positive campus views and satisfaction for students of color (Ancis, et. al, 2000). However, Hurtado and Carter (1997) noted that supportive racial climates on campus are particularly important for Latino students in their feeling a sense of belonging to a school. Discriminatory climates also tend to impact the perceptions of a sense of belonging for African American students who tend to have less positive views as compared to Caucasian students (Johnson, et. al, 2007). The same study noted that co-curricular activities are most important for students of Asian backgrounds whereas faculty interactions are particularly relevant for students of Hispanic backgrounds. For minority students overall, interactions with students from diverse backgrounds is influential in increasing positive campus perceptions.

Additionally, one study found that African American students that attend historically Black college and university settings (HBCU) rather than predominately White schools, tended to have more of a commitment and cultural awareness (Cokley, 2002). It was suggested that faculty could focus more on including cultural components and acceptance within their classrooms while also allowing students to feel welcome to approach them for better interactions and perceptions, particularly at predominately White institutions. Research suggests that welcoming campuses that target multiple learning styles and have faculty of varying backgrounds are crucial for minority students

(Pewerdy & Frey, 2002). In this sense, there is more of a sense of pluralism along with more similar mentors to turn to. Additionally, multicultural experiences and valuing diversity along with interactions for diverse students, as a result of institutional support via programming, services, and accepting policies, lead to improved campus experiences along with education (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Pewerdy & Frey, 2002; Ancis, et. al, 2000, Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Such institutional efforts may assist in preventing campus discrimination and racial issues, reduce attrition, and allow marginalized students to feel more welcome. Therefore, research portrays the idea that students' integration is variable among varying student backgrounds and that uniformity in building a sense of community may not be ideal for various populations.

Future Research

While a sense of belonging has rarely been studied in terms of higher education as a theory and with varying definitions, it is important to further research SSOC as it has been related to student persistence in college (Johnson, et. al, 2007). The current study provided information portraying the importance of racial backgrounds, college generational status, and citizen generational status in terms of SSOC and I/I mission perceptions. Through various operations, institutions have the ability to incorporate campus climate influence towards racial inclusion (Johnson, et al., 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005), and may include diversity aspects to be more inclusive through innovative ideas (Pewewardy & Frey, 2002; Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006). As environments both influence and are influenced by its dwellers, institutional programs and policies have the ability to support diversity and inspire multicultural interactions that research notes lead to positive outcomes (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Not only must

institutions support cultural awareness, but policies, activities, initiatives, and programming must reflect such support to impact students' perceptions (Pewewardy & Frey, 2002). Therefore, campus climates need to be assessed to determine minority students' positive perceptions of inclusion that may otherwise hamper college retention (Rankin & Reason, 2005). As in the present study, college campuses need to be aware of the perceptions and experiences that students encounter and how conducive missions are to including diverse populations through continuous evaluations of campus environments.

Additionally, it may be beneficial to include educational initiatives and integrated culturally-sensitive programming provided that are geared towards an improvement in educational aspirations for several student populations (Portes & Fernández-Kelly, 2008). Therefore, future studies would benefit from incorporating other demographic variables in the analyses that were not included in the study. For instance, it may be worth looking further into the length of time first-generation U.S. citizens have been in the United States as well as how old they were when they first came to the U.S. and age group differences to determine any other potential variances. Also, differences between second- and third-generation groups as well as acculturation and language status may lead to varying results. Socioeconomic status is an important issue to take into consideration as differences in SES status may have an impact on students' campus perceptions and involvement. Furthermore, research should pursue how membership to university clubs and how other sources of social support may have impacted the results. It is necessary for higher institutions of learning to integrate academics with student engagement as research shows how beneficial involvement can be for students, particularly for first-generation status students who are less familiar with college life (Pascarella et al., 2004). It will be

necessary for institutions to work with students and families to demystify college and the requirements and necessities involved to help with better decision-making (Davis, 2010).

In addition, for first-generation status students, research shows that there are knowledge and preparation disadvantages as compared to other students (Garcia, 2010). They also have fewer opportunities to be involved on campus and it is thus necessary to look into what types of involvement as well as lengths of involvement that are necessary for these students to feel more acclimated to college life. Thus, research should pay particular attention to the social interactions on campus that lend positive views for students to continue attending college (Ishitani, 2006). In addition, it would be interesting to look at the varying dynamics related to two-year versus four-year schools and how these settings may play a role in a school sense of community. Research noted that two-year colleges may be more accommodating for first-generation status students with less threatening environments, cheaper prices, and accessibility (Pascarella, et al., 2003). Perhaps, four-year universities would benefit from exploring ways to assist first-generation students who are less aware of college environments and may feel that they fit in less to help recognize the potential benefits they can attain.

Furthermore, programs that can help first-generation status students become more acclimated to college life through easier transitions will be beneficial in ensuring these students continue on to college (Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Terezini et al., 1996). First-generation status students need to feel a sense of pride and belonging and to feel that they can succeed and have support that they otherwise may not be able to receive from their families. In addition, work-study opportunities and hearing the importance of attending and finishing school can also be beneficial factors that should be taken into account

(Terezini et al., 1996). Schools should focus on being more accommodating and relating acceptance to students who are likely to feel less of a sense of belonging and are a group at risk of struggling to survive in college. High school and precollege characteristics, such as family values, may continue to be factors as well.

In addition, as research suggests for first-generation status students, it will be important for students to have assistance in maneuvering family as well as work demands while attending college (Tseng, 2004). Furthermore, organizations that assist families in issues related to language barriers as well as economic struggles need to be further highlighted and accessible to immigrant families. In addition, financial aid can lend support to first-generation U.S. citizens who may not otherwise have the opportunity to attend college without such assistance. Institutions should work to make sure that such populations are integrated into U.S. society in a successful manner.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

ANCOVA analyses, covarying for social desirability, were conducted to determine any differences between first-generation students and non, first-generation U.S. citizens and non, between varying racial groups, and the interactions of these groups in terms of school sense of community (SSOC) as well as innovative and inclusive (I/I) mission perceptions. And lastly, regression analyses were run to determine if I/I scores predicted SSOC scores. The first-generation college students/non-first-generation U.S. citizens group had the strongest scores on innovative and inclusive mission perceptions, while the first-generation college student/ first-generation U.S. citizen group had the strongest scores on school sense of community. Additionally, Caucasian students reported the strongest scores of SSOC whereas Hispanic students perceived the strongest levels of I/I mission perceptions. I/I scores also significantly predicted SSOC scores and may propose that how students view their school mission may impact their sense of belonging on campus. Furthermore, the ANCOVA results may suggest that institutions should pay particular attention to varying groups of students to better understand their connection to the university to assist in facilitating positive perceptions and a strong affinity towards the school environment, which may impact retention in college students (Jacobs & Archie, 2008). Perhaps the institutions may need to focus on targeting specific groups to increase their campus inclusion or fostering mission and values among the population as a whole.

Studying school sense of community along with institutional mission perceptions will contribute not only to community psychology, in terms of social justice and a sense

of community, but to institutional research as well. Once institutions realize that students of varying backgrounds perceive their campus in different lights, the institutions will be able to target any related issues and work with underrepresented students to enhance their views (Rankin & Reason, 2005). On the other hand, it will be imperative for institutional staff to pay particular attention to the management of enrollment as recruitment strategies and enrollment practices may help determine the demographics of an institution as well.

University campuses may be able to assess students' perceptions of the institution along with their sense of community and inclusion and to determine where mission understanding may or may not be present. Such assessments may allow for targeted programs, curriculum, and necessary mission portrayal changes. Academic, advising, along with mentoring services may be viable sources of support for disadvantaged students who may not be as familiar with campus life and occurrences (Arbona & Nora, 2007). It will be necessary to continually gauge students' campus environments and experiences to determine how their campus perceptions are being impacted and for campus stakeholders to get a better understanding of the factors that enhance or limit positive campus perceptions, in turn impacting college retention and degree completion.

REFERENCES

- Acs, G., & Loprest, P. (2005). Who are low-income working families? The Urban Institute: *Low-Income Working Families*, Paper1.
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal Of Counseling & Development*, 78(2), 180-185.
- Arbona, C., & Nora, A. (2007). The influence of academic and environmental factors on Hispanic college degree attainment. *Review of Higher Education: Journal of the Association for the Study of Higher Education*, 30(3), 247-269.
- Blank, R. M. (2004). Poverty, policy and place: How poverty and policies to alleviate poverty are shaped by local characteristics. Rural Poverty Research Center: *Working Paper Series*, 04-02.
- Board on Children and Families, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, and Institute of Medicine. (1995). Immigrant Children and Their Families: Issues for Research and Policy. National Academy of Sciences, Princeton University: *The Future of Children*, 5(2), Critical Issues for Children and Youths, 72-89.
- Camarota, S. A. (2011). *A record-setting decade of immigration: 2000-2010*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies, 1-15.
- Camarota, S. A. (2004). *Economy slowed, but immigration didn't – The foreign-born population, 2000-2004*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies, 1-16.
- Camarota, S. A., & Jensenius, K. (2009). *A shifting tide: Recent trends in the illegal immigrant population*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies, 1-24.
- Carnevale, A., & Fry, R. (2000). *Crossing the great divide: Can we achieve equity when*

- Generation Y goes to college?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- College Board, *The Trends in College Pricing*, New York: The College Entrance Examination Board.
- Cokley, K. (2002). The impact of college racial composition on African American students' academic self-concept: A replication and extension. *Journal Of Negro Education*, 71(4), 288-296.
- Cooper, Eric J. (2010). "The Effects of Race, Poverty & Equal Opportunity in America" National Urban Alliance for Effective Education, *Spotlight on Poverty and Opportunity*.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960) A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). "Spotlight Webcast: Poverty and Education." *Spotlight on Poverty and Opportunity*.
- Davis, J. (2010). *The first-generation student experience: Implications for campus practice, and strategies for improving persistence and success*. Virginia: College Student Educators International.
- DePaul University. (2012). *About DePaul*. Retrieved May 1, 2010, from <http://depaul.edu/about/index.asp>
- DePaul University. (2012). *Access at DePaul*. Retrieved May 1, 2010, from <http://www.depaul.edu/emm/caa/accessDP/index.asp>
- DePaul University. (2012). *Enrollment Facts*. Retrieved May 1, 2010, from <http://www.depaul.edu/emm/facts/index.asp>
- Diaz-Strong, D., Gomez, C., Luna-Duarte, M. E., & Meiners, E. R. (2011). Purged:

- Undocumented Students, Financial Aid Policies, and Access to Higher Education. *Journal Of Hispanic Higher Education*, 10(2), 107-119.
- Eitzen, S. and Eitzen, K. (2009). *Experiencing poverty: Voices from the bottom 2nd edition*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Farley, R., & Alba, R. (2002). The new second generation in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 36(3), 669-701.
- Ferrari, J. R., Bristow, M., & Cowman, S. E. (2005). Looking good or being good? The role of social desirability tendencies in student perceptions of institutional mission and values. *College Student Journal*, 39, 7-13.
- Ferrari, J. R., & Cowman, S. E. (2004). Toward a reliable and valid measure of institutional mission and values perception: The DePaul Values Inventory. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 25, 43-54.
- Ferrari, J. R., Cowman, S. E., & Milner, L. A. (2010). A pilot assessment of student leader involvement in campus organizations: Be true to your school? *Journal of Catholic Higher Education*, 29, 215-226.
- Ferrari, J. R., Cowman, S. E., Milner, L. A., Gutierrez, R. E., & Drake, P. A. (2009). Impact of school sense of community within a faith-based university: Administration and academic staff perceptions on institutional mission and values. *Social Psychology in Education: An International Journal*, 12, 515-528.
- Ferrari, J. R., & Janulis, P. (2009). Embracing the mission: Catholic and non-Catholic faculty and staff perceptions of institutional mission and school sense of community. *Journal of Catholic Higher Education*, 28, 1-10.

- Ferrari, J. R., Kapoor, M., & Cowman, S. (2005). Exploring the relationship between students' values and the values of postsecondary institutions. *Social Psychology of Education, 8*(2), 207-221.
- Ferrari, J.R., Mader, M.C., & Milner, L.A. (2010). Making a positive impression about the mission of an urban, Catholic university: Gender, first generation college, and religious preference comparisons. *Journal of Catholic Higher Education, 29*, 243-253.
- Ferrari, J. R., McCarthy, B. J., & Milner, L. A. (2009). Involved and focused? Students' perceptions of institutional identity, personal goal orientation and levels of campus engagement. *College Student Journal, 44*, 886-896.
- Ferrari, J. R., & Velcoff, J. (2006). Measuring staff perceptions of university identity and activities: The mission and values inventory. *Christian Higher Education, 5*, 243-261.
- Fischer, K. (2011). College 101 for non-native speakers: Pathways programs blend English and academics to help foreign students succeed. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(43).
- Fomby, P. & Cherlin, A. J. (2004). Public assistance use among U.S.-born children of immigrants. *International Migration Review, 38*(2), 584-610.
- Fry, R. (2004). *Latino youth finishing college: The role of selective pathways*. Pew Hispanic Center, 1-40.
- Fuligni, A. J., & Hardway, C. (2004). Preparing diverse adolescents for the transition to adulthood. *Future of Children, 14*(2), 99-119.
- Garcia, V. (2010). First-generation college students: How co-curricular involvement can

- assist with success. *The Vermont Connection*, 31, 46-52.
- Goldin, C. & Katz, L. (2009). The future of inequality: The other reason education matters so much. *The Miliken Institute Review*, 3rd Quarter, 26-33.
- Gonzalez, J. (2011). Antipoverty group works with community colleges to graduate more students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 58.
- Goodenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools*, 30, 79-90.
- Hagborg, W. J. (1994). An exploration of school membership among middle- and high-school students. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 12, 312-323.
- Hicks, T., & Heastie, S. (2008). High school to college transition: A profile of the stressors, physical and psychological health issues that affect the first-year on-campus college student. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 15(3), 143-147.
- Hossain, Z., & Shipman, V. (2009). Mexican immigrant fathers' and mothers' engagement with school-age children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 31(4), 468-491.
- Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology Of Education*, 70(4), 324-345.
- Ishitani, T. T. (2006). Studying attrition and degree completion behavior among first-generation college students in the United States. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 861-885.

- Jacobs, J., & Archie, T. (2008). Investigating sense of community in first-year college students. *Journal of Experiential Education, 30*(3), 282-285.
- Johnson, D. R., Soldner, M., Leonard, J., Alvarez, P., Inkelas, K., Rowan-Kenyon, H., & Longerbeam, S. (2007). Examining sense of belonging among first-year undergraduates from different racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 525-542.
- Keller, U., & Tillman, K. (2008). Post-secondary educational attainment of immigrant and native youth. *Social Forces, 87*(1), 121-152.
- McMillan, D.W., & Chavis, D.M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 6-23.
- Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M., & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 207-225.
- Murnane, R. J., & Steele, J. L. (2007). What is the problem? The challenge of providing effective teachers for all children. *The Future of Children, 17*(1), 15-43.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Nicolas, G., DeSilva, A., & Rabenstein, K. (2009). Educational attainment of Haitian immigrants. *Urban Education, 44*(6), 664-686.
- Nora, A. (2003). Access to higher education for Hispanic students: Real or illusory? In

- J.Castellanos & I. Jones (Eds.), *The majority in the minority: Expanding representation of Latino/a faculty, administration and students in higher education* (p. 47-67), Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Nora, A., & Cabrera, A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 119-148.
- O'Connor, A. (2001). *Poverty Knowledge: Social science, social policy, and the poor in twentieth-century U.S. history*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ.
- Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 249-284.
- Pascarella, E. T., Wolniak, G. C., Pierson, C. T., Terenzini, P. T. (2003). Experiences and outcomes of first-generation students in community colleges. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 44(3), 420-429.
- Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. (2008). *Trends in unauthorized immigration: Undocumented inflow now trails legal inflow*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 1-25.
- Perna, L., & Titus, M. A. (2005). The relationship between parental involvement as social capital and college enrollment: An examination of racial/ethnic group differences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 485-518.
- Pewewardy, C., & Frey, B. (2002). Surveying the landscape: Perceptions of multicultural support services and racial climate at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 71(1-2), 77-95.
- Portes, A., & Fernández-Kelly, P. (2008). No margin for error: Educational and

- occupational achievement among disadvantaged children of immigrants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 620(1), 12-36.
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43-61.
- Reid, L. D., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2003). Race matters: The relation between race and general campus climate. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 9(3), 263-275.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(1), 119-125.
- Rumbaut, R. G., & Komaie, G. (2010). Immigration and Adult Transitions. *Future of Children*, 20(1), 43-66.
- Sanchez, B., Esparza, P., & Colon, Y. (2008). Natural mentoring under the microscope: An investigation of mentoring relationship and Latino adolescents' academic performance. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36, 468-482.
- Sanchez, B., Esparza, P., Colon, Y., & Davis, K. (2010). Tryin' to make it during the transition from high school: The role of family obligation attitudes and economic context for Latino-emerging adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 25(6), 858-884.
- Schmidley, D., & Bureau of the Census (DOC), S. V. (2001). Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000. *Current Population Reports*.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. (2009). Nuanced understandings of development. Essay review of

- Immigrant stories: Ethnicity and academics in middle childhood. *Human Development*, 52(6), 366-370.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Bang, H., & Onaga, M. (2010). Contributions to variations in academic trajectories amongst recent immigrant youth. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 34(6), 500-510.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Todorova, I. G., & Louie, J. (2002). Making up for lost time: The experience of separation and reunification among immigrant families. *Family Process*, 41(4), 625-643.
- Swail, W. S. (2002). *Higher education and the new demographics: Questions for policy*. Taylor & Francis, Ltd., 34(4), 14-23.
- Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Yaeger, P. M., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1996). First-generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 1-22.
- Thompson, B. (2008). How college freshmen communicate student academic support: A grounded theory study. *Communication Education*, 57(1), 123-144.
- Tough, Paul. (2008). *Whatever It Takes: Geoffrey Canada's Quest to Change Harlem and America*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1-270.
- Tseng, V. (2004). Family interdependence and academic adjustment in college: Youth from immigrant and U.S.-born families. *Child Development*, 75, 966-983.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). Back to College, *Current Population Survey*, 1-15.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2001). Annual Demographic File, *Current Population Survey*.
- Warburton, E. C., Bugarin, R., & Nunez, A. (2001). Bridging the gap: Academic

preparation and postsecondary success of first-generation students (NCES 2001-153). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1-85.

Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., Hart, J., & University Of, M.

(2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity In Higher Education*, 1(1), 8-19.

2010 Census Data Study. The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New

Findings from the 2010 Census by John R. Logan (Brown University) and Brian J. Stults (Florida State University)-March 24, 2011.

Appendix A

Description of Target University
(DePaul University)

DePaul University, in Chicago, Illinois, is a large, urban Catholic university, yet is religiously pluralistic and respects its large varied populations. Additionally, DePaul hosts over 25,000 students and is one of the largest private, teaching universities that offers near 300 undergraduate and graduate fields of study. DePaul University's mission statement is identified by *Catholic*, *Vincentian*, and *urban* characteristics. As DePaul follows a Vincentian institutional identity and tradition, therefore there is support for diversity and public service commitments. The Vincentian identity allows DePaul to focus on higher education as a means to engage cultural, social, religious, and ethical values in service to others.

Appendix B

Institutional Identity Measure
The DePaul Mission and Values Inventory (DMV)
(Subscale with ** = *Innovative and Inclusive* subscale)

***DMV Inclusive and Innovative Subscale*

All items rated on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 =strongly agree).

I believe that at — our very diverse personal values and religious beliefs contribute to an atmosphere that fosters mutual understanding and respect.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that we manifest personalism by our care for each member of the university community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that — University is innovative. We are never content with maintaining a “business as usual” approach. Our efforts are marked by innovation and single-minded pursuit of new and effective approaches to meet the needs of our students, society and the educational marketplace.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that—University is inclusive. We provide access for all to higher education regardless of class, race, religion, sexual orientation, disability, ethnicity or economic barriers. The university community is welcoming and draws great strength from its diversities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that — University takes risks that are consistent with its mission and values. Historically the university has always stepped outside of tradition and beyond “status quo” approaches, encouraging and demonstrating an adventurous and entrepreneurial spirit. The measure of our success has always been the measure of our risks.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that —University is pragmatic, grounding its education in the realities of everyday life. Through its curricula and through the delivery of its programs and services, the university offers students practical solutions to their needs for higher education, career advancement and personal growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I believe that —University’s mission and values are visible to all. Its education and operations are grounded in values of service, respect, personalism, justice, holistic education, and creating quality educational opportunities, especially for the underserved and disadvantaged in our society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that our religious heritage remains relevant to the university today.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I support our current approach to expressing its identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I support our current approach to expressing its urban identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

DMV Spiritual Pluralism Subscale

All items rated on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 =strongly agree).

I believe that our university invites all inquirers to freely examine Catholicism, other faith traditions, and other secular values systems in light of their respective contributions to the human enterprise.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that the curricula at our schools and colleges have appropriate expressions of the university's Catholic identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I support our current approach to expressing its Catholic identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
University Ministry provides a variety of services and programs designed to serve the university community and enhance the institution's Catholic, [our patron saint] and religiously pluralistic identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The Office of University Mission and Values provides a variety of services and programs designed to serve the community and enhance the institution's Catholic, [our patron saint] and religiously pluralistic identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The University sponsors a variety services and programs to demonstrate the connectedness to the community that is characteristic of our urban identity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

DMV Urban/Global Engagement Opportunities Subscale

All items rated on a 4-point scale (1 = unimportant; 4 = very important)

How important to you are these community initiatives such as support of Chicago public school reform?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is the community-based service learning?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is the Community Service Association?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the Study Abroad programs?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the international sites?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the international students on campus?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is the faculty and staff volunteer service?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the diversity efforts?	1	2	3	4

DMV Unique Institutional Religious Heritage Subscale

All items rated on a 4-point scale (1 = unimportant; 4 = very important).

How important to you is the [our patron saint] Endowment Fund (grants for faculty, staff, and student projects that enhance the university's [patron saint] and Catholic identity)?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is the [patron] Assistance Fund (emergency financial assistance primarily for students)?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the Annual [patron] Lectures (lectures devoted to the understanding of the life, times, and works of the patron saint and affiliates)?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is the Authors at Lunch series?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the orientation programs (programs for new faculty, students, and staff introducing them to the university's mission and values)?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the Mission/Heritage published materials?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are the Faculty/Staff/Student [patron] Heritage Tours (biennial study trips for faculty, staff, and students to sites in Paris/France)?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is the university ombudsman?	1	2	3	4

DMV Catholic and Other Faith-Formation Opportunities Subscale

All items rated on a 4-point scale (1 = unimportant; 4 = very important)

How important to you are Catholic worship services?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are Catholic sacramental opportunities?	1	2	3	4
How important to you is interfaith worship?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are worship opportunities for other faith traditions?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are religious education and spirituality programs?	1	2	3	4
How important to you are service programs (winter/spring service trips, etc.)?	1	2	3	4

Appendix C

Sense of Belonging Measure
Psychological Sense of School Membership (PSSM-Brief)

All items rated on a 5-point scale (1 = completely false, 5 = completely true)

I feel a real part of my school	1	2	3	4	5
People notice when I'm good at something	1	2	3	4	5
Other students in this school take my opinions seriously	1	2	3	4	5
Most teachers at my school are interested in me	1	2	3	4	5
There's at least one teacher or adult in this school I can talk to if I have a problem	1	2	3	4	5
People at this school are friendly to me.	1	2	3	4	5
I am included in lots of activities at my school	1	2	3	4	5
I am treated with as much respect as other students	1	2	3	4	5
The teachers here respect me	1	2	3	4	5
People know I can do good work	1	2	3	4	5
Other students like the way I am	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D

Social Desirability Measure
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C Form C)

It is sometimes hard for me to go with work if I am not encouraged.	TRUE	FALSE
I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	TRUE	FALSE
On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability to succeed.	TRUE	FALSE
There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	TRUE	FALSE
No matter whom I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	TRUE	FALSE
There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	TRUE	FALSE
I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	TRUE	FALSE
I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	TRUE	FALSE
I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	TRUE	FALSE
I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different than mine.	TRUE	FALSE
There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	TRUE	FALSE
I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	TRUE	FALSE
I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	TRUE	FALSE

Appendix E
Demographic Questions

Are you a transfer student at [university]? [Choose one]

Yes

No

Do you live on campus or commute? [Choose one]

Live on Campus

Commute

What is your current class level? [Choose one]

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Graduate

Non-Degree

What is your major? [Choose from drop-down menu]

What is your gender? [Choose one]

Male

Female

How old are you? [Choose one]

Under 18 years

18 – 19

20-21

22-24

25-29

30-34

35-39

40-49

50-64

65 and over

What is your marital status? [Choose one]

- Single, never married
- Married
- Widowed
- Separated or divorced

What is your religious preference? [Choose one]

- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Protestant
- No preference
- Other (Please specify in the text box)

What racial group(s) do you identify with? [Choose all that apply]

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hawaiian Native or other Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- White or Caucasian
- Other: Please specify

Are you the first in your family to attend college? [Choose one]

- Yes
- No